



## Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan

### Summary of responses received to Regulation 16 publicity period

Canal & Rivers Trust	No comments.
National Grid	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus. National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.
Natural England	<p>In our review of the Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan we note that there are no designated sites or protected landscapes within or near the Neighbourhood Plan area and there are less than 500 additional dwelling sites or 1000 sqm of commercial sites proposed. As a result we have no specific comment to make.</p> <p><u>Further Recommendations</u></p> <p>Natural England would also like to highlight that removal of green space in favour of development may have serious impacts on biodiversity and connected habitat and therefore species ability to adapt to climate change. We recommend that the final neighbourhood plan include:</p> <p>Policies around connected Green Infrastructure (GI) within the parish. Elements of GI such as open green space, wild green space, allotments, and green walls and roofs can all be used to create connected habitats suitable for species adaptation to climate change. Green infrastructure also provides multiple benefits for people including recreation, health and well-being, access to nature, opportunities for food growing, and resilience to climate change.</p>
Anglian Water	<p><b>SNP2 Local Green Space Designation</b></p> <p>We note that changes have been in response to our previous comments on the wording of Policy SNP2 of the Second Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The policy as drafted now states development within designated Local Green Spaces will be allowed in exceptional circumstances where the benefits clearly outweigh the harm.</p> <p>We are supportive of the policy as drafted assuming that infrastructure provided by Anglian Water would constitute an exception to this policy.</p>
Chris Lloyd	<p>I am a resident of Bancroft and I wish to raise my concerns regarding the proposed parking plans for Hadrians Drive, Bancroft. As I understand it, the plan proposes reducing the grass verges to make way for parking spaces.</p> <p>We already have a major problem on Hadrians Drive with non residents</p>

	<p>using it as a cut through from H2 to H3 and the speed of this traffic along this road. This has been proved by the recent use of speed monitoring equipment and the results posted in the latest edition of the Stantonbury Parish News magazine.</p> <p>My concern is that by providing parking spaces which are set back from the road, you are in effect opening up the road which in turn will encourage more through traffic as well as speeding. There are currently no traffic calming measures in place along Hadrians Drive.</p> <p>Considering the close proximity to Bancroft preschool and the park and play area, surely encouraging more speeding traffic along Hadrians Drive is the last thing we need.</p> <p>While I acknowledge that parking on grass verges is a problem along Hadrians Drive, surely wooden posts placed along the roadside edge of the verges is a much more cost effective way of preventing this.</p> <p>Hadrians Drive is wide enough to allow parking on the roadside and not hinder traffic without the need for setback parking spaces.</p>
Emma Wilson	<p>I would like to express my concerns with the new plans to shorten the grass verges down Hadrians Drive.</p> <p>Although this will help with visits to the park and centre.</p> <p>Those will only clear the path for the speeder and people that use Hadrians Drive as a cut through speeds clocked up to 65mph giving a clear run. Our children and pets are in danger. My son has severe anxiety, asd and has no concept of running into the road at all. Also the speed of some cars that backfire have caused him to be sick due to the loud bang noises they make.</p> <p>Please can we put something in place to stop Hadrians Drive being a cut through. Speed cameras or speed bumps.</p>
Mrs McBride	<p>I am writing to register my objection with regard to the proposed dwellings on the 0.2 hectares of land on the corner of Mathieson Road/Bradwell Road in Bradville.</p> <p>That area of land is next door to a care home and Mathieson Road is already very dangerous due to a) the amount of cars using it as a cut through at peak times and b) the cars belonging to the care home staff which park along one side of it effectively reducing the road to a single track road.</p> <p>Driving up and down that section of Road is extremely difficult and dangerous already because of these issues and adding 7 more houses adds the potential for at least 7 more cars but more likely 14 more cars upwards, plus visitors/delivery vehicles, etc.</p> <p>Attempting to cross the road at any point between the roundabout where the proposed new houses would be and V6 is almost impossible at peak times and anything that adds to this already high risk would increase the chances of accidents.</p> <p>Even if the proposed houses had parking spaces there are bound to be residents and visitors parking out on Mathieson Road, adding to the chaos already caused by the care home staff and visitors. Mathieson Road would effectively become almost impossible to drive up or down most of the time.</p> <p>Unless there is a plan to put yellow lines down both sides of Mathieson Road I strongly object to the proposed development and suggest members of the planning committee bring themselves a chair and a cup</p>

