

THE CONSULTATION STATEMENT

This document has been prepared in line with regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended.) The document provides details of all the various forms of consultation that have gone into the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, from the first formation of a Steering Group to manage the process, through to formal submission to Milton Keynes Council of the Plan.

1. FORMATION OF THE STEERING GROUP

Initially this group was initially comprised wholly of councillors, along with the Town Clerk and Deputy Town Clerk. Advertisements were placed in the quarterly publication sent out by the Town Council in February 2013, asking for interested parties and local residents who showed interest in the Plan were invited to join. The Steering Group consists of voting members, these being seven Town Councillors (Cllrs Ian Carman – chairman, Paul Alexander, Roger Clarke, Mark Lombardo, Joan Sidebottom, Trevor Webb and Phil Winsor) and non-voting members, these being three members of the public, (David Blamires, Grant Gibson and Alan Mills - a retired senior planning officer) a senior planning officer from Milton Keynes Council, (Mark Harris) the Town Clerk (Shar Roselman) and the Deputy Town Clerk (Patrick Donovan). Interestingly, one resident who joined the Steering Group later was co-opted onto the Town Council as a Councillor.

2. CONSULTATION WITH ORGANISATIONS IN THE TOWN

2.1 Sports organisations

During 2012 and early 2013, when the vision was being established for the Town Council, Newport Pagnell Town Council met with various sports organisations in the town, including the Newport Pagnell Tennis Club, the Newport Pagnell Football Club, the Newport Pagnell Cricket Club, and the Newport Pagnell Bowls Club to establish what sporting requirements existed. It became evident through these face to face consultations that the principal need was for additional land at Willen Road Sports Ground, to expand facilities. The development of sports in the town became a key pillar of the Newport Pagnell Town Council vision, as a result of these meetings held with sports club.

2.2 The Newport Pagnell Partnership and the Newport Pagnell Business Association.

In November 2014, a meeting was held with both the Newport Pagnell Partnership and the Newport Pagnell Business Association, where the results of resident consultations were discussed, and proposed priorities for the Neighbourhood Plan were put forward. No issues were raised apart from the need to consider more parking in the town centre, and traffic through the town centre. The meeting was attended by the chairman of the Partnership and the Chairman of the Business Association.

3. CONSULTATIONS WITH RESIDENTS

3.1 The Issues Consultation

An open public consultation on issues surrounding development in Newport Pagnell was held on 20th and 21st December 2013. Every household was advised of the consultation through the quarterly publication, flyers were sent out to businesses and other groups in the town, and a banner was erected in the High Street. Over 300 people attended the consultation and nearly 100 residents responded to a survey sent out in the Town Council's quarterly publication, with responses made via the Town Council website, or returned in hard copy. The consultation was open format, without a prescriptive attempt to limit the public's thinking on issues or scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. The public was asked to make open comment on parts of the town which had been divided into zones. An example of comments made is appended. Open format questions were also asked. Responses to these are appended. The objectives of this consultation were:

- to outline to people why the Town Council believed in engaging in a Neighbourhood Plan was necessary,
- to establish concerns people had about development in the town
- to inform the scope of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan
- to explain how the Core Strategy requirements for housing land were likely to affect the Town.

Findings of the consultation:

- at that point in time two sites were listed in the SHLAA. One of these, the Portfields Farm site, was very contentious whilst the other, the Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve Site, was not.
- concerns were raised about school places if development took place.

- people were very worried about existing difficulties of getting medical appointments with General Practitioners.

The findings of this consultation provided a good starting point for the work of the Steering Group. Following actions included direct meetings with General Practitioners in the town and with schools in the town.

