

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | Q1. Do you agree with the proposed Neighbourhood Plan 3? | Q2. If you have answered no, or partially to the question above, please elaborate below on the issues you do not agree with? | Q3. Is there anything in the plan you don't understand? | Q4. If you have answered yes, please give details | Q5. Policy NP 1 is about maintaining the settlement boundary and new housing. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP1 below. | Q6. Policy NP 2 is about the Tickford Fields Development Site. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP2 below. |
|-------------------|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Response 1 | YES | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 2 | YES | N/A | NO | N/A | Good to hear the Police Station is now to become retirement housing. No action required. | N/A |
| Response 3 | YES | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | It's a concern that we are losing green land. We have to grow but the question is 'how big'. Policy NP4 seeks to address the retention and enhancement of Green Infrastructure. No action required. |
| Response 4 | NO | The redway should not cross the playing field but go round. I found the maps too small and could not work out the details. Moving the redway proved impractical, and leaving it where it is will ensure good accessibility to the Sports Ground. The maps were enlarged and made easier to read. | YES | The maps. The maps were enlarged and made easier to read. | I like the plan. If it goes ahead. No action required. | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| Response 5 | YES | N/A | NO | N/A | N/A | Pleased to see this includes green areas and local centres. No action required. |
| Response 6 | YES | N/A | NO | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 7 | YES | N/A | YES | Why is there no mention of increased secondary school provision? Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area will be more than adequate in the longer term. | N/A | Our concern is that there may not be sufficient capacity within the existing healthcare, dental services etc. This point is covered in the background information to the Policy NP2 which demonstrates no further need for medical services space, and provision will be made for additional medical staff at the existing facilities. |
| Response 8 | PARTIALLY | I do not believe that the amount of additional healthcare provision set to be provided as a result of the new development at Tickford Fields is adequate and would encourage stakeholders to look at this again. There are already significant challenges with the level of healthcare provision provided in Newport Pagnell and I dont think that 1 extra GP | NO | N/A | N/A | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|---|----|-----|--|-------------------------------|
| | | is enough to cater for 900 new homes, plus dealing with the current issues experienced by residents. This point is covered in the background information to the Policy NP2 which demonstrates no further need for medical services space, however provision will be made for additional medical staff at the existing facilities. Each new GP will take on at least 1200 new patients. | | | | |
| Response 9 | YES | N/A | NO | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 10 | YES | | NO | | V.v. good! Thanks! NOTE! Must check with MK Council plan for MK East development. Flood plain --> elevation = ? Also, MK East (5000 homes) in new "garden city" development. MKE development is outside of the designated area of the Neighbourhood Plan. No action required. | vg No action required. |
| Response 11 | PARTIALLY | I note that MKCC is still seeking a development partner for the Tickford | NO | N/A | N/A | See Q.15 |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|---|-----|---|-----|---|
| | | Fields Development. Please see Q.15 for my thoughts, concerns and proposals | | | | |
| Response 12 | PARTIALLY | | NO | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 13 | NO | There is no amendment to the provision of schooling. The school data shown in the June 2021 plan is from 2014, they show a surplus of secondary school places by 2019 and that the new homes being developed on proposed sites can be absorbed into that surplus or village children can be moved to Olney. The reality in 2021 and 2022 and 2023 is there is no spare capacity at Ousedale on either campus. The school cannot offer enough places to children already in catchment and the building at Tickford Fields is not even started. Where | YES | Why are you still using school data from 2014 - when will you update the statistics. More recent data for all School provision is not available, but the Steering Group has seen the secondary school projections for future years 2024-2029 which demonstrate in the longer term there will be more than adequate provision for secondary schooling places. | N/A | This development does not include any secondary school provision. Ousedale school cannot take all catchment children in 2021 and 2022 and 2023. Anyone moving into the new homes will not be able to get their child into Ousedale as every year group is currently full with waiting lists. Where will these children go???? Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area will be more than adequate in the longer term. There is however, provision in the s106 contributions from the Tickford Field development for additional facilities at secondary schools. |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|---|----|-----|----------------------------------|---|
| | | will they go!. Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area will be more than adequate in the longer term. | | | | |
| Response 14 | YES | N/A | NO | N/A | N/A | Please ensure there is a provision that any on-street parking for residential dwellings have access to an electric car charging point. The roads and streets need to be suitably wide enough for vehicles to avoid bottlenecks and poor visibility due to vehicles parking on corners and kerbs etc. The architectural style should match the recent development of North Crawley Road. Look at Monkston Park in Milton Keynes as to what to avoid. The streets are too narrow for cars! I hope the local centre will have either a CO-OP, Sainsbury's, Costa and independent eateries! This will be covered by a detailed planning application, however the Town Council is in discussion with developers Vistry Group regarding these issues. |