	<p>of tea and sit on that piece of land between 7.30-9am or 2.30-4pm on a weekday during school term time to see what I mean.</p>
Adam Taylor	<p>I write to voice my comments on the proposed future development of the site labelled SNP 10 MATHIESEN ROAD within the Standtonbury Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Whilst I am not specifically against development of this site, this has been open space available to the public for decades. This site is on the corner of a busy junction and one of the main arteries into the estate, especially the south end of Bradville including Bradwell Road, Eston Court, Bishopstone, Wallingford and Withington. Development of this site will not only cause serious traffic congestion during the building itself, but also ongoing difficulty in access to the main V6 for residents of the south side of Bradville due to increased traffic and reduced visibility at the junction. Many of the other sites on the development plan are much more worthy candidates as many are derelict and in desperate need of regeneration. Whilst I appreciate these sites may carry more of a cost to develop they will have a much greater effect on the overall community and provide accommodation for new families in areas that are currently causing only antisocial issues – for example the garage site at Ormonde and Rowle Close which is a disgrace to the local community and parish council.</p> <p>I am not specifically against development of the land at Mathiesen Road, but feel it would be better used by selling or leasing part of the land to the Mathiesen Centre as additional car parking and place double yellow lines to stop parking on the main Mathiesen Road – currently a major form of traffic issues accessing and exiting Bradville form the V6. The remaining land could be landscaped into a new family area which would greatly benefit the residents of Bradville South.</p> <p>Should permission for new homes be granted on the Matheisen Road site my feeling is that the conditions should be for a maximum of 5 homes, integrate a small landscaped area possibly with a play area for children, and major junction improvement works to include a better crossing and larger roundabout to ease traffic flow at busy times and allow the busses to navigate the junction more easily.</p>
Marshall MK AC	<p>I am writing as Chairman of Marshall Milton Keynes Athletic Club, which is based at the athletics stadium at Stantonbury Campus. There are two areas of concern for my club. On page 43 of the plan, there is a map showing areas identified (in black) for community facility/civic office. Area B contains around 30% of the car-park space for the athletics track. These car-park spaces are very frequently used in the evenings and at weekends for people who use the track, the tennis courts and the all-weather football pitches, and any diminution in their number would be seen as a retrograde step. If the area in blue (identified for an indoor sports facility), long campaigned for by the athletics club, comes into fruition, there will be a need for significantly more car-park spaces.</p> <p>Area D currently contains the compound and storage facility for the track. The building within the compound is used by the athletics club for weight training. It also contains the lighting switches and meters for the tennis court, all-weather football pitch and athletics stadium lights, and is very heavily used by the club.</p> <p>We would need to be very much involved in any potential change of use for either of these spaces.</p>

David Lock Associates	<p>DLA are proposing the development of a 0.84-acre site fronting the Grand Union Canal, accessed from the Wolverton Road, immediately east of Ryland Croft, Oakridge Park. It is located behind the existing pet shop. This site is known as Stantonbury Wharf and lies within the neighbourhood plan area. I enclose a site plan showing the extent of the land in red.</p> <p>The land is privately owned and not publicly accessible. It has historically been used for the storage of circus equipment and more recently as a caravan site for show people. There is a mixture of temporary built structures currently on site.</p> <p>DLA will be submitting an outline planning application seeking to secure the principle of residential development on the site for up to 9 homes. Pre-application advice was sought from MKC in June 2016 and a positive response was provided (16/01180/PRESMA). The draft Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan shows the land as Open Space (figure 2, page 19) as part of the Stanton Low Park and Stonepit Field and covered by policy SNP2 Local Green Space Designation. Policy SNP5 Housing Infill supports windfall development but not where it leads to the loss of open space identified in figure 2. The Stantonbury Wharf site is clearly not open space. The open space designation also includes the adjacent pet shop, customer car park and yard; none of which can be considered to be open space either. We believe the designation in figure 2 is an anomaly taken from the old adopted Local Plan Proposals Map.</p> <p>We suggest that this is simply a historic mapping mistake. This could be easily rectified by removing Stantonbury Wharf from the open space green annotation on figure 2 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan. This would provide greater accuracy for the plan and for residents.</p> <p>Stantonbury Parish is also invited to allocate the land for housing development in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is noted that of the sites currently proposed for residential development in the plan, site SNP10 Mathiesen Road is also designated Recreation and Open Space, SNP11 Wylie/Harrowden is amenity land and an open field and SNP12 Stanton School proposes residential development on part of the school field and orchard.</p> <p>The Stantonbury Wharf site is recognised by MKC as a sustainable location and its allocation has clear advantages.</p>
CMYK on behalf of MK Nominees and Talyor Wimpey (South Midlands)	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Vision (Page 8)</b>  <i>Support:</i> the vision outlined will enhance Stantonbury to the benefit of its residents and the wider community.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Plan Objectives (Page 8)</b>  <i>Support:</i> the objectives outlined will enhance Stantonbury to the benefit of its residents and the wider community.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Policies (Paragraph 52)</b>  <i>Support:</i> Stantonbury Parish Council's positive approach to development will enhance the area to the benefit of its residents and the wider community.</p> <p><b>Site Specific Policies (Paragraph 53)</b>  <i>Support:</i> Stantonbury Parish Council's ongoing engagement with landowners will ensure sites' deliverability and effectiveness in achieving the SNP's objectives.</p>

