

Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

1. Introduction

2. Neighbourhood Area Designation

3. Dateline of Events

4. First Public Open Meeting

5. 'Have Your Say' Days

6. Village Survey

7. Visioning Workshop

8. First Parish Council Public Consultation

9. Parish Council Consideration of First Public Consultation

10. Second Parish Council Public Consultation

11. Parish Council Consideration of Second Public Consultation

12. Evidence Base Appendices

- A. 'Have Your Say' Day Comments
- B. Village Survey Questionnaire
- C. Summary of Responses to Village Survey
- D. Specific Addressees contacted by the Clerk to comment on the Pre-Submission Draft CNP
- E. Responses to First Public Consultation and Parish Council Decisions
- F. Responses to Second Public Consultation and Parish Council Decisions
- G. Housing Sites Assessment

1. Introduction

This consultation statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 in respect of the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan (CNP). The legal basis of this Statement is provided by Section 15 (2) of part 5 of the 2012 Neighbourhood Planning Regulations, which requires that a consultation statement should:-

- i. Contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan (including their contact details)
- ii. Explain how they were consulted
- iii. Summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted
- iv. Describe how those issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

2. Neighbourhood Area Designation

The Neighbourhood Area was designated by Milton Keynes Council 28th May 2013 in a delegated decision by Cllr David Hopkins, following the statutory publicity and covers the whole of the parish but does not intrude into any of the adjoining parishes.

3. Dateline of Events

2nd February 2011 – MKC Planning invite expressions of interest in joining NP Vanguard

25th May 2011 – MKC Planning announce funding given to four Vanguard parishes in MK including Castlethorpe

23rd January 2012 - NP Public Open Meeting led by MKC Planning.

28th March 2012 – Yardley Gobion Community Workshop (Cllr Sweetland attended to obtain third party experience)

17th May 2012 Thame Workshop (Chairman and Clerk attend to obtain third party experience)

25th September 2012 CIB / rCOH Seminar (Paul O'Hare and Neil Homer) (Clerk attends)

21st February 2013 Parish Council Application to MKC for Designation of NP Area

17th April 2013 Oxford Workshop leads to decision to use consultants (Chairman and Clerk attend)

1st May 2013 Community Impact Bucks appointed as Project managers for CNP.

28th May 2013 MKC Decision on NP Area by MKC Cabinet Member, Cllr David Hopkins.

July 2013 Creation of Steering Group with wider parish representatives joining Cllrs

February/March 2014 'Have Your Say' Days

Mid 2014 Construction of Village Survey based on output from Open Days

14th September to 19th October 2014 Village Survey – online and paper copies

3rd December 2014 Visioning Workshop

2015 Writing of draft CNP

8th September -20th October 2015 - 6 week Parish Council Public Consultation

7th November 2015 Parish Council considers responses to Public Consultation and resolves to amend CNP to include two new Policies.

7th December to 1st February 2016 Parish Council Second Public Consultation

8th February 2016 Parish Council considers responses to Second Public Consultation and approves draft NP to be passed to MKC

4. First Public Open Meeting

A Public Meeting on 23rd January 2012 was advertised on the Village Notice Boards to launch the CNP. It was attended by Cllrs Ayles, Keane and Sweetland, the Clerk and 9 members of the public, a representative of Planning Aid (Ellie Gingell) and was run by Tom Podd who was the then MKC Planning lead for CNP. The meeting was primarily to explain what a Neighbourhood Plan was, how it differed from our previous Parish Plan and the process for making a Neighbourhood Plan.

At the following Parish Council Meeting, it was resolved to form a CNP Steering Group consisting of councillors Cllrs Ayles, Keane, Stacey & Sweetland, advised by the Clerk, with members of the public co-opted as necessary.

However, the remainder of 2012 was spent attending various workshops to learn how other communities addressed their Neighbourhood Planning. It was realised that the process needed to be properly resourced and that many other neighbourhoods used external contractors. And a formal decision to this effect was made at the parish council meeting of 1st October 2012. In January 2013, a contract was let to Community Impact Bucks(CIB) and its subcontractor, rCOH, to support the production of CNP.

The first stage was to gain formal designation of the CNP area which was done February to May 2013. The Steering Group was then broadened to invite residents and members of village organisations. Invitations were sent to:

David Barker (Castlethorpe First School)
Nicola Birchall (Zumba Group, Village Hall)
David Brooks (Church Men's Group)
Davina Brown (Church)
Margaret Chapman (WI)
Susan Chinnery (Church Ladies Group)
Tim Flach (Allotments Association)
John Foakes (Entertainment Group)
Sharron Jones (Short Mat Bowls Club)
Scott Pearson (Castlethorpe Cricket Club)

Keith Prestidge (Open Gardens)
Elaine Ledster (Pre-School)
Phil Robinson (Castlethorpe Football Club)
Karen Russo (Village Show)
Philip Sawbridge (Lodge Farm and Lincoln Lodge Business Parks owner)
David Scott (Village Shop Association)
John Sweetland (NAG)
Stewart Tate (Castlethorpe Cricket Club)
Carol Wray (Craft Club)

and all parish councillors.

