

HAVERSHAM-CUM-LITTLE LINFORD PARISH COUNCIL

Neighbourhood Plan Community Responses to Regulation 14 Consultation, April 2022

INTRODUCTION

A Regulation 14 Consultation on the Pre-Submission document of the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan took place during March and April 2022.

In addition to responses from statutory bodies, which have been summarised by consultants oneill homer in the document titled *HcLL Reg 14 summary report May 2022*, 16 comments were received from members of the public. This document details the comments received, which have been anonymized as far as possible to protect identities in this public document.

The comments were all considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and the following changes have been made as a result.

1. It was noted from some of the comments that the Pre-Submission Document was not sufficiently clear about why Site 6 was not being put forward for development. As a result para 4.12 has been amended to clarify that the landowner of site 6 was no longer willing to put forward a site of 1 hectare or less.
2. The inclusion of the Site 11 Illustrative Site Plan within the Pre-Submission document was felt to be inappropriate, and could potentially be confused with a formal planning application, a comment also made by Milton Keynes Council. The Illustrative Site Plan has therefore been removed from the Submission Document.

COMMUNITY RESPONSES (presented in no particular order):

Respondent 1:

Firstly congratulations to the Team who put The Plan together with the enormous amount of data which has been gathered and presented in such a clear and concise way.

Why a Neighbourhood Plan? This has been answered in the documentation presented for consideration, but in addition from my perspective there was a degree of urgency almost panic to get The Plan published as soon as possible because of the difficulties Milton Keynes Council faced through its failure satisfy the Housing Land Supply as required under the National Planning Policy Framework, this was particularly relevant to Haversham because of the disproportionate number of Planning Applications made and a significant number being successful in the neighbouring Village of Hanslope.

However from my perspective although absolutely essential the level of urgency to complete The Plan has lessened giving time to reflect and make evidence based decisions.

I follow the explanations as to why the initial number of 11 Sites put forward by Land Owners was initially reduced to 7, and then to 5, and although there is a list and discussion in the Site Assessment Report dated February 2022 (The Report) there do not seem to be Plans of all 11 Sites listed in Table A to allow consideration and comparison although there are Plans of the final 5 Sites shown in Table C.

Of the 5 favoured Sites 4 are in Old Haversham and 1 only in New Haversham (Site 6). From reading The Report "Site 11 Land to the North of 27 High Street Old Haversham" is clearly the preferred option because of the prominent treatment it is given including a Site Layout Plan, this surely puts the other 4 Sites at a disadvantage when final consideration is to be made.

The reduction of the number of Sites from 11 to 5 worries me because the choice is being limited and the withdrawal of Sites 7&8 following a request by the Parish Council to reduce the areas makes it quite clear that the Landowners of these Sites contemplate much larger scale Applications at a future date and they may well argue that they were denied the right to be considered in the Neighbourhood Plan because of their Site size and the Neighbourhood Plan should be ignored so far as any Applications in respect of those Sites are concerned,

I am sure that many representations will be made from those far better than me to comment but from my perspective there needs to be a comparison between Sites 3, 6 and 11 which are all of the same size 1 Hectare.

Sites 3 and 11 both have the same disadvantages some being mentioned in The Report:

- They both front a busy narrow road on a steep incline, Site 3 at the top, and Site 11 at the bottom. Although there might be "good visibility" as stated in The Report, however in my opinion without major Road widening works and creation of a safe Footpath access to and egress from the two Site on to the road from possibly a maximum of 48 houses with 90+Vehicles? is going to be hazardous all road users.
- There is no Local Bus Service available the current Footpath only extends to Site 11.
- Services are Limited to Water and Electricity only. There is no mains drainage or a Gas supply the former being a major disadvantage with a requirement for the installation of Private Sewage Treatment Plants creating a potential Environmental issue.
- Because of the narrow road and being on an incline (Site 3 in particular) the Construction process will be difficult and more expensive than a level site with better and safer Road access.
- If the Neighbourhood Plan does include these two Sites as preferred options the Housing density should be considerably scaled down which will probably result in the loss of a Social Housing provision, and construction being economically unviable.