**Site Specific Policies (Paragraph 56)**

*Support:* SNP's identification of sites, where change is likely and the introduction of strategies to positively manage these, provides certainty and direction to all parties.

**Site Specific Policies (Paragraph 58)**

*Support:* SNP's use of site specific policies provides certainty and direction to all parties. However each proposal must be considered on its own merits and thus the policies should be applied in the context of other material considerations.

**Delivery of Site Based Policies (Paragraph 59)**

*Support:* SNP's use of site specific policies provides certainty and direction to all parties. However each proposal must be considered on its own merits and thus the policies should be applied in the context of other material considerations.

**Delivery of Site Based Policies (Paragraph 60)**

*Suggested Modification:* Each proposal must be considered on its own merits and thus the policies should be applied in the context of other material considerations. Suggest the wording of this paragraph be modified to: "*Applications should meet each of the policy criteria...*".

**Delivery of Site Based Policies (Paragraph 61)**

*Support:* SNP's use of site specific policies provides certainty and direction to all parties. However each proposal must be considered on its own merits and thus the policies should be applied in the context of other material considerations.

**Policy SNP1: Open Space & Leisure**

*Suggested Modification:* Each proposal must be considered on its own merits and thus the policies should be applied in the context of other material considerations. Open space should only be protected where it is of intrinsic value to its surroundings. There are cases, such as the land associated with Site SNP18, where neglected open space detracts from the quality of the area (for example by encouraging fly tipping and anti-social behaviour) and thus its purpose should be revisited to secure greater community benefit, such as regeneration, the ability to provide maintained, purposeful open space and, most importantly, enhancing the area's quality and functionality. A careful balance must be achieved between the value of less important landscape areas and the detrimental landscape impact uncontrolled parking and other anti-social behaviour can have. Furthermore, Stantonbury Parish Council have recognised that in some instances, such as the regeneration of Rowle Close, it may be appropriate to replace trees with low level planting to secure social as well as environmental benefit.

Accordingly, suggest the wording of Policy SNP1 be modified as follows:

- "*Subject to other material considerations, within the open space areas identified on Figure 2 (page 19) only development that supports the increased use or functionality of the open space will be encouraged and permitted.*"
- "*Proposals which involve justified loss of trees must include for their replacement with planting of similar species or low-level planting as appropriate.*"

**Figure 2: Open Space & Leisure**

*Suggested Modification:* Each proposal must be considered on its own

merits and thus the policies should be applied in the context of other material considerations. Open space should only be protected where it is of intrinsic value to its surroundings. There are cases, such as the land associated with Site SNP18, where neglected open space detracts from the quality of the area (for example by encouraging fly tipping and anti-social behaviour) and thus its purpose should be revisited to secure greater community benefit, such as regeneration, the ability to provide maintained, purposeful open space and, most importantly, enhancing the area's quality and functionality. As such the small area of open space located within Site SNP18 should not be identified as amenity land on Figure 2: in its current form it offers no amenity value; however, its purpose should be revisited as part of the Site SNP18 regeneration proposals (NPPF Paragraph 99).

***Policy SNP3: Parking Enhancements (Paragraph 76)***

*Support:* Parking inadequacies could be managed though development proposals considered on their own merits given the needs of the immediate area. For example, subject to securing an appropriate design, landscape and management solution it would be possible to formalise parking on the existing verges in the area immediately surrounding Site SNP18.

***Policy SNP3: Parking Enhancements (Figure 17)***

*Support:* The identification of land at Rowle Close for parking enhancements is supported.

***Policy SNP4: Design Principles***

*Support:* To a large extent the policy detail is appropriately worded, providing both flexibility and certainty.

*Suggested Modification:* The policy's insistence (i.e. 'must') does not accommodate innovative design solutions nor material considerations which may cause slight but appropriate deviation from the design principles. The wording of the introductory sentence must therefore be changed to 'should'. The last sentence should also be omitted from the policy. Such flexibility will ensure more place-appropriate design is pursued, thereby resulting in better site specific development outcomes.

***Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages***

*Support:* The regeneration of Site SNP18 provides a key catalyst for the regeneration of the area as a whole and has the potential not only to secure significant housing delivery but also provide for other community aspirations (NPPF Paragraph 69).

***Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages (Paragraph 139)***

*Support:* The description of the site is generally accurate.

***Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages (Paragraph 140)***

*Support:* The description of the site is generally accurate.

***Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages (Paragraph 141)***

*Support:* The poor state of Site SNP18 does result in parking on local amenity space, to the detriment of the local environment. The regeneration potential of this site can alleviate this issue and will result in environmental enhancements.

***Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages (Paragraph 143)***

*Support:* The description of engagement is generally accurate.

***Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages (Site Location Plan)***

*Suggested Modification:* the land required (and under control) to deliver

	<p>the Rowle Close regeneration extends further than that shown on the SNP Policy SNP18 site location plan. The red line plan below shows the extent of land associated with this regeneration opportunity. The SNP Policy SNP18 site location plan red line should be extended to reflect this.</p> <p><b>Policy SNP18 Rowle Close Garages</b></p> <p><i>Suggested Modification:</i> Whilst acknowledging the broad development aspirations of Policy SNP18 (NPPF Paragraph 125), we make the following comments to ensure that the associated aspirations are viable and therefore deliverable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density (a): existing development density in the area immediately around Site SNP18 is between 55.9 and 64.5 dwellings per hectare. Proposals should be considered on their own merits, for example innovative design may result in increased development density yet could also bring enhancements. Development must be appropriate to its context and in relation to overall objectives. Suggest Part (a) of the policy be modified to read “Housing density through the redevelopment of the red edged areas must respect and be appropriate to the density of the surrounding area.”,</li> <li>• Height (b): Proposals should be considered on their own merits, for example innovative design may result in increased development height yet could also bring enhancements. Development must be appropriate to its context and in relation to overall objectives. Suggest Part (b) of the policy be modified to read “Housing height through the redevelopment of the red edged areas must respect and be appropriate to surrounding building heights.”</li> </ul> <p><i>Support:</i> Whilst acknowledging the broad development aspirations of Policy SNP18 (NPPF Paragraph 125), we make the following comments to ensure that the associated aspirations are viable and therefore deliverable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement Parking (d): it is only proper that replacement parking provision should be secured for garage owners displaced by the regeneration of Site SNP18. Opportunities that offer the potential for more appropriate, better landscaped parking provision should be supported, for example through the use of the amenity land identified.</li> <li>• LEAP (f): Acknowledge the need for LEAP provision in the locality and consider the wording of this element of Policy SNP18 allows for appropriate flexibility, thereby ensuring the most beneficial, viable development outcome.</li> <li>• Landscaping Provision (g and h): landscaping can be used not only to enhance an area but also alleviate problems (such as parking).</li> </ul>
Jane Hudson	<p>I was very disappointed to</p> <p>a) only receive notification that any replies to the final plans for the proposed New Development of 35 Houses on the STANTON SCHOOL Orchard/Copse area and the Amenity Ground for a further 10 houses appeared in the Stantonbury Parish Newsletter which was delivered at the weekend. There was no previous notification to the residents of Naseby Court who attended the meeting in July 2018 on the whole refurbishment/New Development when we submitted objections and</p>