5. 'Have Your Say' Days

The next stage was for the Steering Group to arrange a number of 'Have Your Say' Days at the Village Hall which included a Saturday morning, a Sunday afternoon and a working day evening in an attempt to make the sessions accessible to all residents.

- 10 am – 12 noon, Saturday, 22 February 2014
- 6.30 pm – 9 pm, Thursday, 27 February 2014
- 2 pm – 4 pm, Sunday, 2 March 2014.

A number of information boards showing the village and covering a number of topics were on display and residents were invited to comment by sticking 'post it' stickers onto the relevant boards. The 'Have Your Say' Days were hosted by the Steering Committee and were well attended and the resulting comments are shown in Appendix A.

6. Village Survey

The comments from the Open Days were then used to construct a Village Survey. The survey had two elements; the Neighbourhood Plan and some Parish Plan and other questions designed to give the parish council guidance on improvement of village facilities. Thames Valley Police also asked us to ask a question on the top three Community Safety priorities.

The survey was conducted from 14th September to 19th October 2014. A paper copy of the questionnaire was delivered to every household in the parish with advertisements and links to the survey electronically placed on the village website and Facebook page.

There were 139 returns in all consisting of:

- 115 unique addresses
- 18 second/third addresses
- 4 not entered
- 2 'not provided'

There were about 450 households in the parish.

The Survey is shown at Appendix B and a summary of the Neighbourhood Plan elements (Questions 30-46) in Appendix C.

7. Visioning Workshop

Following a Steering group discussion of the survey results, CIB arranged a 'Visioning Workshop' on 3rd December 2014 in which the Steering Group constructed the elements of the CNP and a draft CNP was prepared during the first half of 2015.

8. First Parish Council Public Consultation

When the parish council's advisors at CIB/rCOH and MKC were satisfied that the draft pre-submission CNP was satisfactory, the parish council ran a Public Consultation from 8th September - 20th October 2015.

The Pre-Submission Draft CNP was made available online and paper copies were available in the village shop and from the Clerk. It was advertised on the village website, on the Facebook page and in the quarterly village newsletter 'Castlethorpe News'. In addition, the Clerk wrote either by email or by post to all landowners, the outlying farmers (who may otherwise have been unaware of the consultation) and the statutory consultees. A list of specific addressees is in Appendix D.

9. Parish Council Consideration of First Public Consultation

There were responses to the first public consultation from Historic England, Anglian Water, MKC Planning, Carrington Estates and two residents as in Appendix E.

The responses were considered by the parish council at its meeting of 7th November 2015 and the council's Decisions are also shown in Appendix E. As a result, it was decided to introduce two new policies to amend the settlement boundary and to designate land to the south of Paddock Close, called 'Maltings 2' for development of up to 30 houses.

10. Second Parish Council Public Consultation

Following amendment of the Pre-Submission Draft CNP, a second Public Consultation was carried out from 7th December 2015 to 1st February 2016. The same advertisements (website, Facebook page and Castlethorpe News) were placed and the same list of specific addressees. (Appendix D)

11. Parish Council Consideration of Second Public Consultation

There were responses to the first public consultation from Historic England, Anglian Water, MKC Planning, Carrington Estates and two residents as in Appendix F.

The responses were considered by the parish council at its meeting of 8th February 2016 and the council's Decisions are also shown in Appendix F.

The most substantive response was from a local landowner who wished to put forward land to the east of Fox Covert Lane as an alternative to Maltings 2. A Housing Sites Assessment, shown in Appendix G, was presented for these two options at the council meeting and the Decision was made to support the initial Decision to designate Maltings 2 for additional housing and not the new proposed site.

With minor changes as in Appendix F, the Parish Council approved the Pre-submission Draft CNP to be passed to MKC.

12. Evidence Base Appendices

APPENDIX A: 'Have Your Say' Day Comments

Development

Comment	CLP or NDP Issue.
I think with the planning permissions given we do not need any more now.	NDP
Do we need to expand the village in terms of housing to sustain the facilities we already have	NDP
Housing – no more Commercial – Yes but only at these sites	NDP
We are seeing resurgence in Railways as a means of transport in this country. A station in the village would be an asset – parking problems not with standing	NDP
A508 turning dangerous. Something needs to be done before serious accident happens	NDP / CLP
A bus service to Stoney Stratford	CLP
Large development – no. Infill – ok. Commercial – possibly on existing brown filled sites.	NDP
Re-open railway station. With very limited buses available the train would be a much needed transport benefit far out weighing any negative issues.	NDP
If the neighbourhood plan recommends zero development can this cause the plan to fail external inspection? Has such a plan been accepted to draft?	NDP
Commercial property, small scale, no large lorries	NDP
Try to improve traffic calming and parking in village.	NDP / CLP
No more development around village.	NDP
What progress has been made for the development of the village centre?	NDP
We need a bus service to our nearest town – Stony Stratford	CLP
Roads: 1. Look at parking restrictions on corner of Thrupp Close / Bullington End Road 2. Improve speed restrictions on entrance to village and station road 3. Improve junction of Wolverton Road / Bullington End Road to slow traffic.	CLP
Move the traffic calming (entrance to village), Hanslope road. Apart from crashes (reported and unreported) lots of road rage, shouting and profanity from angry motorists	CLP
Residential – in fill housing (affordable)	NDP