| Response 15 | YES | N/A | NO | N/A | Concerned about traffic on north | See previous (NP1) |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----|---|----|-----|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | <p>Crawley road around the proposed new school and local centre. Adequate parking needs to be made available for parents dropping and picking up children from school.</p> <p>These concerns are addressed in Policy NP2, which states "(d) Any planning application should be accompanied by a Transport Assessment which assesses the cumulative impact of the whole development to demonstrate the traffic impact on the surrounding highway network, and propose any mitigation measures needed" and "(h) The development should provide...towards the provision of a new primary school... complete with drop-off parking and secure cycle parking provision."</p> | |
| Response 16 | NO | I think the idea is absolutely appalling and not thought out at all. We are going to completely lose all of our surrounding countryside. We are already being swallowed up by other new developments. You | NO | N/A | <p>I think this is ill thought out. I can see a new primary school is planned but not a secondary. This is a huge concern. Ousedale is already oversubscribed and many families bought houses on red house park mistakingly (sic) believing they would get a place at the school.</p> <p>Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have</p> | See previous (NP1) |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----|---|-----|---|---|-----|
| | | will see a huge change (not for the better) if this goes through. This comment can only refer to the Tickford Field site which did appear in our Neighbourhood Plan version 1, which was fully supported at referendum. | | | confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area will be more than adequate in the longer term. | |
| Response 17 | NO | I don't think the secondary school provision has been planned and explained enough and the effect this will have on the outer areas, with villages that are in catchment not securing places at Ousedale. Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area will be more than adequate in the longer term. | YES | It is very vague about schools and education provision for the planned developments, and what will happen in the interim between building houses and families moving in and eventually building a new secondary school. This will push those in catchment on outer edges of NP and surrounding villages out of the area that the existing secondary school can provide spaces for. Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area | N/A | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|--|----|---|---|---|
| | | | | will be more than adequate in the longer term. | | |
| Response 18 | Partially | Whilst we support the making of the Neighbourhood Plan, as landowners, the Society of Merchant Venturers (SMV) has concerns about the proposals to reserve land for biodiversity net gain. These concerns are detailed below in the section on NP4 and specifically relate to the SMV landholdings at the site identified as Portfield Farm. | NO | N/A | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | Q7. Policy NP 3 is about Living in the Town Centre. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP3 below. | Q8. Policy NP 4 is about the Green Infrastructure Network. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP4 below. | Q9. Policy NP 5 is about the Aston Martin Heritage Centre. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP5 below. | Q10. Policy NP 6 is about Design Guidance. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP6 below. | Q11. Policy NP7 is about Affordable housing and tenure. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP7 below | Q12. Policy NP8 is about Local Cycling and Walking Network. Please write any comments you may have about Policy NP8 below. |
| Response 1 | Generally a good idea to encourage Town Centre | Parking near Football Club already a problem. More | Not before time! No action required. | N/A | Affordable and first homes should be expanded to assist young people to | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|-----|--|---|
| | living and regeneration. MK East Dev is a cause for concern. MKE development is outside of the designated area of the Neighbourhood Plan. No action required. | parking is required to cater for additional sports facilities in this area. New plan will provide additional parking for sporting facility. No action required. | | | remain. The policy requires a mix of appropriate housing on each site, and at least 31% of homes on each site will be social housing. NP7 sets out requirements for both offering some affordable housing to local people, and for changing the proportion of affordable housing to increase the shared ownership proportion and decrease the social rented proportion. | |
| Response 2 | Encouraging people to live in the Town Centre is an excellent idea, as is utilising existing buildings. Good to develop brownfield sites. The MK East development is a major concern. MKE development is outside of the designated area of the Neighbourhood Plan. No action required. | Excellent that the Marsh End Road land is earmarked for biodiversity. However, carparking for sports ground also needs to be enlarged and urgently! Football game days are a traffic nightmare. New plan will provide additional parking for sporting facility. No action required. | Looking good and enhances that end of the Town. The more Aston Martin can do for the town the better. The Heritage Centre needs to get on with making use of the remaining heritage building. No action required. | N/A | Adding an additional storey to existing buildings will provide much needed affordable housing. No action required. | Brownfield sites should be utilised as a priority. The Plan seeks to prioritise the use of brownfield sites (NP3) and retain, maintain and enhance Green Infrastructure (NP4). No action required. |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|---|--|-----|--|-----|
