Tuesday 20th July 2021

Session 1 of 1:

1	Do you have any idea how many houses there are going to be?	The objective is to provide sites for 30-35 houses. The largest site is site 2a, with 15 dwellings. Sites 3 and 4 together allow for up to 10 dwellings. Site 6 allows for three dwellings. Site 9 would contain two dwellings. There is likely to be some infill housing over the next few years.
2	For the unchosen sites, is it still open to the landowner to apply to develop the land?	They have a right to seek independent planning consent. The area outside of the settlement boundary is open countryside for planning purposes and so is likely to be rejected by Milton Keynes Council. Following the advice of the independent experts regarding site suitability has the additional advantage of reducing the risk of the site allocations being challenged later on.
3	What provision is there of affordable housing, to ensure our children have a chance to stay in the village?	We are specifying a mixture of two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses across all of the sites. Milton Keynes Council's policy (within Plan:MK) on affordable housing is very restrictive. There will be a sizable amount of affordable housing in the new development at Tickford Farm. We are recommending that there will be 40 per cent two-bedroom houses, 40 per cent three-bedroom houses, and 20 per cent four-bedroom houses across the sites. The landowner of site 2a will also need to provide some form of affordable housing as part of the development.
4	Is it the developer who makes the arrangements with the landowner to develop the sites or does Milton Keynes Council buy the sites?	The land is all in private ownership. It is up to the landowners to develop them. One of the advantages of the Neighbourhood Plan process is the ability to ask landowners to work together on adjacent sites.
5	Will there still be an opportunity to object to a development through the planning process?	Yes. If the Neighbourhood Plan receives a majority at a referendum, it becomes part of planning policy for this area. However, any development will require a planning application to be made, and the same planning process will continue to apply.
6	What happens without a Neighbourhood Plan?	The original 15 sites will not simply go away. Development for North Crawley Parish generally, and presumably for those sites in particular, will still be on the cards. Any of them would be susceptible to prospective development.
7	Do you get the impression that Milton Keynes Council is keen to develop this area?	No. However, we are aware of three or four landowners who have land which is now being managed by land-promoters. Through the Neighbourhood Plan process, the Steering Group has been engaging with them to achieve mutually acceptable development.
8	What about the changes to planning policy being put forward by Central Government at the moment?	These would bring about much greater freedom in development generally, although consultation remains ongoing. It is better for the Parish Council to have something to hold up as a protection against unwanted development. If you want to have your say on the proposed changes, then you can and should write to your Member of Parliament. We do not believe that we should take a chance on how planning rules will end up looking.

9	Congratulations on the work you have done. It is important for the village not to lose the shop, the pub, and the school.	Received with thanks.

Wednesday 21st July 2021

Session 1 of 2:

1	It's a very good presentation. Just to clarify: Are all of the sites going to be included in the Neighbourhood Plan or is it going to be a site-by-site choice?	The only sites that we will be voting for in the Neighbourhood Plan are the five sites that have been highlighted. We will be voting for/against all of them as a complete package: essentially, the five of them (together) are the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. At one stage, we thought we would have to go through some form of process to whittle the sites down because we had 15 of them, which would have been far too many. We thought, for example, that we might go back to residents with a weighting system. However, once the site assessment process was completed, we ended up with only five sites deemed suitable, on which we could only get about 29-30 houses. So, actually, all 5 of the suitable sites are needed to get the desired housing number.
2	Incorporated in the Plan, are we making a proper allowance for the younger people in the village? They do not seem to be looking for the type of houses that might go on these sites.	We have asked Milton Keynes Council's advice on this. The Plan will specify two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses: we do not want larger houses than that. We want some bungalows, in recognition of the demand from some older people, who may want to downsize. It is very much part of the justification for having a Neighbourhood Plan that we want to keep younger people in the village and to allow families to remain in the village. The proportion we are looking at, that is compliant with Milton Keynes Council policies – they have advised us on this matter, is 40 per cent two-bedroom houses, 40 per cent three-bedroom houses, and 20 per cent four-bedroom houses. We have also looked into affordable housing, and this has been a really difficult issue for us. Milton Keynes Council's policy only includes affordable houses to rent and shared ownership with a housing association. This is not what residents told us we needed in this village; however, we are not allowed to include a policy that goes against Milton Keynes Council's policies unless we have a reason to do so. We would have to do a housing needs assessment to show that we are different from the rest of the Milton Keynes area. We cannot do that: we do not have enough evidence to be able to put that kind of case forward.

		Additionally, the previous Steering Group investigated whether or not a housing association would be willing to work with us, but we are just not big enough. When you consider what is happening at the Milton Keynes East and Tickford Farm developments, that is where affordable housing (as defined by Milton Keynes Council) is going to be. What we have in North Crawley is one site of 15 houses where, consequently, the developer will be obliged to provide some kind of affordable housing. We were hoping that that would be below-market-pricing housing, but we are not going to be able to do that because it would go against local planning policy.
3	Would it be possible for you to show us, using the parish map, the exact locations of the five sites, and to give their names?	Site 2a (Top Croft), adjacent to the eastern side of Chicheley Road and north of Orchard Way. The development would remain within the historic boundary, which separates it from site 2b (Bottom Croft) because development of that site would result in coalescence between North Crawley and Little Crawley, which we do not want. The undeveloped Bottom Croft, therefore, becomes part of the defensible boundary to site 2a. Site 3 (Maslin Site), adjacent to the northern side of Orchard Way and east of the existing row of houses at the entrance to that road. This would contain five houses. Site 4 (Orchard Way), adjacent to the northern side of Orchard Way and east of site 3. This site would contain five houses. Concerns about an entrance road across the verge separating that site from the road have been addressed and the proposed Local Green Space Policy in the Neighbourhood Plan would leave the verge intact. Instead, the respective owners of sites 3 and 4 have agreed to work together to form a communal entrance through site 3 (west of the pumping station). Site 6 (High Street), immediately east and west of the terraced row of 36-46 High Street. This site consists of an infill site between 34 and 36 High Street and the vacant land east of 46 High Street, providing for three houses. Site 9 (Folly Lane), adjacent to the western side of Folly Lane and immediately south of the existing houses at the entrance from the High Street. Development requiring access from Folly Lane is strictly limited, owing to the highways issues that would arise, and this is a significant part of the reason why almost all of those sites were deemed unsuitable. The developer for site 9 has identified an area at

