

## Neighbourhood Development Plan

### Consultees Comments

The Parish Council have now reviewed the comments made on the Draft Plan. The comments were considered in conjunction with the draft plan. Councillors reviewed each comment and assessed its relevance and merit to the existing statement and if warranted amended the original text. The amended Plan has now been approved by Council.

All of the comments received are listed below together with the Council's response.

W - Willen	O - Oldbrook
W/S - Woolstone	F - Fishermead
S - Springfield	O/T - Other
U/S - Estate not specified	

	<b>Comments</b>		<b>Action</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>		
2.1 to 2.5	No comments		
2.6	<b>Housing</b>		
2.6.1	statement of 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> generation preferential treatment should be removed as it is inconsistent with a mobile workforce and the new nature of MK	W	Noted, no change
2.6.2	No comments		
2.7	<b>Employment &amp; Retail</b>		
2.7.1	No comments		
2.7.2	not sure this is in the policies and should state aim to benefit wider MK not just the Parish	W	Noted, no change
2.8	<b>Leisure, Wellbeing &amp; Community Facilities</b>		
	should mention a focus on sustainable transport		Covered in connectivity policies
2.8.1	No comment		
2.8.2	this is a vague and unachievable statement "everyone has access"	W	Noted, no change
2.9	<b>Connectivity</b>		
2.9.1 & 2.9.2	No comments		
2.10	<b>Environment &amp; Design Quality</b>		
2.10.1	"support and promote" is vague and not measurable	W	Noted, no change
2.10.2	No comment		
2.11	<b>Heritage</b>		
2.11.1	No comment		
2.11.2	doesn't mention sweep identified later in document for further conservation areas (executive summary should summarise whole document)	W	Noted, no change
	Not a conservation area	W	Noted, no change
2.12	<b>Consultation Process</b>		
2.12.1 & 2.12.2	No comments		
2.12.3	we suggest that a 5 yearly review is too restricting. Better to say that the Plan will be kept under continuous review. This means "as and when required" (Old Woughton PC)	OTH	Noted, the Plan will be reviewed on at least a bi-annual basis.
<b>3.</b>	<b>Introduction</b>		
	generally – lacks critique and what needs improving, very verbose	W	Noted but gives background

3.1 to 3.4	No comments		
3.5	do we need to define redway – not obvious to non-local reader	W	Glossary to be included in Plan to include definition of a Redway
3.6 to 3.13	No comments		
3.14	does Woughton mean Woughton Community Council or Old Woughton or both? (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Amended
3.15 to 3.21	No comments		
3.22	<b>Population</b>		
	Broadly speaking I am in agreement with the spirit of the policies, but some of the details seem inconsistent with the policies. For example, the projected population increase is 250 (para 3.22), the largest proportion in Oldbrook. Yet the housing demand is for 225+ properties (para 5.8), which implies single occupancy of all new properties, which is unrealistic. So which is correct? And which is the target, as it seems the proposed new housing development is larger than the need? Moreover, most of the new development is identified for Fishermead, whereas the largest population increase is identified as being in Oldbrook, for which there were no plans articulated in Section 7.7. Further, the area identified as a potential site for residential development in Woolstone will not contribute significantly to the additional population identified in para 3.22 (as the number of properties will be very limited) AND will remove local employment opportunities thereby contradicting EPs 3 & 4 (paras 7.14.1 and 7.15.1) of the NDP. Finally, 7.5.10 identifies the likelihood of a growing student community in and around CMK, which has the potential to bring economic and social vibrancy to the adjacent communities, yet Para 7.6.1 seems designed to inhibit to the development of a student “sub”-community – to actually imply that we do not want to develop such a “sub”-community. That would seem a retrograde policy.	W/S	Amended
3.23 to 3.30	No comments		
3.31	<b>Facilities &amp; Services</b>		
5.31	is this really a true statement?	W	Yes
3.32 to 3.40	No comments		
3.41	<b>Deprivation</b>		
3.42	<b>Schools</b>		

3.43 & 3.44	No comments		
3.35	<b>Parish Summary</b>		
3.45.1	meaningless statistic given split demography of the Parish	W	Refers to Parish as a whole, no change. Provides context to the Plan
3.45.2 to 3.45.5	No comments		
3.45.6	should be in exec summary	W	Noted, no change
3.45.7	should be in exec summary	W	Noted, no change
3.45.7	In general yes but it's a very vague high end ideal lacking in detail	W	Noted, no change
3.45.7	we support the principles stated in the vision statement. We would be interested in the detail beyond the general statement.	W/S	Noted
3.45.7	Reference to ward – should this be parish?	W	No, amended to show clarification
3.45.8	No comment		
<b>4.</b>	<b>The Vision</b>		
4.1	not many of the open spaces are listed in Appendix 3		Noted, - Appendix 3 amended
4.1	no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, but disagree – see Housing Needs Survey
4.1	4.1 – this should be a key statement but instead is an obscure long sentence, how about using 2.1? (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted, no change
4.2	no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, but disagree – see Housing Needs Survey
4.2	last sentence the word “drive” is not clear; provide context maybe? (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted, amended to “guide”
4.3	Community Cohesion – here on Fishermead we have never felt so overwhelmed by the conduct and attitude of the Somali community. Having lived here for 13 years the past 6 months have become truly horrific. Who is responsible for integrating the community? The population is far from cohesive.	F	Noted, object to singling out individual communities. Community & Environment Committee to prioritise cohesion issues on all estates

4.3	second part - The Parish should be all those things but a massive omission for the vision is that it should be an attractive place. It would be frustrating to go through all this effort to produce a place that is not attractive and vibrant, but just ticks the boxes	W/S	Noted, no change
4.4	needs to be made more specific i.e. one person's improvement is another persons regression.	W/S	Amended to include reference to sustainability
4.4	no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, but disagree – see Housing Needs Survey
4.4	Retain landscape areas	W/S	Noted
4.4	The plan proposes "development policies"? (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted, no change
4.5	<b>Aims</b>		
4.5	to be pragmatic, either you increase taxes indefinitely or you aim to the essential rubbish and ASBO are the main priorities. Rats, birds and other animals now find abundance of food and litter.	O	Noted, not relevant to Plan
4.5	no mention of developing sports and leisure facilities eg no swimming pool, tennis facilities (nothing indoors) badminton etc	W	Noted – refer to 7.21.3
4.5	no mention of a drive to a near zero carbon parish	W	Noted, refer to 7.21.7 & 7.46.15
4.5	the aims and objectives (and most of the document) are not "smart" (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time based). Success against them is guaranteed!!	W	Noted, the aims and objectives are aspirations of the Parish Council to influence the Plan
4.5	do not, to my mind adequately reflect a key point in para 4.3 – "respecting its diverse character". Woolstone must be protected while enabling development to meet needs elsewhere.	W/S	Noted, Plan encourages sustainable development in accordance with the principle of the NPPF in appropriate areas and offers suitable protection against inappropriate development
4.5	seeks to "ensure that the parish is enhanced and developed by building" (a plan carry out a tangible action) (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted, CPPC supports sustainable development
4.5.1	definition of "community" is a group of people, so the literal meaning of this para is that the CPPC-NP has the aim of "building a pleasant group of people" I think it would be clearer to omit "pleasant communities, and"	W/S	Noted, add definition of community to glossary

4.5.1	Agree in principle, concern would be the density and height of any building development. No green spaces taken away please!	W/S	Noted, protected by NPPF and MKC planning policies
4.5.2	I wonder if legacy is a better word than heritage. Heritage is generally understood to be centuries-old history - as in parts of Woolstones and Willen, e.g. - whereas legacy would also encompass things more recently handed down - such as the open spaces and quality infrastructure gifted by the Development Corporation.	W/S	Noted, no change
4.5.2	this is essential to us as residents of a historically significant area which is used not only by local residents but by the wider MK community and beyond.	W/S	Noted
4.5.2	add at the end "respecting its heritage and the distinctive needs of different parts of the Parish"		Noted, no change
4.5.2	why are the facilities of paddocks in Aldrich Drive not listed? The paddock on Aldrich Drive should be added as a key area of open/green space in appendix 3. It is a haven of wildlife with hedgehogs and other endangered species.	W	Noted, amended to include paddock
4.5.3	No comment		
4.5.4	I think "external challenge" is jargon. I suspect most people, like me, will not know its meaning.	W/S	Noted
4.5.4	whatever does "a plan responsive to external challenges" mean?	W	Noted, no change
4.5.5	Partial support - are "weasel words" for allowing building development which usually means cramming in more houses. Not what I want to see.	W/S	Noted
4.5.6	again I state Fishermead has become a hub of African communities who do not integrate with anyone else making Fishermead a very unpleasant place to work and live.	F	Noted, do not accept or agree with statement
4.6	<b>Objectives</b>		
4.6	the aims and objectives (and most of the document) are not "smart" (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, time based). Success against them is guaranteed!!	W	Noted, the aims and objectives are aspirations of the Parish Council to influence the plan
4.6	Partial support - are "weasel words" for allowing building development which usually means cramming in more houses. Not what I want to see.	W/S	Noted
4.6	do not, to my mind adequately reflect a key point in para 4.3 - "respecting its diverse character". Woolstone must be protected while enabling development to meet needs elsewhere.	W/S	Noted, objectives support vision
4.6	this is just typical statements which are easily forgotten and made to placate people. They have no substance.	F	Noted
4.6	objectives are supported	O	Noted

4.6.1	no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, but disagree – see Housing Needs Survey
4.6	a circular objective! Do you mean “To promote appropriate development and change? (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted, no change
4.6.2	no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, but disagree – see Housing Needs Survey
<b>5.</b>	<b>Plan Preparation</b>		
5.1	Constraints - are there figures to prove this is true? Is this a speculative subjective statement? If so it is not valid and upholds the negative narrative discourse surrounding the estate and should be removed	F	Noted, information obtained from MKC 2011 Census
5.2 to 5.7.4	No comments		
5.7.5	no specific action to address concerns raised.	W	Noted, addressed in policies
5.7.6	no specific action to address concerns raised.	W	Noted, addressed in policies
5.7.6	The language of segregation and division is very rife in the UK and parts of Europe. It was the language used by Nigel Farage to fight his Brexit campaign when he had the image of a long line showing a host of Syrian immigrants coming into the UK. The actual truth is however, far from this picture. Of 5 million refugees, 4 million went to neighbouring countries such as Turkey and Jordan. Almost 800,000 went to Germany and only 20,000 came to Britain. The entire ethnic population of the UK is less than 13% of the total population. With these facts in mind of what the reality of diversity and immigrants are to the UK we cannot endorse language which enforces the idea of ‘them’ and ‘us’. We cannot be seen to endorse the idea all the problems faced by the Working-Class British are caused by immigrants to the UK whom we know come, here to, in the main positively contribute to the development of the country. In this regard, I feel the statement on this section which says houses are offered to immigrants should be qualified. Although the survey results indicate that a small number of people have made this point the Parish should make a point of stating that this is not the case and if this is the case then the Council should provide the numbers to back this statement. Otherwise it stands out for me as racist and xenophobic and not supported by truth.	F	Noted  Reporting comment made by a resident in the Housing Needs Survey
5.7.7	no specific action to address concerns raised.	W	Noted, addressed in policies
5.7.8	No comment		
<b>5.8</b>	<b>Housing Needs Survey</b>		

