

Responses to Pre-Submission Consultation February to April 2016

Walton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation 2016			
No.	Comments submitted by	Summary of comments	How the Plan was amended
1.	Ryan Hendry (Local resident)	I live on Dunchurch dale. I have received the leaflet about our neighbourhood plan. I would like to ask for fibre optic broadband. When I speak to BT or sky they say we're are not in your area and you should speak to your local council about it.	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; There is superfast internet access provision in new estates. Commitment added to Action Plan for WCC to monitor all development proposals to ensure the inclusion of fibre optic connections.
2.	Mr. Newcombe (Local resident)	Thank you for taking the time to drop a leaflet in regarding this plan. Having reached senior age, & have WASTED in the past, hours of my life attending meetings & consultations, I know the Local Authority will only do what they want to do regardless of public opinion. This action is only taken to make the public feel they have some input. Let me tell you they DO NOT. A prime example is the closure of Great home Fire station to Ashlands. With all the development to the west of MK, & now the fire station further away from the villages of Haversham, Castlethorpe, Hanslope etc. I hope they have good fire insurance as they will be burnt to the ground before a fire appliance gets there. The public are as far as local authority are concerned are just there to donate the money for their grandiose plans, You will have gathered by now, I will not be wasting any more of my time on meetings or referendum where there will ALWAYS be a prior done deal.	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.
3.	David Hopkins (Councillor for Danesborough & Walton ward)	I have now read through the very impressive Walton Neighbourhood Plan and would make the following general comments. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The layout and reader friendly style is to be applauded. 2. There is just the right amount of detail. 3. The plan acknowledges the planning hierarchy and its position as a major planning document but one that sits below national polices (NPPF) and local (Milton Keynes policies) Core Strategy, retained 2001-11 Local Plan Policies and the anticipated Plan:MK. 4. The presumption in favour of development in the sites identified is to be welcomed and the useful conditions set against such development sets a local and city wide context for such developments and provides a very positive perspective when reading the document as a whole. Neighbourhood Plans that set out a Nimby's charter are set to fail so this realistic approach is to be welcomed. 5. The emphasis of working with rather than dictating to landowners, developers and their agents is also welcome. <p>I'm a little unsure as to how the evidence gathered from the residents questionnaire has been translated into the policies. There is always a danger of committee presumptions and</p>	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; An index has been added to the Plan, which maps the evidence from the consultation to the policies and commitments in the Plan.

		possibly prejudices/preferences overriding the general views of the community and the plan needs to ensure it has a robust and defensible evidence base to call upon at light touch inspection.	
4.	Jenni Ferrans (Councillor for Monkston ward)	<p>In general this plan is well-thought out and the proposals are reasonable. However I would make the following detailed comments.</p> <p>Intro</p> <p>p10 Adjacent parishes - the name is Kents Hill and Monkston parish</p> <p>p11 The intro is weird and unbalanced - pulling out a few fairly random bits, talking about what's on Walnut Tree but ignoring what is elsewhere.</p> <p>Policy WNP1 Walton Manor</p> <p>p15 The flood plain on Walton Manor covers the south east corner of the site, not the whole of the south. Please correct this as it will seriously worry people otherwise, without being sustainable in planning terms.</p> <p>Policy: You have stated that no access to the extended employment site should come off the H9 and all should come off Hullwell Gate. This would imply considerable extra traffic on the Hullwell Gate access. This is in contradiction to the planning brief, and I see no reason for it. The separation of vehicles could potentially be better from the H9 access, as could, potentially, the route for pedestrians. I therefore oppose this and suggest alternative: "Access to both the main part of the residential area and the employment site should be off the H9. However, as far as possible these should be by separate routes, with minimal interaction between the employment traffic and the main pedestrian route from the housing to the underpass under the H9."</p> <p>You have stated that the minimum requirement should be for a LEAP. That is very small (similar to most of the Walnut Tree play areas). If they develop the maximum number of homes then a NEAP will be required by MKC planning requirements, even for this site alone. But it will not only serve this site. There will be around 500 homes that are nearer to this site than any other NEAP and which have no other play area within a reasonable range, and the total provision on the Simpson-Walton grid square falls well below MKC standards. Failure to provide a NEAP will almost certainly lead to anti-social behaviour within the play area as a result of over use. S106 money has been reserved from the Walton Grange development for additional equipment, surfacing, etc with the intention of adding this to the Walton Manor play area to extend it to a NEAP if necessary, and the planning brief caters for this. A NEAP would also require more separation from homes. I therefore oppose the WCC policy as it stands, and recommend using the following wording which picks up on the final version used in the amended development brief:</p> <p>"If the development is 200+ homes, a NEAP will be required. If the development is under 200 homes then a LEAP will be required. However in that case, the Council will welcome the LEAP being provided in a location which allows for extension to a NEAP, as the area is under-provided with play facilities. The extended play area should thus be located at least 30m from any road and 40m from the nearest homes."</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>Amendments have been made to correct grammar, typographical errors and formatting issues; the introduction has been expanded to reflect the wider area; the references to the flood plain at WNP1 have been amended to reflect the south-east of the site; the restriction to access to the employment area from the H9 roadway stub, applies only to the existing employment area and not the new employment areas, therefore there should be no implications for increased traffic from Hullwell Gate; the NPWG considered the point regarding the request for a NEAP at Walton Manor, however due to the installation of a NEAP at nearby Simpson Drive it was felt a minimum requirement of a LEAP was sufficient; as the NPWG did not amend the requirement for a NEAP at WNP1 this has not been added to the list of infrastructure at WNP14; WNP2 has been amended to require a minimum of a LEAP but to upgrade to a NEAP if this has not been approved/provided within other sites within the Wavendon Triangle ; Set back distances at WNP4 have now been stipulated in line with MKC's Residential Design Guide; The view of the NPWG is that affordable housing is not appropriate for this site but will be delivered elsewhere in the area through larger allocated sites; The references to retention of car parking at WNP5 Hindhead Knoll has been amended to reflect existing parking across both parcels of land; the references to lorry parking at WT6 site within WNP7 has been included as a result of issues identified during area surveys, the NPWG supports the provision of temporary parking for lorries delivering to the local centre; the reference to the triathlon centre at WNP9 has been amended to reflect a more generic water sports based facility; reference has been made at WNP11 HiMO's to the MKC HiMO policy; support for the provision of lighting</p>