	<p>concerns at that time. <b>A plan showing how the housing will be built would be much appreciated.</b></p> <p>b) There is no mention anywhere of my concerns that this Orchard/Copse area was given to the Stanton School in 1975 under a Deed of Trust between the MK Council (they were handed this from Bucks Co. Co) and the Trustees of Stanton School and as I was given to understand with a Stipend of £8,000 p.a. to maintain same. What happens to this Stipend. How IS this DEED OF COVENANT being overturned and who determines how the land should be used.</p> <p>c) Under the Freedom of Information Act we have been completely stonewalled by Planning Dept at the Council who have not replied to several requests for information of how or when the Planning Application has or will be made.</p> <p>d) All Parish Council Minutes when debating any of these matters go into closed session and therefore Minutes are not available under the Freedom of Information Act when requested.</p> <p>e) The Amenities Ground which backs onto the residents of Nos. 1 – 5 Naseby Court were all assured that this ground would never be built on as all the pipes, sewers etc ran under this land and all the excess water also runs away under this land resulting in a full ditch of water at the bottom during the winter months. What allowances have been made to absorb all this excess water.</p> <p>None of these concerns were mentioned in spite of our completing the forms and speaking to the Parish Councillors and MK Council Representative at the time back in August 2018.</p>
Milton Keynes Council (Housing)	<p>Overall, the housing service supports the objectives of the Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan, in particular objective three, to <i>improve the quality of the housing stock and broaden the range of new homes for the benefit of the existing communities and attract new residents.</i></p> <p><u>With specific reference to SNP14: North Bradville Regeneration</u>, we have the following comments:</p> <p>We support the key commitment for Stantonbury Parish Council to engage with Milton Keynes Council and the designated developers to promote clear communication with residents throughout the regeneration programme. We are committed to working with the Parish Council and other local community groups to facilitate community consultation with all residents of the regeneration area to enable and maximise engagement in the process.</p> <p>SNP 14 c) We would question the 50% open space provision given that the current site plan appears to show less than this. This would limit the options available for residents to consider as part of the regeneration programme. The quality of the open space is as important as the amount. Retaining and enhancing the amount of open space currently enjoyed should be the minimum requirement. In terms of regeneration, future investment should focus on enhancing and improving the existing open space provision with a commitment to enlarge it where viable.</p> <p>SNP 14 d) Regeneration will be community led and will be subject to a ballot of eligible residents and organisations, in line with the principles established on Fullers Slade. Options put forward for ballot will be agreed with the local community. Whilst the Council would always seek to achieve a density in line with the neighbourhood plan, it should be</p>



acknowledged that it may be necessary to exceed this in order to be viable. Viability would be tested throughout the consultation phase.

SNP 14 f) Bedroom numbers should be based on evidenced housing need (Strategic Housing Market Assessment) and a local housing needs survey that will be carried out as part of the consultation phase of regeneration and not limited to 2 and 3 bedroom homes.

SNP 14 i) We support the 5% target for single storey / ground floor homes and would suggest going further by stating these properties should be built specifically for people with mobility issues and disabilities.

SNP 14 k) Bedroom numbers should be based on evidenced affordable housing need (Strategic Housing Market Assessment and supplementary evidence from the MKC Housing service) and a local housing needs survey that will be carried out as part of the consultation phase of regeneration and not limited to 2 and 3 bedroom homes.

SNP 14 m) Any regeneration project would look to support local people's views. If we are able to meet these requirements and deliver a viable scheme then we will do, but recognise that these are matters that will need to be tested for viability and cannot be guaranteed if they render a scheme not viable.

SNP 14 n) Sheltered accommodation is not currently in great demand in Milton Keynes. Any decisions regarding the development of sheltered accommodation should be based on up to date evidenced need, available from the MKC housing service.

With specific reference to SNP 6: Houses in Multiple Occupation, we have the following comments:

In relation to the key commitment that Stantonbury Parish Council will hold a register of potential HiMO's identified by Parish Councillors or reported to them by residents, the housing service is concerned about this as there is no legal instrument that allows the Parish Council to hold a register of HiMO's. MKC as the Local Housing Authority is required by law to hold such a register and even then we receive many challenges from landlords who appear on the register. Holding such a register could potentially put the Parish in breach of GDPR and it may, therefore, need to seek legal advice.

SNP b) states that HiMO development will only normally be supported for semi-detached or terraced houses where a noise assessment demonstrates that there will be no negative impact on neighbouring properties through internal walls. Noise assessments are only carried out by the council where there is a specific noise nuisance between neighbours, usually investigated initially by the Environmental Health/Anti-Social Behaviour teams. Where there is a planning application with a perceived noise problem from the development, the Environmental Health team or the Planning team may request that a noise impact assessment is carried out; this is usually carried out by a noise consultant on behalf of a developer making the planning application, and will inform the planning team when considering the planning application. We would therefore request that this section be clarified.

Para 88. In the context states that this policy complements the existing Milton Keynes Council policy and SPD and ensures that should the Council policy be deleted and not replaced in the emerging Plan:MK, the key