Site 6

- This has the advantage of having far better Road access
- The Site appears to be level and the Construction process more straightforward
- All main Services being available Water Gas Electricity Main Drainage Footpath and access to the local Bus Service

Respondent 2

I have just spent a good couple of hours reading the documentation. It is a well thought out pre-submission which includes good controls for implementation.

Ideally I wouldn't want any further development of Haversham but understand this isn't realistic. Therefore on balance I support the pre-submission plan.

Please pass on my thanks to all involved in pulling these papers together.

Respondent 3

Thank you for the chance to reflect on the pre-submission plan, a very comprehensive and informative document.

I agree with your outline in that

* site 11 seems to be most appropriate for housing.

* I've noted that the MK plan states that the village is not incumbent of increasing our housing quota.

* site 6 has been withdrawn from further consultation. If this had been due for further consideration the concern would be that a precedent would have been set for further developments on this site which would erode the essence of the village.

Respondent 4

I'd like to commend everyone's efforts and the hard work done over the last few years in preparing the neighbourhood plan.

I do not have any comments in particular regarding the proposed plan except that the "Triangle" appeared to be the logical place for a small development and it's somewhat reassuring that the process of choosing a site seems to confirm as such.

Thank you and good luck in the next steps of the process.

Respondent 5

I wanted to feed back that we have reviewed the latest neighbourhood proposal and are on board with the proposed changes. Whilst we do like the small size of the village, we accept there is a need for growth and appreciate the plan having minimal impact on the visual aspect of the village and not obstructing views of the fields behind the houses.

Respondent 6

We live at X High Street in Haversham. We moved in 4 years ago and we noticed the traffic has considerably increased; there is a lack of parking as some of our neighbours have to park on the street which makes traffic even worse.

Our concerns:

- Parking. Will the new homes have allocated parking spaces; if not- where are they going to park. The plan is for 16 homes- which will be roughly 32 cars?
- Most of us have issues with our septic tanks due to poor soakaways; as the homes will be based on a roughly inclined area? will their soakaways drain into ours as we are lower based therefore making it worse...
- Not enough paving for walking; unsuitable and unsafe for walking, especially children; cars going very fast despite 30miles warning speed sign
- Lack of facilities in the village: street lighting still not adequate; will there be new facilities introduced for families or elderly couples requiring support.
- Poor Design. We've had a look at the design of the proposed buildings and they don't seem in keeping with the rest of the village houses: either brick or stones; the proposed barns are covered in black cladding?

Respondent 7

Neighbourhood Plan success at meeting objectives:

Firstly I would like to thank all those people involved in the production of the NP this far for the time and effort that they have put in.

Objective 1. To provide homes for local people.....

I feel that the site (11) put forward fails to meet this objective. Those looking to downsize in the housing survey were predominantly elderly people who with advancing years have limited mobility and ultimately will have to give up driving. The notion of elderly people walking up the hill to catch a bus due to the fact that there is no public transport passing the proposed development is unrealistic. They will therefore become dependent on others and increasingly isolated.

Young people many of whom might be residents of the affordable home element of the development would use cars for most of their journeys from the site due to the lack of public transport links. Where these young people had young children who I hope might be attending Haversham Village school walking to school presents a number of issues. Firstly it is a considerable distance for a young child to walk. The footpath from the site to the school changes sides of the road at the Pub, meaning the High Street has to be crossed on a blind bend at a time of rush hour traffic. The footpath up the hill is narrow and unsuited to a parent pushing a buggy with another child in hand and we are already aware that the footpath is frequently poorly maintained by MKC. Not an enviable prospect for a young parent twice daily.

The inclusion of some recreational/play area within the indicative plan would be a welcome addition and support families with young children.

Objective 2. To encourage that will make....roads safer.....

Any development within the parish could help to do this through S106/CIF funding and the conditions within the proposal establish conditions that will be supportive. The lack of any public transport passed the site means that most journeys to and from the site by potential residents will have to be by car, I am not convinced that the proposed entry onto the High Street from the site, as shown in the indicative plan, is a safe one. I recognize this will be a matter for a planning application in future.