		which it would be possible to provide the visibility splays required by the Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council.
4	Would the development of site 9 go all the way down to the southern end of that field?	No. We have agreed with the landowner that there will be two bungalows at the top of the site, so as to be consistent with the adjacent bungalows that define the character of that area. They will use the southern end of the site to create an internal driveway that will allow access to those bungalows. The policies within the Neighbourhood Plan will specify what is acceptable on each site, based on all of the feedback we have had so far – these will be checked by professionals to ensure that the policies are compliant with local and national policy and that they are reasonable. One of the considerations for a site such as site 9 is that it is part of the rural approach to the village and we would like to keep that. To have the bungalows confined to the top of the site allows the lower part to be landscaped so that it retains that rural character. The policy will also specify that the protected trees will be retained and, although they will have to remove part of the hedgerow to provide access, there will be planting of new hedgerow within the site.
5	Folly Lane is quite a steep road. If there is going to be a new access (for site 9), will new drainage be put in as well?	Yes. There is an existing culvert, and it will be for the developer to address the drainage requirements as part of their planning application. Just because a site is included within a Neighbourhood Plan, adopted following a referendum, does not mean that any development of that site is automatically acceptable. It means that we, as a community, are endorsing development of that site within the design codes that we set down. The landowner will still have to make a planning application to Milton Keynes Council, who will have to be satisfied that all of the planning requirements are met, including drainage and access. Moreover, residents retain the right to object to that application in the same way that they can to any other application.
6	Can we have any influence over the naming of any of the sites? There have been suggestions of using the Maslin name for site 3.	We have written to the land promoter for site 3 and the landowner is favourable to that sort of thing. Parish and local councils, working with the developer, can influence the naming of developments.

Session 2 of 2:

1	Is it easier for somebody to be able to develop a site if it is outside of the settlement boundary?	No, on the contrary. Sites that are outside of the settlement boundary are within the open countryside. We are aware that steps are being taken by the U.K. government to try to relax the planning process because of the drive to build more housing generally. Equally, there is a lot of public opinion against the loosening of planning rules and the possibility of the open countryside being developed. That is, of course, something over which we have no control whatsoever. By having a Neighbourhood Plan, however, the Parish Council will at least have a legal document specifying how residents want the village to develop. This will provide additional protection against speculative development. We know, for instance, that a house is going to be built in Folly Lane that arguably did not comply with the existing planning rules, but which received planning consent from Milton Keynes Council, nonetheless. These things do happen and, although we are asked our opinion, the Parish Council has no legal power to stop a development. However, a Neighbourhood Plan would provide an additional safeguard for the Parish Council to call upon.
2	We know that landowners have proposed these sites, but is there any commitment to actually sell/develop these sites? If, for instance, the land passes to someone else, is there a commitment to how/if a site is developed?	No, we have not sought that sort of commitment. It would be very difficult to impose that sort of commitment with legal effect. It is partly for that reason that larger sites (e.g. sites 1, 5, and 7) are unsuitable and will not be in the Neighbourhood Plan. Nevertheless, the owners of the rejected sites have chosen to put them forward for development and, in the case of site 1, there have even been multiple applications to develop this site. Those applications had to go through the normal planning process, and the Parish Council has no power to stop that. With a Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council and Milton Keynes Council have a planning policy document they can rely on to object to applications on sites that are not included in that Plan. The Steering Group are already working with land promoters for four of the five viable sites. They have been given the rights to promote that land by the owners. With the other site, the Steering Group is working with a representative who has been nominated by the people who own it and who are keen to support the Neighbourhood Plan and are working very closely with us. They are looking at getting a promoter on board but we have already been having meetings with their representative about design codes. We believe that there is a strong commitment from the respective owners to develop all five sites, and there are already developers involved with four of them.

3	Thank you for all your hard work. I work very closely with the planning authorities. AECOM are a fab company, so I am glad that you have chosen to go with them. My only concern is about the Folly Lane site and its visibility splays. For example, if the Infrastructure Development Manager of Oxford City Council would not have allowed development there, whilst Milton Keynes Council potentially would, my concern is the strength of that argument when it goes to the Independent Examiner? If technical people feel differently over that aspect, is that the way that the Independent Examiner will go? As you have said, there is not going to be another chance at this and I think a Neighbourhood Plan is absolutely important. I have seen other places where people have not adopted one. We could end up with any development given to us, including very large ones near the village, if we do not adopt a Plan.	One of the things that we have to present to the Independent Examiner is the evidence base behind the decisions that we have made. Our evidence base, on this matter, begins with our E-mail correspondence and discussions with the Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council. A member of the Steering Group did a considerable amount of technical work on Folly Lane to look at what was and was not possible there. We have an E-mail from the Highways Officer at Milton Keynes Council saying that he would not support extensive development on Folly Lane but that he accepts that, where a visibility splay can be proven, a maximum of 3 dwellings on site 9 would be acceptable. Accordingly, site 9 has been included with reference to consultation with the Highways Officer. In addition, although the whole of site 9 was put forward at the initial sift, the land promoter changed that site during subsequent consultation, reducing it to only the northern half of that field. The Steering Group went back to them and explained that the proposal would make the site non-viable because there was no way that it would accommodate the required visibility splay. We suggested that an internal road (from the southern end of the site) might still achieve this, as well as retaining hedgerow and the protected trees. The promoters took that feedback away and, just last week, came back with their version of the plan for that site; with two bungalows at the northern end and the access at the southern end. Incidentally, it is for this reason that this evening's display for site 9 looks slightly different from the others. We retain the chain of E-mail correspondence with their planners showing that they have been out and assessed it and that there is a suitable visibility splay at that point. Also, because of the existing footpath, there is the additional space for the visibility splay for that access. It will mean that a small amount of the existing hedgerow will need to be removed, but the promoters have said that they will landscape internally (within site 9) on the part of the site with the driveway leading to the top of the site. In this way, the Steering Group has had some really positive discussions with landowners and their agents about how to make a site viable for exactly the reasons you have mentioned. We do not want the Neighbourhood Plan to fail at the Independent Examiner stage. In the case of site 9, the engagement with Highways as well as the professional urban planners and our site assessment team, AECOM, has established that site 9 is viable if that access is in place. We believe that we have covered all bases and are able to present a strong case for the viability of site 9.