Commercial – Already premises given for more units therefore no need for more Pub – should be re-opened and be multipurpose coffee shops / community use	
We certainly don't need any more commercial property in the village. Weight restriction for lorries going through the village should be introduced.	NDP
1 st time buyer scheme / social housing / affordable housing	NDP / CLP
20 mph speed limit through village.	CLP / NDP
Seems obvious that next housing land is between fox covert lane and railway line	NDP
Should be lower speed limits: Bullington End Road in view of parked cars / thrupp close junction. Thrupp close – children playing, narrow roads.	NDP / CLP
More speed bumps. Still speeding out of North street / Wolverton Road especially at night!	CLP / NDP
Speed limit – digital signs in Bullinton End	CLP
There should be no parking in North Street between school and sheppertons house.	CLP / NDP
Cannot see either way when pulling out of Thrupp close onto Bullington End Road.	CLP / NDP
Happy for more housing in Station Road	NDP
Only infill housing to support nursery and school. Commercial – no new units – no benefit to our village.	NDP

Environment

Comment	CLP or NDP issue
Yes to sustainable energy. A project to generate electricity for the village by the village would be forward thinking	NDP / CLP
Water tower needs restoring at least on the outside and don't know if it could be used for any useful purpose.	CLP
Encourage people to take pride in their village. Litter / Dog fouling / noise – we don't want it.	CLP
Dog fouling – keep our village clean and safe camera's name and shame.	CLP
Shame about Fish ponds play area hardly ever used. Should be looked into.	CLP
Solar PANELS – FINE IF PUT ON ROOFS NOT FACING THE STREET.	NDP
Prevent parking outside pub.	NDP CLP
No to wind turbines	NDP
No large wind farms	NDP
Proposed wind turbine would be illegally close to 2 public footpaths	CLP
No wind turbines	NDP
Renewable energy – no Play areas – don't want one on sports field Allotments – yes if there is a waiting list. Land at end of Bullington end Lane	NDP / CLP

More allotments – yes somewhere where the soil is good! Footpaths, the one that I use regularly – to the Railway footbridge via south street needs cleaning up. Covered in Mud.	NDP
Work needed on war memorial – lettering in poor state – wall needs attention.	CLP
Can we plant more trees? Princess Diana Tree missing. Please replant	NDP / CLP
Please arrange for the overgrowth on the footpath at the bottom of the football pitch to be cleared. Some bushes have almost obscured path.	CLP
What happened to the offer of an off road cycle track from Castlethorpe to Hanslope?	NDP
I don't know where allotments would go but I think there should be more and perhaps produce could be sold in the shop again.	NDP
I would be in favour of renewable energy being developed in the village if it was done by the village for the village. Other villages are doing this sort of thing.	NDP
Allotments should be for villagers. People have them that do not live here.	CLP
Official footpath to be approved between nos11 Mill View and 13 Station Road to give access to the play area and fields beyond.	NDP / CLP
Renewable energy is what we should be looking at.	NDP

Facilities

Comment	CLP or NDP Issue
Sports Field – Provide new access road from Bullingtons End Road to sports ground and provide car park and make more use of sports pavilions for village events.	NDP / CLP
The pub should be kept as a pub – I realise that we are in the hands of the developer or is there an alternative? – I would use the pub but not keen on the idea of a fish restaurant that is too restricting.	NDP
Public transport is an issue – no Sunday service or evening service. Going into MK is difficult in the evening particularly. Non drivers and elderly have to use taxis. Could a volunteer run transport scheme be set up? If there an identified need for hospital and doctor appointments perhaps? Hanslope surgery very good and deliver prescriptions.	CLP
Would be good if the pub re-opened but needs to provide more activities for the community, restaurant, coffee bar, meeting place. Could it be run as a community pub? Plunkett foundation support community run enterprises. Has the pub been listed as a community asset?	NDP / CLP
Pub – 1. Yes but open for us to meet and have a coffee after shopping & dropping off school children etc.	NDP / CLP
Pub – don't think these questions should have been asked. We were promised a pub, we want a pub for use of all village. Coffee could be served as well.	NDP / CLP

