

## NEWPORT PAGNELL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2016–2031 SECOND MODIFICATION CONSULTATION STATEMENT

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012 section 15(2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- a) details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan.
- b) explains how they were consulted.
- c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted.
- d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

### 1. THE STEERING GROUP

The Steering Group, otherwise known as the Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group (NPIG), consists of voting members, these being eight Town Councillors (Cllrs Ian Carman - Chairman, Phil Winsor, Euan Henderson, Diane Kitchen, Richard Pearson, Roger Hornblow, Binta Bah-Pokawa, Philip Gage, a non-voting member (Alan Mills - retired senior planning officer), the Town Clerk (Shar Roselman) and the Deputy Clerk (Abi Bassett). The Steering Group met approx. every 2 – 3 months from January 2021 to January 2023. From January 2021 to November 2022, the Steering Group discussed and agreed the scope of the proposed modifications to the plan.

### 2. CONSULTATIONS WITH LANDOWNERS

#### 2.1 Early Consultations

Starting in February 2022, the Steering Group contacted by letter and tried to arrange meetings with the following landowners/agents to outline the proposed Plan and to gauge support.

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP TO OWNER	LAND	CONSULTATION RESPONSE	STEERING GROUP RESPONSE
Paul Allen – at Bidwells, agent for the Needham family. Paul Allen has now been replaced by the agent David Jones of Robinson and Hall.	Land South of A422	At a meeting on 24 11 23, Mr Allen was asked if the owners had any intentions for the land, and he was advised of the Biodiversity Net Gain opportunities. At the time of the meeting, Mr Allen had not discussed BDN options with the landowners. He advised that the owners currently have no plans to do anything with the land, but that he would raise the possibility of carbon offsetting with them to gauge their reception. Should the landowners wish to discuss it further, the Clerk invited them to enter into a dialogue with NPTC.	The Steering Group considers that no further consultation outside of the Regulation 16 consultation is required, as all efforts to discuss the matter have been exhausted.
Paul Allen – at Bidwells, agent for the Needham family. Paul Allen has now been replaced by the agent David Jones of Robinson and Hall.	Land East of Willen Road Sports Ground.	As above.	As above.
James Paynter agent for land east of WRSG , acting for Bloor Homes on behalf of the owners the Saunders family	Triangular piece of land to the east of Willen Road Sports Ground	Bloor Homes has agreed to use this land as sports field provision for their MK East site, to the South of Newport Pagnell.	Agreed that this site should be developed in this way, to allow effective collective management of the sporting facilities.

James Paynter agent for land east of WRSG , acting for Bloor Homes on behalf of the owners the Saunders family	One of the three owners of land West of Willen Road Sports Ground	Bloor Homes has already made a planning application which was approved, and uses this piece of land for biodiversity offsetting against development in the MK East site.	Agreed that this site should be used for biodiversity and carbon offsetting purposes.
Louise Knapp	Land opposite WRSG	Telephone conversation with the Town Clerk where the policies, in particular Policy NP4, were explained. Ms Knapp stated she would consider the policies and respond in due course. No further response received.	The Steering Group considers that no further consultation outside of the Regulation 16 consultation is required, as all efforts to discuss the matter have been exhausted.
John Gale, Savills, agent for The Society of Merchant Venturers	Portfields Farm	Initial response to meeting was that Savills offered an alternative site for biodiversity offsetting, wishing to retain this site for possible future development despite its lack of access.	The Steering Group felt that the alternative site offered which was to the north of Portfield farm, between the farm and the Great Ouse River, was already a highly diverse site, being rich in alluvial soil and holding a wealth of wildlife. No further benefit could be achieved by setting this land aside for biodiversity and carbon offsetting. Portfield Farm itself also offers great potential to retain and extend the wildlife corridor and its loss to building would lose the links to Bury Field Common.
Landowner	1-3 High Street	The owners of 1-3 High Street gave their support for their properties to be listed in Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre as properties deemed suitable for second storey redevelopment.	No further action required.
Landowner	58-58a High Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	62 High Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	64 High Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.

		Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	
Landowner	66 High Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	85 High Street	The owners of 85 High Street gave their support for their properties to be listed in Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre as properties deemed suitable for second storey redevelopment.	No further action required.
Landowner	129 High Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	5 St John Street	The owners of 5 St John Street gave their support for their properties to be listed in Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre as properties deemed suitable for second storey redevelopment.	No further action required.
Landowner	7-9 St John Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	11-13 St John Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.

Landowner	15 St John Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	17-17a St John Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Landowner	19-21 St John Street	The Steering Group has written two (2) letters; one to the occupier and one to the registered owner as established by a Land Registry search. It has also advertised in a local newspaper that the Neighbourhood Plan would be affecting this and other properties. No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this landowner. No further action required.
Stuart Proffitt, Director Environment & Property, Milton Keynes City Council – owner of site	Library site St John's Street	In principle Stuart Proffitt and the Head Librarian agreed that MKCC may not be able to continue to manage the library in the long term future, and would welcome the opportunity for it to move to other premises particularly if the Town Council were to manage the new premises at their cost.	Agreed with this but further comments from MKCC were forthcoming. See details under Reg 14 consultation. A new meeting has been arranged with Stuart Proffitt and the Head of Libraries.
Stuart Proffitt (representing the owner MKCC) and Milton Keynes Development Partnership (agent for MKCC).	Tickford Field site	The entire development was agreed over an extended 4 year negotiating period with MKDP, and a Memorandum of Understanding has been agreed with Stuart Proffitt about development contributions on this site.	Both the Steering Group and MKCC are fully aligned on the development of this site.
Giles Ferris – agent, Stimpson Eve, for the owners of the builder's yard. He holds an option on the land in the future.	Builder's yard, Union Street.	The land can only be developed on the death of the current very elderly owner as the site is held in trust until this occurs. In principle, once this occurs there are plans for development on the site. Stimpson Eve's preference is for large 4 bed dwellings, but they are open to discussion.	The Steering Group agreed with residential development for this site, but evidence indicated a strong need for smaller properties, particularly around the town centre, and the lack of parking demonstrated a need for a pedestrian walkway to link the site with Queens Ave car park.
Duncan Mason – funeral director and owner of site	H.W. Mason & Sons Funeral Directors, 9 High Street	Duncan Mason could see definite possibilities for changing the north side of	Steering Group agreed with this perspective, particularly as the buildings