3.2 The Site Allocations Consultation

Following an analysis of all the sites available for development in Newport Pagnell, the Town Council proposed that several sites be considered in the Neighbourhood Plan. Three open door public consultations were held, on the 20th September, the 4th October and the 11th October 2014, at various venues around the Town. People were notified of these consultations by means of the Town Council's quarterly publication, delivered to every household in town, by flyers delivered to groups and organisations, through notices at the Town Council's community centres, and through a banner placed in the High Street. The objectives of this consultation were:

- To determine which sites were most preferred as development sites. At this stage of the consultation both the Tickford Field Farm sites, the North Crawley Road site, the Police Station and Muster sites, and the Marsh End/Tongwell Lane site were included as options for housing development. The plan suggested combining the two Tickford Field Farm sites and the North Crawley Road site into one comprehensive development.
- To establish what residents felt were the most important infrastructure requirements
- To establish any other concerns residents had with the proposed sites for development
- To establish whether the Town Council's view that a larger development site, taking approximately 1200 homes with commensurate development, including in particular a pre and primary school, and well-being facility was preferable to a smaller development of around 600 homes.

379 people came to these consultations, completing 277 questionnaires. The results from analysing the questions were extremely clear. Of the 277 completed questionnaires, 194 respondents were in favour of development on all of the sites suggested and 54 were in favour development on most of the sites suggested. Questions that were asked are detailed below:

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

1. Do you agree that the Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve site, the North Crawley Road Industrial site, and the Marsh End Road/Tongwell Lane site are the right places for development? Place your cross in the box below that you most agree with.

 Yes

 No

 Partially agree

2. If you have answered no to the above question please put the site where you would prefer development to take place in the box below bearing in mind the need to meet the Core Strategy Demands of 1760 homes in the rural area in a sustainable fashion, with the necessary infrastructure.

Preferred Development Site/s:

3. Below are the available development sites.

Please place these in order of preference for development, with 1 being the site you would most prefer for development and 10 being the site you would least prefer for development:

North Crawley Rd Industrial Site		Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve		Tickford Fields Farm East Site	
East of Willen Road		Marsh End Rd/Tongwell Lane		Portfields Farm	
Kickles Farm		Tesco Site		Police Station Site	
Mustard Factory					

One site listed by the Town Council for potential development, the Marsh End Road site, was not regarded favourably by residents. Accordingly the Town Council removed this site from the proposals. Residents were also in favour of development on brownfield sites, specifically on the Tesco site, preferring this to the Marsh End Rd/Tongwell Lane site.

A further written consultation was sent out to all homes in Newport Pagnell showing the amended list of sites. There was a 4.2% response rate, with 73% of respondents agreeing to the amended list of sites, and 16% unsure of whether they agreed or not. Only 11% did not agree. Refer to the results of this questionnaire which are shown below.

Use of Sites Survey – questionnaire
232 forms returned.

Question: The Neighbourhood Plan has now been amended to include the North Crawley Road Industrial Site, the Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve Site, the Tickford Fields Farm East Site, the Police Station site and the Mustard Factory Site for new housing. The Marsh End Road/Tongwell Lane Site has been removed for housing development from the Neighbourhood Plan.

1	Do you agree with the amended Plan?		
a	Yes	163	73%
b	No	24	11%
c	Don't know	35	16%
	Not stated	10	
2	Do you agree with the proposed uses for the other sites?		
	The land east of Willen Road to be reserved for a linear park extension, and recreation		
	Yes	183	83%
	No	17	8%
	Don't know	20	9%
	Not stated	12	
	Marsh End Road/Tongwell Lane to be reserved for a linear park extension		
	Yes	162	74%
	No	34	16%
	Don't know	22	10%
	Not stated	14	
	The Portfields Farm site to remain agricultural land		
	Yes	189	85%
	No	12	5%
	Don't know	21	9%
	Not stated	10	
	The Police Station site for housing with possible use for sheltered housing (retirement housing)		
	Yes	196	88%
	No	18	8%
	Don't know	9	4%
	Not stated	9	
	The land around Kickles Farm to remain agricultural land		
	Yes	190	84%
	No	11	5%
	Don't know	24	11%
	Not stated	7	
	Bury Common to remain common land		
	Yes	217	96%
	No	7	3%
	Don't know	2	1%
	Not stated	6	