	<p>There is no community centre or any area which can be used for community events on this grid square. I would therefore welcome the inclusion of the following, also taken from the planning brief: "Provision of a hard-standing to act as the focus for community events would also be welcomed."</p> <p>This then requires amendments to the priority list of infrastructure, to include a NEAP, not a LEAP, and a hard-standing to act as a focus for community events, and to WNP14 to include a NEAP without wheeled sport facilities at Walton Manor.</p> <p>WNP2 Similarly, unless the Fairfield's site already definitely requires a NEAP, you may wish to include here: "Play facilities should be planned for the Wavendon Triangle as a whole. if no NEAP has been provided elsewhere then it should be provided here, but if a NEAP has been provided on the Fairfield's site then a LEAP should be provided on the Towergate site."</p> <p>WNP4 The set-back distances from the current Residential Design Guide should be quoted explicitly. "Acceptable" is not an enforceable term, and, since some of the adjacent gardens are very small, this will be very important. I absolutely support development to this density, which would, to be consistent with MKC's policies, include some affordable housing, in keeping with the surrounding mixed area. If WCC is determined not to include affordable housing, can I suggest that it specifies that some homes should be fully wheelchair compatible, with ramped access, wide doorways, grab handles, able to take a wheelchair stair lift, etc. so that at least some hard-to-fill housing requirement can be met. The cost of this, if designed in from the start, is not great, and the provision of accommodation for the elderly, which typically includes a level of disability, is an MKC priority. p21 has a typo: red/orange brick not brink!</p> <p>WNP5 You do not mention the car parking along Hindhead Knoll to the north of the southern parcel. Both parking areas appear to be outside MKDP's red line, but perhaps best to be sure! Suggest that you add "on each site" after Development in the second last bullet as the characters of the surrounding areas are different.</p> <p>WNP7 Site WT6 - not sure why you are indicating willingness for off-street lorry parking. If lorry parking on the estate generally is a problem, then fair enough, though there will be no</p>	<p>at Walnut Tree Local Centre car park has been inserted at WNP13 Parking Enhancements; the NPWG felt strongly that the proposal for a new redway link from Walton Hall to Kents Hill remain as there is no certainty on the timing of delivery from an alternative development; Furthermore, the NPWG wished to distinguish the between the upgrade of the existing footpath to a redway and the provision of a new redway which follows the desire line leading to the roundabout at the junction of the H9 and V10; the Design Principle at WNP 16 relating to tree-lined roads has been amended to reflect 'suitable trees' and has also references 'main roads' in a development; WNP16 has also been amended to reference the retention and potential extension of footpaths in addition to redways in new developments; the wording at WNP18 Sports Ground Enhancements has been amended to allow for other improvements in addition to the provision of changing facilities, in line with the leisure use of the associated sites; the NPWG have considered the need to prioritise the list of Infrastructure at WNP19, however it does not feel this necessary in addition to the fact that it is not known when the timing of individual developments will come forward and therefore when contributions/infrastructure will be provided; amendments have been made to the introductory text in the policy.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>means of restricting it to this I think, unless it is commercially controlled. If this is in hope of stopping delivery lorries parking outside the shop etc then I think it's not likely to be successful and would be more likely to aggravate problems by encouraging other lorries. The recommendations look sensible otherwise for the sites in Monkston ward.</p> <p>WNP8 Site A is suitably located for health, which is desperately needed, so I support that. However, expansion of health facilities will also require expansion of parking, and site A is not suitable for parking access I suspect, so I think you need to allow for extra health-related parking at site B, which would obviously double as general community parking. The last bullet point does not restrict itself to any particular proposals! Could be dangerous!</p> <p>WNP10 You have not placed the same design constraints on the Sailing Club expansion or coffee shop as on the triathlon centre. That part could be put in a separate bullet and applied to all. A triathlon centre is very specific, and you might perhaps wish to insert "or other water-related non-powered sport facility" to provide for other alternatives if the triathlon centre falls through. (non-powered to protect the quiet lake area from speedboats or similar).</p> <p>WPN10 first bullet point: the traditional vernacular would be very out of place in some areas of the Neighbourhood Plan area. It is also inconsistent with the revised WPN16. I suggest you add to the last sentence: "unless it matches immediately neighbouring properties."</p> <p>WP11 I would strongly suggest that you lift the specifics from MKC's current policies and enter them here. Terms such as "negative impact" and "insufficient" and "overconcentration" are not enforceable and you are likely to find that any appeal inspector defaults to standard government criteria - which are worse than MK's in general. You could add, though it is unlikely to be enforceable, that "management arrangements that permit residents to stay for at least 3 years will be welcomed, as longer stays encourages the development of community identity and community responsibility". ie ban the infamous 6-month "short-long" tenancy as far as you can. The MKC study of HIMO occupation a few years ago indicated that the vast majority aspired to stay at least a year and usually more, but few managed it because of the terms of their lease.</p> <p>WPN 12 I think you mean grid road dualling, not duelling!</p> <p>WPN13 There are no lights in the Walnut Tree Centre car park at Fyfield Barrow, leading to danger</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>for pedestrians at night. I would welcome your including the following: "The addition of lighting at Walnut Tree Local Centre car park, with operation restricted to the hours the shops are open, would be welcomed."</p> <p>WPN14 As above, include a Neighbourhood Play Area without wheeled sports facilities at Walton Manor. Include a hard-standing for community events at Walton Manor The redway link from Walton Hall to Kents Hill has been included in the Kents Hill Park development brief. However, it is still worth including here so that support on the Walton Hall side is clear.</p> <p>WPN16 There is an increasing need for properties suitable for independent living of the elderly, frail and disabled in all parts of Milton Keynes as numbers rise, and such housing is frequently regarded as acceptable by residents, BUT it is usually compact, and so comparatively high density, even though often low rise, for viability reasons as such tenants are often on low incomes, and/or physically unable to manage large properties. You may therefore wish to make an exception to the density statement along the lines of:</p> <p>As the numbers of the elderly increase, there will be a shortage of housing suitable for the elderly, frail or disabled wishing to live independently in the local area. An exception may therefore be made for housing specifically designed for and restricted to this group. Smaller properties, and thus higher density, would be acceptable provided mobility criteria (eg wheelchair accessibility) for such residents were met, and the design, height, etc. were similar to the surrounding properties. Such schemes should be small, (no more than 12 properties), to ensure a mix of residents across the area. (Unless you want to encourage an extracare scheme of course - but you'd be looking at 250 properties there. I would support either.) Typo: There is a rogue "an" after Tandem parking. I am still concerned about the requirement to have trees on every road. The look of some roads would not permit it and MKC currently only requires it on more main roads. Surely it's good to have a variety? Trees can also cause significant damage to infrastructure. In smaller properties allowing the space needed ups the price considerably. I would prefer restriction of this to main roads (see MKC's highways guide for the road hierarchy). At minimum please can you insert "with a suitable species for their situation" to avoid the totally unsuitable species that cause us so many problems. Redway links are protected as they are public highway. It is "leisure paths" - unlit and not redway - that are under threat. Suggest you add "and existing footpath" after "redway".</p> <p>WPN17</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>You could add at the end: "In that case, replacement planting of a similar species of tree as close to the original site as possible, but in a position where it can fully develop, will be required." That would allow them to negotiate a site with the Parks Trust, for instance.</p> <p>WPN18 Is improving the changing facilities the only enhancement that would be useful at these sites? Provision of a secure equipment store might also help perhaps, and there may be other things. Your wording would not permit anything else.</p> <p>WPN 19. This still worries me, as the first call on S106 for any site should be for the facilities actually needed for that site, eg play areas, local green space, etc. and contributions are also required to expand the hospital, university, etc. You've covered the key local offsite provision I think now, but perhaps reword the last phrase of the opening to ...uncertain, once the on-site needs have been met, the following pieces of area-wide infrastructure..."</p>	
5.	David Newland (Councillor for Walton Community Council)	<p>A solid piece of work with focus on "Walton's" needs, with policies designed to protect and strengthen our neighbourhood.</p> <p>My only concern would relate to public transport in that this plan should look to not only support, but lobby, build and enhance the services that our residents use, which is important as not all of our residents have the luxury of being able to afford a car. I support the view of many of our residents in raising concerns about the difficulty in getting a direct bus to the hospital but I am not sure how practical this is.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; Amended references to Public Transport in WNP 15 – Key Links along with commitment in Action Plan.</p>
6.	Bow Brickhill Parish Council	<p>Thank you for forwarding the draft version of your Neighbourhood Plan for Councillors to view.</p> <p>Congratulations to the Working Group on the production of such an incredibly detailed and well thought out plan. On reading the document it becomes very clear you are indeed able to offer a far greater level of forward planning for the Parish than incremental development could ever hope to achieve. I found the plan extremely open about the areas put forward for development and residents aspirations for them, all of which seem entirely reasonable.</p> <p>Not so much an amendment to the plan but noting the number of Registered Community Assets listed within it, the Asset Register has proved to be of little value as we found out when Brewers Charles Wells sold the Wheatsheaf PH, (a registered Community Asset within our village). To date, MKC have been either unable or unwilling to enforce this. I see the areas you have listed are far greater and of much higher potential value to a developer.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The Walton Manor Development Brief clearly identifies the existing risk in relation to flooding and we would expect any briefs for nearby sites to assess the incremental flood risks to this area.</p>

		<p>It might also be of interest to you to note some of our comments to the SAP that might have an effect on both our parishes (I have used your NP reference numbers) –</p> <p>7.1 Land at Walton Manor WNP1. BBPC has made comments regarding the potential for further flooding in this area by development of U22, U23 and U1.</p> <p>7.6 We have also noted the use of Caldecotte site C WNP6 as a potential site for a bridge</p>	
7.	Harry Meisuria (Local resident)	<p>Why are there no ethnic member in your entire community group?</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group has been created entirely from volunteers and we have made repeated calls for help over the last two years. The Group reflects the community members who came forward as a result.</p>
8.	Shirley Jones (Local resident)	<p>You've asked for comments on the published plan - I hope to attend the event on March 1 so will have further observations then. In the meantime the general plan is to be congratulated having taken into account themes emerging from three surveys, taken a pragmatic view in general and resulted in a detailed and thought-provoking document. However there are some errors in the published plan - unfinished sentences for example - (see for example pages 47/48) which mean it isn't as clear on detail as it might be. You may wish to proof read it.</p> <p>I think my only concern at this stage is the complete absence of the word "arts" in any context.</p> <p>Sport is mentioned numerous times and the arts always tend to be an after-thought. Provision will be overlooked unless it is specified.</p> <p>People need places to undertake and engage with literature, music, dance, visual arts and so forth in well-appointed, safe settings and there is no mention of these items being planned for within our parish - nor secure storage facilities for equipment relating to this. For example a sports pavilion will have somewhere to store bats, balls and nets (etc) and suitable changing areas - but where can arts societies have the same support as sports clubs. It seems that our community facilities get taken over by commercial organisations - particularly those running nurseries - and this is sometimes as a result of poor planning and communication. Our community facilities need to offer a very wide range of opportunities for all - be that bridge, bowls, table tennis, pottery, tribal drumming, singing or judo - diversity would be good to see and this needs detailed consultation with those of us who try to run such things in the Parish. The arts contribute to our health and well-being - especially our mental health - and each sub-hub in the Parish would ideally offer some provision for this starting with a studio theatre and exhibition hall.</p> <p>I recommend The Criterion in Earlsdon, Coventry as an exemplar of how something of this ilk has become established over many years from inception in 1955. Nowadays it is owned by its members - has a bar, café and does wonderful work with and for its community supporting both young people and the elderly.</p> <p>If something were put in place in our parish in the next couple of years with such a vision</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The final Plan has been proofed and taken account of issues highlighted. Reference and support for the Arts have been added to the introductory chapters. Walton Community Council welcomes the support for the development at Browns Wood and notes the offer of input.</p>