4	It seems such a shame that you can take a hedge out to provide access to a site, but you cannot put a hedge in to form a defensible boundary within a site.	These are two different issues. Defensible boundaries are a whole subject area of their own within planning policy and practice. The emphasis, in the site assessments and in the design codes, has been on contained sites. This means, amongst other considerations, that a site has a clearly defined boundary that relates well to the existing form of the village. When we have looked at larger sites (e.g. sites 1, 5, and 7), the developers showed us proposals of the scale that we are looking for, but they also necessarily establish an access that can then be used, at a later date, to develop the greater part of the field. Another example was the first proposal for site 4, which is a site that benefits from already being naturally contained on three sides. That proposal included an agricultural access into the greater part of that field. We responded that, in the same way as the other four potentially suitable sites, it had to be a contained site. They have agreed, and the design codes and the proposed layout of the houses now effectively close off any extension of access beyond the boundary of site 4.

Post-session:

1	Site 2a may have difficulty with sewage outflow. Where will it go?	Here is the response from Anglian Water: "*Water and sewerage companies including Anglian Water prepare business plans on a 5-year investment cycle.* *To assist Anglian water in making future investment decisions we have prepared a long-term strategy relating to the provision of water recycling infrastructure managed by Anglian Water known as the Water Recycling Long Term Plan (September 2018). The Water Recycling Long Term Plan (WRLTP) has been used to inform Anglian Water's Business Plan for the next Asset Management Plan period AMP 7 (2020 to 2025).* *The WRLTP identifies North Crawley WRC as a focus for further investment to accommodate growth in AMP 10 (2035 to 2040).*

		We will continue to review the anticipated scale and timing of all growth within the catchment including any additional dwellings identified in the Neighbourhood Plan and the impact this will have on North Crawley Water Recycling Centre and the timing of any proposed investment by Anglian Water." We will of course keep Anglian Water apprised of significant development proposals within the parish and of course any planning application will have to demonstrate that these aspects are being managed appropriately.
2	My only comments are a vote of thanks to all the SG for your hours of hard work on behalf of the village. A presentation of quality, which has explained the entire process and reflected the extent of effort. Many thanks.	Received with thanks.

Tuesday 27th July 2021

Session 1 of 2:

1	If the proposed development sites are outside the settlement boundary, will you be allowed to move that boundary to include them?	The sites are adjacent to the current settlement boundary. When the boundary is redrawn to include those sites within it, only the housing sites themselves – and no other land – will be brought within the settlement boundary. In creating a Neighbourhood Plan, we are effectively reshaping the settlement boundary but with care, so as to avoid incorporating land that is not part of the Plan.
2	Does site 2a have an issue of potentially causing sprawling development? How do you stop development to the east of site 2a?	As most maps of North Crawley show, site 2a (Top Croft) has a very well-established, clearly-identified boundary around it. It is an individually named, historic field with its own boundary. Sites 2a and 2b are owned by the same party, and they were both put forward for assessment by the Steering Group. The Steering Group rejected site 2b, which is called Bottom Croft and is separate from site 2a. We made this decision partly because it is too big and would locate too many houses in one area, but also because it provides a buffer between North Crawley and Little Crawley. That buffer is important and one of the assessment questions is whether or not the development will cause two

		settlements to coalesce. We want to ensure the historic settlement of Little Crawley remains a hamlet in its own right. When we were actually discussing this with the AECOM Design Codes planners, their first comment when looking at site 2a on Google Maps was: '*That's a nice, contained site*'. We have been looking, as much as possible, for those contained sites where we can prevent that sprawl into the open countryside.
3	If the Plan is passed, and it is for each landowner to develop their site individually, can they go on to develop their land in a different way?	The Neighbourhood Plan will make clear how much of any given site is available and it cannot be developed beyond that boundary for the period of time that the plan remains valid. On the type of housing, the Design Codes document is very clear about what residents and the Parish Council want. It is not binding and we cannot insist that they comply with every detail, but they will be part of the policy and if a proposal strays too far from the Design Codes, then the Parish Council could legitimately say that the proposal is not acceptable. They cannot be unreasonable about it. For example, one of the reasons for having a site with more than 10 houses is that it must then include some affordable housing. We would be expecting the developer to include some form of affordable housing on that site. We are also specifying that 40 per cent of the housing across all of the sites must be two-bedroom houses. This is because one of our objectives is to keep young people in the village. Two- and three-bedroom houses will form the greater proportion (80 per cent) of the development. We do not want developments to include five-bedroom or larger houses. Also, for example, we can specify 1.5-storey houses. When you look at the character of the village, with one or two recent exceptions, the houses are comparatively low. Houses that have been built to full two-storey height have a markedly higher roofline than the surrounding dwellings. They are inconsistent with the character of the area. This is why we have specified bungalows and 1.5-storey houses.
4	Are there going to be any bungalows included in the Neighbourhood Plan?	Yes, for example, the Design Codes specify two bungalows for site 9. We are also suggesting two bungalows on site 3, in keeping with those that are already on Orchard Way.
5	How closely has the Steering Group worked with the owners of the sites?	Three of the sites (sites 3, 4, and 9) have a land promoter. A land promoter is someone who has purchased the right to promote the land, whilst the landowner continues to own the land itself. The landowner has benefited from that relationship with the promoter who has the first option for the