The Tesco site to be designated as mixed use retail/residential, with limiting parameters, but this depends on whether Tesco intend opening a store

Yes	172	78%
No	25	11%
Don't know	23	10%
Not stated	12	

A questionnaire detailing infrastructure requirements was sent out to all homes in Newport Pagnell. Out of the 277 questionnaires returned the following supporting infrastructure was mentioned as being important should development take place:

INFRASTRUCTURE REQUIREMENT	NO. OF TIMES MENTIONED
School facilities	202
Local Park	197
Local Shopping	183
Bus Service	182
Cycle Tracks	174
Pre School	162
Town Centre enhancements	160
Play Area	156
Sports facilities	112

Other infrastructure requirements did not feature above 100 mentions, although additional General Practitioner provision was referred to time and again, despite this not being on the list provided.

3.3 The Housing Needs Analysis

A further written consultation was sent to all homes in Newport Pagnell, asking residents to comment on their requirements for housing mix and tenure. Of the 277 responses received, 31% of respondents stated that smaller homes (1 and 2 bedroom) are needed, whilst 24% asked for family size homes. There was therefore no clarity on whether a particular size of home was required, but there were indications that a range of house sizes were needed. In the latter four months of 2014, a member of the steering group visited every estate agent in Newport Pagnell. Estate agents could not confirm a trend for a particular size home. Milton Keynes Local Plan policy H9 calls for a mix of housing to be provided on a site of this magnitude, so that will in any event provide a good range.

However, the same consultation also demonstrated a need from residents to reserve some affordable housing for local residents, with 50% of respondents stating that residents in their homes would be seeking affordable housing in Newport Pagnell within the next 15 years.

A question asked during this consultation was whether the existing 30% affordable housing policy should be allocated differently between social housing and shared ownership. Milton Keynes Council Affordable Housing SPD currently allocates 25% to affordable/social rented housing and 5% to shared ownership/new build home buy. 64% of respondents said shared ownership component should be increased whilst 31% stated that the policy should remain the same. See the Newport Pagnell Housing Needs Analysis Survey results on www.newport-pagnell.org.uk

A meeting was held in April 2015 with the Housing Team at Milton Keynes Council, to discuss the inclusion of an affordable housing policy in the Neighbourhood Plan. The Policy amends the percentage of social rented housing from 25% to 20%, but increased the percentage of shared ownership homes from 5% to 10%. Milton Keynes Council agreed this was an acceptable amendment given the size and scope of development planned in the Neighbourhood Plan for Newport Pagnell. A further amendment to the Milton Keynes Housing policy was the retention of 10% of affordable housing for a period of six months, for people with a connection to Newport Pagnell. Given the substantial additional delivery of affordable homes this Neighbourhood Plan gives over the Core Strategy, this policy was ultimately agreed to.

3.4 The Employment Needs Analysis

In the above mentioned written consultation, questions were asked about employment needs in the Town. Whilst in general residents felt it would be desirable to have more employment, they were unable to pinpoint the type of employment required or to comment specifically on requirements. Results of this are appended to this document.

4. CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL SCHOOLS

Newport Pagnell Town Council set up meetings with every school principal of all schools in Newport Pagnell between 2013 and 2014. It became evident that there were significant differences between what the schools were reporting as Published Admission Numbers (PAN), and what the local authority was reporting. It also became apparent that apart from the Tickford Park School, there was little land for further development of classrooms on any of the school sites. School travel plans were out of date, and 'kiss and drop' facilities were in very short supply. As the local schools had good reputations, they were attracting children from further afield than the town itself, resulting in significant parking issues with many residents complaining. See appendix 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan for full details of this.

5. CONSULTATION WITH NEIGHBOURING PARISHES

Two consultations, in the form of meetings, were held with neighbouring parishes at the end of 2014 and early 2015, to discuss the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan. Whilst all parishes were invited, only the following attended: Olney Town Council, Great Linford Parish Council, Sherington Parish Council, Castlethorpe Parish Council, Hanslope Parish Council, Haversham Parish Council, and Stoke Goldington Parish Council.