Objective 3. To ensure that important green spaces.....

The NP is to be commended for the proposals that relate to this objective

Objective 4. To ensure all new development respects the rural character.....in terms of design and layout.....

Site 11 could successfully meet respecting the linear character of Old Haversham however the indicative plan does not do this in terms of design and layout as it suggests development that is 3 dwellings deep from the High Street, a feature that is not found anywhere else in Old Haversham. Additionally it opens out the end of habitation on the NW side of the High Street which is currently terminated on both sides with a single depth of property.

The inclusion of Policy HLL5, Climate change mitigation, is fantastic to see and is a bold statement in how far it goes.

Objective 5. To maintain and improve biodiversity.....

The NP document goes a long way to meeting this objective, in particular through the Policy HLL9 green and blue infrastructure and wildlife corridors and is to be commended for this. The connectivity of residents is also well considered here with hopes to improve the footpath network and both extend and link up some of these.

However the development of the whole of site 11 would not only NOT maintain OR improve biodiversity it would destroy an important element of it that is highly valued by many Old Haversham residents.

Respondent 8

I have some comments to make on the Pre-submission Neighbourhood Plan as published by the Parish Council.

1. I was a member of the group that developed this plan over the past 4 years, working with Parish Council members and other volunteer parish residents, and so have a good idea of the amount of work time and commitment involved. This has been a monumental and complex task, especially considering that all members of this group are local volunteers. As a parishioner, I would like to thank all participants for their good work enthusiasm and commitment to see it through. It has been a tough task that is continuing.
2. Leading on from my comment above, I should like to say that this whole Neighbourhood Plan process is far too complex and formalised and should be simplified so that the ordinary local volunteers who do the work do not have to commit years of their lives to produce a document like this pre-submission plan, which few residents will have the time energy or ability to read and fully comprehend. Here I am saying that the fault is with the process and its output rather than with local volunteers or residents.
3. This pre-submission plan has a very large number of very worthwhile proposals for policies and actions derived from the surveys carried out asking for residents' opinions and ideas, and so it properly reflects the residents' aspirations for the medium-term future of Haversham, including the housing needs for low-cost starter homes, homes for singles, and homes for older residents who need to 'down-size'.

4. One important purpose of this process and this document is to provide some defence from the large-scale speculative housing development that we feel we are vulnerable to; as evidenced by Gallaher [or whatever they call themselves today] buying up or 'optioning' large tracts of farmland to the north-west of Haversham towards Hanslope, with aspirations for 10 or even 20 thousand houses being built. This is an entirely ridiculous and oversized potential housing development unsupported by any evidence of local need.
5. I feel that in our laudable efforts to encourage landowners to offer their land for the agreed small-scale housing development, we have arrived at an unsuitable site. Among its many faults; the site is not on a bus route, not walkable to a shop, and a long walk to the Village School and to the Social Centre up the hill on a narrow and badly kept footpath path on a road that often has fast-moving traffic very close to pedestrians' shoulders.
6. In my opinion, a better plan would be to further examine the Recreation Ground land behind Haversham School, to see if there is a way to use part of it for the required small housing development. This land is owned by The Parish Council and so would not have to be purchased, and has none of the faults listed in point 5 above. I feel that a northern section of this land, behind what were council houses, could be used leaving the majority of this land still in use by the community. There is already an access road to Wolverton Road in everyday use.
7. However, if the Neighbourhood Plan is finally presented with the site to the south of 27 High Street as the proposed small-scale housing development, I will vote for this plan:-
 - a. because the rest of the plan is admirable and reflects the wishes of the majority of parish residents.
 - b. to give the parish some protection from large-scale speculative housing development in the future.
8. Whether or not this Neighbourhood Plan is finally agreed in a vote by parishioners, I should like to see The Recreation Ground option for the agreed small-scale housing development re-visited and re-considered in detail. This may be done as part of the ongoing 2-year review process.

Respondent 9

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan.