| Response 3 | <p>This would be good. It could improve the look and feel of the town and bring in new different businesses. Getting rid of 60s looking buildings would be good.</p> <p>No action required.</p> | N/A | <p>It would be really good to have this centre for the town to show and develop their history. People will be interested in this and want to visit. No action required.</p> | N/A | <p>It is hard for the younger generation to afford new housing. A mixture of both shared ownership and ownership would be good. The policy requires a mix of appropriate housing on each site, and at least 31% of homes on each site will be social housing. NP7 sets out requirements for both offering some affordable housing to local people, and for changing the proportion of affordable housing to increase the shared ownership proportion and decrease the social rented proportion.</p> | N/A |
| Response 4 | <p>I agree with the upward development on the High Street except the black and white timbered building. Use more brownfield sites. B&W timbered building is not included in the Plan. No action required.</p> | <p>More green areas are needed. Policy NP4 seeks to address the retention and enhancement of Green Infrastructure. No action required.</p> | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|-----|--|-----|
| Response 5 | The idea of bringing people back into the Town centre to live seems to me to be a much better idea than just concentrating on more retail. No action required. | N/A | I thought the old AM museum building was to be used as a museum. The idea of a dedicated site however, makes a lot of sense. No action required. | N/A | The need for more "affordable" housing in this area has never been higher. The overall thrust of the policies is good but I'm still concerned that many people won't be able to afford to rent in the area, which will damage services and diversity. The policy requires a mix of appropriate housing on each site, and at least 31% of homes on each site will be social housing. NP7 sets out requirements for both offering some affordable housing to local people, and for changing the proportion of affordable housing to increase the shared ownership proportion and decrease the social rented proportion. | N/A |
| Response 6 | Excellent idea to develop brownfield sites more and concentrate on green areas for biodiversity. No action required. | We are pleased more green spaces are proposed. No action required. | Great idea - lots of visitors will love it. I contacted them years ago to ask if our friends could visit and there was no way of doing it. No action required. | N/A | Good idea for more affordable houses. No action required. | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Response 7 | We like the idea of unsympathetic buildings to be reconfigured to fit in with the historic buildings in town and additional housing being created. No action required. | An area of biodiversity at Portfields Farm would also be most welcome. Policy NP4(f) identifies an area of land at Portfield Farm as suitable for BDNG. No action required. | We feel this may bring tourists into town, who may make use of local businesses, eg shops, hotels, restaurants. No action required. | Buildings should be sympathetic to the historic buildings in town. Policy NP3 insists that redevelopment must be in keeping with Conservation area and sympathetic to historic setting. No action required. | This would be welcome for people who wish to live near family in the town (sic), as house prices currently do not make it easy for some to do so. However, it should not be permitted for affordable housing to be snapped up by landlords. NP7 sets out requirements for both offering some affordable housing to local people, and for changing the proportion of affordable housing to increase the shared ownership proportion and decrease the social rented proportion. | The provision of cycling/walking networks would be a great addition to the town. No action required. |
| Response 8 | N/A | N/A | It is not clear how harm to the River Ouzel by way of surface water run-off from the buildings or carparking area will be monitored on a continual basis. The LPA will require sufficient flood mitigation measures to be put in place before any | N/A | N/A | I agree with the plan for the local cycling and walking network but believe this is being underfunded and the whole list of improvements should be prioritised for the wellbeing of residents of Newport Pagnell and Milton Keynes. The final negotiated s106 agreement will determine the necessary levels of funding to address the policy requirements. |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | application is successful. | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| Response 9 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 10 | vg! + good choice of sites. Also rear of properties/"green oasis" 'gardens' (ref good example o/s URC!) With War memorial. No action required. | vg! What are the 2stepping stones"? + What is plan for new sports stadium; adjacent to existing football field + new (limited access) road bridge over main road (ref MK East) The 'Stepping Stones' are now explained in more detail in the background of Policy NP4. The new additional sporting facilities will create more grass pitches, some basketball provision, parking, and changing facilities. However, negotiations with the developer are ongoing. The bridge over the A422 will be for cyclists and pedestrians to offer safe crossing. | Excellent! AM Co site vital + need to liaise with them. Car park should be with green roof and allotments on top + new museum extension @ swimming pool. V.v. good! The Steering Group agree with the importance of the AM heritage site, but there will be no roof on the carpark provision for the AM heritage centre. Specific plans for the heritage centre itself have not as yet been developed. | First rate objectives - must be implemented, including private finance ? Need for "Love Newport Pagnell" community garden (NFP)? The respondent's comment on the need