The only issue raised by neighbouring parishes with respect to the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan was that of schooling. There was a need for the Olney Campus of Ousedale School to prepare to take on children from the villages, as the Newport Pagnell Campus would have to take additional children directly from the catchment area of the town. A concern was raised by Sherington Parish that schools planning should not result in the closure of the Sherington pre-and primary school, which takes children up to age 7.

6. CONSULTATION WITH GENERAL PRACTITIONERS

As this issue had been raised as a principal concern with residents, Newport Pagnell Town Council met with the two local GP surgeries in Newport Pagnell in 2013/14. On the question of provision of doctors, Newport Pagnell was found to have a sufficient supply against the NHS standard of 2500 patients per doctor. However, much of the provision was in the form of locums, and there had been significant movement of doctors. Newport Pagnell Medical Centre advised that shortage of space was becoming an issue, and that they would like to see a 'spoke and hub' distribution, whereby all non- GP services could be moved out of the centre to other premises. The management of the Kingfisher Surgery were in a temporary position, and this service was going out to tender. Notwithstanding, the management stated that as far as they were concerned the facilities were 'not fit for purpose,' although it was not clear whether this referred to space or quality issues.

7. CONSULTATION WITH LAND OWNERS/DEVELOPERS

Newport Pagnell Town Council has held open consultation meetings or telephonic discussions with the land owners or their agents of most of the sites identified in Newport Pagnell and in some cases this included potential developers. Minutes of meetings with developers and land owners can be sought from the Town Council.

Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve Site and the Tickford Field East Site: This site is partially in the ownership of Milton Keynes Council which has already agreed in principle to sell the Strategic Reserve land for housing development. At a meeting held with the Estate Team at Milton Keynes Council in April 2015, the Town Council discussed the development brief for this site, and the need for Milton Keynes Council to undertake their own development brief governing the sale of the land belonging to them. The remainder of this site is in the ownership of Mr and Mrs Parry, and their agent, Ian Gillespie of Carter Jones, met with the Town Council in 2014 advising that the owners were interested in selling, and that they would be interested in putting forward a proposal for the whole Strategic Reserve Site.

North Crawley Road Industrial Estate Site: A planning application for housing on this site has already been submitted and the Town Council has met with the developer and outlined the planning brief that it desires for this site.

Kickles Farm: Four different owners own this site. The Town Council met with them in 2014. They indicated a willingness to work together to treat this area as a single development unit. However, since then on the largest site within this group, owned by Mr Walsh, planning permission has been granted for a solar farm.

Portfields Farm Site: In 2014, a meeting was held with Smiths Gore, agents for the Society of Merchant Venturers who advised that the owners of this land were very interested in developing it.

Marsh End Road Site. This land is held by two owners, the Morgan/Saunders family and Mr Knapp. The Town Council met with on several occasions with one of these owners, Mr Morgan, and his developer, Andy Saunders of Heyford Homes Ltd, who advised that Mr Knapp has also agreed that his site could form part of a joint development. Mr Morgan indicated that he would be willing to release another section of his land of approximately 9.7 ha contained

within the site known as the Land East of Willen Road, for further development of playing fields if he could develop the Marsh End Road Site. Nevertheless, at a meeting of the Town Council held in February 2015, the Town Council did not believe it met resident's requirements and resolved to continue to exclude it from the Neighbourhood Plan

Land East of Willen Road. 59 hectares of this land belongs to one land owner, Mr Needham. Telephonic discussion with his agent, Paul Allen of Bidwells, indicated that he would be willing to lease land to the Town Council for extension of playing fields but was not interested in selling at this time. However, since then, Milton Keynes Council has opened up their site allocation consultation with a call for new sites, and the owner has asked that 1.1 ha of this land be allocated for housing. This small portion of the site suffers from significant flooding, being primarily in flood zone 3, and is likely to be ruled out at stage one of the assessment. For this reason, the Town Council has excluded it from potential development sites.