		then it could be doing much the same as a flagship for the SE corner of MK which has the disadvantage of not having the established communities of the north and west of the town. Many thanks for offering the chance to make comments. I would be most pleased to contribute to the development of the Browns Wood facility so that it is fit for purpose for arts users should this be helpful.	
9.	Mr & Mrs Crighton (Local residents)	<p>Thank you for the chance to look at the draft plan.</p> <p>We note a development brief for the Walton Manor site has been adopted by the council. We commented on that brief and were unaware it had been adopted.</p> <p>We OBJECT to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A local centre/shop within the site. There is no need for it. The site is no more "isolated" than many parts of Walton/Walnut Tree, all of which use the local centre at Walnut Tree and the Spar at Heronsgate. It is likely to attract unwanted traffic into an essentially residential area. 2. Any vehicular access from Simpson Road. Simpson Road has seen increased traffic in recent years. Access to the Walton site will increase it further. People will also seek to access any shop or local centre introduced onto the site causing on-street parking in residential roads. 3. Any so-called "land-mark" building on the higher ground at the north end of the site. The site is highly visible from a great distance, even from the far end of the Lake. Many of us remember only too well the problems we had with "land-mark" buildings at the Caldecotte Lake Promontory. Developers seize the chance to propose as much development as possible in the knowledge they will achieve a compromise, which will meet their commercial objectives. In fighting appeals against planning refusals, they know they will have an adopted plan working in their favour. Councils know too that they risk an award of costs being made in favour of the developer where they withhold planning permission without proper reason. <p>DESIGN</p> <p>We welcome comments about respecting the local vernacular. What a pity the recently completed housing pays no regard to it whatsoever!</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The NPWG has assessed the need for better facilities in the Walton Manor area based on the ultimate amount of development. It is important at the early stage of planning to provide the space for such a facility even if it ends up not being required.</p> <p>The Walton Manor Development Brief completed consultation in 2015 and so pre-dates our plan. However, Section 5.8, page 24 specifies that secondary access only be provided from Simpson Road to a cul-de-sac of no more than 20 dwellings. The Development Brief pre-dates this plan so we are limited with regard influencing the "land mark building".</p>
10.	Sonia Underwood (Local resident)	<p>We have all become insular in our lives, this spreads to the younger generation where most of them aren't have a conversation with the bigger community because they lack social skills. In light of the residential planning - I never see anywhere that provisions have been made for the younger generation. Can I draw your attention that we have two amazing schools within our parish.</p> <p>It would bring their community closer together, stamp out bullying at schools, bring the students from both schools closer together thereby achieving a more friendly neighbourhood feel and a stronger community sense. I have two children who are not "street" children but obviously enjoy the open space with friends at the park areas (albeit limited) this area is normally dominated by football players - which is a shame. My boys are rugby players but don't feel that they are able to set up a game etc. because the football</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Plan sets out to create the environment and facilities that can be used by people of all ages in the areas of leisure, sports, arts, etc. in a flexible way and over the long term. We have consulted widely which included all local head teachers as part of this process along with a specific survey for young people aged 11-19 years.</p>

		<p>players are so prominent of that area.</p> <p>It would be lovely if there was a proper building not the community centre - just for kids with a snooker table, disco games night,. etc. The amount of parents that would hire the hall for birthdays - it would end up paying for it self. I think it a real shame that where we all live is in the most "desirable" areas but we have no foresight for our children their friends or peers to communicate other than by technology.</p> <p>I think that you should be asking the head teachers at the schools for input into this, if the children feel safer going to school they would all walk reducing the amount of cars in the morning getting them to school! Yes, I am one of those parents.</p> <p>You asked for comments - so that is mine!</p>	
11.	Lawrence Hooter (Local resident)	<p>I'm quite satisfied with all the proposals for the area, as being an older resident we don't care for drastic changes to our environment. However, I cannot find any fault in these plans as they stand at this time. Lawrence Hooter, past owner of Walnut Tree farm, Walnut Tree.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p>
12.	Dilip Nathwani (Local resident)	<p>I would like to congratulate all the participants involved in formulating the above.</p> <p>It is an absolutely fantastic piece of work and if there is any competition on such work, it would be a resounding winner</p> <p>I confirm full support of the plans and look forward to the referendum on its adoption.</p> <p>Many Thanks to all involved</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p>
13.	Karl Kuhle (Local resident)	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I have just seen the neighbourhood plan and quite frankly appalled on the proposed residential plans for the tiny parcels of land at Hindhead knoll and for the supposed community land at Hockliffe Brae.</p> <p>Is the intention to build on every single bit of green land in the MK area?</p> <p>Everywhere I look I see new housing.</p> <p>I have quite frankly never seen such disregard for the environment outside of banana republics.</p> <p>Unless we want to build and live in Crime ridden concrete ghettos then common sense and experience shows we need low density housing with large green open spaces that are preserved.</p> <p>I was just thinking today hoe nice walnut tree is with these green open spaces especially at Hindhead knoll.</p> <p>How about a plan to go some more trees and thinking of the environment and our air quality?</p> <p>I have a 2 year old child and just bought an expensive house in the area and do want to see</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Plan aims to protect green space by identifying additional areas for further protection as formal Public Open Space to enhance their current status as amenity land. Where development takes place in the future, additional provision of open space must conform to current planning policy: The Action Plan contains a commitment to investigate a street tree planting scheme, where appropriate; The green spaces in Tatling Grove were reviewed by the NPWG and are currently designated amenity green space; these areas are too small for development and as such the current designation is deemed sufficient.</p>

		<p>it turned into a ghetto like Broughton. Keep the area the same with no more housing please. What we do need are more trees and open areas preserved. They say that Children may never see snow again with global warming. I do not know about that but one thing they will not see are green open fields and countryside. WNP 17 Open Space & Leisure - Thanks for the meeting the other day. It was nice to meet you all. I am just wondering if the green spaces in Tatling Grove can be added to the designated green zones to protect them from development? These should be too small for even the greediest developer but you never know. These estates as is- with exception at Walton Grange, should be used as a model for any future development. I support the Neighbourhood Plan</p>	
14.	Tony Willis (Local resident)	<p>Underpass not a crossing on Brickhill Street. All new buildings should have solar panels. Keep all green areas (make more). No link road to Simpson Road. No building on Walton Park at the bottom end due to flooding (move to half way up the field only). Need more parking at Walnut Tree.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; We have included within our Infrastructure priorities list, the need for an underpass on the V10. The current planning rules and regulations applied by Milton Keynes Council sufficiently cover the need to build sustainably and hence, are not covered in the Plan. The Open Space Policy sets out all areas to be protected from development, new development on allocated sites must provide additional Open Space in line with current planning policy. The Walton Manor Development Brief pre-dates our Plan and dictates constraints for access and building in the flood plain. The Plan has identified the need for additional parking measures at Walnut Tree in WNP13.</p>
15.	Anonymous	<p>Do not support WNP1 Land at Walton Manor. The new development adjacent to the site shown has been a disaster (poor access, no facilities, no underpass, poor access for schools and doctors). The proposed new development will only increase the problems. Do not support WNP5 Land at Hindhead Knoll. Parking is already a major issue in this area. Additional development will only aggravate the problem. Also doctors and schools are not adequate already. Support WNP8 Walnut Tree Community Hubs. Extra facilities will require more parking</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The Walton Manor Development Brief is already approved and pre-dates this Plan. Hindhead Knoll is already allocated land, however this Plan requires parking at the southern end to be retained.</p>
16.	Geoff New	Mainly supports the plan.	Thank you for your response, your comments have

	(Local resident)		been noted.
17.	C. New (Local resident)	Mainly support the plan. One comment, it is lovely having wide grass verges but roads (especially main bus route roads) are too narrow. More off road parking bays so they don't churn up grass or park on bends. Safety first.	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The Action Plan contains a commitment to investigate opportunities to introduce additional parking in key locations.
18.	Vanessa McPake (Councillor for Monkston ward)	Site needs to have social housing as crying out for it in the ward. Also ensure new houses gardens back onto existing properties. Residents in Spearmint concerned about lack of light when houses built.	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; WNP4 includes policies to cover orientation of housing, set back distances and densities. The view of the NPWG is that affordable housing is not appropriate for this site but will be delivered elsewhere in the area through larger allocated sites.
19.	Mr & Mrs Richmond (Local residents)	Support the Neighbourhood Plan. We support the plan overall, however we have concerns regarding WNP18 "The community pavilion at Browns Wood". We have no objection to changing room facility for the sports ground but object in the strongest manner to any facility that is for late evening eg parties / receptions etc. Our homes at 2/4/6/8 Morley Crescent will be about the extended car park and will be heavily impacted by noise and associated anti-social behaviour that accompany late evening functions.	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The NPWG respects your concerns relating to Browns Wood Pavilion. This is a matter for the specific planning process of the facility and your concerns have been directed to Walton Community Council
20.	A. Banks (Local resident)	Support the plan. Not sure I understand all of the policies at this stage but happy to understand more by newsletter.	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.
21.	Homes & Communities Agency (Landowner)	I refer to the above consultation and set out below the response on behalf of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), who as you know are owners of the Towergate A site which is identified within the consultation document for residential development. The site has a current allocation within the Milton Keynes Local Plan for Light Industrial/Office Development (B1), Residential Institutions (C2) and Non-Residential Institutions (D1), although there has been no demand for any of these uses over a number of years with the only demand coming from B2 or B8 users which are not considered suitable on the site. The site is located on the edge of the urban area of Milton Keynes opposite the existing employment site at Brinklow and with residential development to the south west. To the east of the site is open countryside but this is allocated for development as part of the South-East Strategic Development Area. To the south and south east of the site is the Wavendon Business Park which is currently the subject of residential development proposals. The site forms part of a larger employment designation, with the northern part of the site having been developed for a motor dealership and with planning consent having previously	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The NPWG acknowledges the comments, however strongly feels that the need for a "masterplan" to cover the Wavendon Triangle is essential to ensure sufficient infrastructure supports future needs, regardless of the timing of the development in the individual parcels of land.

