Responses to Woughton Neighbourhood Plan Submission

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Person/body** | **Responses** |
| Virginia Bell | I am requesting that the points raised in these comments should be emphasised, or at least mentioned, in the Plan or the notes joined to the Plan.  The Basic Conditions referred to by the comments:-  (1) Localism Act 2011 Test 2 – The Plan should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development  (2) Localism Act 2011 Test 4 - The Plan should comply with EU obligations c) Habitat Directive, which protects endemic species of plants and animals and their habitats, as well as endangered and valued species.  (3)  Local Plan Policy NE1 – protect conservation sites  (4)  Local Plan Policy HE6 – protect conservation areas  (5) Core Strategy Policy  CS12 – support sustainable lifestyles  (6) Core Strategy Policy CS18 – reduce deprivation and health inequalities  (7) Section 106 Agreement – compensatory contributions from the developer                                         ========================================  Policy WN4 Neighbouring nature reserves and SSI’s should be protected from development (2), (3), (4)  Policy WN4 Discourage high maintenance of landscapes (eg constant mowing, using bedding plants) for the following reasons:-1)helping wildlife 2)lower costs 3)the contrast of a mowed  3-6 feet next to the road , with the rest left uncut, is very attractive and looks neat and tidy (1)  Policy WN6 Bucks and Milton Keynes Environmental Records 2016 shows that the Woughton Neighbourhood Plan area contains:-  1 Local Wildlife Site 83NO1 Bleak Hall Railway Cutting  2 Five of the Wildlife Corridors are overlapped by the WNP area  3 Biological Notification Site Grand Union Canal in Tinkers Bridge  Whatever the Statutory status of the above sites, they are precious and can only grow in value as time goes by. They should be protected. Of the 3 areas, only the Grand Union Canal in Peartree Bridge/Tinkers Bridge is listed as a WN6 Designated Local Green Space to be protected. Please list Bleak Hall Railway Cutting and the 5 Wildlife Corridors for protection in the Neighbourhood Plan (2), (3), (4)  Policy WN8 Emphasise the need for wild areas which need little or no management (2)  In allotments, community gardens and orchards, discourage chemical sprays and encourage                                              organic methods of cultivation. This will educate about and promote appreciation for quality                             of life, as well as sustainability (1), (5), (6)  Policy WN9 Mears Group plc (or whomever) should be asked to source their building materials as greenly as possible, for sustainability and for good ethical practice (1)  Policy WN9 Mears Group plc should avoid causing suffering to wildlife before and during development. Also they should not pile topsoil high as this kills all life in the soil (1), (2), (7)  Policy WN9 Mears Group plc should be told to plant according to sustainability (ie less need for maintenance and resources), so plant native, hardy species of flowers and plants (1), (2), (7)  Policy WN9 A maximum building height is not very important compared to the efficient use of land obtained by building upwards  Policy WN13 Air pollution can be a problem on some days for people waiting at the bus stops on the V7 Saxon Street dividing Beanhill and Netherfield. This should be monitored (5), (6)  Policy WN15 Can we have a shop selling healthy and ethical and sustainable food? That is, fruit and vegetables, which are organic, which are vegan, and which are locally produced (or at least have not arrived by ship or plane). Such a shop could be merged with another facility to save costs, eg a healthy living facility (5), (6)  Policy WN18 and Policy WN3 Rather than have people dependent on the health services, set up a community project based at a community centre or meeting place in Woughton which educates about basic healthy living. The WHO has info on healthy food. There can be education about the benefits of 5/10 a day fruit and veg, the benefits of organic food, what foods cause cancer, and so on. There can be exercise days. There can be fire drill days. There can be safety in the home days, and how to deal with minor accidents and illnesses instead of rushing to A&E. Pharmacies have leaflets about illnesses. This facility would have leaflets encouraging healthy living. (5), (6)  Policy WN20 and WN21 and WN22 Solar power could be used for street lighting, or white LED lights, or no lighting where possible (1), (7) |
| Karen Goss, Clerk to Emberton Parish Council | Emberton Parish Council has no objection to the Woughton Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Peter Hobson | We bought our bungalow in good faith in September 2014, totally unaware of the planned redevelopment of Beanhill, based on its size, location and price, and proceeded to spend a great deal of money refurbishing the property so that it would could be our last home, however since we learnt of the councils redevelopment plans we have now had to stop investing in our home.  Whilst I appreciate that you are trying to increase the population density in these Woughton grid squares as well as improving the housing stock, parking is already an issue especially during home games for the MK Dons and the through route from Neapland to Tandra is sometimes nearly impassable. Wider roads will mean less garden space of which there is currently very little.  Within the documents, WN9 claims you will maintain the character of the Woughton grid squares, but it goes on to say you will build 2 & 3 storey dwellings with a few bungalows. Beanhill IS bungalows.  WN21 says households required to relocate must be given the opportunity to return to a smaller dwelling in the same grid square. This ignores the 29.6% of owned property, what will happen to them? When the announcement is made on the redevelopment of Beanhill and the regeneration of other squares, the privately owned properties will become blighted and the values will be artificially depressed by the council’s actions. How then can homeowners find equivalent properties when their homes start losing value by the day, where do we find the extra capital requirement and the moving costs and legal fees that the council is imposing upon us?  WN22 says there will be a community vote which will have no effect if it goes against you (3.80) so what is the point.  This has been thrust upon us and we feel that we will be badly treated as nothing has been said to the contrary and we will not be able to get further mortgages on our pension. |