Nampak, East of Jenna Way. This site was only brought forward in the recent call by Milton Keynes Council for development land for their site allocation plan. Newport Pagnell Town Council had not previously considered it, as it is currently used as occupied employment land, and in consideration, has decided that the loss of employment land and its position between two other pieces of occupied employment land outweighs any positive factors associated with the brownfield nature of the site. A meeting has since been held with the manager of this site, who indicated that the long term future of the factory on the site was unknown at this point in time. He pointed out that the current size of their delivery vehicles makes turning on Howard's Way difficult.

Land off London Road. This site was also brought forward in the recent call for development land. It is well within the flood zone, and is likely to be ruled out at stage one by Milton Keynes Council. For this reason the Town Council has excluded it from potential development sites.

Police Station Site: Newport Pagnell Town Council has kept in constant contact with the police about their intentions with the site. A recent land sale has fallen through on the site.

Tesco Site: Newport Pagnell Town Council has met with Tesco, since their decision not to develop a store on this site. The net result was that Tesco has advised the Town Council that they intend to sell the land to the highest bidder. The site has been advertised, and the Town Council has met with two interested developers, Grand Union Housing Group and Barratt Homes. Both indicated a willingness to bid on this site for housing purposes. The Town Council made it clear to both parties that the Neighbourhood Plan requires some employment to remain on the site, which could be housed in the three historical buildings on site. These must be restored as part of the planning permission.

Mustard Factory: Newport Pagnell Town Council has not met with the owner of this site as the owner has not been found.

Since the Pre-planning Consultation a further meeting has been held with the owner of the land known as the Marsh End Road site. However, no further information emerged from this meeting, which repeated the comments made in the responses to this consultation.

8. CONSULTATION WITH MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL – PLANNING AUTHORITY

Throughout this process the steering group has maintained constant contact with the Local Planning Authority, Milton Keynes Council. The need for site allocation, suitable infrastructure, and the concerns raised by residents during the issues consultation, were complexities which required the two levels of local authority to work together closely. The Senior Planning Officer who was delegated the task of working with the Town Council on developing this plan came to all Neighbourhood Planning meetings, and acted as a source of communication between other departments at the Unitary Authority such as Schools, Planning and Highways, to ensure cross-authority and multi-service implications were considered. Discussion with the Local Planning Authority, based on the results of the Stage 1 community engagement activity showed conformity with existing planning policies.

8.1 Employment Needs

Milton Keynes Core Strategy outlines a requirement for 1.5 jobs for every new home built. However, Policy CS3, on Employment Land Supply, does not allocate any land in Newport Pagnell for further employment, whilst still providing sufficient land to meet the requirements for employment in the Core Strategy. Discussion held with the employment consultants for Milton Keynes Council, GVA Limited, indicated that on the whole employment land in Newport Pagnell was not highly regarded, meeting rural needs but not meeting the type of requirements for modern offices, manufacturing space or business space that had been highlighted as required in their survey. It was felt that expansion of such land would not contribute to the larger employment plan and that the scale of the opportunity for employment development in Newport Pagnell was not ideal. There is no separate rural employment policy, to parallel the separate housing policy for the rural areas, and the Town Council was advised that there is more than sufficient suitable employment land elsewhere in Milton Keynes to meet the requirement of 1.5 jobs for every new home built. Milton Keynes Council said, 'When the Core Strategy was adopted in July 2013 the Inspector examining the plan was satisfied that Milton Keynes had allocated sufficient employment land up to 2026. However, the new Local Plan Plan:MK goes up to 2031. Interim conclusions of an Employment Land Study conducted in 2015 indicate that on current trends in the period up to 2031, additional land will need to be allocated by Milton Keynes Council for office development within CMK. Although there was latent demand for logistics uses along the M1 corridor, the study concluded that there is an oversupply of sites for logistics along this corridor and occupiers are footloose and will locate elsewhere, if sites are not provided within Milton Keynes. In the circumstances for the purposes of advancing the Neighbourhood Plan, the steering group should proceed on the basis that

there is/will be a sufficient amount of employment outside of Newport Pagnell to meet future employment needs and this is a strategic matter for Plan:MK to deal with. MKC is not seeking to prevent new jobs coming forward within the rural area. With the roll out of high speed broadband across the Borough we are providing opportunities for more people to work from home and for rural businesses to compete on a more level playing field.'