5.8.1 to 5.8.4	No comments		
5.9	<b>Opportunities</b>		
5.10	No comments		
5.11	<b>Constraints</b>		
5.11	these constraints are mostly obvious and unalterable consequences of living in Milton Keynes (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted
<b>6.</b>	<b>CPPC Planning Policy Context</b>		
6.1	this section describes how.....		Noted, amended
6.2 to 6.2.3	No comment		
6.2.4	As we are leaving the EU, do we now have UK laws to cover this? If not, do we envisage that this will be the case. This should be stated as the UK will be out of the UK whilst this plan is still being implemented.	F	Noted, no change, not relevant to timescale of the Plan
6.3	No comment		
6.3.1	a very long first sentence that doesn't make sense (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted, no change
6.3.2 to 6.4.1	No comment		
6.4.2	Don't understand this statement and why is the Parish not listed in the core strategy settlement Hierarchy. Some clarity around this required. Laymen will not understand what is being said. I don't.	F	Noted, Explanation of Core strategy to go in glossary
6.4.3	No comment		
6.4.4	The Core Strategy runs to 2026.	MKC	Amended
6.4.5	No comment		
6.5	<b>Next Stages</b>		
6.5.1	6.5.1 – again I state Fishermead has become a hub of African communities who do not integrate with anyone else making Fishermead a very unpleasant place to work and live.	F	Noted
	6.5.1 / 6.5.2 - This paragraph reads as though there will be a further round of consultation on the draft plan (after this current one) before the Plan is submitted to MKC	MKC	Noted, 6.5 deleted
6.5.2	the wording is a little unclear, especially the use of 'submitted' in the second sentence. Please can I suggest that you revisit these two paras and use the steps in the process as set out below? The process is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reg 14 Pre submission draft consultation, by the parish council (this current stage)</li> <li>• The PC considers the results of consultation and considers what changes to make to the plan as a result before preparing the final version for submission to MKC.</li> </ul>	MKC	Noted, used to inform residents

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reg 15 – the PC submits the final plan to MKC</li> <li>• Reg 16 – MKC publicises (consults on) the submitted plan.</li> <li>• Examination of Plan</li> <li>• Referendum if Plan passes the examination stage</li> <li>• MKC makes the plan (brings it into legal force) if the plan is supported by more than 50% of those voting in the referendum. Once made, the Plan forms part of the Development Plan for the parish area and is used when considering planning applications in the area.</li> </ul> <p>MKC Documents box - The Parking Standards is now an SPD, adopted in 2016. ONS box - 2011 Census</p>		Amended
<b>7.</b>	<b>Policies</b>		
	<p>Policies – far too many policies, the WCC has only 23. Too much explanation and background. Needs to concentrate on principles rather than specifics. A Neighbourhood Plan sets out the broad powerful policy guidance for planners; it doesn't need to get down into detailed specifics. These have jumbled character that are not easy to follow</p> <p>General comments: The Plan is overly long, contains too much background padding and duplication. The result is a tedious read in which the key messages, the Policies, are lost in the "noise". We suggest a much shorter, succinct document which would have greater impact and would be more amenable to long term maintenance.</p> <p>(Old Woughton Parish Council)</p>	OTH	Noted, no change
	<p>Throughout the Policies section there are recurring typesetting issues which I have not picked up individually but which need to be addressed to improve the layout and effectiveness of the plan and the ease with which readers will be able to find their way around it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not continue paragraph numbering into policies.</li> <li>• Policies should stand out from the supporting text eg: by using a box (as you have done). Each policy should have its own unique Policy reference/number eg Policy H1</li> <li>• Each policy should have a heading or title as this make it immediately clear what matter is being addressed: eg, Housing Policy 1 could be "<u>Policy H1 – Houses in Multiple Occupation</u>"</li> <li>• It will help people to navigate their way round the plan if sub headings could be added into the text to preface the subject being covered in the following explanatory text and policy/ies. Eg – before para 7.5.6 add a sub heading: "<u>Houses in Multiple Occupation</u>"; before para 7.6.4 add a sub heading "<u>New Housing Sites</u>"</li> <li>• Where you have a list of criteria in a policy that development is expected to comply with, either number the criteria or use bullet points. The current layout, by continuing the paragraph numbering, makes it difficult to identify the criteria.</li> </ul>	MKC	Noted Delete reference numbers in policies but leave in rest of plan for ease of reference

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Community, Connectivity, environment and Heritage sections there are a number of policies that are not really dealing with land-use planning matters and should not therefore be policies in the Plan. What you are seeking to achieve in these 'policies' is, nonetheless, worthwhile and would be better included in a section on "Community Aspirations" or similar title.</li> </ul>		
7.1 – 7.4	No comment		
<b>7.5</b>	<b>Housing Policies</b>		
	<p>When MKC added a number of green open spaces to the emerging Site Allocations Plan in Feb 2015 a number of your residents contacted Xplain in high anxiety wanting to protect treasured open space from inappropriate development.</p> <p>Due to almost universal opposition, the Cabinet of MKC subsequently agreed to withdraw all such contentious sites from the SAP in March 2015 (MKC has now produced a far more sustainable SAP).</p> <p>It therefore needs to be acknowledged in your NP that these are not 'leftover spaces', but spaces that have been carefully designed into the whole fabric of the New City to give residents a decent quality of life.</p> <p>We are also concerned that several very similar open spaces have been included in the draft NP for potential infill housing development.</p> <p>Although the draft NP describes the value of Willen Lake, parkland and play areas in positive terms, we urge you to make good the obvious omission regarding the value of original, as-designed pockets of green open space in the housing areas.</p> <p>For example, para 7.6.6 which states "The residential estates on Springfield, Fishermead, Oldbrook, Woolstone and Willen are well established and the proposed policies identify limited opportunities for development." could be strengthened with words to the effect that "these areas are virtually built-out, and have a distinctively spacious public realm, and modern New Town heritage features, which will be protected due to their numerous benefits."</p> <p>Housing Sites:</p> <p>While we understand the need to find suitable housing sites we believe the following sites should be withdrawn from the draft NP for the reasons given above: Sites 2, 3 and 4 in Fishermead and site 1 in Springfield.</p>	Xpln	Noted, no change The Parish Council believe they have put in place adequate protection of open green spaces – 7.39 – Environment Policy 1

	The open space in these squares or courtyards was designed to benefit residents in the adjacent homes and should be left to continue to do so.		
7.5	It would have been good if you owned the land and the pub on Springfield to make better use of the whole space in that corner.  I still think that you could extend Billingwell Place to join to Walbrook Avenue (where there is already a footpath) and then build 5 or 6 houses each side of that road. I think that there would be minimal objections from residents if you did not build on the green spaces which already have play areas on them.	S	Noted, not relevant  Noted, no change
7.5	Policies 1, 3, 4,5, 6 look fine Policy 2 – seems to be about opposing extension/conservatories. I don't see why this is any business of the Parish if its within private property. Suggest deleting this	W	Noted, no change Falls within NPPF
7.5	the interpretation of "no useful purpose" seems to leave the way clear to authorise development on any green spaces, particularly play areas	S	Noted, no change
7.5	Just to remind you that we do not want any houses built on Springfield. It was one of the reasons we chose to live here after moving from the Wirral Merseyside. We were attracted by how green it was with all the trees, which we would lose if houses were built on our green spaces, then as a childminder would lose the pars close to home.	S	Noted, no change. Legally we have to support sustainable development
7.5	As much social rented housing as possible. I like the idea of turning the Fishermead corners into single person dwellings.	F	Noted
7.5.1	As long as no further attempts to build on the play areas behind the Walbrooke Avenue and Turnmill Avenue, the plans sound fine.	S	Noted – but support sustainable development
7.5.2 – 7.5.9	No comment		
7.5.10	identifies the likelihood of a growing student community in and around CMK, which has the potential to bring economic and social vibrancy to the adjacent communities, yet Para 7.6.1 seems designed to inhibit to the development of a student "sub"-community – to actually imply that we do not want to develop such a "sub"-community. That would seem a retrograde policy.	W/S	Noted, not inhibiting development but managing – see housing criteria and policies
<b>7.6</b>	<b>Housing Policy 1</b>		
	Housing Policy 1 - The text in the dark green box should be moved into the pale green box as this is part of the policy and not the heading. Table of sites - Give the Table a number and a title ie Table 1, New Housing Sites.  Make reference to Maps 2 and 3 where the location of the sites can be seen.	MKC	Noted, no change  Amend – cross reference table to maps
7.6.1 – 7.6.7	No comments		

7.6.8	I am amused that there is a need for elderly housing. Unless you are going to important old houses from elsewhere, brick by brick, the only way to get elderly housing is through the passage of time. Of course you mean housing for elderly people, which I wholeheartedly support.)	S	Noted, amended
<b>7.7</b>	<b>Housing Policy 2</b>		
	Housing Policy 2 - Use the site number for each site, as per the Table and the Maps 2 and 3 so that it is clear which site is which.	MKC	Amend
7.7	no limits are mentioned on population increase (through earlier in document, targets are mentioned albeit different – 5.6.2 says 17000, 3.22 states 16800)	W	Noted, no change
7.7	I don't agree with the presumption that green spaces can or ever could be considered for "infill" building.	W/S	Noted, no change – see Policy 7.39
7.7	would not be happy to have the green space behind my house taken away. We use this area everyday for our dogs and when our grandchildren come to stay. The reason we moved here was because of the open play area at the back of our house. We moved into an established and finished location.	S	Noted, no change Support sustainable development
7.7	only 30% of people were in favour of the development of sites on Fishermead – are the view of people who don't support it going to be considered? Ditto for Springfield	W/S	Noted, no change 70% of respondents did not object
7.7.1	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, Under current legislation "no" is not permitted, however the plan aims to regulate
7.7.1	A number of the identified sites in Fishermead, and one in Springfield, demonstrate a failure to understand the fundamental principle behind the early housing grid schemes, the inter-relationship of homes and accessible/communal open space; the two are integral, with the quadrangles deliberately designed into the fabric of housing areas to improve the quality of life of residents. It was spaces such as these (Sites 2,3,and 4 in F/mead and 1 in Springfield) which caused upheaval in the Council and withdrawal of the Site Allocations Plan for reconsideration, so it is a huge surprise and disappointment that the CPPC persists with these discredited proposals.	W/S	Noted, governed by sustainable development. Planning & Policy Committee consider all planning applications submitted
7.7.2	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, Under current legislation "no" is not permitted, however the Plan aims to regulate development that is sustainable

7.7.2	<p>There is not a clear correlation between the sites listed in para 7.7.2 and the schedule on page 21. I object to development of the sites scheduled on page 21 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site 2, Kellan Drive: existing residents' open space; Kellan Drive not appropriate for vehicular access,</li> <li>- Site 3, Corner Kellan Drive / Fishermead Boulevard: as Site 2, except for development strip on boulevard frontage.</li> <li>- Site 4, Pentewan Gate / Tailland Ave: an outrageous suggestion to build on the garden of a sheltered housing scheme.</li> </ul>	W/S	<p>Amended see previous</p> <p>Planning application has been submitted</p> <p>Do not agree New housing proposals are governed by sustainable development</p>
7.7.2	this will increase traffic flow out of the north side of Fishermead making it more time consuming and difficult to get on to an already busy junction on Childs Way.	F	Noted, no change No evidence of stress on the network
7.7.2	Not completely - more bungalows please for the independent elderlys who do not need sheltered housing.	F	Noted. MKC no longer build bungalows and developers will only build if viable so is unlikely
7.7.2	further development of these areas put more pressure on social amenities, which are overstretched.	F	Noted, no change Surgery on Fishermead has been addressed
7.7.3	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, but disagree – see Housing Needs Survey
7.7.3	this will increase traffic flow out of the north side of Fishermead making it more time consuming and difficult to get on to an already busy junction on Childs Way.	F	Noted, no change
7.7.3	yes agree	F	Noted
7.7.3	Use of the words quadrangles and regeneration might be cause for alarm. Any regeneration must ensure the integrity of the original layout, buildings, and residents' open space. I saw no evidence of these objectives in the NP. What is the financial model that will facilitate regeneration?	W/S	Noted, none of the estates within the Parish are due for regeneration. Financial model not relevant to the plan
7.7.4	Without an explanatory map or diagram this policy is not clear.	W/S	Noted – delete policy as out of date.