		development of that land. We have been working very closely with the land promoters: for example, the plans for site 9 came from the land promoter and the same promoter has also agreed the plans for site 4 with the Steering Group. The land promoters' original proposal for site 4 was a road that looked as though it could be continued into the greater part of the field beyond the site, and it had been labelled as agricultural access into that field. The Steering Group responded saying that agricultural access is not needed from site 4 because the greater part of the field has agricultural access from Pound Lane. Therefore, we proposed two houses located at the end of the road into site 4 to prevent any further extension into site 4, and they agreed to this. We had a very amenable meeting with the land promoters for sites 4 and 9 and they endorse the proposed allocations of the Neighbourhood Plan. These are the same land promoters who also proposed development on the much larger fields of sites 5 and 7. They initially disagreed with our position in respect of those sites, but we put our case to them as to why their proposals established a starting point for development of the greater part of those fields. Developers will often seek opportunities for the next stage of development. We have tried to restrict this because we value the rural character and do not want to lose it. If we are successful, for the next 15 years, we may be able to avoid the sort of expansive development taking place beyond the Parish.
6	How fixed is the 15-year period? Does that mean that in the next 15 years nobody could choose a different site somewhere? What happens after the 15 years?	The statutory time period for the Neighbourhood Plan is 15 years. It has to be reviewed in that time and we are compelled to review it if Milton Keynes Council changes its policies. This is because the Plan has to remain in compliance with Milton Keynes Council's policies. In the ideal world, for the next 15 years, the Neighbourhood Plan will protect our village from speculative development in the Parish. Things can change; we do not know the ultimate effect of the current White Paper and proposed changes to planning legislation. The indication is that the legislation will call for local plans, such as Plan:MK, to identify areas for regeneration, development, and protection. Milton Keynes Council have already done that, whereas 50 per cent of local councils have no local plan at all. Based on this, we can infer that Milton Keynes Council is in accord with the proposed legislation, but there is no way to be certain about this.

		It may be that Milton Keynes Council ultimately forms the view that it does not have all of the housing land that it requires and calls upon the Parish Council to provide a greater amount of housing. In that case, we may have to examine the options for development of the significantly larger fields around the village which we have assessed as unsuitable based on current policy. They would have to re-assessed based on new policies and may then become potentially more suitable: though possibly not more palatable. There are no guarantees but, with a Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council will have some additional power and influence; without a Neighbourhood Plan, they will not have that influence.
7	If there are a lot of objections to one of the proposed sites, will that scupper the whole Neighbourhood Plan?	In some ways it cannot. We have been tasked with finding a sufficient number of sites to accommodation 30 houses. That was the number of houses that residents considered to be acceptable and appropriate. The majority of residents seem to agree that we need some growth because the village has an aging population; older people want to downsize rather than leave. We have two pubs, a shop, a school, as well as various clubs and societies, all of which need a thriving population in order to keep going. There are not enough children in the village to fill the school roll. The school has taken the opportunity to work with a federation of schools so that it remains viable. We need some development in order to sustain our village and all of the things that we value. In order to achieve the amount of development preferred by a majority of residents, the package must include all five proposed sites because those are the only ones that are potentially suitable for development. A referendum on the Neighbourhood Plan will be a vote on all five sites together. There was a considerable level of opposition which ultimately led to the rejection of the previous proposed Neighbourhood Plan. We have worked hard over the last 18 months to understand why that Plan was rejected. We believe we do have a better understanding of that and we have responded to those concerns. For example, we have reduced the number of houses on site 4 from 15 to five, and we are no longer allowing the landowner to have access across the verge on Orchard Way. Instead, we have asked the respective owners of sites 3 and 4 to work together and they have agreed to share access through site 3. Site 4 is now a contained site that retains the verge, with its trees and hedgerows, as a buffer between the houses on Orchard Way and the new development.

		It is that kind of discussion that has influenced what is written into the Design Codes, which become an appendix of the Neighbourhood Plan, that means that we can have some control over future development.
8	Last time, between this stage and the referendum on the old Neighbourhood Plan, changes were made particularly to site 4 that concerned and confused a lot of people. Will there be changes to this Plan before it goes to a vote?	That is another lesson that has been learned. The previous Steering Group felt that it had done the same kind of communication: E-mailing people, posters around the village, and opportunities to look at the documents. Clearly, not everybody had access to the information and some people did not look at the revised version because they thought it was the same as the original one. Although that Steering Group did go through a second consultation process, it did not have an event like this evening's presentation where people have the opportunity to have a look at what is going on. We have learned from what has happened and we have improved our communications. One of the reasons that the previous Neighbourhood Plan changed was that, during the first consultation, one of the landowners had said that their site was non-viable because it was not large enough to contain the proposed number of houses. Milton Keynes Council agreed with that assessment and the site was amended in order to make it viable. This time we have sites, with proposed plans, that we know are viable. The sites will not be changed before the Neighbourhood Plan goes to Milton Keynes Council. We cannot see any reason why they would be changed before they go to a referendum. We have got the five potentially viable sites that provide the number of houses that we have been asked to accommodate. We have kept everybody informed. All of the landowners and promoters of the five sites have been given copies of the site assessment and the relevant pages of the design codes for their respective sites prior to these presentation evenings. They have all been informed in advance that these events would be taking place and that these documents were going to be made public. Indeed, some of those plans have been developed with the landowner and/or amended with their consent. We have held virtual meetings with them since March 2021, so there should be no surprises as to what is in the Neighbourhood Plan. As far as we are concerned, this is the Neighbourhood Plan that we intend to put forward. Opposition to one site would have to be significant for it to be removed because there would be nothing suitable