for Private Finance is not understood in relation to this policy. There is currently adequate provision of five allotment sites in the Town. | No to ground rent & all freehold + plan for existing; including shops The Steering Group agrees that development organisations should not be charging local residents maintenance charges, such as ground rent, and with the respondents comment that titles should be freehold. The Steering Group is currently in discussion with the Vistry Group re Tickford Field Site regarding these issues. Where the development is large enough, shops are planned, such as in NP2. | Plus ensure no accidents from reckless electric bike/scooter riders. Highway Code ("the 3 Cs") + fines!! On the spot. Not relevant to this Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Response 11 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 12 | The proposed development at No.1 Station Road | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| | will not only overlook garden (sic) but also kitchen and bathroom of No.3 station Road. These matters will be determined by the LPA in any forthcoming planning application. | | | | | |
| Response 13 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 14 | I am not too keen on adding stories on top of existing buildings in the high street. But I suppose if done sensitively, and the height does not exceed the current tallest building along the high street then it will be okay. The use of the ground floors for shops and services should be retained. We love our high-street! I do not see any benefit in | All good here!! No action required. | It is a shame that the heritage centre could not be located closer to the existing Aston Martin site and comes at the loss of the allotment site. I am excited to see the site once finished and hope it will bring more visitors to our town for tourism. The car park should be eco-friendly and not paved or feature | It is good to see many heritage sites being retained for public use. I propose developing the former Aston Martin/Salmons Works buildings on Tickford Street into an independent one-screen cinema, including a cafe and gallery. The remaining buildings can be converted to office use. With the increase of residents expected due to housing developments there must be more to | Just make sure that they really are affordable and well-built. We are a young couple looking to start a family and will likely look at moving to a larger property in the town and do not want to live outside of Newport Pagnell. The Steering Group noted this comment. | I would love to see more redways and cycle friendly routes in and around the town. It is right the town council are encouraging this. There should also be a redway considered along the A422 to link up with the proposed redway at the end of Willen Road. This would benefit more residents of Tickford End and allow for a faster connection onward into Milton Keynes. Any future redway and walking routes should also provide plenty of durable public recycling and waste bins to reduce the amount of litter along the routes. Existing bins should also be upgraded. It is likely not covered by the town |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>redeveloping No.1 Station Road and this should remain unchanged. I am strongly against redeveloping the existing library site for residential use. It is a lovely building and easily accessible. I suspect that it cannot be relocated anywhere else whilst being as easily accessible as it already is. There is not enough space there for residential use and would spoil the area, no need to squeeze apartments in everywhere! The Steering Group is proposing the continued use of ground floors for shops and services, it is only on upper floors</p> | | <p>tarmac where possible. It should also have plenty of electric vehicle charging points. Please also provide way-finding signs like the excellent new town signs close to the site to encourage visitors to park at the heritage centre and walk into and visit our town centre. Please include a provision in the planning provision that the building should be carbon neutral and eco-friendly. I hope the heritage centre has a small cafe and has a James Bond display! The Heritage Centre has not come at the loss of an allotment site; rather the allotment site on London Road has been relocated to</p> | <p>attract them to visit the town centre and not make it necessary to travel to Milton Keynes. I believe a cinema is warranted and would benefit the town and provide people of all ages with more things to do in the town. The old Robinson's Wine bar building should be converted to community use. I would like to see the town museum be relocated here and the building developed into a town museum and visitor's centre to add tourism value and compliment the Aston Martin heritage centre. The Steering Group has no ability to influence the owners of the various sites referred to in the way that the respondent</p> | | <p>council but there needs to be a pedestrian bridge built to cross the A509 to the proposed residential development south of the town to link the two. There is a pedestrian bridge being proposed as part of the MKE development, however a redway along the A422 could only be considered as part of the MKE development as land ownership would not allow for a redway to extend this length.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| | where we are seeking residential development. There is a lot of evidence to show that residential properties in the High Street do help to support retail business. The Town Council has identified a central site suitable for the library, with easy access. | | Burgess Gardens, which offers much more suitable ground for an allotment. There are still 5 allotment sites serving the Town. Matters of parking at the centre will come forward in a detailed planning application. | recommends. These options are therefore unviable. | | |