We do appreciate that the task of compiling a Neighbourhood Plan is a particularly difficult and complex task for any Parish Council. We are aware that a number of Councillors and volunteers have had to spend a considerable amount of their time over a number of years working on the Plan. We would like to thank all involved for their efforts.

We will not repeat comments made in earlier consultations about what we consider to be flaws in the communication process. We do think that there are some good policies in the documentation prepared.

In terms of development we do not think the proposal to develop land to the south of 27 High Street meets the needs identified in the housing survey. The identified need is for small houses up to three bedrooms but the illustrative masterplan appears to include a significant number of larger properties.

Also a planning application to build houses on the Greyhound Car Park was not approved by MK Council in 2018. The developer appealed and the Planning Inspector in October 2018 noted following a site visit, "that there are very limited local services or facilities in the vicinity of the appeal site and that the village is located in open countryside. I also have very limited evidence from the appellant in relation to the proximity of local services and facilities and the means by which they can be accessed.

The revised Framework highlights that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. I have very limited information before me to demonstrate how such benefits would arise from the development. I therefore conclude that the site does not represent an appropriate location for housing having regard to access to local services and facilities and the development would not accord with the policies in the revised Framework taken as a whole."

The points noted in 2018 have not changed. The site proposed is further from local services and facilities and would result in an increase in houses in the lower village by approximately 30%.

It is unfortunate that a suitable site nearer to local services and facilities could not be found in the upper village. In the absence of such a site we believe that the Parish Council should give serious consideration to not proposing a site at all given the fact that it is not essential to do so.

Certainly if the Parish Council decide to submit the proposal as drafted we would ask that:

1. A commitment is given to seek a site nearer the upper village when any approved plan is reviewed after two years and
2. Fewer houses are permitted on the site so as not to have such an impact on the nature of the lower village.

Respondent 10

NP legislation is comparatively complex and technical, a great deal of work has gone into producing this Pre-Submission Neighbourhood Plan under exceptionally difficult circumstances. I am appreciative of the time and effort that has gone into this. The overriding comment regarding the necessity of having an NP is that it will 'protect' villages from uncontrolled, excessive development by rogue developers and will enable the village to have some say in how the village can be developed.

As a resident of Haversham I note below my comments regarding the Pre Submission Neighbourhood Plan for Haversham cum Little Linford.

1) Expert opinion and advice is essential as most residents are not experts. The village is lucky to have residents who have experience in development and planning. I was extremely disappointed that several offers of advice and help (at no cost) by a village resident who has many years of experience in both development and neighbourhood planning were just acknowledged without comment or

thanks. Had he been invited to assist or even invited to join the Steering Group his many years of experience in neighbourhood planning and development would have been invaluable and saved both time and costs.

In my opinion the professional planning advisors employed by the Parish Council, who, I understand, have advised on 170 projects and dealt with 51 planning authorities, so are experts, seemed to me be more reactive rather than proactive. For example when they initially ranked the various sites and their rankings were challenged they reversed their original ranking of the 2 lead sites..... but only after some fundamental points were made that they appeared not to have taken into account.

That is not 2) The draft “illustrative” Masterplan. (Policy HLL2 Page 21)

I have looked at over 20 other completed NPs ‘sketch layouts’ none of them have such detailed “illustrative” sketch layouts as Haversham. Looking at this sketch plan its design and level of detail could give the impression to a layperson that this site and plan had been agreed by the developer and planning authorities.

This was demonstrated when two long term residents said that they did not realise the site already had planning permission as the plan “looked detailed and official”

The plan should be a sketch plan in outline at this stage before planning application as in other NPs.

In my opinion such a detailed “illustrative” plan is wholly inappropriate at this early pre -submission stage.

3) An earlier planning application for 2 houses in the High Street was rejected as unsustainable. How can the NP suggest a site in the High Street with a lot more houses and even further away from Wolverton suddenly become sustainable?

4) The NP states “a modest, small scale housing scheme”. Hardly modest as the suggested number of houses is disproportionately high in the historically narrow High Street. 16 new houses is about a 35% increase on the number of houses in the High Streethardly modest and small scale in such a historic and ancient High Street.