Need for pub! Village needs a meeting point/social open day / night for everyone!	NDP / CLP
Villagers to run their own pub – it is vital that it re-opens. It doesn't need to be a gastro pub – it can serve many village functions	CLP
Pub – Yes Community run. Definitely would use regularly would commit financially to village owned pub meetings / coffee etc.	CLP
Coffee Bar in the pub	CLP
If the pub isn't re-opened by the developer could we run it as a community pub? I'm sure people would be interested. Has happened in other places with great success.	CLP
No to pub being redeveloped. If this is seen as an option it will never re open. If he doesn't want to develop it he can sell it cheaply to the community.	NDP
It would be good to re-open as a pub or coffee shop. Is it better to use the building for some use rather than decay? Flats in upper floors? Café downstairs?	NDP / CLP
Pub – yes would use it should be a community focus e.g. coffee shop, place for groups to meet etc.	NDP / CLP
Get something done quickly with the pub and complete eyesore.	NDP
Pub is part of the fabric of a village community. In the last 7 years there has been significant increase in village numbers and should be able to support a pub. I would certainly use it and so would players for the cricket club.	NDP / CLP
Yes want to see the pub re-opened and would use it. Would use any alternative venue in the village. Simon Hill brought the pub promises the village it would be refurbished to re-open as a pub so if he is not going to do this he shouldn't be allowed to develop it for any other purpose.	NDP / CLP
Pub – yes Anywhere in the village He should not be allowed to make it residential, having deprived us of a pub for many years.	NDP
Pub – yes reopen. Yes would use it.	NDP / CLP
Re-open pub. No train station	NDP
A coffee shop in the pub would be ideal of young mums and OAPS	CLP
As a single home owner would like to use tennis courts but do not feel I should pay a family membership. If fees were re-looked at am sure this facility would be used more.	CLP
Develop the water tower	CLP
We need to keep the facilities we currently have. Would be good to have a more expansive bus timetable.	CLP / NDP
Shame so few children are ever seen enjoying the sports facilities.	CLP

Appendix B: Village Survey Questionnaire

The Survey Questionnaire had two parts; Questions 1-29 was to inform a 'Parish Plan' by asking questions which will inform the parish council and other local organisations about improvements sought by residents. Questions 30-46 related to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Village Survey Questionnaire was producing by publishing software and it is not possible to include it in this document so it has been attached separately as a PDF document.

Appendix C: Summary of Responses to Village Survey

Neighbourhood Plan Section Questions 30-46

This summary was prepared by a working group of residents and parish councillors from the responses and comments made in the 2014 village survey. A total of 139 responses were received, 18 of which were 2nd or 3rd responses from the same household. Although 6 responses did not include an address, it is reasonable to assume that 121 households responded out of a total of 470 in the parish which is a household response rate of 25.7%.

Q30. What do you think about building homes? While building houses secures funding for future facilities, it also helps address the need for affordable homes. Affordable homes are defined as social rent, shared ownership and other forms of tenure for eligible households. Affordable homes help young families, 'key workers' (such as nurses, police and teachers) as well as older people to live in the community of their choice. How important do you view this?

Summary: 70% of respondents thought it was important or very important that affordable homes are available.

Q31. How important is it that 'young people and key workers can afford to live in Castlethorpe?

Summary: 74% of respondents thought it was important or very important that young people and key workers can afford to live in Castlethorpe.

Q32. The demand for affordable homes is increasing, while the available stock has declined (falling by 16% from 5.85 million in 1991 to 4.9 million today). Therefore: - The backlog on waiting lists is growing - Short-term need has risen due to recession - Long-term need will continue to be very strong How do you feel about the following statement: "Castlethorpe will need more homes by 2026"

Summary: 54% of respondents thought Castlethorpe will need more homes by 2026.

Q33. If houses are built in Castlethorpe over the next twenty years, which type of housing would you approve or disapprove of? Please tick one box per row

Summary: The percentage in favour of different types of home is shown in the table below:

Type of Home	% in favour
Smaller Homes (1 - 2 beds)	73%
Larger family homes (3+ beds)	55%
Affordable Homes	65%
Homes for rent (to anyone)	36%
Homes for rent (to people from Castlethorpe)	79%
Retirement/Sheltered homes	81%

Q34. Thinking about the possible number of new homes (irrespective of their type) in Castlethorpe for the next 20 years, which of these do you think is appropriate for our village? For guidance there are currently 450 houses in Castlethorpe. Please tick one.

Summary: Over 20 years, 83% of respondents thought that additional homes are appropriate for Castlethorpe. This would include individual plots as well as small scale developments.

Q35. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements

Summary:

There were large majorities in favour of preserving the surrounding countryside and landscape, avoiding spoiling the look of the rural setting, that sufficient infrastructure would need to be in place to support any new housing (e.g. school, water supply, recreation, road capacity etc.), that any new housing should respect the existing style and character of the village, that it is not desirable for Castlethorpe to have any new settlement on its boundary, that Castlethorpe should minimise light pollution and conserve energy by turning some street lighting off at reasonable times and that, as fuel costs are predicted to rise, new homes should have access to sufficient land for home growing, helping households manage their food bills.

There is a small majority who object to renewable energy generation but, of the large minority that support it, most are against wind turbines but supportive of solar panels providing they are not intrusively sited.