		St. John Street, as his business needed to be expanded. His other business is a retail consultancy which offers services to large building companies and planners.	in question detract significantly from the historic street scene.
Churchill Retirement Living (Developer), holds the site under contract with TVP.	Old Police Station site, 124 High Street	Planning ref: 22/00280/FUL refused, matter has now gone to appeal (appeal ref: APP/Y0435/W/23/3333914). The Town Council has requested to be a Rule 6(6) party, in support of the appeal.	The Steering Group is in this instance aligned with the planning application for the site, which corresponds with policy NP3

### 3. PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

The Steering Group held 3 open, public consultation sessions on Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> February, Saturday 11<sup>th</sup> March and Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2023. These sessions were held in local community centres during a variety of times to enable as many people to attend as possible. The policies and policy maps were displayed on large presentation boards and members of the steering group were in attendance to answer any questions. Feedback forms were available at the sessions for attendees to either fill in then or take away with them to consider. The policies and maps were also available to view or download from the Town Council's website and a link was provided to a Survey Monkey survey so that anyone that had not had a chance to attend a session could still view the proposed policies and give their feedback. Over 100 people attended the 3 sessions and provided feedback. The main concerns that were raised were lack of secondary school provision at the Tickford Field development, parking provision at Willen Road Sports Ground and the MK East development. It should be noted that the MK East development falls outside of the scope of this neighbourhood plan designated area and is not in this parish. (See Appendix 1 for written public responses, (although there were many more positive verbal comments, particularly about the use of the Police Station Site, and about Policy NP4), and the Steering Group's response to those written responses. The Steering Group's comments are in **bold** underneath the original comment.)

### 4. SIX WEEK CONSULTATION WITH STATUTORY AND OTHER CONSULTEES (REGULATION 14)

The initial 6 week statutory consultation period started on 1<sup>st</sup> September and was due to conclude on 12<sup>th</sup> October 2023. At the time of the pre-submission consultation, Newport Pagnell Town Council and the steering group wrote letters to and/or emailed the following consultees, formally opening the consultation and advising them of the Town Council's website address where the consultation documents could be read, and inviting comments.

Although the consultation formally opened on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2023, it was later realised that one of the consultation documents, the Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA), had been omitted from the documents upload to the Town Council's website. On advice from their consultant, the Town Council uploaded the missing document and then 'reset the clock' on the consultation, meaning that it ran for a further 6 weeks from 12<sup>th</sup> October to 9<sup>th</sup> November 2023. The consultees (above) then received a second notification letter to let them know about the amended timeline and that the SEA was available to view with the other consultation documents.

A range of methods were employed to advise residents where they could find the Regulation 14 consultation documents and how to make formal comments on the proposals. Everyone was given the opportunity to either request a hard copy by post or to visit the Town Council offices to view the documents, in addition to the information published on the Town Council's website. An online survey was set up (via Survey Monkey) giving residents the opportunity to comment on the proposals. The survey was advertised on the Town Council's website, its Facebook Account, and on the Facebook Local Chit Chat Group in Newport Pagnell that has 30,000 members, many living in Newport Pagnell. Targeted Facebook and Instagram messaging was also applied to account holders who have Newport Pagnell postcodes. Letters were hand delivered to all local businesses in the town centre. A large banner was erected advising residents of the Regulation 14 consultation.

## 5. REGULATION 14 - CONSULTEES AND RESPONSES RECEIVED

Consultee	Response	Steering Group Response	Amendments to NPNP	Further actions taken by the NPTC Steering Group
Natural England	<p><b>Policy NP4: Green and Blue Infrastructure Network</b> We welcome the inclusion of <i>Policy NP4</i> which will aid in the protection of green spaces from inappropriate development and the connection of 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. Annex A provides examples of Green Infrastructure. The attached annex sets out sources of environmental information and some natural environment issues you may wish to consider as you develop your neighbourhood plan or order.</p> <p><b>Environment and Biodiversity Enhancement</b> The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights the role of 'policies and decision making to minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity' (para 174). We would recommend that a policy is added to promote the ecological enhancement of new developments and the wider parish. The policy should provide greater clarity on implementation of the Mitigation Hierarchy, to ensure on-site avoidance, mitigation and compensation is implemented prior to off-site to ensure the policy is consistent with NPPF paras.175, 179. Further general advice on the natural environment and issues and opportunities for your Neighbourhood planning is provided at Annex A.</p>	<p>The consultee supports the approach of Policy NP4 and provides standard advice provided to Neighbourhood Plan Groups.</p> <p>The advice relating to implementation of the Mitigation Hierarchy is noted. As strategic policy has not yet been established to guide the implementation of BNG, it is recommended that a new Clause C of Policy NP4 is inserted.</p>	<p>New Clause C of Policy NP4 is inserted as per the suggestion as follows: <b><i>“C. All qualifying development proposals will be required to deliver at least a 10% measurable biodiversity net gain using the Defra metric or locally approved Biodiversity Impact Assessment Metric. Biodiversity should be provided on-site wherever possible. Off-site measures will only be considered where it can be demonstrated that, after following the mitigation hierarchy, all reasonable opportunities to achieve measurable net gains on-site have been exhausted or where greater gains can be delivered off-site through maximising local place making and nature improvement opportunities.”</i></b></p> <p>Existing Clauses C – H re-numbered accordingly.</p> <p>Amend/add to the preceding supporting text: <b><i>Clauses C - E respond to the biodiversity net gain (BNG) provisions of the Environment Act 2021, which will become a statutory part of plan-making and development management in November 2023 January 2024, April 2024 for small sites...</i></b></p>	None.