7.7.4	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, Under current legislation “no” is not permitted, however the plan aims to regulate
7.7.5	glad to know the public house/site is being considered for something worthwhile.	S	Delete
7.7.5	the pub should be redeveloped along the lines of the “biergarten” in Wolverton. A community pub selling quality beverages with events for the whole community.	S	Noted
7.7.5	pub areas should be kept for that purpose	W/S	Noted
7.7.5	Concern regarding infill on existing estates. Springfield already looks over developed due to the terraced style of housing. There are large areas of Campbell Park still undeveloped so why is that not considered before trying to add extra housing to existing estates. Where does it end – when one site is agreed you will then look for the next one and so it goes on. (App 3 11.5 refers) I strongly disagree with infill on our estates which are mostly fully developed and have been for a number of years. Additional housing makes it uncomfortable to exist with little or no open spaces left for children to play (gardens are very small on average). Campbell Park is still waiting development and has been in the 32 years I’ve lived here. Please leave us some open spaces to take the children/grandchildren to kick a ball around. You have already demolished the climbing frame and the swings are in a state of disrepair most of the time. I now know why the footpath is never repaired as the site is obviously designated for infill in the future (App 3 11.5 item 2 refers)	S	Noted  Campbell Park not in the Parish
7.7.5	Although I agree to development of former Penwith site I think it would be better to a change of use as a community facility rather than a housing development. For support for the community providing facilities for young and old alike and supporting pupils from Jubilee Wood school also eg out of school activities and functions for both school and community purposes.	O	Noted – site remains part of the school  Noted, forward comments to school
7.7.5	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, Under current legislation “no” is not permitted, however the plan aims to regulate
7.7.6	development could impact on the rear of properties at the top end of Stamford Avenue.	S	Noted
7.7.6	glad to know the public house/site is being considered for something worthwhile.	S	Noted
7.7.6	The Springfield public house might be redundant and be redeveloped, but the “site behind” is not a development site but integral residents’ open space as described above.	W/S	Noted, site not allocated MKC open space, governed by sustainable development.
7.7.6	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, Under current legislation “no” is not

			permitted, however the plan aims to regulate
7.7.7	What is 'use class D'? If you want public comment, you need to explain jargon	S	Noted add to glossary
7.7.7	no to HiMOs – no further housing needed. Estates already look crowded, improve existing homes	O	Noted, Under current legislation "no" is not permitted, however the plan aims to regulate
7.7.7	use of discussed public house on Springfield change to either health centre eg Blakelands or children's nursery	F	Noted, no evidence presented
7.7.7	the proposals in Paras 7.7.7 and 7.7.8 seem to conflict with 7.14.1 and 7.15.1	W/S	No conflict, delete 7.7.8
7.7.8	it is essential any residential development of the commercial site complies with Environmental policies and does not result in any harm to the character of the area. It should preferably be single storey and does not increase congestion by traffic or parking issues. If this is true the answer is Yes.	W/S	Agree, delete 7.7.8
7.7.8	The commercial units in Woolstone should remain, and not be changed to residential. The limited commercial activity in this location - opposite the pub and near to the gridsquare entrance - provides a degree of interest and animation during the day with the comings and going s of business people, and an opportunity for sustainable employment of local people.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	the commercial usage of these units should not be changed and kept for current use or that suggested at 7.14.1	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	disagree with proposed development in Woolstone	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Woolstone does not currently have much commercial property, but does have plenty of residential property. Change of use would create an imbalance 7.7.8 Also access to residential property at this particular location could be problematic.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Woolstone - located on corner of main road, - concerns re safety, parking, access, remaining in keeping with immediate surroundings. Other areas more appropriate for development. Mill Lane has already been developed recently	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Commercial units corner of Mill Lane and Newport Road, dangerous corner/junction building works would cause dangerous obstruction to vehicles and pedestrians.	U/E	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy

7.7.8	commercial unit corner of Mill Lane and Newport Road. If this was converted into bungalows, but I would be concerned if these were knocked down and not rebuilt using reclaimed bricks and no higher than the current buildings. The road could probably not accommodate any more traffic, it is a bad corner at certain times of day.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	The commercial units in Woolstone should remain, and not be changed to residential. The limited commercial activity in this location - opposite the pub and near to the grid square entrance - provides a degree of interest and animation during the day with the comings and goings of business people, and an opportunity for sustainable employment of local people.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	the commercial usage of these units should not be changed and kept for current use or that suggested at 7.14.1	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	disagree with proposed development in Woolstone	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Woolstone does not currently have much commercial property, but does have plenty of residential property. Change of use would create an imbalance 7.7.8 Also access to residential property at this particular location could be problematic.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Woolstone - located on corner of main road, - concerns re safety, parking, access, remaining in keeping with immediate surroundings. Other areas more appropriate for development. Mill Lane has already been developed recently	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Just to say I am hoping we can have houses rather than a block of flats on the corner of Mill Lane in Woolstone. Currently it is commercial buildings.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	Commercial units corner of Mill Lane and Newport Road, dangerous corner/junction building works would cause dangerous obstruction to vehicles and pedestrians.	U/E	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	commercial unit corner of Mill Lane and Newport Road. If this was converted into bungalows, but I would be concerned if these were knocked down and not rebuilt using reclaimed bricks and no higher than the current buildings. The road could probably not accommodate any more traffic, it is a bad corner at certain times of day.	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
7.7.8	we are mindful that this could "open the floodgates" for further, less considered developments which may encroach on green spaces and in turn impact negatively on the inherent historically attractive nature of areas such as Woolstone	W/S	CPPC have reviewed policy 7.7.8 and have deleted this policy
<b>7.8</b>	<b>Housing Policy 3</b>		
7.8.1 to 7.8.4	No comments		

<b>7.9</b>	<b>Housing Policy 4</b>		
7.9	<p>7.23.3 is one of the most important policies in the NP therefore it needs to be far stronger. For example it needs to describe what is meant by 'residential amenity' and spell out the type of qualities that require protection in such a way that opportunistic developers cannot use them to rob the policy of its meaning and intent.</p> <p>Similarly, para 7.7.9 "There will be continual pressure for new development within the Parish for the foreseeable future, particularly housing. Other sites may be suitable for development." does not add much and may weaken any intention to avoid conflict over where new housing is appropriate, and where not. We suggest you omit this paragraph altogether.</p> <p>In summary, we urge CPPC to:</p> <p>clearly explain why certain spaces require <i>absolute protection from infill development</i> name and identify where those spaces are and accompany the relevant policy or policies that protect these sites with a detailed map for the avoidance of doubt (rather than relying on the wording in Appendix 3).</p>	Xpln	Noted – see 7.39
7.9.1 & 7.9.2	No comments		
<b>7.10</b>	<b>Housing Policy 5</b>		
	<p>I would recommend that reference to viability should be added to the start of the policy ie: "<i>Subject to viability, all new housing should..</i>" to reflect the requirements of the NPPF. The NPPF, para 173 requires plans to be deliverable and that "<i>the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened.</i>" The NPPG states that "This should not undermine ambition for high quality design and wider social and environmental benefit but such ambition should be tested against the realistic likelihood of delivery."</p> <p>My advice reflects our experience of other neighbourhood plan examinations where Examiners have recommended changes to policies to add new wording to ensure that the impact of obligations would not adversely affect the viability and deliverability of a development proposal.</p> <p>I have also suggested that you use the word "should" rather than "must" as it is conceivable that a development could be considered to be acceptable overall even if it were not able to fully comply with all requirements of the policy.</p>	MKC	Amended

7.10.1	unlikely to apply for small developments, needs a minimum size? Rest seems find – although the Springfield site was controversial when previously considered for new housing – please test local opinion carefully.	W	Noted, no change, tested at public meeting and accepted
7.10.2	unlikely to apply for small developments, needs a minimum size? Rest seems find – although the Springfield site was controversial when previously considered for new housing – please test local opinion carefully.	W	No, no change
7.10.2	I agree with the sentiment, but it would be more credible if the party who will be subject to the endowment and responsible for the maintenance is identified.	W/S	Identified through planning application
	play area and green spaces in situ at present should not be built over for future housing.	S	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with the principle of the NPPF is to be supported. The Plan offers suitable protection against inappropriate development
7.10.3 – 7.10.7	No comments		
7.10.8	“maximise” is too weak. Target should be zero emission, regardless a specific target should be stated.	W	Noted, no change, but unlikely to be viable
7.10.8	At the end of the statement please add ‘Solar energy’	F	Noted, addressed under “renewable”
7.10.8	All new builds to include energy efficiency policy eg solar panels and other energy savings that are invented in the future.	F	Noted, no change
7.10.9	How can you enforce a condition for residents to use their garages for their cars? Perverse, maybe, but it might be more logical not to count garages as parking spaces and encourage “garage-type” storage in rear gardens.	W/S	Noted, garages not considered as parking spaces under SPD
7.10.9	Clarify what is meant by an “appropriate” level of car parking – ie: is it in accordance with the Council’s adopted Parking Standards SPD?	MKC	Noted, see 7.3 which makes it clear that reference to SPDs and standards etc are those adopted by MKC
<b>7.11</b>	<b>Employment &amp; Retail Policies</b>		
7.11.1 & 7.11.2	No comments		

7.11.3	"There are around 800 (FTE) jobs in businesses in the Parish, whilst most of the working population (over 8,000) is employed in CMK which is adjacent to the Parish." Where does this data come from? Is it based on hard evidence?	S	Yes, details from MKC Observatory
7.11.4 - 7.11.6	No comments		
<b>7.12</b>	<b>Employment Policy 1</b>		
7.12.2	"new development supported in appropriate locations is open and not specific enough, leaves the door open. Who decides what is appropriate?	W	The plan aims to regulate
7.12.3	spend money on improving housing, people drive, bus to MK not use canal	O	Noted
	this aspiration has existed for at least 24 years. There appears to be no compelling commercial argument eg a "toll canal" (like MK6 toll motorway). Also there are 2 marina nearby and many barges are not permanently moored. They simply move every 14 days. Aspiration is nice but is needs to be realistically achievable and this does not fit that criteria - remove it.	W/S	Noted, development has started
<b>7.13</b>	<b>Employment Policy 2</b>		
7.13.1 & 7.13.2	No comments		
<b>7.14</b>	<b>Employment Policy 3</b>		
7.14	how can you not see landlords already have thriving business by letting multi occupancy tenancies, many houses have 5-6 different tenants. Is this what you mean by home-business?	F	Noted, No
7.14.1	seems conflict with the proposals in Paras 7.7.7 and 7.7.8	W/S	Noted
7.14.2	No comment		
<b>7.15</b>	<b>Employment Policy 4</b>		
	Is the "Unify" site at Willen identified on the proposals map?	MKC	Noted
7.15.1	The Plan will need a Proposals Map showing, in one place, the location of all site allocations and any other relevant spatial issues, eg the location of the Unify site referred to in Employment Policy 4.	MKC	Noted, include map 7.21.3 amended
7.15.1	seems conflict with the proposals in Paras 7.7.7 and 7.7.8	W/S	Noted
7.15.1	Part 1 - Developers are masters at creating blight and then demonstrating there is no longer a genuine need for facilities; and Councils are generally weak in the face of them. The aim should be to avoid such blight, yet not be afraid to embrace progress and change.	W/S	Noted, no change
7.15.1	Part 2 - "... any proposal" is very sweeping. If it is envisaged that the site might be developed then it would need to enhance the level of facilities available and be an attractive and sensitive addition to the area.	W/S	Noted, no change
7.15.1	"...An exception to this will be the current 'Unify' site at Willen where any proposal directly related to the lakeside activity will be supported."	S	Noted, site identified for employment 7.21.3