	<p>requirements are retained in the Neighbourhood Plan. This may not be a realistic expectation as a Neighbourhood plan must be in general conformity with the Local Plan and the housing service seeks clarification from the Local Planning Authority on how planning applications would be considered in the event that the Local Plan is amended to remove these key policy areas.</p>
Kevin & Christine Smith	<p>We would like to express our frustration about how the Neighbourhood Plan has been developed, specifically the plan identified as SNP 12 Stanton School. As you know, this suggests a new housing development covering part of the school land and also the park (defined as amenity land) behind Naseby Court.</p> <p>Despite the fine words expressed in the Neighbourhood Plan document, there has never been any direct engagement with the residents of Naseby Court about these plans. The first time we became aware of them was when they were mentioned at the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018 Community Drop-in event at the Bradville Hall Community Centre. We did not attend said event, as the SNP 12 Stanton School plan was not publicised in advance. Luckily some friends, who do not live in Naseby Court, attended the meeting because they had an interest in a property on Harrowden which they thought would be discussed.</p> <p>Subsequent to this, both we and our next door neighbour - whose property is adjacent to Stanton School - have tried to find out more details of the plans. We have not been able to do so. We attended an engagement event together on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2018 on Redbridge, Stantonbury, where we asked why the residents of Naseby Court had not been consulted. We were told by the Neighbourhood Plan Project Manager that we had been sent leaflets about the plans; this is just not true. We explained that nobody we know in Naseby Court had received ANY direct communication on this.</p> <p>At this event, we and our neighbour submitted statements on the forms provided, detailing our objections to these plans, together with complaints about the lack of consultation.</p> <p>Neither of our statements is documented in the Consultation Statement that has been produced. Why have our statements not been included? In fact, there are no statements at all by any resident, that cover the Stanton School development – a damning judgement on the lack of engagement with the key resident stakeholders for this particular plan.</p> <p>I note that “representatives from the (Stanton School) federation have been on the NPSG since the outset. The policy has been developed with their full support” – but with zero input from the residents most effected. Is this a fair and democratic process?</p> <p>We would also like to highlight that the first we became aware of the deadline for final comments on the plan was via the Parish Newsletter delivered to us only last weekend – this just adds to a pattern of failure to consult properly.</p> <p>On the specific merits of the plan itself, I would like to point out some obvious issues:</p> <p>1/ Environmental – Why was no Local Green Space Designation considered for the park behind Naseby Court? As well as the splendid trees, it is the home of a variety of wildlife and provides a rare oasis of quiet in the middle of</p>

	<p>existing housing. Other nearby green spaces are primarily open fields in comparison.</p> <p>- How is it possible for the ancient copse (described as an orchard) on Stanton School land to be built on? My understanding is that it has a deed of covenant applied to it?</p> <p>- Surrounding Naseby Court with houses will destroy the peace of the area.</p> <p>2/ Safety</p> <p>– Mercers Drive is already a rat route used by commuters. There are regular incidents of speeding and cars parked on the road in unsafe places. This is a threat to the residents of the area, particularly school children walking to and from Stanton and Pepper Hill Schools and Stantonbury International School. Adding an additional 40+ homes is only going to increase the problem.</p> <p>No doubt we would have other concerns but as we cannot obtain any detailed information on the plans despite freedom of information requests by my neighbour – we will have to reserve them for another day.</p>
Gareth Williams	<p>As a resident of Bancroft Park, I would like to firstly say that I agree with the plan as a whole. It is very detailed and easy to read.</p> <p>As I am only a resident of Bancroft Park, I can ultimately only comment on SNP15 as this directly affects me.</p> <p>With regards to SNP15.A (The visitors centre):</p> <p>Is a visitors centre a suitable use of funds? The MK museum is 1/2 mile away which could contain more information about the roman villa, or, rather than driving traffic to the museum surely the funds would be better spent improving the current plaques installed at the villa alongside actually preserving the remains?</p> <p>Overall, I am happy for the plans to increase awareness about the roman villa and its history. I just don't believe building a visitors centre to be the best solution.</p> <p>With regards to SNP15.B (The neighbourhood play facility):</p> <p>Surely this wasn't thought through? The existing play facility at the other side of the park by Bancroft Pre School has just completed a full refurbishment. Why does this not suffice?</p> <p>What would another play facility, that is not located near any existing paths/parking bring to the area? Especially at the detriment of the existing "orchard".</p> <p>Has security been addressed? The potential for anti-social behaviour? Lighting which would affect residents which back onto the park, like myself? The extra vehicle traffic to a cul-de-sac or having to build more parking on existing green spaces?</p> <p>If you're determined to add community facilities, why not regenerate the allotment from the few apple trees into something like a community garden/vegetable patch?</p> <p>The existing play facility on Bancroft Park could probably use some attention rather than building another one.</p>
J Chawla	<p>As a home owner in Naseby Court mk13 that you have failed to see as a concern or home owner with an obligatory duty to, I write this with the upmost concern and objection to the news of a new housing development planned on being erected surrounding my property.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to congratulate you on achieving the simple task of</p>

locating ownership of the land between Naseby Court and Staunton middle school. Something that proved to be an impossible task for those employed with authority in this presumably straight forward department, for many years, when I made contact multiple times regarding the maintenance of said land that was directly affecting my property negatively, and also when enquiring about purchasing a section of this land for home improvement that would also benefit funding within whatever department that had responsibility of the land that was fully abandoned.