			<p><b><i>Biodiversity net gain can be achieved on-site, off-site or through a combination of on-site and off-site measures, or, as a last resort, through the purchase of statutory biodiversity credits. Clause C establishes the preference for biodiversity net gain to be delivered in accordance with the biodiversity mitigation hierarchy: avoidance, minimization, restoration and offsets. If at least 10% biodiversity net gain cannot be achieved on-site, then off-site biodiversity net gain may be acceptable, and applicants are directed to the opportunities identified as part of this Neighbourhood Plan.</i></b></p>	
Environment Agency	<p><u>Flood Risk</u></p> <p>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan includes areas which are located in Flood Zone 2 and 3. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paras 159-165, we remind you that the Sequential Test and Exception Tests should be undertaken if the plan is proposing development or promoting growth to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk taking climate change into account. The application of the Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA). This is reflected in section 4.9.3 of the Plan, which states: "Any site for development within a high-risk flood zone will need a site-specific flood assessment proposing flood mitigation measures but this already forms part of the Planning Authority's regulations so there is no need to build it into the Neighbourhood Plan."</p> <p>We note section 5.3 indicates parts of the town centre where new housing development can take place, including No.1 Station Road. As this site sits within Flood Zone 3, we welcome the inclusion of Policy NP3, Section C, particularly the requirement that any development must demonstrate that the scheme will be safe for its lifetime and will not increase flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p><u>Water Resources</u></p> <p>Being in one of the driest areas of the country, our environment has come under significant pressure from potable water demand. New developments should make a significant contribution towards reducing water</p>	<p>The Environment Agency helpfully recognises that the Sequential and Exception Test should be undertaken in relation to the vacant yard adjoining No.1 Station Road, the subject of Clause C in Policy NP3. The preceding text supporting the policy demonstrates how these tests have been met. The response also supports the provisions of Clause C in Policy NP3 in relation to its provisions on flood risk.</p> <p>The response also raises awareness of limited water resources in the area as well as groundwater protection. It is noted that the provisions of Plan:MK on water supply and groundwater protection (at Policy FR1) which requires all new development to demonstrate that appropriate provisions have been made will continue to apply to new development in the neighbourhood area.</p>	No amendments necessary.	None.

	<p>demand and mitigate against the risk of deterioration to our rivers, groundwater and habitats from groundwater abstraction. We recommend you check the capacity of available water supplies with the water company, in line with the emerging 2024 Water Resources Management Plan which is due to be published in 2023. The Local Planning Authorities Water Cycle Study and Local Plan may indicate constraints in water supply and provide recommendations for phasing of development to tie in with new alternative strategic supplies.</p> <p>New development should as a minimum meet the highest levels of water efficiency standards, as per the policies in the adopted Local Plan. In most cases development will be expected to achieve 110 litres per person per day as set out in <a href="#">the Building Regulations &amp;c. (Amendment) Regulations 2015</a>. However, a higher standard of water efficiency (e.g. 85 l/p/d) should be considered, looking at all options including rainwater harvesting and greywater systems. Using the water efficiency calculator in Part G of the Building Regulations enables you to calculate the devices and fittings required to ensure a home is built to the right specifications to meet the 110 l/p/d requirement. We recommend all new non-residential development of 1000sqm gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption. Developments that require their own abstraction where it will exceed 20 cubic metres per day from a surface water source (river, stream) or from underground strata (via borehole or well) will require an abstraction licence under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991. There is no guarantee that a licence will be granted as this is dependent on available water resources and existing protected rights. The relevant abstraction licencing strategy for your area provides information on water availability and licencing policy at <a href="#">Abstraction licencing strategies (CAMS process) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)</a>.</p> <p><u>Informative</u></p> <p>We encourage you to seek ways in which your neighbourhood plan can improve the local environment. For your information, together with Natural England, Historic England and Forestry Commission, we have published joint guidance on neighbourhood planning, which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans. This is available at: How to consider the environment in Neighbourhood plans - Locality Neighbourhood Planning.</p> <p><u>Groundwater Protection</u></p> <p>Your plan includes areas which are located on principal and secondary aquifers. These should be considered within your plan if growth or development is proposed here. The relevance of the designation and the potential</p>			
--	--	--	--	--