Para 4.7 states in the NP

“.....in line with the feedback received from the community,we were interested in sites which:

- Are small in size
- Are predominately affordable housing
- Will preserve the character of the village in the surrounding landscape, e.g. where sites should maintain the linear nature of the High Street at Old Haversham
- Will preserve local biodiversity value that cannot be replaced
- Will not significantly worsen existing traffic congestion and/or safety issues
- Will deliver low energy use, low water use and zero carbon footprint housing

the planned Site 11 seems to fall short on all of these Community Feedback points.

Once again, for the avoidance of doubt I personally have never been of the opinion or stated that there should be no development in the High Street only that any development on the High Street or

anywhere in Haversham for the NP should be less than 12 houses, sustainable, maintain the historic character, green spaces and be in character with the surrounding houses (most of which are stone) including a listed property noted in the Domesday book.

7) Draft Site Assessment Report Site 11 Page 3....Relatively level?

Anybody who has walked the site may be surprised by the term “relatively level” which in this case is meaninglessrelative to what? The site has a significant slope from North to South, it runs from the lower part of a significant hill North of the site that is substantially higher than the top of the closest High Street buildings. The phrase “relatively level” is misleading but very, very relevant to future flood risk and drainage. I remind you that the High Street has no mains drainage.

8)The voting system in a village made up of 3 distinct residential parts where 1 part has over 2/3rds of the total residents’ voting must always be skewed. Unfortunately I am told there is nothing that can be done about it.

If this development goes ahead I believe historic Haversham High Street will eventually be lost forever in an excess of unsympathetic and unimaginative development which will conversely facilitate more of the same ubiquitous style of modern development.

Respondent 11

I have read the neighbourhood plan and support the proposals.

Respondent 12

Please pass our thanks to the Parish Council and teams who have spent hours producing a very well presented plan. The chosen site, albeit hard for those properties opposite or next to it, is a logical non agricultural infill site, with current look of neglect. It all looks very sympathetic to the village, maintaining the stone walls and creating green boundaries on the proposed site on the High Street.

Our only comments are:

- 1) are there slightly too many houses on the site to allow enough parking for each house and gardens? You want to avoid a lot of cars on the road
- 2) porous driveways might be beneficial to alleviate excess run off in extreme weather?
- 3) do the terraces facing the High Street need a little more space for front planting?

Respondent 13

I would like to express my support for the Neighbourhood plan as set-out in the pre-submission draft and make the following comments:

- I found the document clear and comprehensive. Whilst I know for many the primary aspect will be the potential sites for development, I also believe that the other policies proposed are critical and are very much aligned with the rural nature of our Parish and the desire to

maximise the value of the community assets (Pub, public rights of way, views etc.) which are a key part of what makes our Parish rural.

- I am supportive of suitable and appropriate small scale development in the Parish and believe that the design principles that are proposed are in keeping with maintaining the style and character of the existing dwellings in any future development.
- I believe that the proposed site (site 11) and the illustrative plan for development are suitable and placed in a part of the Old village of Haversham which is currently in a poor state and would benefit from the regeneration that will come with the site being developed. I am pleased that the existing rights of way are called out as something that must be maintained.
- It is disappointing to see that the most popular site in the New Village (site 6) was withdrawn from the process after a change of the offer by the landowner. However, I am totally supportive of its exclusion, as the larger proposal revealed by the developer after the questionnaire process would be of too large a scale for the Parish and contrary to the wishes expressed by residents and the overall intent as outlined in the draft Neighbourhood Plan.

I would also like to thank the efforts of the Parish Council and the Steering Group to develop this excellent plan and driving the process to date.

Respondent 14

This is an initial response to the NP proposal as requested on the orange flyer.

(I have sent 2 detailed responses and comments during the consultation stages, which it would seem, whilst being recorded, haven't been responded to in any meaningful way, as is evident from the current plan.) So I'll just respond generally for now, but also very sadly, as we feel we'll now have to follow neighbours and move away from a village we've enjoyed for nearly 20 years.