	What does this mean (what is the 'Unify' site) and why is an exception being made?		Site location reference to be added to Plan
7.15.2	No comment		
<b>7.16</b>	<b>Employment Policy 5</b>		
7.16.1	we support as written but retail facilities at Fishermead should also be supported.	W/S	Noted
<b>7.17</b>	<b>Employment Policy 6</b>		
7.17	Is there evidence or reasoning behind the last sentence, that an over concentration of gymnasiums will not be supported? Is there a particular problem? If so you should explain why a policy is considered necessary.	MKC	Noted, delete last sentence
7.17	the specific mention of gymnasiums here is a bit comical and should be made general (eg over concentration of the same type of service)	W	Noted, delete last sentence
7.17.1	"....be predominantly A1 and community and health facilities (D1)" I can't support (or object to) this without knowing what A1 is.	S	Noted, add to glossary
<b>7.18</b>	<b>Employment Policy 7</b>		
7.18.1	Is this intended to exclude non-community facilities e.g. commercial? It appears to conflict with Employment Policy 8 which states that commercial development will not normally be permitted outside the Local Centre.	W/S	Noted, delete
<b>7.19</b>	<b>Employment Policy 8</b>		
	Surely 'new commercial development' is likely to also be a 'new facility'? You would need to clarify what you mean by this sentence.	MKC	Noted, amend
7.19.1	Statement is confusing. Starts with 'New ....unless it is a new facility'. Isn't it the point that it is new? Confusing. Please clarify. Also, if we could add that all new commercial development must demonstrate not just economic, but societal and environmental impact	F	Noted, amend
<b>7.20</b>	<b>Leisure, Wellbeing and Community Facilities Policies</b>		
	general and elsewhere. There is a lot of repeated info here from into which is wasteful and makes the document more daunting (and more impressive) than it really is.	W	Noted, no change
7.20.1	No comment		
7.20.2	police and authorities ignore race crimes against English, white people, also they ignore and don't respond to crimes against lesbian/gay people. I don't want to hear about averages Many people object to MKBC housing refugees and other asylum seekers. We have a large problem of homelessness in MK. Also the local rat problem is severe, rats cause disease.	F	Noted, irrelevant to plan
7.20.3	No comment		

7.20.4	if plans, permissions and agreements exist for the entire 24kms link then OK or if there is a reasonable prospect of these being obtained by 2022 otherwise this should be removed	W/S	Noted, no change
7.20.4	I was of course pleased to see the Willen Lake area (including Newlands) considered in detail, However unless there is a technical reason for not doing so, I would urge you to also list the relevant portions of Newlands and the Willen Lake surroundings, as open/green spaces, within para 11.4 in Appendix 3.	Oth	Noted, amend
7.20.7 to 7.20.9	No comment		
7.20.10	I assume that LEAPS that are old and have poor quality equipment etc will be updated / improved rather than given over to development.	W/S	Local play provision currently under review by MKC
7.20.10	there is no clear plan to deal with the issue identified in, play facilities becoming old. The small play area between Butterfield Close and Wilford Close is rarely, if ever, used; in a poor condition and very close to a larger play area of Pattision Lane. The play area could be cleared and turned to more clear green space.	W/S	Noted, see 7.26.1
7.20.10	Add that these are being refurbished where possible or taken out of use if no longer needed or viable.	F	Noted, see 7.26.1
<b>7.21</b>	<b>Community Policy 1</b>		
7.21.1	No comment		
7.21.2	rather than preventing loss of sports and leisure we should be looking to positively enhance and build new (ref obesity problem	W	Noted, see 7.21.3
	this paragraph is in conflict with the decision to abandon the cricket square at the Woolstone Sports Ground.	W/S	Noted, viability and result of the consultation with Woolstone residents
7.21.3	supports the commercial exploitation of Willen lake north.	W	Noted, see 7.21.6
	I don't want leisure related development of the North Lake. It should be left for wild life and nature. Any development of the South Lake should be in keeping with the current standard. No tacky over development please	W	Noted, see 7.21.6
7.21.4	supports the commercial exploitation of Willen lake north.	W	Noted, see 7.21.6
7.21.4	the paddocks in Willen should remain as key areas of green space.	W	Amended
7.21.4	while I support Willen Hospice, the statement should be about "nearby residents"	W	Noted, states surrounding residential properties
7.21.4	however very concerned that paragraph is implemented. In Woolstone we frequently get noise from activities at Willen Lake South and Gulliver's Land	W/S	Noted, no change

7.21.4	If only this would apply to Policy 2 section 7.7 for housing however it does not. I feel having new housing behind my house instead of green play area affects my surroundings and amenities severely.	S	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with the principle of the NPPF in appropriate areas and offers suitable protection against inappropriate development
7.21.5	supports the commercial exploitation of Willen lake north.	W	Disagree
	a large amount of traffic flow problems in Milton Keynes particularly on estates, where cars, vans etc park on pavements, often opposite other vehicle doing the same. Although in many cases they have driveways or garages. Taxi/mini cab owners worst offenders making it impossible for ambulance/fire engines to get through.	S	Noted, no change
7.21.6	the paddocks in Willen should remain as key areas of green space.	W	Amended
	how can you achieve any development with no adverse effect on landscape/appearance – think this should be softened, perhaps add the word “disproportionate”? This section is very strong overall in my view.	W	Noted
7.21.7	should be a policy on its own	W	Noted, see 7.10.8
7.21.8	supports the commercial exploitation of Willen lake north.	W	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with NPPF
	The estimated cost to the environment should be shown to provide a clear understanding of the impact on biodiversity. Also, the social and economic impact must also be shown.	F	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with NPPF
7.21.9	No comment		
<b>7.22</b>	<b>Community Policy 2</b>		
7.22.1 to 7.22.4	No comment		
<b>7.23</b>	<b>Community Policy 3</b>		
7.23.1 & 7.23.2	No comment		
7.23.3	is one of the most important policies in the NP therefore it needs to be far stronger. For example it needs to describe what is meant by ‘residential amenity’ and spell out the type of qualities that require protection in such a way that opportunistic developers cannot use them to rob the policy of its meaning and intent.	Xpln	Noted, no change

7.23.4 – 7.23.9	No comment		
7.23.10	reference to “localism Act” recently the Council seems to be riding roughshod over the Localism Act which the majority of residents voted for. It would appear that they ignore it when it does not fit in with some of their more dubious plans, which are often detrimental and are against the wishes of the residents.	S	Noted, no change
7.23.11	No comment		
<b>7.24</b>	<b>Community Policy 4</b>		
7.24	As it stands, this isn’t really a policy , but an aspiration. If you were to identify a site for a new post office then that could be a policy, but that would require background work to establish the deliverability of a new post office in a certain location and consideration of alternative sites.	MKC	Noted, no change
7.24.1	why is a new Parish Office needed?	W/S	Noted, current office does not meet statutory access regulations
7.24.1	that any new community facility serves the whole of that community	O	Noted
7.24.1	what is the case for a new parish office? Only mentioned in this one-liner!	W	Noted, current office does not meet statutory access regulations
7.24.1	“Opportunities shall be taken to provide a new Parish Office.” This seems to stand alone without justification. It may well be needed but at the moment it reads as though it was inserted gratuitously because someone fancies a new office.	S	Noted, current office does not meet statutory access regulations Amend 7.21.9
7.24.1	however, it is not clear why 7.24.1. is proposed.....no evidence is outlined in the NDP that suggests a new office is needed, and it is not at all clear what issue in the NDP this is trying to solve!	W/S	Noted, current office does not meet statutory access regulations
<b>7.25</b>	<b>Community Policy 5</b>		
7.25.1	“Existing churches, religious buildings and community facilities shall be protected and retained unless it has been clearly demonstrated that there is no longer a genuine need for such facilities.” There needs to be some consideration of the changing – changes that may have already occurred or may occur in the future – culture of the community. Is there, now for example, a significant Muslim community in the Parish? If so, then the Parish should consider whether there is need for a Mosque within the Parish.	S	Noted
<b>7.26</b>	<b>Community Policy 6</b>		
7.26.1	Policy 6 - Again, not really a policy as it is primarily dealing with the improvement of facilities rather than location of new ones.	MKC	Noted, but no change proposed. CPPC considers that this is

			relevant to the Plan but will be guided by the Independent Examiner
<b>7.27</b>	<b>Community Policy 7</b>		
7.27.1	Again, not really a policy as it is primarily dealing with the improvement of facilities rather than location of new ones. A policy could identify a site for the location of new changing facilities but you would need to consider how those could be delivered (ie who would pay for them etc)	MKC	Noted, but no change proposed. CPPC considers that this is relevant to the Plan but will be guided by the Independent Examiner
<b>7.28</b>	<b>Community Policy 8</b>		
7.28.1	Community Policy 8 - Again, not really a policy	MKC	Noted, but no change proposed. CPPC considers that this is relevant to the Plan but will be guided by the Independent Examiner
<b>7.29</b>	<b>Connectivity Policies</b>		
7.29	dedicated lanes for electric vehicles (full electric with anpr)	W	Noted, see 7.29.3
7.29	there is no mention of high speed broadband provision.	S	Noted, see 7.29.3
7.29	Overall I would like more emphasis on better public transport and cycling so the community is less reliant on cars. The bus services are just not adequate, particularly in the evenings and weekends.	W	Noted, no change, see 7.31.1
7.29	but particular emphasis on promoting cycling, walking	W/S	Noted, see 7.32.1, 2,3,4,5,6
7.29	but keep Woolstone bus service as it is!! Update/improve maintenance of redways and paths to bus stops on H6 Woolstone both carriageways	U/S	Noted, service has improved, see also 7.32.1
7.29.1 to 7.29.3	No comments		
<b>7.30</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 1</b>		
	connectivity policy 1 should include reference to appropriate traffic speed management and road safety (Note Community policy 3 does include reference to safety)	W/S	Noted, see 7.32.1, 2,3,4,5,6
	a large amount of traffic flow problems in Milton Keynes particularly on estates, where cars, vans etc park on pavements, often opposite other vehicle doing the same. Although in many cases they have driveways or garages. Taxi/mini cab owners worst offenders making it impossible for ambulance/fire engines to get through.	S	Noted

7.30.1	is very important and should be the underpinning criteria on which to determine connectivity policies.	W/S	Noted
	"appropriate" provisions for the car should be defined as it is currently unclear to people using the plan what you consider appropriate to be	MKC	Noted, in line with MKC policies, see 7.3
7.30.2	No comment		
7.30.3	Not in agreement with Milton Keynes Council policies	O	Noted
	"[New developments] include appropriate provisions for parking in line with Milton Keynes Council's Parking Standards SPD." Does that include cycle parking? It should do, but I suspect it does not. Specific mention should be made to stipulate that new developments should include cycle racks, especially at all commercial, health and leisure facilities.	S	Noted, only applies to HiMOs and flats as per MKC policies
7.30.4 & 7.30.5	No comments		
<b>7.31</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 2</b>		
7.31	while I support low carbon buses, I can't see how low carbon support at stops will improve facilities.	W	Noted, no change
7.31	the main focus of buses should be making sure they arrive (which they don't always), extending frequency and hours of service (addressing 1 concern funding taxi cost as compensation)	W	Noted, not relevant to plan
7.31	improved facilities for bus users must include bus shelters at major bus stops. There are none at Willen????	w	Noted, bus shelters on H and V roads as per MKC policy
7.31.1	No comment		
<b>7.32</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 3</b>		
	This is not really a land use policy. Ideally the plan would identify on a map, locations where specific improvement or new links in the redway network are planned in order to improve connectivity. Once identified, then there would be a potential opportunity to seek contributions from relevant new development, subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations (ie that they are that they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind). Connectivity Policies 4, 6,7,8 - These are not policies – move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted, no change
7.32.1	This should also mention ease of movement to CMK eg removing unnecessary slopes or putting in a series of cycle super highways	W	Noted, no change
7.32.2	I applaud the sentiment in this policy. There is a key project that it could facilitate. A missing link in the local footpath/cycleway network is between Springfield east and Campbell Park (gridsquare). This will be particularly evident with the proposed	W/S	Likely to be included as part of forthcoming planning application

	development of the canal-side site in Campbell Park which would be given a boost by such a link. At the moment, access between these two areas is tortuous; e.g. consider the route one would take from Avebury Boulevard footpath, or the G or H blocks, in Campbell Park to the eastern areas of Springfield; or to Woolstones and Oakgrove. The development plans prepared by the Development Corporation included at least one connection in this area, similar to the connections from Downs Barn and Downhead Park to the north of Campbell Park. It is included on the large model of CMK (last seen in MK Council offices in Saxon Court) so it is clearly an unfinished element of the plan and requires completion. Elsewhere in the NP there are aspirational objectives, some without realistic hopes of achievement; delivering this missing link will be difficult, of course, and will need innovative thinking and collaboration with CMK Town Council and MK Council, and the funding would have to come from, for instance, a mixture public sector grants, tariffs / Section 106 monies, etc.		
7.32.3	No comment		
7.32.4	this is particularly important as this will encourage children to walk to the school in Oakgrove and use the facilities that we do not have in Woolstone Map is missing	W/S	Noted, there are two pedestrian access points.
7.32.5	"Safety provisions in underpasses and overbridges linking to Central Milton Keynes." Such as? I can't think what you have in mind.	S	Noted, no change
7.32.5	underpasses are a particular safety issue. Lighting MUST be maintained properly and the shrubbery/landscaping to the entrances of these underpasses properly managed so that clear visibility is provided.	W/S	Noted, no change
7.32.6	unsure as to what speed management measures on cycle routes would be and whether needed (however felt lots of fast bikes go by)	O	Noted, no change
7.32.6	"Installation of speed management measures on cycle routes particularly from Central Milton Keynes, the Redway network adjoining Child's Way." This is a specific proposal without justification. Why is it there?	S	Noted, no change
7.32.6	there is absolutely no need to waste public money on speed management for cyclists. This will put serious cyclists off.	W/S	Noted, no change
<b>7.33</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 4</b>		
7.33	not policies – move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted, no change
7.33	I object to a blanket speed restriction around school because 1] the policy is too vague what does "around schools" mean. 2] there should not be a reduction. A school is a building with children in it or going to it. All other times its an empty building!! Eg Sunday afternoons, all night from 8pm, most of summer and yet the 20mph will still be in force – why?? Guess when police with their speed guns will be in attendance. I wager not at 9am on Monday morning in term time.	W/S	Noted, no change