	<p>implication upon development proposals should be considered with reference to our Groundwater Protection guidance:  <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/groundwater-protection</a></p>			
The Society of Merchant Venturers	<p>The Society of Merchant Venturers (SMV) supports the making of the Neighbourhood Plan and the general principle of delivering biodiversity gain.</p> <p>Nevertheless, SMV hold concern in respect of the proposals to reserve land for biodiversity net gain (BNG) in the way set out by Policy NP4. These concerns are detailed below and specifically relate to the SMV landholdings at the site identified as Portfield Farm, which lies to the north of Newport Pagnell.</p> <p>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 arising through new development on land. No development is being proposed via the Neighbourhood Plan that will specifically link delivery of BNG offset to Portfield Farm. Furthermore, the Environment Act requires that land be registered for BNG offsetting by the landowner and presently the land at Portfield Farm is not registered, which would contradict the statutory provisions of the Act.</p> <p>Portfield Farm is subject to an agricultural tenancy and as such is not currently available for any form of use other than for agriculture. The allocation proposed by NP4 is neither subject to a policy mechanism to secure BNG or deliverable in nature.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan makes several references to the proposed BNG sites as 'stepping stones' which is taken from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 174. The NPPF defines these as "pockets of habitat that, while not necessarily connected, facilitate the movement of species across otherwise inhospitable landscapes".</p> <p>The proposals for the three sites on the edge of Newport Pagnell read less as stepping stones for the movement of species but as a barrier to development in what are largely sustainable locations in close proximity to the urban edge of the settlement. If these areas were to be 100% given over to BNG set aside, assuming linked development off site within the authority, then this would restrict development on the edge of the town in these locations for a period of at least 30 years. With these sites effectively removed from the assessment of sustainable development under the planning system, it could stifle the growth of Newport Pagnell.</p> <p>SMV notes 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 minimum target of 10% gain is laudable. The Town's ambitions to support</p>	<p>In line with DEFRA's recommendations to Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to prepare for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), the Qualifying Body has identified local habitat creation and enhancement opportunities in a way which maximises local place making and nature improvement opportunities. Identifying how and where off-site BNG should be delivered is also recommended by the Planning Advisory Service for the purposes of plan-making. The Qualifying Body has been guided by this leading practice and advice in identifying locations most suitable for BNG. Appendix 2 of the published Neighbourhood Plan document demonstrates the potential the proposed biodiversity off-setting sites have in increasing biodiversity within the town. Alongside this, the Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for growth over the plan period that remains in excess of what would have been a reasonable contribution to the LPA's objectively assessed housing need. The site assessment process followed for the made Neighbourhood Plan has already been scrutinised and Portfield Farm ranked low in terms of its suitability for housing development, particularly in relation to accessibility. It was therefore not selected as a residential site allocation and is not needed to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. Its location in relation to the wider green infrastructure network however is significant and can play an important role in maximising local nature improvement opportunities. It is understood that realising these opportunities will rely upon future investment and</p>	<p>Addition of an explanation in the supporting text of Policy NP4 regarding why the alternative site was refused.</p>	<p>None.</p>

	<p>this through their Neighbourhood Plan is equally forward thinking and the SMV would be keen to support their endeavours – indeed SMV have engaged and proposed an alternative site opportunity in order to further explore meeting such aspirations. The Town Council opted not to further investigate this line of enquiry, despite the greater suitability and greater likelihood of the identified land becoming available.</p> <p>As a deliverable strategy for biodiversity on the Portfield Farm site SMV consider that a more realistic mechanism to achieve BNG is to accommodate development, which in turn can then be offset with onsite ecological creation to provide a BNG of at least 10% as mandated by the 2021 legislation. SMV intends to continue to promote Portfield Farm for development in future, respectful of the strategy set out by the consultation material of the Neighbourhood Plan and that development may not be realised in the immediate term.</p>	the support of relevant landowners.		
National Highways	<p>National Highways welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Proposed Modifications to the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>National Highways has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. In relation to the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan, our principal interest is in safeguarding the operation of the M1 which borders to plan to the west. We agree with the policies set out in the plan and wish to request we are consulted when planning applications come forward in the usual way. Particular for the Tickfords Fields Development. Due to its size and location we will want the developer to shown (sic) the impact on the SRN.</p>	The Consultee agrees with the policies set out in the plan.	No further action necessary.	None.
Mr Hill, Newport Pagnell resident	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2023 version of the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan. I have a comment regarding Policy NP1B.</p> <p>As a long-standing (45 years+) resident of Newport Pagnell I value the town and its community and have found it to be a very pleasant town to reside. I recognise that part of its attraction is dependent on what we all have inherited from previous generations, and we should seek to retain the best elements of that inheritance. I therefore support the Council's objective of retaining the character of its older residential areas where this is beneficial. The Design Study has been a positive step in providing sound guidance on how this may be achieved.</p> <p>My particular concern is how such guidance has been translated into a simplified sentence in Policy NP1B. That sentence reads:</p>	It was agreed that there was some conflict between Policies NP1(b) and NP6 in this respect. To remedy this, it was agreed to incorporate Mr Hall's comments into Policy NP1(b).	Incorporation of Mr Hall's comments into Policy NP1(b): "Proposals to subdivide residential plots to develop new homes on rear or side gardens will not be supported unless they maintain the area's prevailing character and setting as defined in the Newport Pagnell Design Study."	None.

	<p><i>Proposals to subdivide residential plots to develop new homes on rear or side garden land will not be supported.</i></p> <p>This statement is clear and suggests no potential for exceptions. However, the discussion at paragraph 5.1.2 indicates differently. That paragraph seems to indicate that proposals that comply with the guidance issued in the Design Study would be allowable if they were appropriate and sympathetic. I can understand that developments in rear gardens are unlikely to meet the design criteria, but paragraph 5.1.2 suggests that some “in-line” developments on side gardens would meet the design criteria. I concur with this – indeed some development of side gardens can provide a better fit with the Design Study than what is there already. Not all side land is pleasant garden land. Indeed, there is a potential inconsistency between the sentence in italics above and the previous sentence in the Policy which relates to encouraging “<i>suitable and beneficial reuse of previously developed land</i>”. Surely, what is important is that any development is appropriate and sympathetic. This should be reflected not only in the discussion paragraph but also in the Policy.</p> <p>I therefore suggest that the Policy be reworded as follows:</p> <p><i>Proposals to subdivide residential plots to develop new homes on rear or side gardens will not be supported unless they are appropriate and accord with the criteria set out in the Design Study.</i></p> <p>This I believe is in accordance with the discussion of this item at the Council Meeting on 10 July 2023 where the minute reads:</p> <p><i>Any applicant for such development (involving subdivision of plots) must demonstrate why it would be acceptable to not have regard to the 2020 Newport Pagnell Design Study.</i></p>			
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP1: Settlement Boundary and New Housing Clause A - The Police Station site</p> <p>This modification materially changes the allocation of this site from 14 homes to an indeterminate number of homes, with a preference for retirement living uses. The pre-amble at para 5.1.2 states “the Police Station site has a planning application pending determination”, which is no longer correct – that application for retirement living having been refused for several reasons, including matters of principle relating to flood risk.</p> <p>Part of this site lies within Flood Zone 3 and therefore any development must meet the sequential test. Do you have any new evidence as to the need for retirement living uses on that site?</p>	<p>NP1 Clause A:</p> <p>The recent officer’s report for planning application 22/0280/FUL in its paragraphs 7.10 – 7.13 establishes the need for retirement living uses in MK. On housing needs, the Neighbourhood Plan concludes that residents continue to seek homes for their grown children and some of the population is looking to downsize. The location of the site in proximity to infrastructure and services within the town demonstrates that the location is suitable for development of this type.</p>	<p>The Steering Group amended policy NP1 on use, mix, sequential test, and parking by properly allocating this site.</p>	<p>Meeting held with Churchills on 12<sup>th</sup> Dec 23 where it was established that Churchill Developers have lodged an appeal on this site. It was therefore felt that this site may well be viable for development if the appeal is approved. The appeal hearing is scheduled for 12<sup>th</sup> March. The Steering Group has asked permission to be a rule 6 party at this appeal.</p>

Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP1: Settlement Boundary and New Housing Clause B - Use of garden land</p> <p>The closing limb from NP4A in the 2021 made version, stating <i>"Proposals to subdivide residential plots to develop new homes on rear or side garden land will not be supported"</i>, has been moved to policy NP1.</p> <p>The NPPF states, at para 71, "... <i>Plans should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area</i>".</p> <p>The term 'inappropriate' requires a judgement to be made on each and every case, so an 'in principle' refusal for such proposals does not accord with the national framework.</p> <p>Also, contrary to it being stated that it continues the approach in the made plan to "resist inappropriate" development, the proposed wording of NP1 steps further, imposing a blanket ban in the context of what NP1 seeks to do (i.e. steer the locations of new housing development) and ignoring whether the development is inappropriate or not in terms of impact. This does not accord with the NPPF, nor strategic policies of Plan:MK, and therefore fails to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>If this part of the policy is to be retained, it should be amended to identify the circumstances in which inappropriate development would be resisted.</p>	<p>See response to Mr Roger Hall's comments above.</p> <p>MKCC quotes one NPPF paragraph and concludes that policy provision does not meet basic conditions for national or strategic policy. MKCC to clarify how it has come to that conclusion. It is therefore recommended that a meeting to clarify this matter is sought.</p>	Amendment to Policy NP1(b) as above.	Follow up meeting held with MKCC 12 <sup>th</sup> Dec 23. MKCC agreed with the new wording of Policy NP1(b).
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre</p> <p>NPPF para 16 (b) states that "plans should be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable." There are too many uncertainties with regard to the delivery of the proposals within this policy. The NPPF states that "to be considered deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years." This policy would be better written as a series of criteria which would enable redevelopment within the town centre, but without identifying specific sites.</p>	The Steering Group considered the points raised by MKCC and understood that principles would be helpful, but nevertheless felt that the identification of the sites would clarify such principles.		
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre Clause A</p> <p>A character study to inform the reasons for allowing the specified properties to extend upwards, and not others, is absent. Set criteria should be established to avoid the identification of properties being too subjective. Question whether some of the properties listed would be suitable for 3 storey development, given the impact that this would have on neighbouring/adjoining listed buildings or non-designated heritage assets.</p>	Whether a building makes a positive, neutral, or negative impact on the character of a conservation area is a subjective judgement. It is accepted that a buildings contribution can include well designed modern buildings which also contribute to the special character of a place as they contribute to its evolution as recognised in paragraphs 2.36 and 2.37 of the Newport Pagnell Design Study attached to the Plan.	The following text is inserted in bullet point 2 in Appendix 4: <b><i>"...In doing so the NPIG undertook a walkaround with the consultants. It was noted that the character of the Town Centre (as a Conservation Area) continues to be diminished by the appearance of two of its three main gateways:</i></b>	Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12th December 23. MKCC content with new wording.

		<p>The Design Study also recognises that new buildings have been constructed in prominent locations within the town centre which are not appropriate for the context.</p> <p>It should be noted that the final policy provision in Clause A seeks to ensure that a judgement is made on adjoining heritage assets as well as their settings in relation to any detailed schemes being submitted.</p> <p>Also, please see amendments made to Policy NP3(a) as above.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>High Street/Station Road from the west – a combination of the public car park, the prominent vacant site adjoining and to the rear of Subway and the single storey building occupied by a takeaway;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Tickford Street/St. John Street from the south – a combination of the mass of the 60s retail units on St. John Street, the library building and public car park and undercroft garages.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Its character is also diminished by a combination of car parking and service areas to the rear of 58-72 High Street as well as the massing of the Co-op building (no. 62) which detract from the appearance of Union Street.”</b></p>	
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre Clause B - The library site</p> <p>The deliverability of this policy is questioned. There is no evidence that the library is looking to relocate or that the Town Council's offices would be an acceptable alternative site. Relocation of the Town Council offices is dependent on redevelopment of the Police Station site, but the application for retirement homes has been refused.</p> <p>As stated previously, the Library Service has invested quite heavily in the building and would need to be consulted on any proposals to relocate. Both the Property team and the Library Service would have to work together on any such proposition. This hasn't happened to date and there don't appear to be any internal discussions in the pipeline. So, as it stands the NP policy does not have MKCC backing.</p>	<p>The 1960's building on the site detracts from the significance and setting of heritage assets. It is also understood that the existing library building is too large for its existing purpose and one of the floors is not fit for purpose and is not used as part of the library. Previously the Town Council has consulted the Director of Library Services and the Head Librarian who agreed to open discussions on moving the library service. The Town Council is therefore seeking to negotiate the relocation of this service in a building that is more suitable, and negotiations are ongoing. The plan period runs until 2031 by which time the building is likely to require refurbishment in any case. The policy only supports the redevelopment of the site if this service can be relocated.</p>	<p>No change to policy at this time, but change to supporting text</p>	<p>Meeting with Simon Sims and Stuart Proffitt (February 24). It was agreed that the Library site was part of a wider conversation, and it would be discussed again in due course.</p>
	<p>Policy NP3: Living in the Town Centre Clause C - 1 Station Road</p>	<p>The fact that individual planning applications have not passed the</p>	<p>No change to policy; however, a meeting is needed with</p>	<p>Follow up meeting held with MKCC on 12<sup>th</sup> Dec</p>