		to replace it with. Removal of a site would therefore reduce the number of houses to a lower number than that which we have been trying to achieve.
9	How many people have attended these presentation evenings?	If everyone who has booked a place at one of the next two presentations (session 2 of 2 today and session 1 of 1 on Friday 30th July 2021) attends, then we will have had 65 residents attend these presentations or approximately 10 per cent of the adult population of North Crawley. Almost all of those attendees represents a different household. We can only offer people the opportunity to attend. A leaflet advertising these evenings was posted through every door in the village, it was posted on Facebook, twice, it was E-mailed to 160 people on the Steering Group's distribution list, and all attendees were E-mailed prior to the meetings to say that they could bring a second person because there was sufficient capacity. We have tried our best to make sure that everybody knows that they have this opportunity and we have been much better at getting information into the public domain. The documents on the Parish Council website are regularly updated. We believe that people are much more aware of the Neighbourhood Plan than they were previously. It is also possible that residents did not really understand the implications of the proposed Neighbourhood Plan last time. It is now very obvious what is happening, for example, in Cranfield and also at the Tickford Farm site. It seems that it is now hitting home that we may lose the character of this village if we do not take some kind of action to control development.
10	What proportion of residents have to vote for the Plan for it to pass at the referendum?	It doesn't matter how many vote, it is the percentage who vote for or against that will determine whether the plan is accepted. The plan requires at least fifty one percent of the vote in order to be adopted by Milton Keynes Council.
11	You have done a good job, with a lot of hard work from all of you.	Received with thanks.
12	I am very grateful to all of you for doing this, and I live beside one of the sites.	None of us wants development on our doorstep. It has to go somewhere. All that we can try to do is to make sure that it is only permitted where it is suitable and that the impact is as small as possible.

13	Has there been much opposition to the proposed sites?	Not a substantial amount. We have only had one person saying that they would entirely oppose development of a particular site, whereas others have said that the same site is appropriate and makes sense. The sites on Folly Lane are the ones that have received the most opposition and a member of the Steering Group did a lot of work to look at whether and how site 9 could be viable. Initially, seven houses were proposed for site 9 and we corresponded extensively with the Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council. The conclusion was that the Highways Department were very unhappy with development that would increase traffic on Folly Lane and they questioned whether or not it could accommodate the required visibility splays. The promoters then reduced the site to the northern half of that field, which we had established could not accommodate the required visibility splays. We worked with them and they have just recently produced a plan that makes that site viable. Incidentally, it is for this reason that the presentation of the plans for site 9 appear slightly different from those of the other sites. Their proposal enables us to retain that rural approach to the village, with a driveway contained within the landscaped southern half of the site, as suggested by the Steering Group, accessed from a point where there is a sufficient visibility splay, and minimising the removal of hedgerows. Therefore, it should be quite a sympathetic development with negligible impact on traffic levels on Folly Lane.
14	What is a 1.5-storey house?	The second floor is partly in the eaves of a pitched roof.
15	You have done a good job and we really appreciate it. We will spread the word.	Received with thanks.

Session 2 of 2:

1	Are we going to see an increase in parking on the High Street? The capacity of the road cannot cope as it is.	That is a matter for the Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council. Any developments will have to comply with highways policy and regulations. What we have tried to do is to ensure that those developments are not adding significantly to the problem of increased traffic. An example of this is site 6, on the High Street. One of the plans produced by our Designs Code team proposed a separate driveway for each house connecting to the highway. There are existing traffic flow issues on the High Street, where a number of existing houses have no off-street parking at all. Accordingly, the Steering Group said that three separate driveways was not acceptable because it

		would multiply the traffic issues in that part of the village. This is why two of the proposed houses (adjacent to 46 High Street) will now share a driveway and a third house (adjacent to 36 High Street) will use an existing access.
2	What size of houses are you looking at for site 6?	It is likely to be one three-bedroom house and two four-bedroom houses.
3	Will there be enough parking?	There will be a minimum of two parking spaces per house, in accordance with the applicable regulations. Where possible, there may also be additional visitors' spaces. One of the specifications that we have made for the Design Codes is to avoid additional on-street parking. We have had discussions about the maximum numbers of parked cars and parking spaces per house. However, there are regulations within which the developers work and we cannot change those regulations. At the moment, those regulations require two parking spaces per house
4	The questionnaire showed that people wanted houses for young families who want to move into the village, who were originally from the village. How many of the houses will be appropriate to that?	We are specifying a 40 per cent two-bedroom houses, 40 per cent three-bedroom houses, and 20 per cent four-bedroom houses. We are not specifying or accepting any houses bigger than that. Those proportions apply across all five sites, but site 2a will allow some affordable housing to come through as well because the developer is obliged to offer a proportion of affordable housing on any site that contains more than ten houses. The type of affordable housing is something that we have struggled with because Milton Keynes Council's policies on affordable housing are quite restrictive and do not encompass the full range of types of affordable housing, based on the housing needs assessment for the Milton Keynes area. We were hoping to include below-market-price housing (housing with a price set at 20 per cent below market value in perpetuity). However, Milton Keynes Council policy does not include that particular type of affordable housing because they believe that it would still not be affordable at that price.
5	If you look around, a lot of houses are bought and then rented out, for example, to the students from Cranfield University. Is it possible to give priority to young people from North Crawley?	It is very difficult to make that a legal requirement. We can work with the developers and ask them to apply a first-come-first-served policy for people who have an existing connection with the village. That could be expressed as a preference in the Neighbourhood Plan so that it becomes one of the considerations that developers have to incorporate into their applications. They may be prepared to do that, but we cannot expect them to hold a house vacant for an extended period of time to see whether or not someone from the village wants to buy it.

6	Is 40 per cent not quite a large proportion of two-bedroom houses? Will the housing number include any flats?	We have based the figure of 40 per cent on Milton Keynes Council's quantum of housing. We have to have evidence to explain why we have proposed that. There will not be any flats because we are not specifying inclusion of any flats. We are specifying bungalows on site 9 (Folly Lane) and site 3 (Orchard Way).
7	Is it down to the owner/developer what types and sizes of houses are built on a site?	They have to work with the Parish Council using the Design Codes as guidelines. They also have to apply for planning permission through the normal planning process with Milton Keynes Council. The Neighbourhood Plan enables the Parish Council to say no if an application is departing significantly from what the village has said is desirable. At the moment, all residents can do is write in and object, which may not carry much weight. Residents will still be able to do that as part of the normal planning process if they do not like the way a development is going.
8	Would there be any tall town houses?	No, absolutely not. We have specified bungalows and 1.5-storey houses (where the upper floor is built into the eaves of the house). That is intentionally done to recognise and reflect the character of our village, which tends to consist of lower dwellings. We do not want a new estate that towers above everything else. Similarly, it affects how the houses will sit in the landscape, given that most of the sites are rural fields. Setting developments into the landscape, keeping existing hedgerows, retaining some green space, including plenty of space between the houses and generous gardens: these are all intended to be in keeping with the area.
9	What is there to stop the owner of site 4 developing the rest of that field?	The Steering Group raised that same concern. One of the first plans, that was put forward as a planning application by the land promoters (who purchase from the landowner the rights to promote the land), was rejected by the Parish Council and by Milton Keynes Council. It would have had an access across the verge on Orchard Way and the road carried on all the way into the rest of the field as an agricultural access. The Steering Group said that this was not acceptable. When we discussed this issue with AECOM, they said that the shape of site 4 was such that it is naturally contained on three sides. The eastern side is the more open and potentially vulnerable side.