	<p>been granted for a petrol filling station. Existing access to the site from Grove Way (H9) serves the motor dealership and adjoining site as well as the subject site.</p> <p>Despite extensive marketing over the past ten years and the current ongoing significant shortage of development sites within Milton Keynes, the land has failed to be developed for any use. This marketing demonstrated only limited demand for policy compliant uses, despite the fact that it is one of the last remaining sites within Milton Keynes which would be suitable for delivery of large footprint (100,000 sq ft plus) buildings. The most definite interest in the site was from Lantamannen Unibake UK Ltd who submitted an application for development of the site, which was subsequently refused with significant local opposition.</p> <p>It is clear that despite extensive marketing and interest in the site, a suitable employment use has not been identified. The one potential occupier which resulted in a planning application for the proposed use was refused planning consent despite an initial recommendation to Planning Committee that Approval should be granted. This was in no small part due to the large number of objections received from residents of the adjoining area and also reference to the potential impact of such development upon the use of The Stables. The two significant expressions of interest have both been for B2 or B8 uses, which would not be in accordance with the policy designation of the site. The proposal for B2 development of the site gave rise to significant levels of objection, and development on adjoining land for residential will increase the sensitivity of Towergate A for employment purposes in accordance with the current allocation.</p> <p>It is clear that development of the site for B1 uses is most unlikely to occur with most office occupiers tending to locate within Central Milton Keynes where there are currently significant amounts of vacant space. The other uses which are permitted under the Policy designation, are similarly unlikely to be developed given the complete lack of interest in the site for these purposes. In addition the current thrust of policy (Core Strategy Policy CS4) is to direct new office development towards Central Milton Keynes, where links to sustainable transport modes are more readily available.</p> <p>It is clear that there is adequate employment land within Milton Keynes that would be preferred by developers to the Towergate site. Despite many years of marketing no suitable development has come forward on the site, whilst many other employment sites have come forward for development.</p> <p>Milton Keynes as a whole continues to have a shortfall of housing sites, notwithstanding the number of sites which are allocated for development. The recent decision in the Wain Close (Frosts) Appeal, demonstrates that the council is unable to show that it has a five year housing supply, and in these circumstances paragraph 49 of the NPPF sets out that relevant policies for the supply of housing within the Local Plan should not be considered up to date.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>You will be aware that the recently published Site Allocations Plan – Emerging Preferred Options document published by Milton Keynes Council identifies the site for residential development which is supported by the HCA, and the identification of the site for residential development within the WNP is welcomed and supported by the HCA. If a residential allocation of the land is confirmed, it would be the intention of the HCA to offer the site through its Developer Partner Panel (DPP) later this year in accordance with its Land Disposal and Development Plan which will allow the delivery of housing at an early stage of the MK Plan period.</p> <p>Whilst the HCA welcomes the proposals to develop the site for housing, it does not control adjoining sites which are at varying stages of the development process, and through its dealings with the DPP to dispose of the site, will seek to ensure that development of the site reflects the development in the wider area. Whilst the HCA can influence the development of the Towergate site, it does not of course have control over adjoining landowners and/or sites.</p> <p>I would be pleased to receive confirmation of receipt of this response, and to be kept up to date with the subsequent progress of the plan.</p>	
22.	Hewlett Packard (Landowner)	<p>NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – PUBLIC CONSULTATION</p> <p>We act for Hewlett Packard Enterprise Services UK Ltd (“HPE”) in respect of land at Wavendon Business Park. HPE has been pleased to work with the Community Council in the development of its Neighbourhood Plan. To assist further HPE has the following comments in respect of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan (“NP”):</p> <p>1. Site Specific Policies - WNP3</p> <p>HPE received a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 agreement on Tuesday 8 March 2016 from the Council for its residential planning application (15/02337/OUT) for upto 134 units and a neighbourhood shop (70-100sq.m). This is an outline application with all matters reserved save for access.</p> <p>At page 18 of the NP the site is identified as comprising redundant car park, woodland and yard. The site is zoned for employment and has the benefit of implemented lawful Class B1 Business Use through the development of the business park. The site was in part formerly agricultural land in the north section which has now regenerated with some saplings. The southern half of the site was the construction site and parking for the development of the business park. Immediately east of the site is a car park which is still in use for the short term. Further east is land zoned for residential development and strategic buffer within the Strategic Land Allocation (“SLA”). This area was also granted permission for residential use under application 15/02337/OUT.</p> <p>The development of the site will follow the principles for development in the SLA as set out in the SPD for Wavendon Triangle. The extent of strategic buffer is a matter for future</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to reflect the current planning status. The NPWG have acknowledged the inclusion of space for a neighbourhood shop, which is line with the recommendation for the Wavendon Triangle.</p>

		determination in the context of the SPD and the Inspector's Report into the Core Strategy SLA. Therefore, WNP3 will need to be redrafted to reflect the current planning circumstances.	
23.	Mick Carter (Local resident)	<p>WNP 1 – Land at Walton Manor Support if built sympathetically having regard to proximity to river park</p> <p>WNP 5 – Land at Hindhead Knoll - Don't know - there is great pressure on parking in this area due to school. Car park must be retained.</p> <p>WNP 7 – Community Foundation Reserve Sites - Infill has got to be appropriate and safe. WG4 is needed for school parking. I have problems leaving Gable Thorne at certain times of the day- it would be safer for another car park.</p> <p>WNP 19 – Infrastructure Delivery</p> <p>Support - with all possible new development - expansion of the Health Centre is essential. This should be highest priority - what funding? proposals are in place with housing delivery?</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>WNP5 Hindhead Knoll site is already allocated for development, but the Plan requires retention of parking spaces at the southern end.</p> <p>The expansion of the health centre, is on the list in the policy at WNP 19, however, it is a matter for NHS England with regard the timing and funding of the expansion. The Plan seeks to ensure that "space" is available for future development should the funding become available.</p>
24.	Oliver Tomlinson (Local resident)	<p>WNP 5 – Land at Hindhead Knoll</p> <p>Don't know - at certain times severe lack of parking - school events, expansion and increase in car users, could car parking be a better use?</p> <p>WNP 9 Caldecotte Lakeside Support - triathlon centre - very specific sport - would a generic sports facility be better wording?</p> <p>WNP 11 Housing HiMO</p> <p>Support - HiMO parking issues - insufficient is too vague?</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Plan has identified the need for additional parking in the area. Policy WNP7 identifies potential areas for parking, whilst the Action Plan sets out a commitment to review all opportunities for additional parking in the area by Walton Community Council.</p> <p>We have amended the wording in WNP9 Caldecotte Lakeside to indicate support for a more generic water based sporting use.</p> <p>The more detailed specifications relating to parking and other standards for WNP 11 HiMO, are contained within MKC's current HiMO Policy and will be assessed in accordance with these requirements.</p>
25.	Morris (Local resident)	<p>Do not support the plan. Agree that there could be some infilling. Totally disagree with ANY form of development on Community Foundation reserve sites. Totally disagree with ANY form of development adjacent to Walton High in North Hub A. All residential development plans must provide adequate car parking and have roads wide enough to permit emergency service vehicles access past parked units.</p> <p>WNP 7</p> <p>Totally disagree with any attempt by the council to sell off these sites for any development whatsoever. The small number of such "green" areas should be left as such to the benefit of the whole community. Green space is valuable to us all!</p> <p>WNP 8 Walnut Tree Community Hubs -</p> <p>Strongly feel that the area of the north hub immediately adjacent to Walton High should not</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Community Foundation Reserve sites listed at WNP7 are already allocated for some form of development, the Plan suggests best use in the event of no suitable community use being identified. Residential development must conform to current MKC planning requirements and we have augmented where we feel it was necessary to meet local circumstances.</p>