No one took ownership for the land, it appeared to be of no parties responsibility or owned by any party/local authority at all as I was repeatedly told over a number of years. It was implied that the land appeared legally to not even exist?

With this I ask how anyone has been able to have planning for development agreed for land that isn't registered under any authority? Or whether I had in fact been repeatedly lied to by employees who shockingly are unequipped, uneducated or simply too lazy to do their job, a job in the civil sector which I along with the rest of the country enable by paying taxes to provide these services that are supposedly provided for us?

Secondly, I am outraged that no planning proposal was outlined or forwarded to the residents and home owners of Naseby Court previous to acceptance? I understand that you have an obligation to have informed us of any planning proposals and have stated that you did indeed do this however, I confirm to you that not one property owner in Naseby Court has received any such information and the first we have heard of any of this was in a generic parish council newsletter.

Maybe you assumed it was sent out by the same department who had such difficulty in gaining the simple knowledge of locating or acknowledgement that this land even existed as stated above?

I would like for you to please forward a copy of the documentation that was neglected to be sent out to home owners with proof of evidence that this has previously been done and that it hasn't in fact been wrongly kept from us.

There are many concerns regarding this planning proposal such as increased population in such a small area without adequate facilities, increased traffic and parking problems in an already problem area also raising safety issues for children accessing the nearby recreation facilities and schools. The negative financial impact on our properties, privacy issues not only for the existing dynamic to Naseby Court but with the proximity to my own property and that my property was purchased with surrounding privacy being a factor, the existing structure and access layout to Naseby court being affected, heightened security and crime risk due to not only an increased population in such a small area but the access that would then be directly available, this in turn would not only affect the property value negatively but as suggested but also increase insurance and such like costs.

Naseby Court is currently one of the more desirable streets on bradville this status will no doubt no longer be the case whilst you continue to surround us with an over populated area, this would be the second time after the building on Hume Close and its neighbouring Street which also

	<p>took away the history and charm of the existing original farm house and the health of its elderly owner, with socially questionable, and not in a positive way, residents.</p> <p>I look forward to reviewing the requested documents and evidence, proposed solutions or answers to the valid objections raised, an official meeting for the concerned home owners in Naseby Court and a proposed financial compensation plan for those affected if this planning should go ahead, before any official consent occurs of course, meeting the duty of responsibility by yourself that to date has been neglected in many ways. I would like to hope that this won't come to being resolved in a justifiable legal case raised by the Home owners of Naseby Court, and that it is handled efficiently in an unbiased way, not in the usual Manor of home owners and upstanding members of the community being ignored and affected negatively in the pursuit of financial gain by yourselves.</p>
Rebecca Williams	<p>I am writing in regards to the Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan proposed changes to the area designated "Site B".</p> <p>I only moved to Bancroft Park last year, but chose this location due to it's quietness (regardless of train traffic) and proximity to a dog friendly walking park. Upon seeing the proposed idea (on Monday 4th, I did not hear or see any such plan before Monday) to install a playground where the Orchard is has horrified me. My objections and considerations of this proposed change will not be articulately described in this email, but please consider them regardless:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site B is a remote location, and such poses a child protection risk as well as an antisocial behaviour risk. This location cannot be viewed from anywhere else, unless you propose to rip out all the vegetation (I'll get to that later). Children play areas should not be built whereby they are sheltered from public view, mostly to prevent untoward occurrences happening there - such an isolated area would be easy pickings for a child molester or rapist but also older children and young adults that prefer to destroy things rather than build them will have a field day in such a location - unless CCTV is due to be installed and monitored.</li> <li>2. This area is a peaceful area that many dog-walkers love to walk through to safely let their dogs off lead, away from the main roads and away from picnic areas or other children play areas. Many parks in MK have lakes in them which are full of (amazing) birds and waterfowl, which means many of us have to walk around those (gladly) with our dogs on lead. At Bancroft, we can let them go a little more.</li> <li>3. The surrounding paths are not maintained very well, and even more traffic on these paths would create a bog. If you care about those of us that walk in this area at all then those paths would be maintained yearly. So if we are not under 8, does no one in the Parish Council care? More should be invested in encouraging dog walkers to pick up after their mess, it is a scourge on society but there are not enough dog poo bins. I'd also say that more should be done to encourage disabled people and older people to access the park. Maintaining adequate paths would go along way towards this.</li> <li>4. There is only 1 road in and out of Bancroft Park. If you are</li> </ol>