8.2 Schooling

At a face to face meeting with Milton Keynes Council's local schools team, the issue of differences between the school's own view of Public Admission Numbers (PAN) and the local authority figures of PAN were discussed. It was noted that special needs students are reflected differently on the School's personal PAN lists, and that seasonal adjustments to the figures also had to be taken into account. Final figures were agreed with the local authority, which demonstrated clearly that if 600 new homes were built as per the requirements of the Core Strategy, there would not be a need for the provision of a new pre-and primary school, but that 1000/1200 new homes would definitely trigger the need for such a provision.

8.3 Medical Facilities

At a meeting held between Newport Pagnell Town Council, Milton Keynes Council, and the NHS Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group, Newport Pagnell Town Council pointed out that 1200-1400 new homes were outlined for development the Neighbourhood Plan and that this would have some impact on medical provision. The Town Council further mentioned the vast number of complaints raised by residents about difficulties in getting GP appointments, and mentioned what the existing GP services had said about facilities. The Associate Director of the NHS Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group said that access to appointments was not an issue at the moment. The Primary Care Transformation Board had just been set up which would focus on access at its next meeting. The Tariff Programme Manager at Milton Keynes Council added that MKC had just started consulting on the Site Allocations Plan and the Local Plan (Plan:MK). Consultation information will firstly go to MKC Planning and then, when a better idea of the direction of development is known, be fed through to this tripartite group.

8.4 Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) Analysis

Milton Keynes Council confirmed in writing after assessing the sites allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan, that the Plan would not be subject to a SEA Analysis.

9. SIX WEEKS CONSULTATION WITH STATUTORY AND OTHER CONSULTEES

At the time of the pre-submission consultation, Newport Pagnell Town Council and the steering group wrote letters to the following consultees, formally opening the consultation and advising them of the web address where the Neighbourhood Plan could be read, and calling for comments:

- 9.1 Land owners, tenants and interested developers
- 9.2 Milton Keynes Council Planning
- 9.3 Milton Keynes Council Highways
- 9.4 Milton Keynes Council Schools Liaison Team
- 9.5 Milton Keynes Council Infrastructure Coordination & Delivery Team
- 9.6 Milton Keynes Council Housing Policy & Development
- 9.7 Milton Keynes Council Planning Obligations
- 9.8 Milton Keynes Council's employment consultants – Bilfinger GVA
- 9.9 NHS Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group
- 9.10 NHS England - Area Team
- 9.11 Ward Councillors of Unitary Authority representing the area
- 9.12 The Newport Pagnell Business Association
- 9.13 The Newport Pagnell Partnership
- 9.14 Adjoining Parish Councils.
- 9.15 Housing Associations in the area
- 9.16 Affected Utility Companies and water and sewerage organisations.
- 9.17 The Environment Agency
- 9.18 Thames Valley Police
- 9.19 Buckinghamshire Fire Service.
- 9.20 Natural England
- 9.21 English Heritage

- 9.22 The Coal Authority
 9.23 The Homes and Communities Agency
 9.24 Businesses in the town
 9.25 Tele-communications agencies including the Mobile Phone Operators Association <http://www.mobilemastinfo.com/> and local mobile phone operators.
 9.26 British Telecom
 9.27 The National Grid
 The Coal Authority (duplicated above)
 9.28 Religious bodies in the community.
 9.29 The Carnival Committee
 9.30 The Christmas Lights Committee
 9.31 The Re-enactment Committee
 9.32 The Disabled Swimming Club
 9.33 Places for People – partner in leisure of the Town Council
 9.34 Public transport providers operating within the area
 9.35 Local schools
 9.36 Medical centres
 9.37 Network Rail
 9.38 The Highways Agency
 9.39 Community Foundation
 9.40 Community Action MK
 9.41 MK Equality Council
 9.42 MK Council of Faiths
 9.43 Disability Action Group
 9.44 Member of Parliament for MK North
 9.45 Member of Parliament for MK South