Milton Keynes City Council	<p>It is not possible to simply declare that a site passes the sequential test without a robust assessment, objective evidence of which has not been supplied. It would need to be demonstrated that a site of this size is needed to meet housing needs, this development requires this locality (i.e. the town centre of Newport Pagnell) and that this site is less at risk of flooding than others which could meet the housing capacity proposed. It is noted that permission has been refused for development on this site of several occasions in the last 15 months (refs. 21/02388/FUL, 22/02078/FUL and 23/01163/FUL) on flood risk sequential test grounds. An appeal is now pending consideration of the latest refusal. The basis for the inclusion of this site is therefore questioned when an in-principle position has been repeatedly established through a 'testing' of the evidence.</p>	<p>sequential test is not relevant. It is not clear whether MKCC has interrogated the supporting text of Policy NP4 which explains how the sequential test has been applied. It explains that there are no reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development. The proposed development seeks to improve the vitality and viability of the Town Centre and conserve and enhance the historic town centre. The site is the only prominent site at this gateway to the Town Centre which currently detracts from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There is therefore considered to be no other reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in this specific location. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) makes it clear that the geographical area for the sequential test will be defined by local circumstances (PPG: 027 Reference ID: 7-027-20220825) and the objectives of the Modified Plan has done so in a way that promotes sustainable development, the vitality and viability of the Town Centre and that seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment. A scheme should also lead to better outcomes in terms of managing flood risk as demonstrated in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). It is therefore recommended that this matter is clarified with MKCC at the proposed meeting.</p>	<p>MKCC to clarify that the purpose of the policy is not to identify sites for development but to improve the gateway appearance to the Town Centre.</p>	<p>23. MKCC agreed to discuss the sequential test issue internally and respond early in the new year. No response received at the time of submission.</p>
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Para 5.4.2 (third para) states “The BNG Metric (currently in its 3.1 version) will provide the means for applicants to calculate the baseline biodiversity value of the application site in determining the net gain requirement of their proposals.” Current metric is now 4.0 but I would not include that detail anyway as it will be further updated. Para 5.4.2 (third para) states “Green infrastructure is multi-functional but some features – for example amenity and formal recreational land – are unlikely to have biodiversity value or will be suited to improving that value</p>	<p>The Steering Group recognises that the BNG Metric will change but believes that the current metric is a good starting point, and by identifying it as 4.0 prohibits biodiversity improvements lower than this base rate.</p>	<p>The background text was amended to reflect the updated BNG metric of 4.0.</p>	

	by the nature of their use.” All areas will have some value, and most will be capable of improvement and enhancement.			
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clause A</p> <p>An evidential basis is required to assess sites as to their status and inform whether to designate (or not) land for planning policy reasons. No evidence is provided to allow for a robust testing of these designations. For example, no reference is made to allotments which should also be classified as ‘green infrastructure’.</p>	MKCC has raised concerns regarding the use of certain terms. It is therefore recommended that the policy wording is amended.	<p>Amend Clause A as follows:</p> <p><b><i>“A. The Neighbourhood Plan <u>designates identifies</u> a Green and Blue Infrastructure Network, as shown on the Policies Map, for the multi-functional purposes of promoting ecological connectivity (wildlife corridors), outdoor recreation and sustainable movement through the town and into neighbouring parishes and helping mitigate climate change. The Network <del>comprises</del> includes the Town’s existing variety of green spaces, <u>such as</u> ancient woodland, trees and hedgerows, water bodies, assets of biodiversity value, parks, children’s play areas, recreational playing fields, off-street footways, cycleways and bridleways, and green corridors connecting these spaces across the Parish.”</i></b></p>	Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 23. MKCC were content with the new wording.
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clause B</p> <p>The first part of the clause needs amending to clarify its intention. It includes a requirement for development proposals that lie within or adjoining the Network to create, maintain and improve the Network. However, proposals will not need to do all three things – ‘and’ should be replaced with ‘or’.</p> <p>The statement with regard to protection of trees and hedgerows should be qualified along the lines of “Elsewhere, all proposals should protect and maintain mature trees and hedgerows where possible ...”.</p>	MKCC has raised concerns regarding the use of certain terms. It is therefore recommended that the policy wording is amended.	<p>Amend Clause B as follows:</p> <p><b><i>“B. Development proposals that lie within or adjoining the Network will be required to create, maintain and or improve the Network in the design of their layouts, landscaping schemes and public open space and play provisions. Elsewhere, all proposals should protect and maintain <u>mature</u> trees and hedgerows <u>where possible</u>, and provide for the planting of new trees, hedgerows and other appropriate planting to enhance the quality of the public realm...”</i></b></p>	Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 23. MKCC were content with the new wording.