7.33.1	the implementation of a 20mph speed limit around all schools - does this mean along the V10 and H7? If so I don't support this. Traffic rarely exceeds this speed when students are going to and leaving school so implementing these speeds at other times will cause traffic problems.	W/S	Noted, no change
7.33.1	Disagree with 20mph near schools as unworkable, you'd be better off designing methods to stop parents parking badly. Their arrogant behaviour is more dangerous than 30mph. When schools start and finish its almost impossible to go faster than 20 in any case. The rest of the time, the children will be in school. I cannot understand politicians obsession with speeding, an almost non-existent problem on the estates.	S	Noted, no change
7.33.1	"The management of traffic is a major element of this Plan. Under this policy, Milton Keynes Council as Highway Authority will be approached to seek the introduction of a 20 mph speed limit on roads around all schools in the Parish." Yes, but consideration should be given to wider use of 20 mph speed limits.	S	Noted, no change
7.33.1	should the 20mph speed limit be extended to all estate roads?	S	Noted, no change
<b>7.34</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 5</b>		
7.34.1	"There is a presumption against loss of existing public car parking provision and numbers and quality of parking overall will not be reduced as a result of new development within the Parish. The current quality of parking provision shall be improved over time in partnership with the relevant landowners and this Plan seeks improvements to existing parking and provision of additional spaces where appropriate. Opportunities to increase public car parking in various parts of the Parish will be supported and additional car parking will be required as part of any redevelopment proposals to meet adopted standards." This is not forward thinking. The continual growth in the use of cars is not sustainable. While there are circumstances in which additional parking is needed and justified, a blanket statement in support of increased public parking is not good for the long-term health of the Parish.	S	Noted, no change
<b>7.35</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 6</b>		
7.35	This is not a policy - move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted, no change
7.35	Any resident parking permits must be limited in number in total and per household to be commensurate with the number of residents which could be reasonably expected to live in each property when originally built! and allowing for garage and carports availability.	W/S	Noted, no change
7.35.1	No comment		
<b>7.36</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 7</b>		
7.36	This is not a policy - move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted, but no change proposed. CPPC considers that this is relevant to the Plan but

			will be guided by the Independent Examiner
7.36	do not change grid road speed limits but ban right turns out of all estates onto grid roads.	O	Noted, no change
7.36.1	urgent attention should be given to the extensively dangerous offset junction where Pattison Lane and Newport Road intersect Chaffron Way. There have been accidents and fatalities at this junction. Some vehicles proceeding eastwards along Chaffron Way indicate they are turning left into Pattison Lane but do not turn! The vehicle travels straight ahead – the indicator has not be cancelled. Any vehicle wanting to turn right onto Chaffron Way or to cross into Newport Road could thus be in collision (and vice versa). Introduction of an appropriate speed limit and installation of traffic lights should provide a solution – hopefully before more fatalities occur.	W/S	Noted, no change
7.36.1	there should be a presumption on use of roundabouts and not traffic lights, nor lengthy detours caused by “no right turns”		Noted, no change
<b>7.37</b>	<b>Connectivity Policy 8</b>		
7.37	This is not a policy – move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted, no change
7.37.1	I hope this review includes the condition of the surfaces of footpaths/cycleways and the means to bring them all up to a standard fit-for-purpose.	W/S	Noted, MKC responsibility
7.37.1	something I have endured on many occasions .... On my push bike. Dark, early hours, its raining. The Redway “wanders”, it follows a scenic route but I really do need some “direct route” options. ie. Willen to “National” bus station, Willen to work/factory areas.	W	Noted, MKC responsibility
<b>7.38</b>	<b>Environmental Policies</b>		
7.38	There should be a policy with specific targets for the Parish on CO2 emissions	W	Noted, reduction built in to other policies
7.38	the Parish should not have any investments in CO2 generating organisations.	W	Noted
7.38	the Parish Council should have a published plan for CO2 reduction of its own operation	W	Noted, reduction built in to other policies
7.38	we would not want to see open green spaces taken out of public use, as a general rule. Benefits of open spaces to health and well-being eg mindfulness in the local and wider community must be considered	W/S	Noted, see 7.39
7.38.1	the words used here do not give strong enough protection to green spaces of any size, large or small. There should by now in a mature and developed area such as the entire parish a presumption that such places will not be developed.	W/S	Noted, see 7.39
7.38.2	traffic speed limits – although keeping traffic moving is important, as a professional driver of many years it is my opinion that the limits on single carriageway roads, where there are adjacent estate exits, that the limit here should be set at 40mph. It is very difficult to judge the speed of a vehicle approaching at these junctions and the current	O	Noted, no change

	limit of 60 is too high at these spots. Many more accidents will occur unless this is addressed.		
7.38.2	Pattison Lane/Chaffron Road needs to be a solid junction or no right turn – left turn only. Could be similar Chrysalis junction. – road between Childs way and Chaffron Way: Pattison Lane is now used to bypass Marlborough Street roundabout congestion.	W/S	Noted, see 7.36.1
7.38.3 to 7.38.5	No comments		
7.38.6	maintain all redways to a higher standard	F	Noted, irrelevant to plan
7.38.7	No comment		
7.38.8	all redway under passes to be brightly lit – use solar panels for the lighting.	F	Noted, see 7.32.5
7.38.9	“Any proposals for art forms including ‘urban art’ within underpasses is sensitive to the local area and does not create a fear of crime.” What a bizarre thing to say! What sort of art creates a fear of crime? Rather, have a statement which encourages all forms of art.	S	Noted, amend 7.38.9
7.38.9	the words used here do not give strong enough protection to green spaces of any size, large or small. There should by now in a mature and developed area such as the entire parish a presumption that such places will not be developed.	W/S	Noted, see 7.39
7.38.9	This is a blanket statement which might close the door for future work which might be beneficial and useful to the Parish. It does not need to be in the Neighbourhood plan but should be an issue dealt with on a case by case basis by the Parish	F	Noted, no change
7.38.10	No comment		
<b>7.39</b>	<b>Environment Policy 1</b>		
7.39	is almost an invitation for building on green open space. Also, this contradicts Policy 7.23.3 to “protect residential amenity”.	Xpln	Noted, see 7.39
7.39	I don’t have a problem with the policy itself but I fear the need for housing will over-ride any concern about potential loss of green/open spaces. Who is going to decide whether a proposal does not result in any harm to the area etc. If central government can over-rule any local decisions it might be better to say “new development resulting in the loss of green/open space will not be supported, full stop.	W	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with the principle of the NPPF in appropriate areas and offers suitable protection against inappropriate development
7.39.1	Milton Keynes has been left an incredibly rich physical legacy including the marvelous urban landscape and open space provision. This endowment is sacrosanct. In vain I searched the document for policy statements that recognise this and categorically rule out any possibility of development on the accessible open spaces. There is “wriggle	W/S	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with the principle of the NPPF in

	room" in all the statements, indeed there are actual proposals to build on it in places (see Q 3 Housing Policy 2). 7.39 provides an open invitation - virtually guidelines - for building on green space, which directly contradicts Policy 7.23.3. This needs to be rectified urgently.		appropriate areas and offers suitable protection against inappropriate development
7.39.1	should just say "new development which will result in the potential loss of green/open spaces will not be supported "  Therefore 7.39.2 / 7.39.3 / 7.39.4 not required.	W	Noted, no change
	7.39.1/2/3/4 - the Willen paddocks should be designated as key areas of green space	W	Amended
7.39.2	a bit vague. Some green spaces are/have a useful purpose just by being there. It is what sets Milton Keynes apart from most other places. Whilst the plan broadly seems to support my views I wanted to state that I am in favour of a] preserving the green spaces/lakes, canals etc. b] keeping extending the grid system as necessary. C] refurbish the redways which in some areas are in a very poor state of repair eg Fishermead to Woolstone alongside H7 Chaffron Way. D] improvements to public transport	O	Noted, sustainable development in accordance with the principle of the NPPF in appropriate areas and offers suitable protection against inappropriate development
7.39.2	green spaces may be valuable as green spaces even though they don't fulfil a "useful purpose".	W/S	Noted
7.39.2	the term "useful" must include health and well-being benefits the space provided. * spoke to resident on the 23/11/16 to clarify some wording, and on his instruction left out a word relating to his comment on 7.39.2 The Council should also be supportive of residents who complain that very large trees and high hedges and anti-social use of gardens are detrimental to neighbours' enjoyment of their garden.	W/S	Noted
7.39.2	when does a green space NEVER serve a useful purpose....at the very least is will be acting as a carbon sink?	W/S	Noted, amend 7.39.2
7.39.4	benefits to whom? The Parish, the Builder etc!! I personally found this development plan far too repetitive, long winded and down right boring. No matter how many times I read this I found that I was more confused and that there was not as such a straight forward question to which you can actually answer yes or no to, therefore I don't consider that the majority of replies you get are going to be true. I consider myself of above intelligence. So I consider this 45 page plan is a total waste of the Parish Councils money and my time!!	S	Noted, see 7.39.4 Noted

7.39.5	Gardens are an important characteristic in some areas. These contribute to the character of the area and street scene and also to the biodiversity and richness of urban landscapes which is often underestimated. Development affecting residential gardens should ensure that private green space provided by gardens is maintained and take opportunities to enhance the biodiversity of private gardens.” Good. Could there also be policies to discourage the paving/tarmacking of front gardens	S	Noted  Not relevant
<b>7.40</b>	<b>Environment Policy 2</b>		
	A clear cost analysis of the benefits of the development across social and economic lines should be shown	F	Noted
7.40.1 & 7.40.2	No comments		
<b>7.41</b>	<b>Environment Policy 3</b>		
7.41.1	“Resisted” is weak. Veto is the word to be used.	W/S	Unclear
7.41.1	refers to the retention of “important trees and hedgerows”. That appears to be a very ambiguous statement open to interpretation depending on one’s definition of what constitutes an important tree. For example, the developer might consider a tree unimportant whereas a local resident might think otherwise, who would determine its importance? I note there is just the one tree preservation order in place within the entire parish.	O	Noted, NPPF and MKC SPD’s apply Additional planting
<b>7.42</b>	<b>Environment Policy 4</b>		
	This is not a policy – move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted, but no change proposed. CPPC considers that this is relevant to the Plan but will be guided by the Independent Examiner
7.42.1	No comment		
7.42.2	Add. Providing clear quantitative and qualitative data relating to the economic, societal and environmental impact and how they will impact on all stakeholders.	F	Noted, see 7.39.4
<b>7.43</b>	<b>Environment Policy 5</b>		
	Add. Effect on wellbeing on the community and the impact on the environment.	F	Noted, NPPF applies
7.43.1	No comment		
<b>7.44</b>	<b>Environment Policy 6</b>		
7.44.1	No comment		
<b>7.45</b>	<b>Design Quality Policies</b>		