Residents received the Town Council's quarterly publication delivered to their homes advising them of where they could find the Plan, either electronically or in hard copy, and how to make comments on the plan. Hard copies of the plan were placed in the Library and in the Town Council Offices. A notice was placed in the Phonebox monthly magazine about the Neighbourhood Plan, and letters were delivered to all local businesses.

The following table shows all the consultation responses, and the steering group's decisions on whether or not to alter the Neighbourhood Plan, based on those responses. Email addresses and IP addresses of individual respondents have been redacted to preserve their privacy.

List of Consultees who responded as part of the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation on the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan.						
Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan	Pre-submission Consultation Log (Reg 14)					
Type	Contact Name Consultee /email	Organisation	Date letter/link emailed	Comments	Action taken by NPTC in response	Amendments to NP
Local planning authority	Rod Aitken - Senior Estates Surveyor	Milton Keynes Council	28/05/2015	Comments on amending Tickford Fields Estate Development Brief. This email sent in before the pre-submission consultation started.	No amendments to the Brief. It is anticipated that a further brief will be completed by the Milton Keynes Council Urban Design team, adding to the existing brief with design principles and transport requirements after plans have been submitted and the Transport Assessment has been done.	No change to the Neighbourhood Plan based on this comment as Health Check on plan indicated Brief an important part of Plan.
	Bob Wilson - Development Plans Manager	Milton Keynes Council	29/05/2015	Suggested amendments to the Town Mayor's introduction on page 3 of the N/Plan	Amendments incorporated in the Mayor's on 01/06/2015	Change has already been made.

Local planning authority	Sam Dix - Planning Officer Development plans	Milton Keynes Council	09/07/2015	1. Best practice suggests that Neighbourhood Groups need to ensure the results of the final consultation are carefully reflected in submission document and consultation statement. Don't rush plan. 2. Consider adding more consistent paragraphs numbering. 3. Ensure month of submission is added in. 4. Remove reference to retail mix. 5. Remove 'unfortunately' in paragraph 3 section 1. 6. Change 'favoured' for 'potential' in second para. page 5 clause 3.22. 7. Worth referring to the fact that NP are entitled to allocate more but not less housing than Local Plan, in para. 184. page 7. item 3.23. 8. Consider removing diagrams of site on page 28-30 or move them to before section 7.2. 9. Add in that this tenure split on page 50 has been agreed with the Housing Team at MKC.	Changes will be made to NP as per next column.	The steering group considered the advice not to rush submission. Changes to the Neighbourhood Plan will be made slowly and with care, having been considered in depth by the steering committee. Paragraph re-numbering was considered but rejected, as easier for residents to read this way. Month of submission has been added. Point 4, the reference to retail mix will be removed. Point 5, the word unfortunately will be removed. Point 6, the steering group considered the word favoured to be more suitable. Point 7, a reference to this will be made in the Plan, Point 8, Diagrams will be retained in position but further clarification added in text. Point 9, the Neighbourhood Plan will now include a statement that the tenure split has been agreed with the Housing Team at Milton Keynes Council.
	Simon Sims - Programme Lead, Setting and School Sufficiency and Access	Milton Keynes Council	10/07/2015	Pleased that Neighbourhood Plan largely reflects discussions and correspondence previously held. With regards Paragraph (h) of Policy NP2: I confirm that our desire would be for the site to be transferred to us prior to first occupation rather than 100th, as currently stated therein.	Changes will be made to NP as per next column.	A change will be made in the Neighbourhood Plan to alter occupation prior to school site provision to 1st home rather than the 100th.
Local businesses	Mark Landry	MK Network Solutions	02/06/2015	Impact of Tesco redevelopment on parking in Priory Street	Change made to NP as per next column.	Any development here should be subject to a later resident's parking survey, which will be included in the Neighbourhood Plan.
Landowners	Andy Saunders	Marsh End Road/Tongwell Lane	04/06/2015	Why no development of Marsh End Road site?	Meeting held post consultation with owner. Notes are available on request.	See next item, Leybourne Estates.