		We have agreed plans for the site with the land promoter that situate houses in such a way as to block access into the greater part of that field. The land promoters for site 4 are also responsible for site 9. They have been very accommodating in discussions. We have challenged them on a number of issues based on what residents have told us they want and do not want. They have agreed with plans in the Design Codes and we retain the chains of e-mail correspondence that we have exchanged with them. They have endorsed the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and our approach to it, even though it has included rejection of larger fields (e.g. sites 1, 5, and 7). They seem to be generally supportive of what we are trying to achieve.
10	It must be frustrating for the Steering Group to try to re-balance development around the centre of the village. Eighty-five per cent of the proposed housing is located on the extreme northern edge of the village. Has one of the conceptual objectives not been achieved?	It is one of many things that have been frustrating about this process. When we assessed the sites to the south of the village, there were so many different reasons why they are unsuitable for development. For example, we did a lot of work with the Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council in relation to the sites on Folly Lane. A member of the Steering Group has undertaken surveys, measuring visibility splays and assessing options for development there. The e-mail chain with the Highways Department confirms that they would not support development on Folly Lane at all; however, if it can be proven that visibility splays can be effectively included on site 9, then they would accept reluctantly that two dwellings may be appropriate.
11	Why are there only two dwellings proposed on site 9?	This is because of the limitations of Folly Lane in terms of highways issues and safety concerns. The regulations for new developments are very strict. You have to have footpaths and visibility splays. The solution that we and the land promoter have come up with includes an internal road within site 9, providing a visibility splay at the southern end of the site, avoiding protected trees and significant hedgerow reduction. They have agreed that two bungalows at the northern end of that site, in keeping with the bungalows adjacent to that site, allows for a landscaped rural approach to the village.
12	Is it not a problem for site 2a that there is no pavement on Chicheley Road?	No, because only the vehicular access is located on Chicheley Road. The pedestrian access is achieved through site 3 onto Orchard Way.
13	Is it also a frustration that people have land in the Parish, all of which is covered by the Neighbourhood Plan,	In that respect, we have not made other land in the Parish undevelopable; but rather Milton Keynes Council's policies have. A member of the Steering Group wrote to David Blandamer, Urban Designer, at Milton Keynes Council to ask, if the Neighbourhood Plan becomes part of planning policy for the entire

	but being bound to the settlement boundary means you can only add additional layers to the onion? I know several people who have land in the Parish that is not massively far from the centre of the village and who wanted to put their land forward, but it is not adjacent to the settlement boundary. Have we not made their land undevelopable?	Parish, whether or not some development in other parts of the Parish could be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as well. The answer that came back was that this is not possible. The hamlets around the village of North Crawley are in the open countryside and do not have their own settlement boundary. The starting point is land that is either within the settlement boundary or which can be brought within that boundary without incorporating additional green space. It is a question that very expressly was raised precisely because the village of North Crawley is about two per cent of the entire Parish, but there was no ambiguity in the response. Another consideration is the number of houses that we were looking to accommodate, which is 30-35 houses. We are not talking about a very significant amount of land. One of the policies that we will be including in the Neighbourhood Plan will be a windfall policy. We will be following the guidelines of Milton Keynes and the National Planning Policy Framework, but that does not prevent owners of brownfield sites or sites with existing structures from applying to redevelop that land. Those would not necessarily fulfil the needs of the Neighbourhood Plan but it does mean that land well outside of the settlement boundary can still qualify under national and local planning policy and could be developed. However, if there is no history of development on a particular piece of land, for instance because it is agricultural land, Milton Keynes would reject proposals for its development.
14	Does the site on Orchard Way not also lack a defensible boundary to stop the field from being developed as extensively as the site that was in the previous proposed Neighbourhood Plan?	That is why we have worked with the landowners to make sure that the road ends at two houses and cannot, therefore, be extended. With the agreement of the landowner, we have used the Design Codes to contain that site.
15	Have you had any feedback from the other presentations to say that it does not look very different from the previous proposed Neighbourhood Plan?	We have not had that feedback. The feedback that we have had so far has generally been quite positive. We have had questions, seeking explanation of the decisions we have taken but it has been largely positive. These presentations evenings form the latest stage of a multi-stage process. We have received feedback throughout the various stages of the process. The point has been made, prior to this stage, that sites are being put forward that were in the previous Neighbourhood Plan. We have endeavoured

		to address the concerns associated with that history, but we recognise that there is significant sensitivity around those sites that formed an integral part of the previous proposed Plan. We have tried to understand why the previous Plan was rejected. It seemed that it was in significant part due to the changes in size of the two main sites, and people feeling uninformed about those changes. We have improved our communications, placing a much greater amount of information in the public domain, including all of the questions and answers from public meetings and professional consultations. All the documents, including tonight's presentation, are and will continue to be made available. We have also listened to the reasons that people objected to the sites increasing in size. They increased in size as a result of the landowner saying that the proposed number of houses would not fit on the smaller-scale site, and so the sites were increased to allow for the greater number of houses, and both of those were opposed. We know that the verge on Orchard Way is a sensitive local issue and that residents do value that land, so it is now identified as a Local Green Space and it is written into the Design Codes and referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan that access will not be allowed across the verge. The respective land promoters for sites 3 and 4 have agreed to a shared access through site 3 so that the verge can remain as an unbroken, green buffer between the existing houses on Orchard Way and the new development. Site 4 will consist of five houses, contributing to a total of ten houses across sites 3 and 4 (rather than 15 houses contributing to a total of 20 houses on those two sites in the previous proposed Neighbourhood Plan). In this way, we have tried to listen to people's concerns and to address them. The houses have got to go somewhere and we know that we will not please everybody, but we are trying to make any development as sensitive as possible. In fact, the greater opposition has been to site 9, which was not part of the previous proposed plan.
16	I want to commend the people who have done this work. The communication has been much better and much more compelling. I know how much of a straitjacket it must feel to operate within, and how difficult it is to	Received with thanks.

	try to find ways around the limitations. I think residents will genuinely appreciate it. You really have made a good job of communicating the confines within which you are operating.	