7.45.1	At the end of the first statement 'quality of future developments' add 'which should include a consideration of new innovative energy saving buildings which provide sustainability for the future.	F	Noted, see 7.39.2, Urban Design Code applies
<b>7.46</b>	<b>Design Policy 1</b>		
7.46	Even a development of less than 10 dwellings can have a negative impact on the locality if you do not require high standards of design. Therefore we suggest you revise policy "New development including residential development above 10 dwellings shall ensure the following criteria are considered:"	Xpln	Noted, amended
7.46.1	Design policy details mentions parking (for cars) but no mention of facilities for cyclists. Mention is made of redway connection and footpaths but cycling facilities for cyclists (racks, access etc) are not mentioned	W	Noted, incorrect, see 7.46.5
7.46.1	should one of these criteria not be that the development is agreeable with affected residents?	W/S	Noted, NPPF applies
7.46.1	again I read this as code for excuses "get out clauses" for development of lots of dwellings. Max 10 new dwellings should be the limit for the entire parish.	W/S	Noted, 7.46.1 amended
7.46.1	7.46.1 – 7.46.12 – improve not expand, estates look overcrowded	O	
	7.46.1 - 7.46.15 - Clearly nobody could argue with the criteria presented, however it should apply also to developments of less than 10 dwellings; a lesser quality development should not be acceptable just because of the numbers involved, and some of the small sites could be in prominent locations. The only nationally recognised design standard required is Secure By Design which is a worthy standard, though open to significantly broad interpretation according to the police officers involved - e.g some regard cul-de-sacs as a fundamental requirement while others advise against them for more connectivity. Other national design standards could be considered more beneficial such as Building for Life, Lifetime Homes (not the same thing!) and BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method).	W/S	Noted, 7.46.1 amended MKC Urban Design Policy applies
7.46.1	the consideration of all the listed criteria from 7.46.2 to 7.46.15 inclusive should apply to all new development, not just to residential developments above 10 dwellings.	O	Noted, amended
7.46.2 to 7.46.14	No comments		7.46.9 refer to 7,3
7.46.15	low carbon should not state "zero carbon" or if not attainable, a specific target should be stated	W	Noted, not viable to set a specific target
7.46.15	don't understand what "proportionate to the scale...! Means, again no measurable statements here	W	Noted, no change
7.46.15	there should be something about noise reduction ie all new buildings should be of sufficient quality to prevent noise from neighbouring dwellings. Modern buildings are	W	Covered by legislation eg building regulations



	shared ownership homes in Dolben Court, Willen by Peter Howard for MKDC.		
7.47	Willen Lakes status as a heritage area should be expanded to include surrounding areas including Pineham works (a bit late...)	W	Noted , the parish council does consider pans and objected to waste transfer site
	can Southfield Close (including pond) be added as a heritage site please	W	Noted add to green open space
7.47.1 to 7.47.6	No comments		
7.47.6	Survived not survives	F	Noted amend to survive
7.47.7	Add following or similar to final sentence...'The heritage policies seek to enhance and protect the areas with a long history and also areas that are significant to the modern history of Milton Keynes, Britain's most innovative and successful New Town.'	Xpln	Noted, amended
<b>7.48</b>	<b>Heritage Policy 1</b>		
7.48.1	New developments must demonstrate that the proposal has paid due regard to the need to conserve and enhance their setting and any special architectural, archaeological or other historic features, including special features of the 20C New Town era.	Xpln	Noted
<b>7.49</b>	<b>Heritage Policy 2</b>		
7.49.1	Strongly supported	W/S	
7.49.1	This is not a policy – move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	
7.49.1	(page 36) – “review the extent of the Willen Conservation area”. In my opinion Willen Lake has been ruined over the years by intrusive changes to the southern end making it look tacky and has probably damaged the local flora and fauna due to increased noise and rubbish. So are the north end is relatively untouched i.e serene!  [1] the Cathedral of Trees has been subjected to badly executed maintenance (ask the man who designed it). The Parks Trust should be brought to book on this aspect. Also the mess that is left after events are held there is inadequately dealt with, it at all. [2] I strongly object to proposals to expand the marina at Campbell Park. This is a park, not somewhere for shops, pubs etc etc As it is Campbell Park should not have had all those houses built on it. It is meant to be an area of beauty and recreation.	S	Noted, CPPC support sustainable development Policies seek to protect northern lake form commercialisation but realise that the southern lake is part of the leisure facilities of MK as a whole  Noted no change run by Parks Trust  Noted CPPC support sustainable development Noted Campbell park is not within CPPC area

7.49.1	what is a "conservation area"? How does a conservation area differ from those areas not designated as conservations areas?	W/S	Noted, Glossary
7.49.1	it is not clear how and why a conservation area in Woolstone would benefit this community. All buildings and sites are already listed? 1. The book "A guide to the historic buildings of Milton Keynes" (1986) lists more listed buildings in Woolstone. The ones omitted from the plan document are Hill Farmhouse, Rosebery Music Room, the Rectory and the Cross Keys	W/S	Noted  amend include in list
7.49.1	we would like to see a determined effort to achieve a conservation order for the lower part of Milton Road, Willen Village which is probably the oldest part and contains 3 pairs of workers cottages now all restored which date back to 1820's. It is also the site of an earlier Saxon village sited near what was a pond.	W	Included in the conservation area
<b>7.50</b>	<b>Heritage Policy 3</b>		
7.50	This is not a policy – move to Community Aspirations section	MKC	Noted
7.50	After many years there is still no sign that MKC has the resources to produce a Local Heritage List. Therefore, although the aspiration of Policy 3 is correct, we urge you to reinforce the need to protect these distinctive, unlisted Heritage Assets in all relevant policies including Design, Open Space and Connectivity.  Furthermore, this is <i>living</i> heritage. Residents continue to reap multiple benefits from this original, innovative layout so we strongly urge you to reflect this important heritage in the reflected in the wording of the document and in the policies.	Xpln	Noted Amended
7.50	the population should be consulted on their views for heritage candidates	W	Consulted Willen residents re the consercation area
<b>8.</b>	<b>Design Policy</b>		
	making it happen – much of this section states the obvious eg 8.1.6, 8.1.9, 8.1.11 (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted
8.1.1	states "...CPPC will look to apply.." Surely this should be "...will apply". Otherwise the implication is the CPPC can choose not to follow the NDP.	W/S	Noted – amend all relevant policies
8.1.2	The Core Strategy runs to 2026	MKC	amended
8.1.3	it states "measures will be developed". This is NOT good enough! Appropriate measures should be part of the NDP so we can all see how the effectiveness of the plan can be judged.	W/S	Noted, amended
8.1.4	No comment		
8.1.5	What does the word s.106 mean? A definition is required	F	Glossary
<b>9</b>	No comments		
10.1 to 10.10	No comments		

10.11	The Parish is commenting on this data. It has not done so on any of the other data. The comment made by the Parish on the survey result is not backed by any data. It is speculative and so should be removed.	F	Evidence base from survey. 10.11 amended
10.12 to 10.26	No comments		
<b>11</b>	<b>Appendix 3 – green open space</b>		
	<p>Similarly, we urge you to give absolute protection to the following sites (notwithstanding that some of these sites are listed in Appendix 3):</p> <p><b>Springfield green open space:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. off Kenwood Gate, backing onto homes at Falcon Avenue and Wealdstone Place</li> <li>b. opposite here, off Kenwood Gate, backing onto homes at Clerkenwell Place.</li> <li>c. space bounded by homes along Clerkenwell Place, Walbrook and Turnmill Avenues.</li> <li>d. space bounded by Turnmill Avenue, Billingwell Place and Springfield Boulevard.</li> <li>e. space backing onto homes off Graveney, Stamford and Beverley Place, and Springfield Boulevard</li> </ul> <p><b>Woolstones green open space, including but not confined to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. off Pattison Lane, between Butterfield Drive and Wilford</li> <li>b. between Pattison Lane and Newport Road, south of Rendlesham</li> <li>c. off Newport Road, almost opposite the old cottages and near the Cross Keys pub.</li> </ul> <p>If not done already, we urge you to complete a survey to clarify which open spaces fall into this category. Please do not rely on MKC's out-of-date and erroneous Local Plan map dated 2005 as your source of information on open spaces as large areas have been washed over with a 'residential' notation when in reality they contain amenity open space which earlier, more accurate maps reveal. Similarly, do not rely on recent MKC planning exercises such as the land categorization exercise of late 2015, or the recent Open Space Assessment prepared as part of Plan MK, as these also rely on the 2005 map which is known to contain errors and omissions.</p> <p>Although there is not much evidence that residents raised <i>the retention</i> of this type of open space as an issue in the early consultations this could be because most people</p>	Xpln	<p>Already included</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>In conflict with housing policy</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>Already included</p> <p>Noted but cannot give absolute protection</p> <p>Noted, no change</p>

	<p>assumed it was there for good. It is well known that the open spaces in CPPC area not only add to the health and wellbeing of their immediate residents: they add to the quality of life of residents outside the parish too.</p> <p>All enjoy the space for:  Health: informal recreation and exercise; walking the dog, children's play  Social cohesion: a place to meet and greet neighbours, freely open to all  Wellbeing: the benefits of being in contact with nature are well known</p> <p>Wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.</p> <p>The body of evidence which shows how much residents value green open space includes the Community Foundation surveys and recent experience over the Site Allocations Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, Community Policy 7.23.3 "Protect residential amenity" needs significantly more back up than it currently has in the rest of the document if it is to have any meaning or weight.</p> <p>To quote from objections that Springfield and Woolstones residents made at the time of Delegated Decisions, Cabinet and full Council meetings in Feb/March 2015, building new uld be back to back housing over carefully designed open amenity space "would create back-to-back housing of the sort people came to MK to escape!"</p> <p>With this in mind, the wording of several policies is too unclear, open to interpretation and therefore weak.</p> <p>For example, saying that development will not be supported in an area 'unless it can be demonstrated that existing uses are unviable' could easily lead to huge conflict between residents and opportunistic development.</p> <p>This would undermine the hard work that has gone into producing the NP and the aims of the whole exercise.</p>		
11.3	There are more parks in Fishermead in use than those listed. Leaving all of these out of a plan which looks at the future of the Parish means the play areas of the estate will not be protected something vital for sustainable development and the wellbeing of the community and its children.	F	MKC have reviewed CPPC will seek to retain large parks and have part funded upgrade of parks within the parish
11.4	green area in centre of Corbett Close – we would like to point out that the open space referred to is private property, owned and maintained by the residents of Corbett Close – Numbers 1, 2 and 4	W	Noted, amended
11.4	I want the Parish and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive, in Willen as a "key area of open/green space"	W	Amended