Q36. How would you describe your attitude to commercial development that may provide local employment - for example offices, light industrial units, shops.

Summary: The large majority of respondents were hostile to building inside the settlement boundary whereas a small majority favoured commercial development outside the boundary though a small majority also wanted no further commercial development at all.

Q37. If yes, which of the following do you see as appropriate commercial developments for Castlethorpe?

Summary: Of those respondents who favoured some commercial development, only one respondent was in favour of warehousing and distribution but a small majority of respondents favoured light industrial units, general office / commercial and business start-up and a large minority favoured specialist sector (creative & media/science/marketing).

The main concern was about increased traffic movements especially of HGVs.

Q38. Traditionally UK planners have placed employment sites away from homes. However, it has been proven that a mix of both businesses and homes ensures that streets are lively throughout the day. Housebound residents feel less isolated and businesses and homes are less likely to suffer from crime such as vandalism and burglary. If there is employment development in Castlethorpe, which of

these would you like to see? Please tick one box per row. Note small employment buildings employ less than 10 people. Medium ones employ 10 to 50. Large ones employ more than 50.

Summary: For new small employment buildings, responses were evenly spread among being away from all existing buildings, mixed in with homes or alongside existing employment.

For medium and large new employment buildings, respondents did not want them mixed with new homes and, for larger buildings, respondents wanted them to be in completely new sites.

Q39. Are there any particular areas within the Parish you think are suitable for commercial development?

Summary: The main areas thought suitable were the Station Yard (if the currently approved residential development did not proceed) or at the existing business centres.

Q40. Do you want the 'Carrington Arms' to be retained as a pub/restaurant?

Summary: 85% of respondents wanted to see the pub re-opened with 6% against it and 8% don't know.

Q41. If it cannot be retained, what would you like to see the building used for?

Summary: The main uses were to retain as a pub, convert to a café / restaurant or use as a community facility. A small minority favoured residential development.

Q42. If the Carrington Arms were not re-opened as a pub would you support a pub / club at the Sports Ground?

Summary: A small majority of respondents were in favour of a club at the Sports Ground.

Q43. Are there any particular areas within the village that you think should be developed for sport or play in addition to the existing Sports Ground, and, play areas at the Fish Ponds and Thrupp Close / Bullington End Road?

Summary: 84% of respondents did not want any new sport or play facilities.

Q44. Are there any particular areas within the whole Parish you think need additional planning policy guidance for development (e.g. should be for housing, commercial use, leisure or agriculture)?

Summary: There were a wide range of comments but a common theme was that agriculture and countryside should be preserved around the village.

Q45. Are there any particular areas within the Parish you think require traffic calming?

Summary: 61% of respondents felt more traffic calming was needed and there were a lot of comments about excess speed. Suggestions included 20mph areas in the village centre and in Shepperton, Station and Bullington End roads. There were some concerns about hazards to agricultural vehicle movements in North St.

Q46. If there is anything else that you would like to add that hasn't already been covered please outline this below.

Summary: The responses mostly reiterated comments made elsewhere covering topics such as the need for affordable housing, restricting social housing to those with a connection to the village, preserving the village, speeding, parking, dog fouling, repairing the Fishponds play area, moving the cycleway to Fox Covert Lane and improving the MKC landscaping service. These comments will be reviewed by the parish council to see if further action can be taken though many of them are already ongoing actions.

Philip Ayles
4th December 2014

Appendix D: Specific Addressees contacted by the Clerk to comment on the Pre-Submission Draft CNP

The following communication was sent to specific addressees by the Clerk.

Consultation on Neighbourhood Plan for Castlethorpe Milton Keynes

We are sending you details of this consultation on the pre-submission version of the Castlethorpe Neighbourhood Plan as is required by Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

You can read the version online at:

www.castlethorpepc.org.uk

From which you can also download a .pdf version

Comments are invited during a six week consultation that commences today Wednesday 9th September and ends on Tuesday 20th October 2015 and should be made on the attached form provided in MS Word and .pdf format.

Forms can be returned in hard copy by post to:

Clerk to Castlethorpe Parish Council
c/o 63 Thrupp Close
Castlethorpe
MILTON KEYNES
MK19 7PL

Or electronically by email at: clerk.castlethorpe@gmail.com

Or you can complete an online version at www.castlethorpepc.org.uk

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact the Clerk - contact details provided in this email.