Milton Keynes City Council	Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clauses C & D Second sentence of these clauses is commentary and should be moved to the supporting text.	Both second sentences in these clauses are intended to be policy. Case law indicates that supporting text does not carry the full weight of planning policy. The purpose of the second sentence is to leave the decision-maker in no doubt as to how the policy clause should be interpreted.	No amendments necessary.	
Milton Keynes City Council	Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clause E Have landowners been made aware of the Biodiversity Net Gain offsetting sites that have been designated? What evidence is there that these will be deliverable?	NP4 Clause E: As per the Society of Merchant Venturers response: <i>"In line with DEFRA's recommendations to Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to prepare for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), the Qualifying Body has identified local habitat creation and enhancement opportunities in a way which maximises local place making and nature improvement opportunities. Identifying how and where off-site BNG should be delivered is also recommended by the Planning Advisory Service for the purposes of plan-making. The Qualifying Body has been guided by this leading practice and advice in identifying locations most suitable for BNG. Appendix 2 of the published Neighbourhood Plan document demonstrates the potential the proposed biodiversity off-setting sites have in increasing biodiversity within the town. Alongside this, the Neighbourhood Plan makes provision for growth over the plan period that remains in excess of what would have been a reasonable contribution to the LPA's objectively assessed housing need. The site assessment process followed for the made Neighbourhood Plan has already been scrutinised and Portfield Farm ranked low in terms of its suitability for housing development, particularly in relation to accessibility. It was therefore not selected as a residential site allocation and is not needed to meet the housing requirement over the plan period. Its location in relation to the wider green infrastructure network</i>	It was agreed that the policy does not have to demonstrate deliverability, rather its aim is to identify sites that would be suitable. Therefore, no amendments to policy are considered necessary.	



		<i>however is significant and can play an important role in maximising local nature improvement opportunities. It is understood that realising these opportunities will rely upon future investment and the support of relevant landowners.</i>		
Milton Keynes City Council	Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clause F The policy proposes a change to the previous linear park designation without substantive evidence or basis (removing the sports ground).	This was an error in mapping. The policy does not propose to remove the linear park extension designation. It is therefore recommended that the relevant maps are updated to show the sports ground and its proposed extension remains within the linear park designation.	Agreed to update the map(s).	Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 23. MKCC content with the updated maps.
Milton Keynes City Council	Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clauses G & H These relate to land usage proposals (leisure/recreation) and not to green infrastructure. Should be included in separate policy.	Green and blue infrastructure has a multi-functional role, including serving leisure/recreation purposes.	No further action is considered necessary at this stage.	
Milton Keynes City Council	Policy NP4 – Green Infrastructure Network Clause H Should state ‘permission will not be supported’ rather than ‘permission will be refused’.	MKCC has raised concerns regarding the use of certain terms. It is therefore recommended that the policy wording is amended.	Amend Clause H as follows: <b><i>“H....<u>Permission will be refused for proposals involving the loss of land with leisure and recreational value will not be supported.</u>”</i></b>	Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 23. MKCC agreed with the policy amendment.
Milton Keynes City Council	Policy NP5 – Aston Martin Heritage Centre Part of the proposed site is allotments. Plan:MK policy L2 and para 98 of the NPPF protect open space, unless an assessment has been undertaken which shows that the open space is no longer required or alternative provision will be provided elsewhere. No evidence is presented to demonstrate that the allotments should be allowed to be lost. The policy states ‘the majority’ of the existing woodland should be retained. It would be better to state that “The existing woodland should be retained except where the loss of trees is justified by the need for essential access.” On the Policies Map Inset 2 the woodland has been hidden under the heritage centre site notation. Part of the proposed site is designated as a Wildlife Corridor. Has any assessment of the site against the criteria in Plan:MK policy NE1 (C) been undertaken?	The site has not been used as allotments since 2022 and there are five other allotment sites serving the town, including Burgess Gardens Allotments opened in 2022. It is therefore considered that such needs are being met elsewhere in the town. MKCC has also raised concerns regarding the use of certain terms. It is therefore recommended that the policy wording is amended.  Finally, comments seek an assessment of the site against Plan:MK Policy NE1(c). That policy provision requires: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. A balancing judgement to be made in relation to local development needs and the biodiversity and geological conservation value of the site;</li></ol>	Policy amended as follows: <b><i>“...<del>The majority of the existing woodland on the site is</del> <u>should be retained except where the loss of trees is justified by the need for essential access and its biodiversity value is enhanced through new planting, to be demonstrated in a biodiversity strategy...</u>”</i></b>  <b><i>“...The development does not harm the Wildlife Corridor running alongside the River Ouzel on part of the site and demonstrates <u>this in accordance with existing development plan provisions...</u>”:</i></b>	Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12 <sup>th</sup> December 23. MKCC agreed with the policy amendment.

		<p>2. Mitigation measures to have been put in place; and</p> <p>3. Compensatory provision in line with the mitigation hierarchy to be secured with the intent to achieve a net gain in biodiversity.</p> <p>Clearly a full assessment can only be made once a detailed scheme is submitted. Nonetheless, the supporting text explains local development needs for a scheme of this nature to enable the decision-maker to assess a detailed scheme in this location and the policy makes provision for any scheme to avoid harm to the biodiversity value of that part of the site.</p>	<p>Amend/add to the preceding supporting text:</p> <p><b>“The existing woodland is of little biodiversity value, having been grown originally as a cash crop. It is being retained and would benefit from enhancement particularly with British deciduous species. Part of the site is designated as a Wildlife Corridor. The policy therefore requires a detailed scheme to avoid harm to this function at this part of the site. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate this in the submission of a planning application in accordance with Plan:MK provisions, in particular Policy NE1 (c).”</b></p>	
Milton Keynes City Council	<p>Policy NP8 – Local Cycling and Walking Clause B</p> <p>It is not clear from the wording as to what is required from development proposals. Also, development proposals is a wide-ranging term. Not all development proposals will impact on the cycling and pedestrian network. The following wording for the first sentence is suggested: <i>“Proposals on land that lies adjacent to the Network for development which would generate walking and cycling trips should make provision for a direct connection to the Network.”</i></p>	<p>MKCC requests that clarity is improved. The policy is intended to apply to all new development. Each new scheme has the potential to make walking and cycling easier and more pleasant when designing scheme layouts, means of access and landscape treatment for example.</p>	<p>In the interests of clarity, NP8 Clause B wording is amended as follows:</p> <p><b><i>“ B. Development proposals on land that lies within or adjacent to the Network should make provision for a direct connection sustain, and where practicable, enhance to the functionality and connectivity of the Network by virtue of their layout and means of access and landscape treatment. Proposals that will harm the functioning or connectivity of the Network will not be supported.”</i></b></p> <p>Amend/add to the preceding supporting text:</p> <p><b>“...Where proposals include provision for amenity spaces, landscaping, new means of access or new layouts, there may be an opportunity to relate the land better to the Network and/or improve the attractiveness and connectivity of routes.</b></p>	<p>Follow up meeting with MKCC on 12<sup>th</sup> December 23. MKCC agreed with the policy amendment.</p>