Post-session:

1	A useful, clear presentation. The proposed Plan looks to be an excellent way forward. Well done to the Steering Group.	Received with thanks.
2	Thank you for a very good presentation – informative and understandable. My only concern is the availability of housing for young people who wish to remain or return to the village. Will they be able to afford even a two-bedroom property?	Received with thanks. The ability of younger people to remain in or return to the village is a priority shared by many residents. The Steering Group will continue to work to achieve this objective through the Neighbourhood Plan and Design Codes. In addition to 40 per cent of housing across all five sites being two-bedroom houses, a proportion of the housing on site 2a will be affordable for the purposes of Plan:MK; most likely properties for affordable rent and/or properties in shared ownership.

Friday 30th July 2021

Session 1 of 1:

1	What is there to stop a landowner from building more houses than the Neighbourhood Plan specifies, and/or with designs that are different from the	Currently, there is no Neighbourhood Plan in place. This means that the Parish Council is asked for its opinion but has no legal authority to interfere with the planning process, and there is no obligation on the developer to consult with the Parish Council. They are free to submit and to amend any plans that they wish without having to consult the Parish Council.

	Design Codes, and then re-submitting plans? There are examples of plans being put in, something else being built, and then plans being changed.	A Neighbourhood Plan will oblige the landowner or developer to engage with the Parish Council. Our Design Codes are intended to explain and objectively define the aspects of development that define the character of the village. Accordingly, a developer faces a very different scenario when there is an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Each case will be examined individually. The Steering Group is aware that there have been instances in the past in which initial plans have subsequently been disputed and/or amended after they have been submitted. At the moment, we are reliant on Milton Keynes Council's attention to the detail of individual applications, and the village has no control over the process. With a Neighbourhood Plan, the Parish Council will have a more significant role in that process. There are no guarantees, but a Neighbourhood Plan does provide the village – represented by the Parish Council – with some control, which it would not otherwise have.
2	What is to stop development from just carrying on east of Site 4 after the 15 years are up?	All the sites have been assessed as having defensible boundaries. Site 4 is naturally contained on three sides by established historical boundaries. However, there is a recognition that while the proposed development is sited in an uncultivated corner of the field, it could, potentially allow access into the larger field area at a later date and for this reason, the Steering Group has had extensive conversations with the land promoter and they have agreed to a proposal that is detailed in the Design Codes that includes a configuration of the housing which blocks further extension of the access road. Site 4 therefore effectively becomes a land-locked site, which could not be expanded without demolishing one of the houses. The greater part of that field has and will have only one access, which is an agricultural access from Pound Lane. The Highways Department at Milton Keynes Council have confirmed that Pound Lane is unacceptable as a point of vehicular access to new development. The land promoter for site 4 has not only agreed with the proposed Design Codes, but also approved our approach. As residents, we all tend to be naturally suspicious of anyone who wants to develop, however, these plans are the result of positive and well-documented engagement between the promoter and the Steering Group.

3	Could an access be created from Kilpin Green across the corner of the Recreation Ground?	That was one idea that was considered when assessing site 5. There are a number of reasons why that would be unacceptable. Firstly, the Recreation Ground is managed by the trust that owns the Institute and these are held in trust for the benefit of everyone in the village. The Parish Council nominates one of its members to be a trustee precisely to ensure, on behalf of residents of the village, that nothing happens to the detriment of that space; driving a road through it would be contrary to the aims of the trustees. Secondly, by creating an access from the north-eastern corner of Kilpin Green, all of the traffic into and out of that area would be drawn through what is currently a small cul-de-sac. That would have an unacceptable impact on that area.
4	Is there carte blanche for development to take place in the interim, before the Neighbourhood Plan is adopted?	The protections that we currently have against speculative or unwanted development are Milton Keynes Council's policies. Those policies include the protection of the open countryside, provided that Milton Keynes Council is able to demonstrate that it has a five-year supply of housing land. An example of this was a recent application for development on site 4, which was rejected because that is currently open countryside. Any application to develop outside of the settlement boundary ought to be rejected by Milton Keynes Council and will not be vulnerable to appeal. Milton Keynes Council currently has that housing land supply, but it has been successfully challenged in the past and the significant development around Hanslope is a good example of what can happen when the housing land supply is successfully challenged. With an adopted Neighbourhood Plan, Milton Keynes Council only has to demonstrate a three-year housing land supply in order to be able to enforce its policy of not developing in the open countryside, and this would be much harder for a developer to challenge. The Neighbourhood Plan also allows for occasional infill development whereby a garden or vacant space is used for building or extending a house. That is a natural part of the development of the village, which has taken place in the past and will be able to continue. However, any proposal that is inconsistent with the Neighbourhood Plan would be opposed by the Parish Council for that reason. The Parish Council, when it is asked for its opinion on planning applications, has already relied on the Neighbourhood Planning process to oppose a number of development proposals. That carries some weight, although certainly not the full legal weight of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. If this Neighbourhood Plan is not adopted at referendum, there will not be a third attempt. This is because it will be clear that the village does not want one. In that event, the Parish Council will not