		be developed at all. It should be left as a green area.	
26.	Historic England (Statutory consultee)	<p>Thank you for your e-mail of 19th February advising Historic England of the consultation on the Walton Neighbourhood Plan under Reg 14 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. As the Government’s statutory adviser on the historic environment we are pleased to make the following comments.</p> <p>Historic England has published information on our website on neighbourhood plans and the historic environment which might be helpful: http://www.historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/</p> <p>According to our records there are nine listed buildings in the Plan area, the grade II* St Michael’s Church of the Open University and Walton Hall; The Old Rectory, The Open University; Walton Lodge Cottage; Walnut Tree Farmhouse; Thatched Cottage, Brickhill Street; Walton Manor House; the stable block to Walton Manor; and the barn to the south of the stable block, all grade II. The plan area also contains the significant scheduled monument of the shrunken medieval village of Caldecotte.</p> <p>We would welcome a reference to the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets in the Neighbourhood Plan Vision and to these heritage assets in section 4 as indicators that the history of the plan area is important and pre-dates the development of the New Town. We welcome the objective to improve the built environment.</p> <p>Are there are buildings or features of local interest or any non-scheduled archaeological records on the Historic Environment Record ? Non-designated heritage assets, such as locally important buildings, can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity.</p> <p>The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states “... where it is relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local heritage to guide decisions and put broader strategic heritage policies from the local plan into - 2 - action at a neighbourhood scale. ... In addition, and where relevant, neighbourhood plans need to include enough information about local non-designated heritage assets including sites of archaeological interest to guide decisions”.</p> <p>Historic England considers that Neighbourhood Development Plans should be underpinned by a thorough understanding of the character and special qualities of the area covered by the Plan. Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local and Neighbourhood Plans should “... develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area. Such policies should be</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>Further reference to heritage assets have been included in the Plan in the Introduction and About the Area sections; Review was undertaken and no local listings have been highlighted to the NPWG; The local community have been involved in consultation throughout the development of the Plan and to date no additional buildings have been highlighted to be of local importance.</p>

		<p>based on stated objectives for the future of the area and an understanding and evaluation of its defining characteristics”.</p> <p>A characterisation study can also help inform locations and detailed design of proposed new development, identify possible townscape improvements and establish a baseline against which to measure change. Such a study would also support and reinforce Policy WNP 16 – Design Principles.</p> <p>According to our records, none of the identified development or community reserve sites would be near any of the designated heritage assets in the Plan area. We therefore have no comments on any of these, although we would say that the Historic Environment Record should be consulted for any records of non-scheduled archaeological remains on any of the sites.</p> <p>Finally, the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan offers the opportunity to harness a community’s interest in the historic environment by getting the community to help add to the evidence base, perhaps by undertaking a historic characterisation survey as indicated above, the preparation of a comprehensive list of locally important buildings and features or undertaking a survey of grade II buildings at risk from neglect, decay or other threats.</p> <p>We hope you find these comments helpful. Should you wish to discuss any points within this letter, or if there are particular issues with the historic environment in the Plan area, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p> <p>Thank you again for consulting Historic England.</p>	
27.	Peter Dazley (Local resident)	<p>Having recently visited a drop in session for the Walton Neighbourhood Plan consultation, I have some comments to make. As a resident of Old Farm Park, I have focused my comments on the areas local to me such as OFP1 and WG2 as they would impact me and the local schools more.</p> <p>In my opinion there is more than sufficient housing in the area so there should be no need for further dwellings and the other requirements that this results in. In addition, the open spaces that are around this area are a particular attraction of living here and so should be kept this way.</p> <p>The sites referred to state that they are reserved for “community use” – what does that actually mean?. I would like to see further details of this when it becomes available as this would impact local residents. In my opinion there are sufficient public buildings in the area and any new builds will impact on local amenities and parking would need to be I would like to be supplied with further details of this when it becomes available as this would impact on local residents and amenities and parking would need to be considered carefully.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>Some sites in the area are allocated for development already and therefore the plan aims to ensure such development improves the area within the planning guidelines.</p> <p>Community use in respect of the Reserve sites means facilities of use to the Milton Keynes community as a whole i.e. not necessarily just in Walton. A local example is the MK Snap building in Walnut Tree, under this designation only community or voluntary organisations may develop on the site and the facility must be accessible to the public.</p> <p>WG2 is already allocated and the NP reflects that, but the land may prove unsuitable for development due to the constraints of the site.</p>

		<p>WG 2 is proposed to be built on a hill very close to a dual carriageway and would therefore not be suitable for any type of building. Anything built here may also impact the local schools in close proximity.</p> <p>I hope that the above points are clear to you. If you need any further information, please let me know.</p> <p>WNP 7 Community Foundation Reserve Sites - The sites referred to state that they are reserved for “community use” – what does that actually mean?. I would like to see further details of this when it becomes available as this would impact local residents. In my opinion there are sufficient public buildings in the area and any new builds will impact on local amenities and parking would need to be I would like to be supplied with further details of this when it becomes available as this would impact on local residents and amenities and parking would need to be considered carefully.</p> <p>WG 2 is proposed to be built on a hill very close to a dual carriageway and would therefore not be suitable for any type of building. Anything built here may also impact the local schools in close proximity.</p>	
28.	Jackie Emens (Local resident)	<p>WNP4 Land at Bergamot Gardens This policy is supported in principal but as our house backs on to this land we are concerned about how close to the back of our home houses would be build. There are also trees between our back fence and the new fencing put around this plot – who is going to maintain them as they have been regularly cut back in previous years?</p> <p>WNP5 Land at Hindhead Knoll This policy is not supported. The traffic around Hindhead Knoll is already a nightmare in the mornings and when the school finishes without building more houses.</p> <p>WNP7 Community Foundation Reserve Sites Community Foundation Reserved Sites – Walnut Tree 6 Litchfield Down – Parking should be a priority here as getting around this part of Walnut Tree at school time is a nightmare with all the cars parked on the road. Walnut Tree 7 Hockliffe Brae and Twyford Lane – Consideration needs to be given to vehicle access as cars often turn into Hockliffe Brae to fast and Twyford Lane is quite tight to turn into.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The concern regarding the maintenance of trees will be addressed on point of sale of the land and through the planning process.</p> <p>The land at WNP 5 Hindhead Knoll is already allocated for housing development. The Plan seeks to ensure the issue of parking is addressed.</p> <p>The WT 6 site in policy WNP7, has noted the support of the provision of shared parking in any future development.</p>
29.	The Parks Trust (Statutory consultee)	<p>Thank you for inviting The Parks Trust to comment on the draft Walton Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>1. We welcome that the Plan makes prominent mention of open space and landscaping, much of which is owned and maintained by The Parks Trust.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The description has been enhanced by expanding the contextual description of the area and the open space in particular to highlight the wider strategic role of Caldecotte Lake and the Ouzel Valley Linear Park; The</p>

	<p>2. We feel that the Plan would be improved by expanding the contextual description of the Parish and the open space in particular to highlight the wider strategic role of Caldecotte Lake and the Ouzel Valley Linear Park which have a wider strategic value to Milton Keynes as green space and community recreational/water sports facility. It should acknowledge that this area provides facilities such as the Caldecotte Project and the model railway as well as the sailing club, all of which are of value as community facilities.</p> <p>3. We note that the improvement and enhancement of open spaces was identified as a key issue in the consultation and this is followed through in the Action Plan. We would be happy to discuss this further with the Parish Council. There is, however, no specific policy to address this point, other than Policy WNP18 Enhancement of Sports Grounds. It may help in delivering the objective of improving the environment of the Parish if a policy similar to Policy WNP 15 Key Links was included which says that proposals that will contribute to the improvement of under-maintained areas of public space and/or the enhancement public areas will be supported provided all other policies are adhered to.</p> <p>4. Our other point-specific comments are set out in the following table.</p> <p>Page Section Comment 6 Vision We support the inclusion of “green open spaces and thriving natural environment” in the Vision 8 Results from surveys We note how prominent parks and open spaces feature in the results of the survey and that the concerns raised included “improve maintenance” and “diversify opportunities/types of open space”. In light of these comments we would welcome any further dialogue with the Parish Council over how The Parks Trust may help address these concerns, especially if the concerns or opportunities relate to Parks Trust land. 10 & 11 About the Area Whilst we appreciate this is only intended as a very brief description of the Parish we feel some further expansion of the description of the open space network and the functions these serve would provide some more useful context to the Neighbourhood Plan. We suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Caldecotte Lake is mentioned by name with acknowledgement that this serves as a leisure/recreation and watersports destination for Milton Keynes and surrounding area. · The strategically important green corridor of the Ouzel Valley Linear Park is referenced as running through the Parish; Caldecotte Lake being a key feature of the Linear Park. · Refer to the Caldecotte Brook Linear Park – important green corridor and surface 	<p>zone for the triathlon centre has been enlarged and terminology changed to reflect a more generic water based use; WCC will pursue opportunities to work together regarding maintenance improvements and enhancements to Open Space generally; Consideration was given to an additional Policy with regard improving the environment, however it was felt this should be pursued through the commitments of WCC and an additional policy was unnecessary; the role of the Parks Trust in maintaining the grid road corridors has been acknowledged; Consideration was given to the potential conflict of the location of the neighbourhood play area with WNP 12, however it was considered this would be addressed through planning, if and when any proposed plan came forward.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>attention. WNP 17 Open Space & Leisure We welcome that the Neighbourhood Plan includes a policy for open space and leisure. We feel the policy and supporting statements could be improved by: Expanding the Context section to include mention of the features such as Caldecotte Lake, the Ouzel Valley Linear Park and the Caldecotte Brook Linear Park as outlined in the comments made to the 'About the Area' section above. Including in the Context section a reference to the existing grid road landscape corridors and the contribution these make to the green space network in the parish even though these are not shown on Figure 2. A cross reference could be made here to Policy WNP 12. This policy should include a cross reference to Policy WNP 9 for Caldecotte Lakeside in similar way as for Policy WNP 18 Sports Ground Enhancement.</p>	
30.	Stuart Copeland (Local resident and business owner)	<p>2 Foreword - SC Add missing names to thanks, e.g Mark H, etc 4 Executive Summary The Exec Summary describes the contents of the document, which is fine but it should actually describe what we are saying. I'd like to see the common themes across the sites and then the headlines from the generic policies. This will be our key publicity tool and it needs to describe the 'plan on a page'. WNP 19 In the commitment, there should be a reference to health facilities provision. I know it is not covered by planning policy, but it's one of the biggest complaints in the area. Can we also make the statement about Infrastructure before Expansion being a key requirement - again, maybe a bit vague for the specific policy but WCC will, I'm sure, be making the point very strongly at all stages and for all developments. In the commitment, there should be a reference to health facilities provision. I know it is not covered by planning policy but it's one of the biggest complaints in the area. Can we also make the statement about Infrastructure before Expansion being a key requirement - again, maybe a bit vague for the specific policy but WCC will, I'm sure, be making the point very strongly at all stages and for all developments.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The Foreword has been revised accordingly; The Executive Summary now reflects the policy content</p>
31.	Raymond Mackintosh (Local resident)	<p>Dear Sir/Madam, I am concerned that the plans for the Church Farm Development show little concern for the consequences for the local school, Wavendon Gate School (WGS) and the Walnut Tree Health Centre (WTHC). I was a governor of WGS from 2008 to 2012, and have been a member of the PPG of WTHC for about 6 years and I am currently a member of the MK Patient Congress. My WGS experience gives me some insight into the possible adverse</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; Wavendon Gate School are aware of the issues relating to traffic and implications from Church Farm; The Plan makes reference to the potential use of any surplus land at WG4 Community Reserve site being utilised for parking following the construction of any</p>

