

Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan, Submission Draft April 2014.

Regulation 16 publicity stage - Summary of Responses

Respondent	Organisation	On behalf of	Comments
Marek Mackowiak Development Plans Team	Milton Keynes Council		Recommended a new sentence be added to text to policy GP6 to clarify that remaining areas of open space shown on the proposals map will continue to be protected by saved Local Plan policy LP2. Confirms the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan conforms to the Milton Keynes Core Strategy (July 2013) and the Council supports the Plan (subject to clarification on the open space policy), as submitted.
Miles Crawford Legal Section	Milton Keynes Council		The procedural requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 have been complied with to date in the preparation of the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan.
Paul van Geete Tariff Programme Manager	Milton Keynes Council		Recommended a wording change to policy GP7 to clarify how New Homes Bonus money would be spent.
Gill King Waste Strategy Programme Officer	Milton Keynes Council		Essential that all new buildings have space enough to store recyclables as laid out in Sustainable Development SPD both inside and outside and if any communal areas are proposed for waste collection. Comments that development on the estate may provide opportunities for low carbon development and innovative use of green space on the estate.

Respondent	Organisation	On behalf of	Comments
David Gleeson Regeneration Programme Director	Milton Keynes Council		Highlights that if the referendum produces a positive outcome there is likely to be an expectation that MKC will be obliged to adopt all the proposals contained therein. Nothing will be done unless it is economically viable to do so. MKC are under no obligation to commence works on the Lakes Estate. Suggests changes to plan text and Delivery Strategy correcting typos and factual points.
Neil Sainsbury Head of Urban Design & Landscape Architecture.	Milton Keynes Council		<p>Makes a number of general points and comments on general and site specific policies including:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested for all plans where in the key 'Development Block' is indicated this should be reworded for clarity as 'Indicative development Block' , • Seeks clarification and clarity about status of development on areas of open space • On policy GP3 concerned that the requirement in the policy for new development to positively respond to the established character of the estate as this could be restrictive, • Highlights on policy IN1 there is a contradiction between the third bullet point (built form should actively address Drayton Road) and the illustrative plan which shows active frontages facing inwards.

Respondent	Organisation	On behalf of	Comments
Rachael Bust	Coal Authority		Have no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan wishes the Town Council every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Rio D'Souza	Highways Agency		<p>The Highways Agency is supportive of the objectives and principles set out in the Plan and the positive stance being taken towards ensuring future development is supported by sustainable transport measures and providing more local job opportunities, for which the Agency considers to be critical in helping to deliver sustainable development.</p> <p>Refers to the Agency's protocol for dealing with planning applications and that if development proposals of sufficient scale come forward a Transport Assessment will be required to assess impact on the Agency's Strategic Road network.</p>
Martin Small	English Heritage		Welcomes the requirement in Policy GP2 for proposals for development coming forward within the Development Opportunity Sites to clearly demonstrate a design-led approach and a contemporary approach to design that positively responds to the established character of the estate.

Martin Small	English Heritage		<p>Welcomes the principle in the rationale to policy GP3 that care should be given to ensure that new development does detrimentally impact on setting of listed buildings that comprise the historic core of Water Eaton</p> <p>English Heritage does not consider that the Plan will give rise to any significant effects on the environment and that a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Plan is not necessary.</p>
Charles Routh	Natural England		<p>Natural England does not consider that this plan poses any likely significant risk to internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites and does not wish to make specific comments on the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Agree that the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan does not require a full Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to be undertaken as there are unlikely to be significant environmental effects from the proposed plan in terms of the natural environment.</p>

Respondent	Organisation	On behalf of	Comments
	OFGEM		No comment
Andrew Davies	Central Bedfordshire		No comment
Neville Benn	Environment Agency		Agree that a SEA is not required.
	UK Power Networks		No comment. The Lakes Estate is not within the geographical area managed by UK Power Networks
Teresa Evans			Sought clarification if members of the public are able to comment on the Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan and associated material and of the planning process and terms used. Contents that there has been a lack of public consultation on the plan.
Selina Beghum			Objects to building of houses at the back of Kinloch Place
Kavita Jabbal			Objecting to building of houses at the back of Kinloch Place
Dawn Ashby			Objecting to building of houses at the back of Kinloch Place
Alison Ryan			Against the redevelopment of the Lakes Estate
Denise Carrington			Lives on Kinloch Place objects to building of houses at the back of Kinloch Place spoiling view over the grass, canal and countryside.
Debra White			Objecting to building of houses at the back of Kinloch Place
Jacqueline Gatehouse			Objecting to building of houses at the back of Kinloch Place spoiling view