| Response 15 | Concerns about availability of Parking for shopping during the day and residents overnight. It was not considered that the Town Centre build options were likely to create onerous issues with parking. There is plenty of overnight parking in local car parks, which | Fully in support No action required. | Fully in support No action required. | Fully in support No action required. | Fully in support No action required. | Fully in support but would also like to see how the red ways are going to link up to those in the new MK East development No action required. |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|------------|------------|-----|
| | are not filled with users of the night time economy. | | | | | |
| Response 16 | Why more retirement properties on the police station site? This would have been perfect for family housing without using green field sites. The evidence demonstrates the need for smaller homes at this site and the need to cater to an aging demographic. The only green field site being proposed is Tickford Field Site which did appear in our Neighbourhood Plan version 1, which was fully supported at referendum. | A huge amount of hedgerows that take 100s of years to properly mature have already been ripped out. As have some glorious oak trees. This policy is just a cover up for the devastation that has already been caused. Talking about biodiversity while building on top of green field sites is a joke. The only green field site being proposed is Tickford Field Site which did appear in our Neighbourhood Plan version 1, which was fully supported at referendum. | I don't have any issue with this. It's a good use of a brown field site. However. Again the issue is secondary school Places. Meeting with MKCC's School dept. have confirmed that Secondary School provision in the area will be more than adequate in the longer term. | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Response 17 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Response 18 | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy | The SMV objects to the designation of the Portfield Farm site for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) offsetting and do not believe there is an existing mechanism to meaningfully secure the BNG / carbon off-setting aspirations of the Town Council as set out in Policy NP4. By its definition the process as set out in the Environment Act (2021) is to provide a 'net' gain. The gain is set against the loss through new development on land; but no development is being proposed via the Neighbourhood Plan that will specifically link any BNG offset to Portfield Farm. Furthermore the Environment Act requires that land be registered for BNG offsetting by the landowner and | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy |
|--------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | presently the land at Portfield Farm is not registered, which would contradict the statutory provisions of the Act. For the purposes of development plan preparation sites are often identified for development through an exercise such as a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), whereby submitted and known sites with development potential are assessed for development. As part of this process the sites need to be suitable, available and achievable. We would argue that were the Town Council to proceed with designation of land for BNG purposes then the same assessment criteria should be applied and whilst there could be an | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>argument made for suitability of the site, the deliverability of any BNG will require a willing landowner. The SMV would like to know if other sites within the Town boundaries have been assessed for comparison to the chosen sites. Whilst they might be suitable, showing between 150-210% BNG could be available if all units were to be maximised on the sites selected (see Future Nature report), it could be that other sites further afield would be more suitable with higher figures for BNG. Also, the proposed sites are close to the town delivering BNG offsetting could result in barriers to opportunities for countryside accessibility for local residents for a period</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>of at least 30 years. The SMV consider a more rigorous and complete assessment of sites, which goes beyond simply the BNG uplift value, is carried out to inform the Neighbourhood Plan process. Should the Town Council proceed with its policy aspiration then engagement as to land delivery is a critical consideration and SMV welcome opportunity for further dialogue. The SMV note its general support for the aims and goals of the BNG process as set out in the Environment Act (2021) and the implementation of the</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| | <p>Q13. Policy NP9 is about Developer Contributions. Please write any comments</p> | <p>Q14. A referendum will be held on Neighbourhood Plan 3 later in</p> | <p>Q15. Comments?</p> |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | you may have about Policy NP9 below. | 2023. Are you prepared to cast your vote in the referendum ? | |
|-------------------|--|---|-----|
| Response 1 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 2 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 3 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 4 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 5 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 6 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 7 | It's good that developers create eg play parks but as we've seen in Newport Pagnell recently not all developers are able to maintain the equipment and parks for some reason, consequently, they fall into disrepair or are vandalised. The Town Council has now taken ownership from Milton Keynes City Council, and maintains the vast majority of play areas in the Town. New sites for Parks & play areas will be transferred directly to the ownership of Town Council | YES | N/A |
| Response 8 | Developers should also contribute to provide adequate healthcare | YES | N/A |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------|---|
| | facilities due to expansion. This point is covered in the background information to the Policy NP2 which demonstrates no further need for medical services space, however, provision will be made for additional medical staff at the existing facilities. | | |