		<p>effect on the school, and my PPG membership makes me aware of the pressure on the health centre, and the adverse effect on patients.</p> <p>As well as potential adverse consequences of the development, as it has been presented to us, for WGS and WTHC themselves, there will also be likely knock-on effects for residents, potentially serious, as I shall explain.</p> <p>1. WGS. The traffic situation in Gregories Drive at the beginning and end of the school day is currently barely tolerable, with cars often blocking the outlets of Shuttleworth Grove and Gable Thorne as children arrive or leave by car with their parents. There have been examples of bad tempered interactions as residents try to enter or leave the streets they live on. However, if despite the limitations posed by the physical layout of the school, it is deemed essential for WGS to take children from the Church Farm Development, the uncomfortable situation would become intolerable. The plans for the Church Farm Development MUST in that case include plans for the development of the parking arrangements near WGS. Even if the total numbers attending WGS were to be held at the present level by re-zoning, the problem would remain as a larger proportion of the children would need to come by car with the obvious consequences for the parking problem.</p> <p>2. WTHC. The practice is currently near its capacity and could not accommodate the extra patients from the Church Farm Development. The same is true for its car park, especially since many patients cannot walk far from distant parking areas. I believe that WTHC would like to expand, but this involves major capital investment and whether that is possible within the timescale of the Church Farm Development is very unclear. The plans for the Church Farm Development must include a realistic account of how the health care of the new residents would be looked after.</p>	<p>grid road extension; The Plan identifies potential space for expansion of the Health facilities, however NHS England are responsible for the distribution of funding acquired via Section 106 contributions.</p>
32.	Brian & Ina Eaton (Local resident)	<p>Excellent work!</p> <p>There are some urgent projects identified which we hope can be implemented. We refer to the Walnut Tree local centre access and lay-by, the health centre extension and probably the most disruptive, yet most needed underpass/footbridge on Brickhill Street.</p> <p>This is an excellent document and we congratulate those concerned.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p>
33.	Wavendon Parish Council	<p>Dear Sir / Madam</p> <p>I have been asked to write to you regarding the development of your Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Following discussion at our meeting held on the 21st March 2016, my Parish Council fully support the contents of your draft Neighbourhood Plan and wish you well in the finalisation of the process.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p>

34.	Milton Keynes Council Planners (Statutory consultee)	<p>Thank you for your invitation to comment on the pre-submission draft of the Walton Neighbourhood Plan. Milton Keynes Council congratulates the Community Council on a thorough and very professional plan. We hope the following comments are helpful to you as you progress towards a submission version, which we look forward to receiving in due course. Should you have any queries on the points below or the neighbourhood planning process in general, please don't hesitate to contact us via the usual means.</p> <p>The foreword is not a material part of the plan but we would nevertheless discourage some of the emotive language used. The rationale and background to the plan is well worth including but references to 'bad development' and accountability could give the unfortunate impression that the Community Council and Local Authority do not work together. This is very much untrue and could be harmful to the perception of general conformity that the plan should create. In referring to the original Milton Keynes Masterplan, acknowledging the very different circumstances of the Development Corporation as compared to the Council today would also be helpful context.</p> <p>Although a September referendum date is likely and achievable it may be wise to remove any specific reference to this in case circumstances change or the examination takes longer than anticipated. It is expected this line in the foreword would be removed in the final post-referendum version anyway.</p> <p>Civic Offices, 1 Saxon Gate East, Central Milton Keynes, MK9 3EJ Tel: (01908) 691691 Fax: (01908) 252330</p> <p>Section 3 should not include anything extra that is not in the actual consultation statement. For instance, the consultation timeline is in section 3 of the plan but does not appear to be in the statement currently.</p> <p>It is common for many examiners to recommend paragraph numbering throughout neighbourhood plan documents and this could aid ease of reference but is at the discretion of the Neighbourhood Group to add in to the submission version.</p> <p>Section 5 paragraph 2, should read 'in force' rather than 'enforce'.</p> <p>In Policy WNP4 it may be worth clarifying what "an acceptable set back distance" is, or confirming it is simply the avoidance of overlooking as implied by the rest of the policy.</p> <p>We very much support the site-specific policies and condone the constructive and comprehensive approach the Community Council has taken to these. In due course there may need to be some clarification as to whether these policies are formal allocations that actively seek to bring forward development or simply pre-emptive guidelines for proposals. This distinction is important as it may affect the basic conditions if, as expected, the neighbourhood plan is submitted for examination ahead of the Site Allocations Plan. For instance, technically speaking, a formal allocation of an employment site for residential use may not be interpreted as being in general conformity with the Development Plan until such time that the Site Allocations Plan alters the Proposals Map. To confirm, Milton Keynes Council does support the site-specific policies and considers that they complement our emerging policy but we raise this point now in recognition that the examiner may require</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Foreword has been amended accordingly;</p> <p>References to dates relating to the referendum have been removed;</p> <p>The Timeline has been added to the Consultation Statement;</p> <p>Paragraph numbering has been inserted;</p> <p>The typographical errors have been amended;</p> <p>The acceptable set-back distances have been defined in WNP4;</p> <p>Consideration was given to the densities, however the NPWG felt strongly that they should remain as determined in the Plan;</p> <p>The NPWG considered the Infrastructure List but wished for the Redway Link to remain as there is no guarantee at the time of submission, that delivery of this item will proceed from other planned developments.</p> <p>Furthermore clarification is required with regard the exact route of the proposed redway, taking account of the existing desire line.</p>
-----	---	---	---

		<p>more information on this evolving strategic policy context.</p> <p>It is worth confirming that the densities referred to in the site-specific policies are net densities. We note that the specified densities are a maximum that should not be exceeded. Whilst a figure of 35dph is indeed what we would typically expect on the proposed sites, Policy H8 of the Local Plan refers to this as an average target rather than a rigid maximum. Therefore we recommend a degree of flexibility in the site-specific densities in the Neighbourhood Plan to allow for instances where 35dph may not be achieved. Possible changes could include specifying a range not to be exceeded (e.g. 35-40dph) or removing the 'maximum' aspect of the policies so that densities are 'around' 35dph.</p> <p>You will be aware of previous discussions regarding the infrastructure projects referred to in Policy WNP19. It remains the Council's view that it is unlikely that the level of development the plan proposes will be able to fund all these projects, both in a financial and regulatory sense (i.e. in compliance with CIL legislation). However, we recognise that the policy does not underpin the delivery of the wider plan and can therefore support its status as a 'priority list'. We would though recommend that 'particularly where viability is uncertain' is replaced with 'where viability allows' as the policy will not be consistent with the NPPF if it is used to impose undue obligations in situations where viability is marginal. It may be worth altering the list if, as expected, certain items</p> <p>Civic</p>	
35.	Andrew Eve (Local resident)	<p>Hello Walton Parish Council, I have read through the Walton Neighbourhood Plan. My input is one of an MK resident (with a family) living in Walnut Tree for 26+ years.</p> <p>I do not want to see any housing development in our Parish that does not fit in with the "original" plan of the Milton Keynes grid road system look and feel. A bad example of which is currently and recently taking place in the Broughton area; houses and flats are being built right next to major grid roads and transport thoroughfares; without the green barrier that has been used for many years in MK. I drive through these areas a couple of times a week; and it does not have the feel of MK; and I am glad I do not have to live in these areas. Your planning requirements for lower density housing (I presume) would match the existing average density for an area like Walnut Tree - if it does, I would support this. The new housing should be set back from any major road, and have the green barrier as per MK norm.</p> <p>I support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ideas for the social planning for play areas. - Selling off the infill/parcels of land that are currently not used for the community or housing uses (as long as any developer is not allowed a free hand). - Support for adding infrastructure to new housing developments, eg shops and community 	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Plan attempts to encourage development in line with the principles of MK and supporting the needs, look and feel of the area;</p> <p>The Plan attempts to secure development in keeping with the area while not stifling innovation of design.</p>