Comments.....

1. We seem to have already sent a strong message to the development industry that as far as can be guaranteed, this site, 11, will receive planning permission for 16 houses. (We have already been approached by a local company wishing to get involved!)

2. There was no need to include any housing in the NP as none is required for the foreseeable future.

3. There is no need to include a master plan, which actually looks like a layout (see approach from Developers above) 4. The master plan attached, as page 21, seems not to take much account of issues raised elsewhere in the NP, eg policy HLL5, quality and HLL8 ref walking equestrian routes and cycling. It doesn't really suggest how the concerns raised in these policies will be dealt with.

5. Table D in the site appraisal section of the Site assessment Report raises concerns for potential 'negative affect on the wider landscape' and states that without mitigation there will be negative environmental effects. There's no mitigation or any meaningful planting shown on the master plan. (In fact without the key it's hard to read in any detail anyway.)

6. On top of that the master plan seems to ignore the plans shown elsewhere in the NP, indicating the importance of footpaths and horse trails around the parish as the existing bridleways are not even included on the master plan. (Clearly a lack of understanding of the impact of horses on pathways!)

7. Policy HLL4 explains the importance of respecting local assets, with specific mention of Haversham Grange, which overlooks the site with its traditional farm buildings and adjacent neighbouring barns which form such a beautiful complex typical of this end of the High Street. The proposed layout appears to take no inspiration from this historic complex, typical of the 'Village and rural settlement' (as para 5.4.5 of the strategic environmental assessment)

8. There is no helpful study of village character in design terms which would impact on the proposals in any meaningful way. But if there were, I'm sure it would not suggest a 'diagonal' hard surface, defined by suburban style semi d's and detached units, which terminate on a hard parking area on the Main Street, in full view of everyone. In any language this goes against standard planning preference to restrict the visual presence of the car on the street, but especially in the heart of the village next to the listed grade 2 farming complex going back hundreds of years! (Where the horses and walkers are meant to go, I'm not sure.)

9. Excluding all this work on site 11, there seems to be very little to inspire, or shape the future of our village. Most aims seem small scale and modestly worded. (Even the quoted number of affordable homes is significantly below the ratios I'm currently dealing with elsewhere. As I understand it this was meant to be a key aim of the NP process.)

10. I'm afraid this NP will not protect us from new developments. From my company's work alone I know of 2 other development opportunities being considered in the parish, both significantly in excess of the 'up to 16' quoted on site 11.

In conclusion I suggest that we reconsider the development of site 11, speak again to local landowners and let's see if we can come up with something that will inspire Haversham's development in the remaining plan period.

Now, in case we can't do that, I must go and arrange another valuation on our house and crack on with moving away from this impending disaster

Earlier comments from Respondent 14

Just some further brief comments on the draft NP, following initial comments already made. Those first comments were in response to an initial approach from a local development consultancy of some sort, where it seemed that out there in the wider world, site 11 providing 16 houses seemed relatively definite. Whether it is or not remains to be seen.

However, given where I live I'm sure any comments may be seen as a 'NIMBY' response and I wanted to assure you that it is not.

I deal in the development industry everyday and appreciate the issues. I can't speak for everyone around the site 11 area, but I think there is some acceptance that something will happen here eventually and in principle that's inevitable.

What's important is how this is controlled, and this is the aim of my comments below.

1. If it's felt there needs to be an indicative layout then please make sure it is consistent with other aspirations listed in the draft NP. In particular the response to being so close to the listed and very important Haversham Grange, as well as responding to policies relating to the impact on the landscape locally and the improvements needed in the biodiversity to compensate.

2. The way the proposed site 11 is suggested at the moment creates a false impression of what can be achieved. There appears to be no serious recognition of an on site sewage treatment plant for this type of development, the impact on overhead lines/services and the resultant impact on neighbours.