| Response 9 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 10 | All developers must contribute to the general well being of the townsfolk + must have private/(public) NHS medical facility (in MK East development (1. Community hospital incl. A&E. 2 diagnostic centre 3. Walk In/first Aid 4. Helipad/Air ambulance 5. Fire station/water rescue + ambulance). MKE development is outside of the designated area of the Neighbourhood Plan. No action required. | YES | N/A |
| Response 11 | N/A | YES | For years my name has been on MKC's waiting list to be offered a 'self build' opportunity. One isn't told that you're wasting your time! All that ever comes on the market is hugely overpriced or undesirable. I understand that 'in the old days' a proportion of 'self builds' were offered in new developments so that we didn't always have hundreds of similar homes built by our unimaginative major house builders who seem able to lobby our Government & local authorities around their little fingers. There are some really |

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>good small developers who presumably don't get a look in. I am extremely concerned by both our Government and MKCC's pathetic response to our global warming crisis. I attach just two articles I've read this week, and there is plenty of coverage available of the response to the Government's plans announced yesterday where they are relying on highly questionable carbon capture and storage (CCS) instead of focussing on cutting greenhouse gases. I'm ashamed of our Govt and I cannot understand how MKCC can be pushing ahead with all this house building without insisting on "Passiv" building standards and air source heat pumps. What is wrong with them? The NP3 talks about sustainability there there's absolutely no demand that the developer MUST build eco friendly homes. Pete Marland wrote an article in MK Pulse January 2022 claiming the Tickford Fields Farm development would be the UK's largest eco village.....he should be held to that; it would have been the single positive element amidst the horrors of the whole MK East programme which will see 4600 homes plus another 800 still to be announced built on land which will aggravate our current flooding issues in Newport Pagnell and I'm not aware of any restrictions about non penetrable surfaces.....every hard surface should have to be penetrable to rain.....the technology exists, but the will seems in extremely short supply! Finally, I've had some quotations for retro-fitting</p> <p>my home to eco friendly or Passiv standards and it's enormously expensive. Not dissimilar to knocking down my 4-5 bedroom home and starting afresh. It's a cold house, expensive to heat, just like millions of others. SUGGESTIONS Could MKCC be asked to make 5% of the Tickford Fields site available to 'self build'; I don't want to build my own house personally - I want to be permitted to use my own architect and builder so I can build a Passiv house with as many eco credentials as possible. I am retired and have the money to do this., while still living in my current home. I know there are other people in the same position. We would want plots at the Chicheley Street side of the site because we are retired/older and want to be able to access Newport Pagnell town centre, the medical centre, dentists, churches and community centres, relying on walking or, eventually if necessary, mobility scooter. Do not allow the cost of Passiv houses/eco friendly options to deter a developer from taking on the Tickford Field development. Of course building costs have increased enormously with the war in Ukraine, the cost of gas and electricity, inflation etc., so new homes are going to be expensive but some people are still quite well-off - give us the opportunity to buy houses which will be warm and economical to heat in the future - release us from the worry of the rising costs of gas and electricity, worry over the potentially greater cost of hydrogen (irrespective of safety concerns)...we'd far rather spend an extra £150,000 buying a home designed for the future, rather than shivering in old draughty homes or facing the enormous cost and upheaval of retrofitting them. The Steering Group did not consider that the opportunity to provide a number of self build sites would arise within this Neighbourhood Plan, particularly as the main landowner, MKCC, had not shown any interest in this concept. The Police Station site lends itself more to smaller units, particularly for elderly people given its proximity to the Town centre. Boiler provision</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN V3 EARLY CONSULTATION EVENT RESPONSES
(Steering Group responses in BOLD)

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|------------|---|
| | | | in new homes is already being addressed though Government legislation. It was not felt that there was a need to repeat this as a policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Response 12 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 13 | N/A | NO | N/A |
| Response 14 | It goes without saying the buildings should be of a high quality, sustainable and future-proof. I agree with the points and that the town centre and heritage should be promoted and protected. No comment. | YES | I believe it should be considered the benefit of lowering the speed limit on all 30MPH roads within the town boundary to 20MPH. This will make our roads safer and avoid near misses, accidents and potentially fatalities. This will be more important when there are more residents in town and the focus is on promoting safe walking and cycling routes in and around the town. It also benefits the existing residents and will lower road noise and pollution. This is a matter for the Highways Authority, this is not a consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Response 15 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 16 | The developers and land owners will no doubt profit considerably from this whereas the people who live in this town will suffer. I have already heard that the previous landowners have emigrated to somewhere with more green spaces- the irony. No comment. | YES | N/A |
| Response 17 | N/A | YES | N/A |
| Response 18 | SMV do not wish to comment on this policy | NO | N/A |