Steve Bradbury
Clerk to Castlethorpe Parish Council
63 Thrupp Close
Castlethorpe
Milton Keynes MK19 7PL

Telephone [01908 337928](tel:01908337928)
email clerk.castlethorpe@gmail.com

No.	Consultee	Details
1	Land owners, tenants and interested developers	Milford Leys Farm: Joy Frost Balney Grounds: AR Stacey & Sons Glenmore Farm: Ian Markham Bartholomew Farm: Richard Sawbridge Simon Hill John Holes (via Savills olangdale@savills.co.uk) enquiries@westwaddy.co.uk (for Carrington Estates) otaylor@mjgleeson.com in response to email requesting a copy
2	Milton Keynes Council Planning	Planning.Enquiries@milton-keynes.gov.uk
3	Milton Keynes Council Highways	envservices@milton-keynes.gov.uk
4	Milton Keynes Council Schools Liaison Team	secondaryadmissions@milton-keynes.gov.uk primaryadmissions@milton-keynes.gov.uk
5	Milton Keynes Council Infrastructure Coordination & Delivery Team	mkgrowth@milton-keynes.gov.uk
6	Milton Keynes Council Housing Policy & Development	estatemangement@milton-keynes.gov.uk
7	Milton Keynes Council Planning Obligations	Planning.Enquiries@milton-keynes.gov.uk
8	Milton Keynes Council's employment consultants – Bilfinger GVA	Laura.jewell@gva.co.uk
9	NHS Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group	miltonkeynes.ccg@nhs.net
10	NHS England - Area Team	England.contactus@nhs.net
11	Councillors of Unitary Authority representing the area	andrew.geary@milton-keynes.gov.uk jeannette.green@milton-keynes.gov.uk lynn.patey-smith@milton-keynes.gov.uk
12	Adjoining Parish Councils	Cosgrove: de@mk196aw.fsnet.co.uk Old Stratford: de@mk196aw.fsnet.co.uk Gayhurst: clerk@gayhurst.org Grafton Regis: derekstanleybird@hotmail.com Great Linford: parish.manager@greatlinford.gov.uk

		<p>Hanslope: hanslopeparishcouncil@hotmail.com Haversham: haversham.ltinfordclerk@gmail.com Pottersbury: clerk@potterspurypc.org.uk Sherington: Hannah_balazs@hotmail.co.uk Stoke Goldington: stokegoldingtonpc@hotmail.co.uk Stony Stratford: Office@stonystratford.gov.uk Tyringham & Filgrave: lou175@hotmail.co.uk Wolverton: office@wolvertonandgreenleystowncouncil.gov.uk Yardley Gobion: lesleyratcliffeygpc@btinternet.com</p>
13	Housing Associations in the area	<p>communications@guinness.org.uk customerservices@hastoe.com</p>
14	Affected Utility Companies and water and sewerage organisations	<p>centralsupportteamINF@central-networks.co.uk % eOn jglerum@anglianwater.co.uk info@westernpower.co.uk customerservice@britishgas.co.uk info@edfenergy.com Enquiries@nationalgrid.com helpline@npower.com enquiries@eonenergy.co.uk customerservice@sse.com</p>
15	The Environment Agency	<p>planning_liaison.anglian_central@environment-agency.gov.uk</p>
16	Thames Valley Police	<p>chief.constable@thamesvalley.pnn.police.uk</p>
17	Buckinghamshire Fire Service.	<p>enquiries@bucksfire.gov.uk</p>
18	Natural England	<p>consultations@naturalengland.org.uk</p>
19	English Heritage	<p>martin.small@english-heritage.org.uk lesley.godbolt@historicengland.org.uk e-seast@historicengland.org.uk</p>
20	The Coal Authority	<p>planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</p>

21	The Homes and Communities Agency	mail@homesandcommunities.co.uk
22	Businesses in the parish	Businesses at Lodge Farm Business Centre and Lincoln Lodge Business Centre c/o Philip Sawbridge: enquiries@lodgefarmbc.co.uk Rentakeeper/The Shooting Clinic, Lincoln Grounds, Castlethorpe MK19 7HJ: rent@rentakeeper.co.uk Charles Sawbridge via parish magazine Manor Farm b&b reservations@manorfarmhouse.org via parish magazine Universal blinds via parish magazine Cosgrove Park caravan site enquiries@cosgrovepark.co.uk
23	Tele-communications agencies including the Mobile Phone Operators Association	info@ukmoa.org TechnicalCustomerSupport@three.co.uk O2cellshelpdesk@gshgroup.com site.information@orange-ftgroup.com networkinfo@t-mobile.co.uk emf.advisoryunit@vodafone.co.uk
24	British Telecom	matthew.hard@dipconsultants.co.uk message sent through online form to BT Correspondence Centre Durham – they would not give a generic email address. Email ack 1704 9/9/15
25	The National Grid	Damien.holdstock@amec.com plantprotection@uk.ngrid.com Nationalgrid.Enquiries@nationalgrid.com wpdnewsuppliesmids@westernpower.co.uk
26	Religious bodies in the community	Castlethorpe church: fr.gary@btinternet.com
27	Public transport providers operating within the area	MK Bus users Group: contact@mkbug.co.uk Z and S transport: info@zands.co.uk Passenger Transport MK: passenger.transport@milton-keynes.gov.uk (forwarded to the Passenger Transport Manager Andrew Coleman)