11.4	please include the paddocks at the end of Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space in Appendix 3	W	Amended
11.4	it has come to my attention that the paddocks on Aldrich Drive Willen are no listed in Appendix 3 as being a "key area of open/green space. I would therefore like to ask the Parish Council and Milton Keynes Council to add them as a "key area of open/green space - Appendix 3. These open spaces need to be preserved and cared for. In this day and age stress seems to play a large part in everybody's life and fresh air and open spaces are a must.	W	Amended
11.4	I would like to see added to appendix Willen:- the two paddocks adjoining Aldrich Drive and Willen Lake north to be identified as "key area of open/green space". This area is of significant beauty to Willen and should remain so for future generations.	W	Amended
11.4	I am concerned if I agree to one bit of land being used for houses. Eventually it will spread into other parts of Springfield as mentioned in 11.5 - Springfield.	S	Amended
11.4	I wish the Parish and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space"	W	Amended
11.4	Please could the Parish and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space"	W	Amended
11.4	We request the following areas be clearly identified as a "key area of open/green space" in Willen: paddock off Aldrich Drive, paddock between circular paddock and River Ouzel.	W	Amended
11.4	Please could the Parish and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space"	W	Amended
11.4	I would like to see added the two paddocks adjoining Aldrich Drive and Willen Lake north to be identified as "key area of open/green space". This area is of significant beauty to Willen and should remain so for future generations.	W	Amended
11.4	Excellent. Well thought out and so happy to see that our surroundings are preserved and looked after. If we are all to live together in our communities, then the care, support and management is vital to create a pleasant and stressless community, creates happier and more caring people who then live peacefully together.	W	Noted
11.4	This is a well thought out plan, which should enhance the general area. Overcrowding is to be avoided, and I note that there are minimal possibilities for new housing developments due to the nature of the existing developments within the parish boundaries. The areas proposed for development look reasonable and the areas designated as a "key area of open/green space" are also reasonable. However, I believe the "paddock area" at the south end of Aldrich Drive should be included in Appendix 3. This paddock is home to several horses and regularly attracts water fowl, in particular the distinctive Canadian Goose. The general appearance of the paddock is not only of import	W	Noted  Amended

	to the houses that immediately surround it, but it is an important feature of Willen and greatly enhances the whole lakeside area. I urge that it be included in Appendix 3		
11.4	I would like the Parish and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space	W	Amended
11.4	I would like to request that the Parish and Milton Keynes Council include the paddock on Aldrich Drive in Willen as a "key area of open/green space. This space is of great importance to the locals that live in the area as well as the many families that walk through and stop to see the horses kept here.	W	Amended
11.4	The paddock on Aldrich Drive seems to be missing from the paper and I think this should be included as a key area of open/green space. Would the parish & Milton Keynes Council include this as such please under Appendix 3?	W	Amended
11.4	Please include the horse paddocks near lake at end of Aldrich Drive as a key area of open/green space in appendix 3 (it is clearly a mistake it was not listed)	W	Amended
11.4	I would like the Parish and Milton Keynes Council include the paddock on Aldrich Drive in Willen as a "key area of open/green space.	W	Amended
11.4	I have already submitted my form to the parish council but it has come to my attention that the paddocks on Aldrich Drive Willen are no listed in Appendix 3 (11.4 Willen) as being a "key area of open/green space. I would therefore like to ask the Parish Council and Milton Keynes Council to add them as a "key area of open/green space -Appendix 3. These open spaces need to be preserved and cared for. In this day and age stress seems to play a large part in everybody's life and fresh air and open spaces are a must.	W	Amended
11.4	I would like the Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space.	W	Amended
11.4	I wish the Milton Keynes Council and Campbell Park Parish Council to include the two paddocks at the Chillery Leys end of Aldrich Drive to be included as a "key area of open/green space in Annex 3. This land was gifted to the Parks Trust by MK Development Corporation and should not be developed	W	Amended
11.4	Please include the paddocks at the end of Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space in Appendix 3 11.4	W	Amended
11.4	I want the Parish and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive as a "key area of open/green space	W	Amended
11.4	I very strongly consider the paddock, which is such a feature of Aldrich Drive, be designated as a key area of open/green space. I therefore request that the paddock be clearly identified as a key area of open/green space and be added to Appendix 3 of the Campbell park Neighbourhood Development Plan	W	Amended
11.4	I would like CPPC and Milton Keynes Council to include the paddock on Aldrich Drive Willen as a "key area of open/green space"	W	Amended

11.4	I notice under "Appendix "" there is no mention of the "paddock" (green area) down at the end of Aldrich Drive Willen. Therefore I would prefer to have this included in the statement to ensure no consideration is given to possible development. I understand this is an impounded reservoir beneath the paddock, used for grazing horses and operated by Anglian Water as a water resource.	W	Amended
11.5	Garden Courts on Springfield and Fishermead should be identified as green open spaces	W	Noted

<b>Further Comments</b>		<b>Action</b>
<p>Xplain is a citizens' group which encourages sustainable development in harmony with the original, successful design ethos of Milton Keynes as a New City. It has c. 300 members who live across Milton Keynes, including residents of Campbell Park Parish.</p> <p>CPPC has been an early champion of Neighbourhood Planning and is well aware of the trouble that ensues when opportunistic development appears that conflicts with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan (NP).</p> <p>We urge you to review this draft to ensure that clear, robust wording is used throughout the document in case of legal challenge due to unsympathetic development or planning decisions. Given the ongoing issues facing Central Milton Keynes, policies in your NP must be as clear as possible in order to uphold its original intentions and integrity over time.</p>	Xpla	Noted
<p>Is there anything being considered to address the problem of dog fouling. I'm a responsible dog owner who always picks dog mess but there are some "irresponsible owners who don't"</p>	W/S	Not relevant to plan
<p>I felt this was a comprehensive, well produced document that reflects the needs of the community both now and for the future.</p> <p>I trust that if these policies are approved and implemented they will enhance the beauty of the area and improve those areas which are not as attractive as Willen, Woolstone and Oakgrove. There is a definite need for some areas to receive regeneration and remedial work</p>	W/S	Noted
<p>The Council should also be supportive of residents who complain that very large trees and high hedges and anti-social use of gardens are detrimental to neighbours' enjoyment of their garden. An excellent comprehensive survey presenting all necessary information. Hopefully the rather general aims in many sections will be translated into effective measures when considering each change</p>	W/S	Noted not relevant to plan
<p>The plan was well written and informative. There are some clear plans to support further development and growth of the parish.</p> <p>As the supervisor for the local Neighbourhood Policing Team my staff have always found the Council to be supportive of our work across the whole parish</p>	TVP	Noted
<p>On road parking along Pattison Lane – I would like to bring to the attention of the parish Council the issue of on road parking along Pattison Lane opposite the main play area, by the people mooring their canal boats along this section of canal.</p> <p>There are two major issues</p> <p>It not only impedes the pedestrian access to the play area when crossing the road, but also their vision of oncoming traffic.</p> <p>The other issue being, as this is a bus route the line of parked cars at this point can cause considerable congestion</p>	W/S	Not relevant to plan but will speak to MKC

I'm disappointed it will take so long to get local low cost affordable housing. My son was born and educated here. He works locally but has had to buy a house in Northampton because there was nothing he could afford in MK	S	Plan supports provision of affordable housing
Find ways to reduce traffic noise from grid roads ie reduce speeds/noise reducing road surfaces/more enforcement	S	Not relevant
Our views must be listened to and acted upon. Any referendum must be finding, not advisory. The recent MK development plan referendum result has been largely ignored by MKBC. The EU referendum result is heading the same way. You must respect democracy rather than pretending that it exists.	W/S	Noted
Great job and good luck with the consultation	W/S	Noted
Very impressed with the quality, content detail of the plan. Well done to all involved.	W/S	Noted
Interesting booklet, good to read that you are doing good work and are aware of what improvements can be made to enhance the lives of the community. Reassuring that its improvement rather than massive redevelopment.	W/S	Noted
A very comprehensive Development Plan; our concerns are really associated with the loss of character and identity. We feel that the aims and objectives are sound but we recognise that external factors can be a powerful influence. There must be a balance between new and old, so that the town/city can flourish without undermining its rich heritage. We appreciate the thought that has gone into putting together the questionnaire and the opportunity to express our views.	W/S	Noted
The policies set out in the consultation document are so obviously laudable and right that it would be difficult to respond with a "no" to any of them. The real difficulty is going to be in meeting these aspirations. A prime example being the proposed development at Campbell Park canalside which is an overdevelopment of an inappropriate response to the site.	W/S	Noted
To retain existing landscape and access across grid roads. Noted poor landscape maintenance within the Parish. To promote on each estate the tidy up around footpaths and play areas etc and promote more in Parish newsletter to this end. Be proactive and ensure shops on the estates do more around the shop fronts and bin areas.	W/S	Noted but landscape standard is currently outside of CPPC scope
Thank you for a clearly explained document about our area. I am very pleased to call it my home. And I cannot see any reason to disagree here.	W/S	Noted
It was nice to read a booklet that was very interesting regard the local issues in the areas in Milton Keynes in the booklet. Its nice to know that the local councils are helping the community and the people to make their estates a better and nice place to live and work. Its nice to know that our say will make a difference for the future of Milton Keynes	W	Noted
It would be good to have a path on the Willen road between Willen and Newport Pagnell. Need better transport (bus) links between estates.	W	Noted
The Plan looks good – thank you. As a Willen resident I am concerned about noise and smell pollution. 1] the Cotton Valley sewage works is a challenge and over a million people a year can	W	Noted

<p>smell it! Not a great advert for Milton Keynes. 2] we already suffer the noise from the M1 – this is getting worse. Add into this the newly agreed concrete plant. This seems to be a complete juxtaposition to the Environment Policy.</p>		<p>Cotton Valley sewage works and Waste Transfer station outside the Parish area but the Parish did object to the Waste Transfer station and a councillor continues to monitor the development</p>
<p>Excellent. Well thought out and so happy to see that our surroundings are preserved and looked after. If we are all to live together in our communities, then the care, support and management is vital to create a pleasant and stressless community, creates happier and more caring people who then live peacefully together.</p>	W	Noted
<p>This is a well thought out plan, which should enhance the general area. Overcrowding is to be avoided, and I note that there are minimal possibilities for new housing developments due to the nature of the existing developments within the parish boundaries.</p>	W	Noted
<p>The survey results are all obvious. The devil is in the detail. A good example is the failure to prevent the concrete recycling plant at Willen. There is nothing in the proposal to prevent a similar proposal elsewhere in future.</p>	W	Noted
<p>I feel very sad when I read the development plan. To see half the land (which was one of the reasons we moved here) go to housing. I have no issue with the pub and that land being redeveloped as this would stay within keeping of the area however I do not feel it is in keeping to loose half of the green space which my family have always used in the 22 years we have lived here. If I had wanted to have houses out of my back garden I would have moved onto an estate with this or bought a house with waste land next to it. Then I would have expected houses to be built. I have lived here for 22 years and now you are going to change what I love about living here.</p>	S	Noted, cannot stop sustainable development NPPF
<p>There is no mention of Appendix 3 in the main body of the document and therefore its role is unclear. Is Appendix 3 merely "for information" or does it list areas under consideration for further development? Whichever the inclusion of the word "key" in the heading to the Appendix implies an importance beyond mere information. This could well lead to concern that further development (housing or otherwise) is under consideration for these area. The document would be much better if Appendix 3 was totally removed or, at the very least, replaced with a heading along the lines of "Areas identified as valuable for recreational purposes not under consideration for further development".</p>	S	Noted
<p>Clearly a vast amount of work has gone in to the plan and I commend the Council for the commitment to the good of the Parish.</p>	S	Noted

<p>However, at the moment the plan largely reads as though it has been created to defend what the parish is already doing and is essentially conservative. Maybe there are threats to the parish which make a defensive document necessary, but how much better it would if it were truly visionary. In this regard, I strongly encourage the Council to make use of the resources of the organisation known as 'Living Streets' – see <a href="https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/">https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/</a>  In particular, please explore the resources at: <a href="https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources">https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/resources</a>  The key message I take from Living Streets is that streets are for living: they are not just for getting from A to B. This insight seems to me to be entirely absent from Campbell Park's Neighbourhood Plan.  As an example of 'Living Streets' thinking which I believe the Council could learn from, I draw the Council's attention to the document entitled "No ball games here"  <a href="https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/1404/noballgames.pdf">https://www.livingstreets.org.uk/media/1404/noballgames.pdf</a>  And I remember when the council deliberately had small fences installed along the grass verges of Springfield Boulevard in order to prevent children playing football.</p>		
<p>The book a Guide to the Historic Buildings of Milton Keynes (1986) lists more listed buildings in Woolstone. The ones omitted from Plan document are Hill Farmhouse, Rosebury Music Room, The Rectory and The Cross Keys.</p>	W	Amended
<p>Any methods to discourage cut-through by cars heading west on Child's Way (H6) through Springfield to get onto Marlborough Street (V8) would be most welcome.</p> <p>Congratulations on the Plan! Well thought-out, well presented and well worth the time, money, effort that has been put into it.</p>	S	Not relevant to plan
<p>The only comment I have is the lack of community policing and on Oldbrook Park more to be done about dog fouling and people urinating and drinking there and leaving rubbish – maybe CCTV</p>	O	CPPC will bring up with police
<p>Keep up the good work. One of the beautiful city from UK</p>	O	Noted
<p>Love MK</p>	O	Noted
<p>Overall the consultation documents and info were informative and well presented and easy to read and understand. Well done Campbell Park Parish Council. Your efforts for our community are well appreciated.</p>	O	Noted
<p>The plan appears to be good but it will be interesting to see if they are actually implemented. With most resources being reduced I don't see how more can be achieved. There has been less and less done over the years particularly in maintaining walkways, roads etc. Public land is left and shrubs and weeds have taken over. There is a piece of land at the side of our property that we have maintained since the day we moved here 28 ½ years ago – I would like to have claimed this piece of land but was informed it is owned by the Council. Why do they not look after it. Police resources have been cut which encourages more crime in an area – perhaps Neighbourhood plans could help out in this area.</p>	O	Noted
<p>The plan is very well put together and thought through and other than my critical comments made earlier about HiMOs, I fully support it.</p>	O	Noted