3. The council raised the question of wildlife and ecological impact of the sites asking for additional work to be done. I'm not sure the impact of this has been properly assessed as yet on site 11. I am not an expert on identifying wildlife on the site or in adjacent hedgerows, but those who are better qualified than I assure me that badgers as well as rabbits are well established broadly in the wider area. Whatever is on the site (and I cannot say what is there), has certainly developed quite significant earthworks over the last 6 months or so, and the building of animal homes may well impact on what homes can be built for humans!

4. You may feel that a design character assessment of Old Haversham to guide acceptable qualities is a little over the top with the resources available, but on a recent piece of work I came across a local NP which had a defined section on Design guidance which listed quite clear guidance in each of the development character areas suggested for development. In our case we only have one suggested character area, so there's really no excuse for not clearly defining what we see as appropriate in a much more definite and detailed way.

5. Specifically there's nowhere along the High Street that main habitable rooms and front doors face each other across the street, with only about 10m between them, as is proposed with the current proposal facing the old post office house!

6. One word of caution. It may be 12 or 14 locally, I'm not sure as it varies between local authorities, but there may be provision to build a small development of say 12 or 14 properties or less without any social/affordable housing at all. Hopefully you've covered that loop hole somehow to avoid a developer building a few houses and none being affordable/social housing. This was after all a key aim for the village residents.

7. There are more detailed comments listed in my first emailed response, but I'll not trawl through those again here.

I'm conscious that these comments may sound somewhat negative, but they are based on my experience over the last 45 years of residential design, so I'd like to try to get it right here at site 11, or anywhere else in the village come to that.

So, on a more positive note I would add that the landowner across whose field the next pathway to the south enters the village, adjacent to the stables, has recently planted new trees, and a double row of planting either side of the footpath as you enter the village, which in time will create a lovely green feature. What's more the fences are well kept and the Alpacas look great. It would be good if the process of finalising the NP could encourage similar initiatives, including site 11, but across the whole parish. I don't know what is proposed by the parish with reference to planting trees, but obviously it would be doubly good in the Queen's platinum jubilee year. Is anything meaningful going to be done as part of the NP?

In terms of developing the green qualities of the parish, and reducing the risks of walking and cycling on the High Street, it would be great if the parish council could look at potential links into the linear park system of the wider MK. It is shown in the NP documents, and is I think a council policy to extend the system, so although it may be technically difficult it would be good to at least have the conversation to make new links to the redway and parks trust system direct to the wider MK

Respondent 15

Firstly the neighbourhood plan has obviously required a huge amount of work from various parties and has been done to a really high standard so we would like to thank the team for that.

Broadly we agree with the proposal. It is a great shame that the land between the old and new village has been taken away as an option because I think that development there would make more sense and it seems that the village also share that view. However you have selected the next best option.

We absolutely agree that the development needs to be of a high quality with buildings built in the local vernacular. I was unable to find the pictures online but I saw them at the meeting. Some of the barn type buildings looked to have an unnaturally steep pitch to the roof and also very dark painted wood. To my mind a roof of the pitch of a local barn and using wood such as cedar or oak which can age naturally would be far more in keeping.

We are also delighted to see such focus on our natural environment and would really welcome a footpath to avoid the steep road out of the old village towards Little Linford. A circular footpath would be a great addition to the parish.

Respondent 16

I have studied the above document and would like to make a number of observations.

1) See Page 15. I understand that the original 28 potential development plots were reduced to 5. The document then deals with Policy HLL2 (the land south of 27 High Street).. What happened to the other 4 plots? What factors lead to their elimination?

2) See page 18. Policy HLL2 will comprise up to 16 homes. How is this compatible with the questionnaire responses which suggested that 76% of respondents wanted 2/3 bedroom houses whilst larger houses were only favoured by 50% of the respondents. Apart from the TERRACE homes all the other houses are either BARNS or on larger plots. This doesn't appear to meet the housing needs as expressed in the survey. Is the purpose of this Neighbourhood Plan to suit the developers or the actual expressed housing needs of the area?

3) See page 22. First homes exception sites. It does appear that whilst there are detailed plans for the development area in Old Haversham, there is no similar plan for New Haversham; so is one to assume that New Haversham will get the homes it is given and there will be no requirement to provide quality housing?