		<p>areas etc.</p> <p>One issue I disagree with; is the new housing style should be allowed to be more adventurous; and better styled than ALL of the current brick / rendered, and red tiled houses we all live in.</p> <p>We should allow designs that look more modern and fit in with our new city.</p> <p>There are some fantastic newer housing designs that really do work.</p> <p>I know I am one voice against many traditionalists; but please consider this request.</p> <p>I do not want to see MK and our parish turn into an "urban crush of housing" that does not fit the original MK feel - with some poor residents living right next to a road, with no front garden, or driveway / parking; looking straight onto a grid road or major thoroughfare; they can't walk to a local shop or school safely.</p> <p>I accept we need to expand; but lets do it sensitively.</p> <p>Regards Mr A. Eve WNP 12 – Grid Road System -</p> <p>I do not want to see any housing development in our Parish that does not fit in with the "original" plan of the Milton Keynes grid road system look and feel.</p> <p>A bad example of which is currently and recently taking place in the Broughton area; houses and flats are being built right next to major grid roads and transport thoroughfares; without the green barrier that has been used for many years in MK.</p> <p>I drive through these areas a couple of times a week; and it does not have the feel of MK; and I am glad I do not have to live in these areas.</p>	
36.	Natural England (Statutory consultee)	<p>Dear Mr Copeland, Planning consultation: Walton Neighbourhood Plan Draft Pre-submission. Location: Walton, Milton Keynes.</p> <p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 19 February 2016.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations (2012) (as amended) Wildlife And Countryside Act 1981 (As amended) Walton Neighbourhood Plan Draft Pre-submission</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us regarding this neighbourhood plan pre-submission draft. Having taken a look at the proposed policies within the plan and given the location of this neighbourhood Natural England would have the following comments to make.</p> <p>Walton Parish is 2.6km from Wavendon Heath Ponds Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and 4.9km from Howe Park Wood SSSI however there aren't any Natura 2000 designated</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p>

		<p>sites nearby hence further comment in this regard isn't needed as no impact is foreseen upon either. Milton Keynes has a good Green Infrastructure (GI) network and the neighbourhood plan emphasises maintaining this network and enhancing it where possible within new development in the plan area. The various sites which have been considered are all able to support well implemented Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in order to help cope with inevitable climate change impacts such as heavier rainfall events.</p> <p>Access to the footpath network is also mentioned and enhancements and additions to this are sought, which should be taken forward wherever possible in order to help promote walking and cycling, as these have huge benefits not only for the environment but also the local residents. The designation of new areas of open space formally should help protect these spaces from development in future and will allow more formal identification locally as open spaces.</p> <p>We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	
37.	Lesley Bell (Local resident)	<p>WNP 7 Community Foundation Reserve Sites - Re Wavendon Gate 1 (WG1) Issacson Drive/Wavendon Tower</p> <p>This small area of land protects the entrance to the estate from Groveway, the main road. If this land was used for yet more housing it would be contrary to the planning ethos and principles of Milton Keynes where housing is away from the main H and V roads protected by grass verges, trees and bushes. Leaving the area more or less as it is will be even more important with the development of housing on Towergate, resulting in such natural areas becoming few and far between.</p> <p>Over the years I have found that this area (WG1) has been home to a range of birds and animals which it has protected, including muntjac deer, foxes and pheasant. If you are seeking a community use I suggest it is developed as a natural habit encouraging and attracting a wide range of birds and creatures and a place of learning and appreciation for adults and children alike.</p> <p>Lesley Bell</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The land at WG1 is already allocated for some form of development for community use, the Plan attempts to support use that will benefit the local area, either directly via facilities or via change of use and financial contributions which can then be utilised to provide facilities in more suited locations.</p>
38.	Connolly Homes (Landowner)	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Walton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-submission draft February 2016 Representations on behalf of Connolly Homes Plc,</p> <p>I write on behalf of Bidwells' clients, Connolly Homes Plc, Joanna Mary Beale and Jacqueline Joan Ebeid ("client") in response to the present non-statutory stage reached of the Walton Neighbourhood Plan ("WNP"), namely the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft dated February 2016.</p> <p>Our client is the landowner/promoter of the Church Farm site referenced in the draft WNP.</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted;</p> <p>The Plan has been formulated with due regard to the NPPF and Local Plan, full details of which can be found in the Basic Conditions Statement.</p> <p>The NPWG re-iterates that the Plan has been prepared positively and in an objective manner, however the foreword has been amended.</p>

	<p>The development site is not within the Neighbourhood Plan Area as approved by Milton Keynes Council ("MKC") on 13 January 2015. However the paddock across which access will be achieved to the development site does fall within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. Our client is supportive of the draft plan and the work undertaken by the Working Group. However we wish to highlight our concern in terms of ensuring that the plan has regard to national policy and advice and contributes to the achievement of sustainable development (the first two basic conditions) and is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Development Plan, particularly the Milton Keynes Core Strategy, adopted in 2013 for the area to 2026 (the third basic condition).</p> <p>Beforehand, we express concern at some of the statements made in the Foreword – Residents Perspective by the Chair of the Working Group, Mr Stuart Copeland. For example, reference to '<i>Church Farm is a classic example where 350 homes are to be dumped on our doorstep with no infrastructure or facilities of their own</i>' does not in our view demonstrate that the plan has been 'positively prepared' and in an objective manner.</p> <p>It is well documented through the adopted Development Plan policies and policy guidance, that Church Farm forms part of a wider Strategic Land Allocation ("SLA") and each development parcel is making significant financial contributions towards new and improved infrastructure and/or on-site provision where appropriate.</p> <p>The development site is not within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. The Church Farm site is currently subject to a pending planning appeal which is scheduled to be heard by an Inspector on 26th and 27th April 2016. A s106 Agreement forms part of the planning appeal and sets out how the development will mitigate its impacts to meet the full suite of planning obligations sought by MKC. This will also meet the legal tests of planning obligations set out within the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (as updated) and Paragraphs 203 and 204 of the NPPF. Furthermore, any planning obligations need to conform to the 2010 Community Infrastructure Regulations, as amended ("CIL Regs"). The statement made by Mr Copeland is an unfair representation of discussions and proceedings which Mr Copeland has been party to for the past few years in his role as a member of the Church Farm Stakeholder Group. As discussed at the Church Farm Stakeholder Group meetings, the strategic access to serve Church Farm, has been designed to allow the construction of a grid road by a third party in the future to serve additional future development beyond church farm, should further land be allocated for development</p> <p>Objection</p> <p>We object to the detailed provisions of the pre-submission consultation draft WNP as it is not in general conformity with the adopted Milton Keynes Core Strategy 2013 ("MKCS") and does not contribute towards achieving sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practise Guidance (NPPG). The draft plan does not meet the Basic Conditions Tests as currently written, specifically in regard to draft policies WNP12 – Grid Road Extensions and WNP19 – Infrastructure Delivery. Currently, it has little regard to the impact of the draft policies on the delivery of the MKCS</p>	<p>Page 4 of the basic Conditions Statement outlines how Policy WNP12 Grid Road Extensions is in line with paragraph 58 of the NPPF, the policy also seeks to encourage sustainable movement within the Plan area, in line with Paragraphs 30 and 33 of the NPPF. WNP19 Infrastructure Delivery plans positively for the delivery of strategic infrastructure in the Plan area, in accordance with paragraphs 156 and 157 of the NPPF. Furthermore the Plan does not impose policies on land outside of the designated area.</p> <p>The policies are all in general conformity with the 2013 MKCS.</p> <p>Policy WNP12 Grid Road Extensions has now been amended and is entitled Grid Road Corridors; further amendments have been made to clarify the protection of the corridor as a whole and applies to any highway within the reserve area, not solely the road structure; the NPWG feel strongly that the grid system principles established for MK are upheld along with the guidance laid out in the MK Planning Manual; the reference to grade separated crossing in WNP19 Infrastructure Delivery has been amended to reflect the requirement from any provision of new highways within the grid road corridors; Contributions will be required from neighbouring areas where they impact the Plan area, in line with current planning principles.</p>
--	---	--