| Stephanie Buller, AVDC | Aylesbury Vale District Council has no comments to make on this Neighbourhood Plan. |
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MKC comments on Woughton Neighbourhood Plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MKC Archaeological Team | No comment. |
| MKC Housing Policy & Development | We were pleased to see that **Policy WN7** was reworded as we suggested with regards to the loss of trees.  There is still a slight concern around **Policy W10**. The Plan understandably aims to establish some fundamental principles to deliver the kind of place that the local community wants, especially if redevelopment of one or more of the regeneration Grid Squares is proposed and that it sets a series of principles for master planning, rather than prescribe the master planning process itself.  More detailed comments will no doubt be forthcoming from the Council’s regeneration partner, YourMK who will be best placed to make an informed comment.  However, our query remains about Item E of this policy which states that:  ***All existing social rented homes will either be retained or refurbished or will be replaced by another social rented home in the same Grid Square so that there will be no net loss in the total number of social rented homes***  Whilst we do not have a problem per se with this aim, we would query whether this is actually a planning matter within the definition of the Neighbourhood Plan process.  The text that accompanies the policy states  that *‘……the regeneration schemes must be economically and technically viable if they are to succeed’* and we support this statement.  So we would prefer it if **item E** could be re-worded slightly as follows:  ***All existing social rented homes will either be retained or refurbished or will be replaced by another social rented home in the same Grid Square so that there will be no net loss in the total number of social rented homes.  Any departure from this principle will only be allowed if it can be satisfactorily demonstrated & supported on economic and technical viability grounds.*** |
| MKC  (Comments from pre-submission of WNP) | Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft neighbourhood plan.  MKC recognises the changes made to the Woughton Neighbourhood Plan in light of the MKC comments on the pre-submission draft version of the WNP. However there are a few remaining comments from pre-submission draft version;   1. **WN9: Housing Design – Comments from Housing Service and Planning**   It was recommended that the first sentence of the policy be amended to say:  “**Subject to viability**, proposals for new homes should seek to maintain a distinct Milton Keynes appearance and character, as defined by the Milton Keynes New Residential Development Design Guide, and should have a specific regard to the following design principles:”   1. **WN10: Housing Mix in Regeneration Grid Squares – Comments from Housing Service and Planning**   It was recommended that the first sentence of the policy be amended to say:  “**Subject to viability**, proposals for the refurbishment and redevelopment of existing housing in one or more Grid Squares designated for regeneration should have full regard to the following…”. There is a reference to viability in para 3.34 but this should be elevated to the policy wording in order to reflect the requirements of the NPPF.   1. **Item E:**   “All existing social rented homes will either be retained or refurbished or will be replaced by another social rented home in the same Grid Square so that there will be no net loss in the total number of social rented homes”  Whilst we do not have a problem per se with this aim, we would query whether this is actually a planning matter within the definition of a Neighbourhood Plan process.   1. **Policy WN12: Houses in Multiple Occupancy**   (3.45) “This is especially acute in the estates of Tinkers Bridge, Netherfield, and Peartree Bridge and therefore this policy seeks to reduce the numbers of HMOs in those areas only, while maintaining the SPD levels in all other estates (see evidence base).”  There are no provisions within planning to reduce the existing numbers of HMOs or SPDs in other estates, this is market driven. So we recommend that this paragraph is taken out.   1. **Policy WN23 Regeneration: Masterplanning - comments from Planning and Urban Design**   Whilst the approach to the preparation of a masterplan for a regeneration scheme would normally follow the stages outlined in the policy (evidence gathering, informal consultation, draft , formal consultation and final plan), the requirement for an independent examination and community vote is not a recognised approach. There are no provisions in the planning legislation for this hybrid approach. Furthermore, there would be cost implications of both the examination and the vote – it is assumed that the implication is that Milton Keynes Council would carry this cost, but there is no budgetary provision for this.  However item 14.1 of the Action Plan that accompanies the Council Plan 2016 states as follows:  *“14.1 Ensure community-led plans for every priority regeneration estate, and hold a referendum for every individual plan, as a “double lock” for communities.”*  It is therefore recommended that the reference to the examination and community vote should be removed and replaced with reference to the commitment to a referendum in the Council Plan.  In terms of the process to prepare th4 masterplans, the emphasis should be on early and continuous engagement with the local community as a way of ensuring that they have a full and effective role in the masterplanning of their area.  Para 3.73, in acknowledging that “*The precise arrangements of this process can be determined at a later stage”* recognises that the cost and practical implications of the examination and vote proposal are unknown at the time of preparing the plan and could therefore represent an onerous requirement for Milton Keynes Council and Your:MK. This statement could be removed if the changes recommended above are implemented. |
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