28	Local schools	office@castlethorpe.milton-keynes.sch.uk admin@hanslope.milton-keynes.sch.uk michele.rhodes@stantonbury.org.uk admin@radcliffeschool.org.uk enquiries@st-pauls.org.uk
29	Medical centres	Lindsey.richards@hca.gsi.gov.uk Hanslope Medical Centre c/o practice manager: Sylvia.barnsley@gp-k83052.nhs.uk Northampton Hospital: PALS@ngh.nhs.uk Milton Keynes Hospital: general.office@mkhospital.nhs.uk
30	Network Rail	townplanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk property@networkrail.co.uk
31	The Highways Agency	Darren.rhoden@highwaysengland.co.uk
32	Community Foundation	info@mkcommunityfoundation.co.uk
33	Community Action MK	Info@CommunityActionMK.org
34	MK Equality Council	admin@mkequalitycouncil.org.uk
35	MK Council of Faiths	douglas.mccall6@btinternet.com
36	Disability Action Group	kim.burchell@mkcil.org.uk
37	Member of Parliament for MK North	GATESR@parliament.uk
38	Member of Parliament for MK South	iain.stewart.mp@parliament.uk
39	Local Green Spaces	Gobbey's Field: c/o James Painter jmp@sdforbes.com Village Green: c/o Rob Ward Public Realm Services Group MK Council: rob.ward@milton-keynes.gov.uk Sports Ground: Allotments Association c/o Tim Flach tim.flach@btinternet.com South Street Paddock: Carington Estates: enquiries@carington.co.uk

Appendix E: Responses to First Public Consultation and Parish Council Decisions

Historic England

In particular, we would like to commend the guidance for new development provided in Policy 1: Design Guidance, including the clear link to understanding of different character areas within the village and recognition of area specific details such as distinctive materials and building/roof form. Nevertheless, as the plan does not include a built-up area boundary it is not altogether clear where the limits of Character Area 2 are and, as such the Policy may not be sufficiently clear for implementation. We would recommend amending Plan H to clearly identify Character Area 1 (The Conservation Area) and Character Area 2. Given the specific consideration for design provided by paragraph 4.13 relating to the area identified on Plan H, we recommend including this text in the Policy text highlighted in bold.

With regard to Local Green Space and Assets of Community Value we recommend identifying whether their status as heritage assets, either in their own right or as part of the conservation area demonstrates their historic interest or value to the community, where this justifies their designation in the plan.

[Decision: Accept and modify Plan as suggested.](#)

Anglian Water (re Surface Water management)

We would recommend the inclusion of a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan to include the following key messages:

- Evidence that the developments had followed the surface water management hierarchy will help to ensure infiltration is considered ahead of maintaining connection to sewers.
- Understand exceedance of existing and proposed surface water management measures and safeguard/design flow routes reinstating natural pathways, where possible. Should the rainfall extent exceed the capabilities of the surface water systems, this will help to ensure properties are protected and urban design of public open space considers the potential flows of surface water.
- Development should seek to reduce flood risk to the site and third parties. Early engagement with relevant bodies including Anglian Water is key to ensuring adequate surface water management measures are included.
- The policy should also ensure that adequate drainage infrastructure is in place to serve development without risk to existing development.

[Decision: Seek further advice from CIB / rCOH which was that this was a Planning matter that would be raised at the time an Application was made.](#)

Resident 1 (re Carrington Arms)

This is failing to comply with Section 3 - Conservation Area - this needs addressing now and not keep being delayed by the developer. We feel that he is just giving the run around to the Parish Council and us residents and we believe that he wants to redevelop the site and NOT as a pub.

Decision: We have done as much as possible to protect the pub by designating it a Community Asset. Other actions may continue to encourage the owner both directly and through MKC but would not be a legitimate part of the NP.

Resident 2

Policy 1: what consideration to emergency exit in case of fire has been considered when recommending small windows in relation to elevation of building. Decision: No action. Planning / Building regs will determine safety on any new building or modification.

Ground on corner of Fox Covert and North St ('Bert's Plot') should be considered a community asset / green space. Decision: No action. Planning permission has already been granted for this land.

Any future developments should consider sewage as current facilities are inadequate. Decision: No action in NP. This is a standing issue raised on all new planning applications.

Village should be protected from large heavy vehicles. Decision: No action. Directional signage (MKC) deters lorries and village has narrows, bends and humps which make it less attractive as a lorry route. The parish council has previously explored banning 'through' lorries and this is not practical or enforceable.

WestWaddy (representing Carrington Estates)

Wish to designate 'Maltings 2' for future development of up to 30 houses.

Decision: That Maltings 2 should be designated for future development of up to 30 new houses.

MKC Planning

Policy 2: Community Facilities (and later at para 5.4) identifies a number of properties which the Plan says should be regarded as Community Assets. There is a specific process by which a property can be listed as an Asset of Community Value (ACV) and details of this are available through Milton Keynes Council. The benefit of designating a property as an ACV is that the community would then have the right to Bid in the event that the property were to be put up for sale. If the Parish Council intends to apply to MKC to have these properties listed as ACVs then it would be worthwhile making this clear in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Para 5.5 states that the Parish Council will 'encourage and support applications for designation' - the Parish Council itself is a relevant body for making such applications, so it can do more than 'encourage and support', it can actually apply.