			<b>Proposals should therefore consider this in the design of schemes without undermining other planning policy objectives...”</b>	
Milton Keynes City Council	Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) The SEA should have flagged up that two allocated sites are in flood risk 3 and therefore would be subject to the sequential test. The SEA only refers to surface water flooding in relation to policy NP3, and fluvial flooding with regard to Tickford Fields.	It is recommended that the SEA is amended to recognise the full extent of Flood Zone 3 in relation to the NP allocations. It is considered that the sequential test has been undertaken where required (PPG: 027 Reference ID: 7-027-20220825).	SEA has been amended to show extent of Flood Zone 3.	
Andy Burton, Head, Ousedale School (NP Campus)	My only real comment and concern is regarding the provision of education and especially secondary education. The document states that there will be an additional 1,163 homes to meet the housing needs of the town over the plan period 2020 – 2031. The plan also states that it must ensure the adequate provision of school places. However, there are only plans for enhanced and increased primary provision, no mention or planning at all for secondary provision. This is a concern especially as the current provision at Ousedale School is too small, is outdated and failing in terms of maintenance of old buildings and environmental sustainability and carbon neutrality. A new school build within NP is essential and should be reflected in the plan we believe. Can the plan look to provide provision/ambition in terms of sites for a rebuild to create an enhanced and suitable secondary provision that would meet the increased demand from over 1,000 additional homes, and meet environmental and sustainability objectives etc?	Meeting held with Vistry Group (Tickford Field site Developers) on 07.11.23 to discuss school provision. The following options were put forward:  1) That a through-school be placed on the Tickford Field site, instead of just a pre-and primary school with the current Ousedale School site being sold for housing.  2) That part of the land at Ousedale School be sold off for housing, and a new multi-storey school be built on a smaller part of that site with the proceeds of the sale.  Vistry Group agreed to open discussions with the Head of Ousedale School.  However, MKCC have provided updated school forecast figures which do not, beyond 2025, show an oversupply of students for any year group at secondary schools in this area.  The Steering Group considered that it could not take this matter forward in the neighbourhood plan as it related to ongoing and confidential negotiations between two parties that would not necessarily be deliverable.	No change to policy necessary.	
Canals & Rivers Trust	The Trust has no waterways, assets or land interests within the area covered by the document and as such, has no comment to make.	No action required.		

NHS Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), now Integrated Care Board (ICB)	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party. Previous consultations on the first Neighbourhood Plan took place with the CCG, but there has been no response from the newly formed ICB.		
Hertfordshire & South Midlands Area Team of NHS England	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Ward Councillors of Unitary Authority representing the area	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Newport Pagnell Partnership	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Milton Keynes Chamber of Commerce	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Central Beds Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Housing Associations in the area	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Bedford Group of Drainage Boards	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Thames Valley Police	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Buckinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
English Heritage	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Homes England	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Historic England	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Coal Authority	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		

The Homes and Communities Agency	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
British Telecom	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The National Grid	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Carnival Committee	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Christmas Lights Committee	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Re-enactment Committee	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Assisted Swimming Club	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Places Leisure – partner in leisure of the Town Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Sport England	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Marine Management Organisation	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Public transport providers operating within the area	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Medical centres/GP surgeries	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Network Rail	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
MK Community Foundation	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Community Action MK	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Rotary Club of Newport Pagnell	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		

Newport Pagnell & Olney Lions Club	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
The Brooklands Centre	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
MK Equality Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
MK Council of Faiths	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Disability Action Group	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Ben Everitt MP Milton Keynes North	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Chicheley Parish Meeting	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Gayhurst Parish Meeting	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Filgrave & Tyringham Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Great Linford Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Hanslope Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Haversham & Little Linford Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Lathbury Parish Meeting	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Mulsoe Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
North Crawley Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Weston Underwood Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		

Sherington Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Stoke Goldington Parish Council	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Tickford Park Primary School	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Portfield School	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Green Park School	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Lovat Hall School	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		
Cedars School	No response received.	The Steering Group believe they have made all reasonable efforts to consult this party.		

## 5. METHODS OF COMMUNICATING ABOUT THE CONSULTATIONS

Residents received the Town Council's quarterly publication (Town Talk) delivered to every home in Newport Pagnell advising them of where they could find the consultation documents and how to make comments on the proposals. An online survey was set up (using Survey Monkey) giving residents the opportunity to comment on the proposals. A large banner was put up in the High Street. The survey was advertised on the Town Council's website, on its Facebook Account, and on the Facebook Local Chit Chat Group in Newport Pagnell that has 30,000 members, many living in Newport Pagnell. Letters and emails were sent to stakeholders and statutory consultees, and adverts were placed in local papers (MK Citizen and Phonebox Magazine) advising residents of the consultation and asking for landowners the Steering Group had not been able to contact with to get in touch. As a result of these advertisements in the local press, two landowners made contact with the Town Council. Their details are reflected above.