Thanks for all the work gone into this – hope you get helpful and clear feedback	W	Noted
Congratulations are due to the Steering Group and those others who helped to draw up this plan. A well presented, precise and enlightening document.	W	Noted
An impressive and comprehensive document, no wonder it was a “long time in the making”. As a long term resident of Springfield it certainly gets my support. A lot of thought has been put into it to improve all aspects of life here without anything too drastic happening.	S	Noted
Online form not fit for purpose Comments – maybe not relevant for this survey 1. Parking at Oldbrook shops – double yellow lines are abused causing jams – should be enforced 2. Physical traffic calming measures – bumps – width restrictions are more problems than they solve – should not be considered A number of surveys have been completed – Parish/City national – a number of which have been ignored with the views of the people not taken into account. NDP policies are mainly common sense if followed. Time and hard work over a long period has gone into the project – time will tell if it was worth it. However well done to those who have committed time and energy to get it this far.	O	Noted addressed  Noted
In Confidence : parking on Oldbrook has been mentioned several times, something needs to be done about parking on Illingworth Place including disabled parking which is housing belonging to Habinteg. Parking on corner of Illingworth Place where it meets Century Avenue by a disabled person and their visitors is extremely dangerous and contravenes the highway code. This is a daily occurrence and needs to be addressed emergency vehicles and peoples lives are being put at risk.	O	Noted
Would like to see more police patrolling the streets. Would also like to see restriction of vehicle parking on pavements blocking walkways. Also Campbell Park Parish is populated enough without having to build on small green spaces and verges and not living in a concrete jungle.	O	Noted
No speed ramps on estates (Newport Pagnell is awful!). Keep grid road speed limits at statutory limits. Don't allow any more HiMOs on Oldbrook Boulevard due to existing parking problems. Keep up the good work.	O	Noted
like I said about the trees is an end house in Oldbrook with lots of trees close to my house it's a nightmare as there is always people putting their rubbish at the side of my house as the greenery and trees are there. I don't drive but I still manage to get my rubbish to the tip, its just unfair that people keep doing this as I do my best to keep my property and garden tidy, so I also think there problems with fly tipping.	O	Noted
Any large developments within the CPPC should be made transparent with how they meet the criteria listed in the development plan being visible so the residents can monitor the decision making.	O	Noted, the Parish considers all planning applications within the Parish area
A pleasing report with lots of detail and obvious hard work. The vision laid out can only continue to make the homes and lives of all residents happy and fulfilled.	O	Noted

I trust you to do the best possible job for our communities	O	Noted
As I read in the consultation booklet, it said the Parish Council are seeking alternative accommodation for their office as the present building at 1 Pencarrow Place is no longer meeting their needs ie not big enough anymore. I strongly feel that they should have an opportunity to relocate to the new building being constructed further along at Pentwan Gate at the corner of Fishermead Boulevard next to Fishermead medical centre. If not having the whole building at least occupying some of it at least, it would make sense to me. Still in a central location, not far to have to move and I am concerned that when this building is completed it will only have a limited use for only certain parts of the community. A Parish Council presence to be there would ensure that there would be representation for all parts of the community location wise and population wise. And as the building has constantly been stopped and started many times due to the fact that the funding is only coming from charitable resources. If the Parish Council could have become involved and could bid for some premises there, maybe they could get help with more funding as it would benefit them and the surrounding community. I don't know if they have already at some point had an opportunity ever to consider my suggestion but I think that they would bring some much needed life and vibrancy to this potential property. I really hope something could come of this idea. PS sorry I meant corner of Pentwen Gate and Fishermead Boulevard not Pencarrow Place – across the road from the Co-op.	O	Noted
I have lived in Milton Keynes since 1980, 1980-2003 in Fishermead and moved to Oldbrook in 2003 where I have lived ever since. My 5 children all grew up here and benefitted from very good schools. I enjoy living here with all the wide open spaces in parks, lakes, forests etc and fully support all you efforts to continue to make Milton Keynes a great place to live	O	Noted
the times I have contacted CPPC I have found everyone very helpful and responsive. Thank you and please continue the good work	O	Noted
I feel that there are empty properties within the parish owned by housing associations and council do not remember needing anything We need to be setting up club, net ball team, we ae doing well with football for the amount of young people around the parish we need more work and why not make street one way at the boulevards with some speed bumps.	O	Noted
As a resident of Fishermead of many years multiple occupancy has taken its toll and made our estate on par to a sink estate. This should be now controlled, also too many trees reaching far too greater heights near housing blocking out light – amenities should always have small trees not fast growing large ones! Where roots impede roads or integrate under the foundations of housing – causing repair issues! More bungalows are needed, I am an independent 65 year old that has a two bedroom house on Polruan who wishes to move into a one bedroom bungalow but none are being built near the city. I like Fishermead and wish to see it return to its clean status as it once was. It's the first estate newcomers see when coming to the mall facilities lets keep it clean and bring its "I'd like to live there" status back. Keep trees cut, bushes cut, maintain rubbish fines included if people dump rubbish out after day bin collection! I want Fishermead back to a desired estate again.	F	Noted, HiMO sub committee set up to address the issue

<p>More police walking around. More places to go in the area not just the city centre vicinity of Fishermead.</p>	F	Not relevant to plan
<p>Change and modernisation is an inevitable part of progress in providing a suitable environment for the growing population to expand. Expansion is occurring in part because of the attraction of a thriving economy in Milton Keynes. Those of us who live here appreciate the attractive scenery that is all around us, but it has to be recognised that in order to maintain this, changes must occur in providing employment opportunities and as a consequence, accommodation. Whilst there are "problem" areas, these are in a minority and by making progress with the main issues of housing and employment the other issues of education, health and well-being and environment, which includes traffic flow, can be improved over time. Thanks to the intelligence and diligence of our local elected Parish Councillor, we can look forward to gradual improvement of these issues.</p>	F	Noted
<p>Overall a well thought out and considered plan. Having allowed Milton Keynes to be built at all, surely it is a little late to have such stringent exemptions for the older "established" ex-villages. You cant keep cramming dwellings into an area that is already overcrowded, and it is a shame that the assumption that an area has a transient population is carte blanche to presume that they wont object to a potential detrimental development in their area. One thing Fishermead at least seems to need is a feeling of pride in its residents. No one seems to care much about where they live, so have no desire to protect it.</p>	F	Noted
<p>Would strongly encourage current housing to be re-vamped and made "good". It would be nice to spend money on existing residents to ensure they feel engaged with. This estate feels disenfranchised, not valued unless you are foreign.</p>	F	Noted
<p>A very clear and insightful document, although I would have liked to have seen more about education and how the Parish could provide more locally based services for people with additional needs, working in partnership with MK Council and local voluntary agencies such as Age UK, thereby supporting local residents in their local communities. There are local secondary schools within or very close to the parish, the area and more work could be done to xxx students with work in their local community.</p>	F	Noted C& E committee
<p>My concern is the footpath near the Co-op, the telephone booth and the bus stop. The walk way is too narrow. There is a mound to the left and Co-op to the right when someone comes through on a buggy there is very little space for other pedestrians. The mound could be narrowed to provide a wider area for mothers with pushchairs and disabled on buggies and other pedestrians.</p>	F	Noted being addressed
<p>Q3 – Please see comments on back page. Other estates also have space for housing. We should be building to reduce the number of people who are homeless in our borough. We are very pleased to see that Fishermead has land to build further houses. It must be noted that these house should have a high percentage of social housing, shared ownership and low cost starter homes. We are somewhat surprised to see that the rest of Kellan Drive is not being currently utilised for housing. So much land is wasted and seeing the drunks and druggies using the areas we believe</p>	F	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agree, will review when plan is made, if dev proposal is submitted then this will be</p>

houses and flats would be a better option. We also believe that land on one side of Pentewan Gate should also be used for housing.		considered against all relevant polices in plan
Really pleased to have the opportunity to comment on such plans... and on the whole, they seem positive overall. They are however lacking in depth so its very difficult to comment objectively but great to see that the parish has plans to improve the area.	F	Noted
<p>The plan is concise, clear and makes for easy reading in its layout. It presents the reader with a detailed and open perspective on the position, plan and direction of CPPC with regards to the future of the Parish. Indeed given the amount of work that would have gone into producing it I would say: 'well done on this first draft'.</p> <p>Overall I think there needs to be more of a commitment to sustainable development within the Parish. Yes it has been mentioned a few times within the document and biodiversity has also come up but it feels as though it is just mentioned as some sort of compliance exercise rather than as a real commitment to sustainable development. The triple bottom line of economic development, social equity and environmental protection need to take up more attention and feature as a key driver for development in the future.</p> <p>Also more needs to be said to encourage businesses/developers to commit to developing more eco-friendly buildings that make use of solar energy, manage waste, support the community through relevant Corporate Social Responsibility programmes and work towards a circular economy including a review of internal processes within new buildings which reduce waste and encourage wellbeing in the communities.</p>	F	Noted
Important to preserve what makes MK the place it is i.e respect for open spaces and the environment, particularly on the older more established areas – these should be left alone unless absolutely essential.	W/S	Noted
<p>I was delighted to read the document, and to discover some facts about the CPPC area that I didn't previously know. As a Member of MK Council - and often a member of the Development Control Committee - it's not for me to comment on the policies you chose to set for your area. But I will say that I generally found the policies and the reasoning for them very clear to read and understand.</p> <p>I was of course pleased to see the Willen Lake area (including Newlands) considered in detail, at paras 7.20.4-6. However unless there is a technical reason for not doing so, I would urge you to also list the relevant portions of Newlands and the Willen Lake surroundings, as open/green spaces, within para 11.4 in Appendix 3.</p> <p>You have an "and" and an "or" within policy 7.39, allowing two possible interpretations. For the sake of ensuring that DCC interprets this entire policy the way you intend the compound logic to be interpreted, can I urge you to clarify how you want it read.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for the invitation to comment, and I wish you every success with the remainder of the process.</p>	OTH	<p>Letter of thanks to J Bint for his comments</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted no change. The policy is written in a way to allow for an either or situation but the third element is a firm</p>

		requirement required for either choice
The Plan is overly long, contains too much background padding and duplication. The result is a tedious read in which the key messages, the Policies, are lost in the "noise". We suggest a much shorter, succinct document which would have greater impact and would be more amenable to long term maintenance. (Old Woughton Parish Council)	OTH	Noted
Your proposals of what you are planning will only enhance what you have got already.	S	Noted
It's a really excellent document. Clear, well laid out, well written. Thank you for sharing it.	S	Noted
Do not know what you are talking about it will cost taxpayer more money for your waste. It will not help Oldbrook resident one bit pay council tax all so Parish Council's what rip off. Plus we are not a city you tried 3 time more money wasted	U/S	Noted
How you can justify the use of public monies with this plan you are creating another Council body doing what you want to do even when mandated to increase precept to 5% you make it 7% who can trust you	U/S	Noted
When are you going to do something about people putting their rubbish out early and making the estates look an eyesore?	U/S	Not relevant
shame all the pictures make the parish look so wonderful! I think a few of how some areas really look would of been a good idea as some areas are awful.	U/S	Noted
Springfield Resident's comments – 34 pages	S	CPPC has extensively examined all comments and have made a number of amendments to the Plan in response to the consultation exercise on the draft Plan. This has been in the form of further explanation, additions or deletions as appropriate.