

Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan North
Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan South

Summary of comments received during the publicity period on the submitted plans.

The Submitted Great Linford Parish Neighbourhood Plans North and South were publicised between 10th August and 21st September 2015.

Four comments were received during the publicity period as follows:

Response reference	Respondent	Summary of comments
GLPC1	Natural England	No comments on either Plan.
GLPC2	David Lock Associates on behalf of Pete Winkelman	<p>Comments on Great Linford Neighbourhood Plan North: Welcome the production of the two Neighbourhood Plans</p> <p>Policy N6 - welcome the amendment to the policy which permits developments within residential gardens when it can be demonstrated that the benefits outweigh any dis-benefits.</p> <p>Policy GLPC N14A – We support that new development must demonstrate that any proposals within the setting of a listed building should pay due regard to the need to conserve and enhance this setting and therefore supports Policy GLPC N14A.</p> <p>Policy GLPC N14B – The additional of Policy GLPC N14B is supported particularly in relation to Great Linford Manor and its former parkland much of which is now embraced with a Management Plan. This Plan with the proposed Neighbourhood Plan seeks to protect and secure the future of historic buildings and there setting in the park, accepting that small scale, well designed, enabling works may be required within the grounds. Further to our representations to the pre-submission we support the link between this</p>

		<p>policy and ‘Policy GLPC N6 – Gardens development.’</p> <p>Other Comments We note and welcome the Parish Councils ambitions for Marsh Drive, it is felt that these ambitions may benefit from an additional tier of policy support in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
GLPC3	Milton Keynes Council, Development Plans Team	<p>To reiterate comments made on the draft Neighbourhood Plans, a number of policies in both Plans use the word “appropriate” when stating what should be provided (for example, Policy GLPC S1 “<i>New developments must ensure that: c) they include appropriate provisions for access and parking</i>”). Words such as “adequate” and “suitable” are also used in the context of the level or standard of provision (eg Policy GLPC S1 again “<i>Landscaping is provided and maintained to a suitable standard</i>”). The concern is that by using these terms , the policies are in danger of being unclear and difficult to interpret.</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance states that “<i>A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence.</i> “</p> <p>Whilst not a matter relating to the Plans’ compliance with the basic conditions in themselves, this concern does relate to the effectiveness of the Plans and we would welcome the views of the Examiner on this.</p>
GLPC4	Mr R. Merrington	<p>I am of the opinion that the current Draft Plan fails to recognise the existence of the Bridleway and Horse Trail network through the area and beyond. These facilities are essential components of the green spaces and their existence and protection need to be referred to in the Plan.</p>

		<p>As a Neighbourhood Plan I support most of the Policies In particular that of GLCP 4. The paddocks are an amenity for local residents and I trust will be protected. I suggest that para 6.1.6 and the attached Parks Trust Plan is not relevant to the GLPC Plan. The sites (paddocks) have not been identified in any MKC documents but were put out for informal consultation by the Parks Trust. In my view the Parks Trust finances should have no bearing on the Plan or its policies.</p>
--	--	--