		<p>Strategic Land Allocation, which includes land at Church Farm, predominantly as it has not been positively prepared in this respect.</p> <p>Furthermore, as currently written the policies do not solely relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004 ("PCPA").</p> <p>Commentary</p> <p>National Planning Practice Guidance para 41-005-20140306 requires that:</p> <p>"If the policies and proposals are to be implemented as the community intended a neighbourhood plan needs to be deliverable. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that the sites and the scale of development identified in a plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened."</p> <p>A Neighbourhood Plan must give sufficient clarity to enable a policy to do the development management job it is intended to do; or have due regard to Guidance. Paragraph 042 of the Guidance goes on to explain that "A policy in a neighbourhood plan should be clear and unambiguous. It should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. It should be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence".</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 16 is concerned with Neighbourhood Planning, stating that neighbourhoods should "develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development" and "plan positively to support local development, shaping and directing development in their area that is outside the strategic elements of the Local Plan". It goes on to state in Paragraph 32 that "Development should only be prevented or refused where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe" and that in determining planning applications MKC is required "to apply the presumption in favour of sustainable development" under Paragraph 196 which includes ensuring that development is viable.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should be in general conformity with the existing Development Plan, in this case the strategic policies set out in the 2013 MKCS. Some of the requirements do not allow for sufficient flexibility for the deliverability of the Strategic Land Allocation within the adopted MKCS Policy CS5 "Strategic Land Allocation" and specifically, where it relates to the Church Farm part of the SLA.</p> <p>It is vital that the policies do not prejudice the delivery of any part of the neighbouring Church Farm allocation. The policies need to reflect that at the present time there is no certainty over whether any additional land will be identified for development further east in a future version of the Development Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that modifications to the plan will be necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("TCPA"), when it is formally submitted.</p> <p>We have set out our main concerns, and required amendments to the WNP below.</p> <p>Additions are shown in bold and underlined; deletions are shown with a strikethrough.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>General Policies: Section 18. Grid Road Extensions</p> <p>Our client acknowledges the need for Policy WNP12 to protect a grid road corridor to safeguard and future proof the grid road network for any 'significant expansion of Milton Keynes' as noted in its subtext i.e. future allocations to be made through the emerging Plan:MK or its successors.</p> <p>However as currently written, the policy itself sends a confusing message and has the potential to mislead. The current allocation in the 2013 MKCS does not require a grid road extension through the reserve land, being a development of up to 350 homes. This is agreed with MKC (as local planning and highway authority) through a Statement of Common Ground.</p> <p>Whilst the policy expressly relates to grid road extensions, in title and in the first paragraph, it widens to 'any future road extension' at the second paragraph. This is not justified. The policy should be amended to state:</p> <p>"Any future grid road extension for development beyond Church Farm through the reserve should be planned in accordance with the original principles of the grid road system. Development of a new grid road will be expected to include the following:"</p> <p>This would provide the necessary clarity to the draft policy to prevent prejudice to delivering the existing strategic land allocation which does not require a grid road extension and to conform to the MKCS Policy CS5 and the advice and guidance in the NPPF/NPPG.</p> <p>Furthermore, the text 'will be refused' appears in two places. In our view this is not positively worded and conflicts with NPPF Paragraphs 32 and 196. This text should be deleted and replaced by 'will be resisted'.</p> <p>General Policies: Section 25. Infrastructure Delivery</p> <p>We support the inclusion of a general policy on infrastructure requirements to support development proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan Area. It is not expressly stated that this applies to residential led schemes, but this is clearly what is inferred through the trigger of 'over 10 units' on page 41. The context paragraph could be updated to state 'over 10 residential units' for clarity, if that is the intention. Furthermore, the WNP covers the period to 2026 and an additional sentence could be added to reflect the Council's intentions to introduce a Community Infrastructure Levy during this period at which time the Context section risks being automatically out of date in its current form. A suitable form of words could be:</p> <p>Walton Neighbourhood Plan "Development of sites over 10 residential units will be required to pay s106 contributions to Milton Keynes Council and/or direct provision on-site (i.e. affordable housing, footpath links/redways) to mitigate the impact of development on the local area. If a Community Infrastructure Levy is introduced then these items remain a priority for delivery."</p> <p>However we object to the wording of the policy which extends to developments 'closely linked' to the Neighbourhood Plan Area. This introductory text should be deleted to conform to Section 38A of the PCPA.</p> <p>Specifically, the specific statement within Policy WNP19 seeking grade separated crossing</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>over Byrd Crescent for a H10 extension into Church Farm is misleading and relates to development that is not wholly within the Neighbourhood Plan Area. There is no evidence to support this statement. It is clearly documented within the Outline Planning Application (which is now the subject of an appeal), that the Church Farm scheme, at up to 350 homes, does not require a (H10) grid road extension with a grade separated crossing to be acceptable in highway safety terms. It can be served by a local road connection to/from the H10 roundabout. Notwithstanding this, a scheme of this size could not sustain the level of investment required to provide a H10 grid road extension. Clarity should be provided within the policy to separate the requirements for the allocated Church Farm site from that which may be necessary to serve any future expansion of the city to the east. As currently drafted, the policy conflicts with MKCS Policy CS5, the NPPF paragraphs 32 and 196 and the NPPG. This limb should be changed to read</p> <p>"Grade separated crossing over Byrd Crescent for any future H10 grid road extension into Church Farm"</p> <p>This would better reflect the objectives of the WNP12 which recognises that any plan-led expansion of the city to the east (i.e. beyond the current allocated SLA/Church Farm site) may require an extension to the grid road network. It also removes the link to the adjacent Church farm site which does not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>If Policy WNP12 and WNP19 are to form part of the adopted Development Plan for Milton Keynes once made, the policies should be capable of delivering a successful development for the existing SLA which is a strategic policy of the adopted MKCS to 2026.</p> <p>We have suggested some changes to ensure that the policies are sufficiently flexible in order to prevent any prejudice to the viability and deliverability of the allocated Site at Church Farm coming forward for development, in order to meet the basic conditions.</p> <p>I look forward to receiving confirmation of receipt of this submission and to be notified of all stages of the plan progress.</p>	
39.	Milton Keynes Development Partnership (Landowner)	<p>First of all, may I apologise for submitting these comments after your deadline but I've just returned to work after being on sick leave.</p> <p>MKDP comments on your Neighbourhood Plan are set out below. We are generally supportive of the Plan but have a few points of detail where we have concerns and which we would ask for you to review.</p> <p>The site at Walton Manor is owned by MKDP (page 15 of consultation document). With regard to the hedgerows within the site, we will undertake an ecological survey to be submitted along with any planning application and will try to integrate hedgerows into the development where practical.</p> <p>The site at Caldecotte 'site c' – we are content with the residential/mixed use designation</p>	<p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted; The NPWG acknowledge the undertaking to retain hedgerows at WNP1; The NPWG also note your point regarding the provision of parking, however the Policy does not require this, but simply aims to state parking would be supported if opportunity arose to address this need.</p>

		<p>for this site. We have two concerns. We have previously engaged with East/West Rail and Network Rail. Their proposals are still so uncertain and distant that they could sterilise most of this site for the long term. We will continue to liaise with them when we have a development proposal to see whether their plans have crystallised.</p> <p>The second issue is parking. It is unreasonable to expect MKDP to address parking issues relating to Caldecotte Lake Business Park which is not in our ownership. This should be addressed by the owners of the Business Park, the individual property owners and MK Council and their transport and parking strategy.</p>	
40.	National Grid (Statutory consultee)	<p>Dear Sir / Madam Walton Neighbourhood Plan Consultation SUBMISSION ON BEHALF OF NATIONAL GRID</p> <p>National Grid has appointed Amec Foster Wheeler to review and respond to development plan consultations on its behalf. We are instructed by our client to submit the following representation with regards to the above Neighbourhood Plan consultation.</p> <p>About National Grid National Grid owns and operates the high voltage electricity transmission system in England and Wales and operate the Scottish high voltage transmission system. National Grid also owns and operates the gas transmission system. In the UK, gas leaves the transmission system and enters the distribution networks at high pressure. It is then transported through a number of reducing pressure tiers until it is finally delivered to our customers. National Grid own four of the UK's gas distribution networks and transport gas to 11 million homes, schools and businesses through 81,000 miles of gas pipelines within North West, East of England, West Midlands and North London.</p> <p>To help ensure the continued safe operation of existing sites and equipment and to facilitate future infrastructure investment, National Grid wishes to be involved in the preparation, alteration and review of plans and strategies which may affect our assets.</p> <p>Specific Comments An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Gas Distribution – Low / Medium Pressure Whilst there is no implications for National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate / High Pressure apparatus, there may however be Low Pressure (LP) / Medium Pressure (MP) Gas Distribution pipes present within proposed development sites. If further information is required in relation to the Gas Distribution network please contact plantprotection@nationalgrid.com</p>	Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.

		<p>Key resources / contacts</p> <p>National Grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link:</p> <p>http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/</p>	
--	--	--	--