		have that first line of defence or any power to prevent or control development; rather, it will remain merely a conduit for residents to communicate with Milton Keynes Council.
5	Was the previous Neighbourhood Plan rejected because people did not understand the intricacies of planning rules with and without a plan?	The major difference with this Neighbourhood Planning process is that communication has been significantly better. Residents are aware of the processes that we have been going through, although we have not had as many people attending these sessions as we had hoped. However, attendance at these event does represent approximately 50 households and we will be making all of the presentation slides, notes, and documentation available electronically. We believe that everyone will have had the opportunity to learn about and understand the process.
6	On what sort of grounds was the first Neighbourhood Plan turned down and would that be likely to happen again?	It is difficult to be precise about that. The referendum is determined by a simple majority of whatever number of residents turns out to vote. The 2019 referendum had a relatively low turnout, compared to the population of the village, and there was a relatively small majority of that turnout opposed to that plan. The previous Neighbourhood Plan, and the sites it contained, became the subject of some significant contention amongst some residents. They, as they were perfectly entitled to, sought to ensure that their concerns were conveyed as clearly and as regularly as possible to other residents through a coordinated campaign. This occurred after the previous Steering Group had been disbanded and no attempt was made to provide a contrary view until much later on. This was evidently one of the reasons why the previous plan failed. The current Steering Group consists, in part, of members who opposed the previous Neighbourhood Plan. This reflects our wish to understand why that happened and to learn the lessons of that referendum. Not everybody who joined this Steering Group at the beginning of the process has stayed on, partly because it has been a contentious process and there has been some vehement disagreement from time to time along the way. This was not made any easier by the fact that the Steering Group has had to conduct almost all of its meetings remotely during the last 18 months. Nevertheless, the Steering Group has carried the process forward on behalf of residents to try to achieve what they have asked for. It would have been very easy to abandon the process altogether, but it was felt that we were obliged to see the process through to the end. We are hopeful that the lessons

		we have learned will enable this Plan to succeed and we hope to continue to provide information to residents until the referendum is actually held. We have also taken into account the objections of those residents who opposed the previous plan. We have, for instance, sought to temper the retained areas of development in order to accommodate those objections. We have generally tried to compromise with residents who are not happy with development of the five sites.
7	Would it be possible for the Neighbourhood Plan to include a mini-roundabout at the junction of Chicheley Road and Orchard Way to slow the traffic down?	It is unlikely, because that would be very costly and any proposal has to be financially viable for a developer. In addition, the Highways Department would have to agree and it is not likely that the road is wide enough to additionally accommodate a mini-roundabout. It would also have to intrude into site 1. The issue of traffic has been a significant consideration for the Parish Council. The Council recognises that this issue is not going to go away, indeed, it is certain to get worse. That is a natural consequence of increased development outside of the Parish, construction traffic, and the growth of commuter traffic resulting from the growth of Cranfield and Newport Pagnell. The Parish Council will be holding an extraordinary, informal meeting in August to consider the concept of traffic-calming in the village. Minutes of that meeting will be published afterwards. Some rough plans for how that might be done have been produced before and they would have to be adjusted (because there was no Neighbourhood Plan in place at that time). We have already received agreement from the developers of Tickford Field not to put construction traffic through the village. We are waiting for the opportunity to do the same in relation to the Milton Keynes East development. Whether they stick to that agreement is another issue and residents will have to monitor the nature of construction traffic through the village.
8	Why could they not have had a mini-roundabout at the junction of Chicheley Road and Orchard Way, and then had a road across site 1 to another mini-roundabout on Brook End? It would slow the traffic on both of those roads,	Any development of a site in that field would define a new settlement boundary and the whole of the rest of that field would then be adjacent to that boundary. There is a recognised principle of not creating a contrived boundary where there are no existing features of that kind. The danger would still be establishing the starting point for progressively greater sprawl into the open countryside. All of the larger fields around the village are affected by that same issue when it comes to development. Site 1, as

	and created the defensible boundary to a development on that site.	well as being one of the sites that already has a land promoter involved, has a history of developments proposals which have been consistently rejected by the village for this very reason.
9	Is the reason why a lot of people were opposed to the previous Plan that, with the Neighbourhood Plan in place, we have to provide land for 10 per cent of what we have, whereas without it, a developer could build 75-100 houses on one piece of land?	The figure of 10 per cent of existing houses is merely a suggestion. When it comes to significantly larger developments, this could happen if Milton Keynes Council's policies fail. At the moment, those policies are strong, but we cannot guarantee that this will continue to be the case in the future. A Neighbourhood Plan would give the village a first line of defence and an additional basis for objecting to developments like that. It gives the Parish Council the right to put forward a view that has to be considered, which is much firmer than what we have now. There is also the policy map which shows what land has been put forward for housing and which becomes part of Milton Keynes Council's policies. When somebody comes forward with a proposal to develop land that is not on that policy map then the proposal will simply be rejected.
10	I can imagine the amount of time that has been put in by unpaid volunteers to put this Plan together. I just hope that, when people in the village look at this as an option, they will think carefully about the implications of voting against it.	Received with thanks. The Steering Group wishes to stress that, whether you are for the proposed Neighbourhood Plan or against it, you should use your vote. The village needs a high turnout so that the result, whatever it is, reflects the true will of the village as a whole.
11	Thank you to you and your colleagues for putting so much time and effort into it. It is appreciated.	Received with thanks.

Post-session:

1	Really informative evening, although we rent our house, this is still our home, we had concerns about how the sites would impact the village in general. It seems that the Steering Group has done	Received with thanks.

	an amazing job regarding the sites and what is being put on them, how they look, and how they are built. Little concerned with site 6 and the driveways, as the traffic really flies through that end of the village. Whilst there is an ANPR device there, maybe a speedbump or roundabout would be an idea to slow things down? Obviously, that is to do with Highways, but it's just a thought.	When it comes to access to site 6, the Steering Group has worked with the landowner and the AECOM Design Codes team to produce designs that would add only one additional access from the High Street. The Highways Department will be consulted as part of the consultation process before the plan passes to the Independent Examiner. In addition, any planning application, for this or any other site, will be assessed by the Highways Officer.
2	I am writing to express my thanks to the members of the Steering Group of the NCNP for all of their time and hard work they have put into this project. The presentations in The Institute were very informative. I may not agree with all of the Steering Group's decisions but I can understand what a complicated and difficult project this has been.	Received with thanks.