Decision: Accept and modify Plan as suggested.

7th November 2015

Appendix F: Responses to Second Public Consultation and Parish Council Decisions

1. Anglian Water asks that a new Policy statement is added to the Malting 2 site that "A foul drainage strategy is submitted with the application which demonstrates that infrastructure capacity is available or there will be sufficient capacity to serve this development".

Decision: Accept and include.

2. MKC Archaeology asks that a Policy Statement be added to the Maltings 2 site that "Prior to a planning application being submitted the area should be subject to an archaeological field evaluation comprising trial trenching. This will enable any necessary mitigation (excavation or avoidance of significant buried archaeology) to be agreed and secured via a condition on the eventual planning permission."

Decision: Accept and include.

3. WestWaddy, representing Carrington Estates, are supportive. (No decision necessary)
4. Resident 1 comments about restricting further commercial development at Lincoln Lodge and also about the location of the bridleway there.

Decision: On advice from MKC Planning, it was decided that this was a matter for any Planning Application made in the area referred or, in the second matter, for Planning Enforcement. Neither were matters for a Neighbourhood Plan.

5. Resident 2 opposes Maltings 2 on the basis that vehicular access would be difficult through Maltings Field. It is not clear yet whether Highways would want vehicular access on this route though the parish council has a draft policy statement that there should be at least good quality (hard surfaced and unimpeded) pedestrian access.

Decision: On advice from MKC Planning, it was decided that this would be a matter for MKC Highways in any future Planning Application.

6. Resident 3 supports the draft NP. (No decision necessary)
7. Savills, representing a local landowner have requested that land to the east of Fox Covert Lane is designated for housing instead of Maltings 2.

A Housing Site Assessment was made of the two sites and consider by the council in coming to its decision. Both sites had been included in land submissions to the SHLA and were designated CS2 (Land to east of Fox Covert Lane) and CS5 (Maltings 2). The Assessment is included as Appendix G.

Decision: To reject CS2 and to continue with CS5 (Maltings 2) as a site to be designated for 30 houses.

8th February 2016

Appendix G: Housing Sites Assessment

Assessment Criteria	Site CS2 Land to east of Fox Covert Lane	Site CS5 Land south of Paddock Close
Site Capacity	approx 100 houses	approx 30 houses
Impact on village character and facilities	Castlethorpe has about 450 dwellings so this would be, along with other sites with outstanding planning permission, about a 25% increase in village size. This might take certain facilities, in particular the First School, above capacity even with maximum feasible expansion of the school.	Together with outstanding permissions, this would represent about a 10% increase in village size. No unmanageable impacts are envisaged.
Noise & vibration (from railway)	The site is adjacent to the railway and planning conditions would have to be imposed to ensure acceptable levels of noise and vibration. However, the size of the site means that this would be easier than on site CS5 for 30 houses though, if the housing was increased to the 100 capacity, both sites would be comparable.	The site is adjacent to the railway and planning conditions would have to be imposed to ensure acceptable levels of noise and vibration.
Site access arrangements (Note Fox Covert Lane is 4.8m wide with 1x2m footway which is the residential standard for up to 50 dwellings)	Vehicular access would be from Fox Covert Lane. Widening of Fox Covert would be necessary with the construction of a second footway on the east side.	Vehicular access would be from Fox Covert Lane. which is adequate for access for the proposed 30 houses plus the 9 houses in Paddock Close. A second access would be possible through Maltings Field and a minimum unfettered pedestrian access would be required.
Access to village facilities (pre-school, nursery, school, shop, church, playarea, Castle fields, sports ground)	Vehicular access via Fox Covert Lane. Pedestrian access to Maltings Field would be possible though the footpath has kissing gates and the ground is rough or along Fox Covert and North St.	Vehicular access via Fox Covert Lane. Pedestrian access will be provided on a new footway to Maltings Field. The site is significantly closer to village facilities by foot than site CS2.

Impact on the landscape	This would be significant. The site would be highly visible on the approach from Wolverton Rd and from the Bullington End Rd junction with North St.	Negligible. Providing the hedge bounding the farm track extending from Fox Covert lane is maintained, the site would scarcely be visible.
Integration with the village form	The site represents a significant extension to the existing settlement boundary into the open countryside and is not considered to represent the 'rounding off' of the village boundary.	The site squares off the existing settlement boundary and integrates well.
Creation of long term defensible boundaries	The site does not create a defensible boundary and might encourage further development on the other side of Wolverton Rd and further to the east adjacent to site CS2. In fact, the site then leaves CS5 'stranded' and would make development on that site difficult to oppose subsequently.	The site creates a clear boundary along Fox Covert Lane and its farm track extension to the railway line.

Castlethorpe Parish Council
8th February 2016