proposing to increase this traffic by trying to attract people to the park with a visitors centre (not entirely happy with that either, but lesser of two evils and all that) then attracting more people to a play area will incur an even higher traffic count. And yes, people will have to drive to this park - unless you live on Bancroft Park, Site B is at least 0.5KM from any other area - even those that live on Lullingstone Drive would be walking almost 0.5KM. Which means either Constantine Way and/or Willowford would see parking on the road or verges (unacceptable) or you would need to destroy more of the park to create a car park (this would suggest having to also drive a car through the park, which is actually crazy). If people are supposed to park at the "visitors centre" car park, then why would these people not just go to the new play area on Bancroft just over the bridge. It is already almost a one lane street with residents parking on the road. This would be unfair to those of us who chose to live here BECAUSE of the lack of amenities. We don't want a shop, ANOTHER play area etc. Even the space next to the H2 bridge would be a better location (though I guess that's parks trust land, not council land).

5. If people have to drive to get to a play park, why not direct them or why would they not choose to go to Stanton Low? An impressive play area, a BMX track, an open field area and a walk to the canal and church ruins. Far more substantial and far less intrusive to this population.
6. There is a small play area on Constantine Way - why not improve that? And expand it to the grassy area adjacent to it? It would be in full view of the road area and opposite the Roman Ruins? Much safer as long as there is an adequate fence around it.
7. Bringing me to my last point, ecology. This area of Bancroft Park has stood for well over 30years as it is. It is home to countless species, of which, have more of a right to be there than a play area. The trees provide some protection against the noise of the trains, so removing them is out of the question. The orchard itself is in a poor condition, but I would rather see the area regenerated to a quiet, reflective zone than a play park that holds inherent dangers (especially if an accident occurs and a child is unable to get to safety and/or an ambulance has to drive through the park to reach them). It would be fabulous to have a community garden, picnic zones and benches to sit at.

My issue is really that none of the proposed changes to Bancroft Park will directly enhance the lives of those of us that actually live in Bancroft Park. We already have access to a wonderful parkland, that already has a great new play area. I doubt anyone that lives on Bancroft Park would frequent the "visitor's centre" because the park is already adequate enough and people can just go home to have a cup of tea. So what will these changes actually bring, except stress? Why does the council insist on building on every square inch of land it owes? Oh wait...ah yes, money. You can't replace those garages with a play area because it means you won't get your windfall amount of money from building houses on it. But of course, you are quite happy to destroy the natural beauty of a park area to pretend you're doing something to help parents entertain their child for

	<p>free. I will vote against the proposed changes to Bancroft Park, if I am afforded the opportunity.</p>
Lawrence Morgan	<p>To meet SNP Objective #3 "Improve the quality of the housing stock and broaden the range of new homes for the benefit of the existing communities and attract new residents"</p> <p>I would like to suggest the inclusion of "<a href="#">community-led Housing</a>" to be able to meet the housing need with the community truly at its core of develop and provide what residents of Stantonbury need. "Genuinely affordable" homes beyond the gov definition of 80% of market and keeps properties actually affordable in perpetuity. Also community-led housing is able to complete small scale development of areas where commercial developers would not see a viable.</p>
Jake Taylor	<p>I have recently been informed of the plan to redevelop a range of areas of Stantonbury Parish and write with specific regard to SNP18, the Garages at the rear of Rowle Close and Ormonde.</p> <p>As noted in your plan, the site has fallen into major disrepair but has been like this for many years now. I currently have an active complaint with the Council regarding the condition as believe it to be a health and safety hazard. This is two fold in that the large volume of waste and combustible materials poses a serious fire risk when there is already similar anti-social behaviour in the area, and also that I have witnessed rats and other vermin within this waste.</p> <p>No effort has ever been made to tidy this area and only myself and a dozen or so other owners keep their garages tidy with locked doors. The rest of the area is either in ruin or has open fronted space to house the aforementioned waste.</p> <p>I believe that the regeneration of this area would be a huge benefit for the current residents here as it would reduce the negative effect and anti-social behaviour given by the state of repair of the garages. With the correct reimbursement in place, I think it would be welcome to most that own their facilities. I do feel this trade off will be key as we purchased our properties with this facility and so to lose its use completely with be detrimental.</p> <p>I feel that one critical area will be the issue of parking in the area and this needs to be addressed seriously before any development could begin. With the garage area being in such an anti-social state, most residents park on the street at the front of their properties or along the very roads that will likely be used to access the new development. Taking away this area to put more houses and cars will cause further issues along Ormonde I feel. If this issue can be address and some of the green space along Ormonde used for parking off road, or suitable parking at the new developments with adequate lighting and security, this would also be a huge benefit to residents.</p>