<p>Landowner's agent - Leybourne Estates representing landowners of Willen Road/Marsh End Road/Tongwell Lane site.</p>	<p>Rachel Collinge</p>	<p>Leybourne Estates</p>	<p>09/07/2014</p>	<p>1. Marsh End Rd site scores higher than Tickford Fields East. 2. What evidence is used to grade flooding, viability, access, drainage and site specific constraints? Request clearer justification. 3. Site can come forward earlier than others 4. Site can deliver £4,000,000 in contributions. 5. A strong landscape edge would be retained. 6. Site is lower grade agricultural. 7. Site is already urbanised by power lines. 8. Land has frequent trespassers. 9. Works can alleviate traffic issues. 10. A footpath would be retained and landscape character would be protected. 11. Would provide additional recreational land. 12. Traffic light system is crude in balancing floodplain issues not understanding the difference between 1:100 year and 1:1000 year categories. 13. Site has scored well but is side stepped.</p>	<p>No change to Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>1. The site does score higher, but has more Ambers. See also point 13. 2. There is a key to the traffic light system at the top of the Collective Site Assessment form, Appendix 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Amber indicates current problems to overcome. It does not mean the problems cannot be solved. Part of the site is within a flood plain, access is not straightforward and would need remodelling of March End Rd/WillenRd/Tongwell junction. Drainage. It is a low lying site with an adjacent flood plain. SUDs would need to replicate greenfield run-off rate. Site specifics - overhead lines to sub-station, noise issues from M1 and A422. 3. No evidence provided. N.Crawley Rd has current planning application. Tesco site available. 4. All sites are required to contribute S106. 5&6. Agree with these comments. 7. Hence amber rating to site. 8. No comment. 9. Requires a Transport Assessment, but very strong public objections to this site, regarded as exacerbating current traffic congestion problems on Marsh End Rd at peak times. 10. Footpath along Tongwell Lane lies outside of site, so would be retained in any event. 11. Offer of land for playing fields would be a positive contribution to town's facilities, but outweighed by other factors. 12. Traffic light system follows methodology used by MK Council in site assessment. The Amber light to flooding just indicates an issue to be addressed whether flood zones 2 or 3. Continued below...</p>
--	------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------	---	---	---

					continued/...	<p>13. Of the greenfield sites, this site scored slightly better than either Tickford Fields Farm sites. However, the Tickford Field Farm Strategic Reserve Site had been identified in the Milton Keynes Local Plan 2005 as the favoured site for housing after 2011. The public response to the 1st Neighbourhood Plan Consultation strongly identified the need to provide the infrastructure to accompany any new housing. In developing the evidence base, it became clear that identifying sufficient sites just to meet the Core Strategy target, would not deliver required infrastructure. Selecting land at Tickford Farm East to be developed conjointly with the Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve site would generate the scale to deliver new pre- and primary schools, a local centre, health/well-being facility and NEAP, to make development sustainable. The Marsh End Road/Tongwell site is a smaller, self-contained site on the other side of town, with no opportunity to create the scale of the development able to deliver this infrastructure. This site attracted the most public opposition at the 2nd public consultation, due to perceived traffic congestion.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---------------	--

Landowners agent - David Lock Associates Ltd on Portfields Farm	Joanne Cave	David Lock Associates	10/ 07 /15	<p>1. Access can be gained via extension of one of the existing roads within Poet's Estate. 2. Development will improve environment by provision visual and noise attenuation to M1. 3. Air quality could be improved with physical buffer. 4. Provision of the former quarry and woodland would make accessible open space and facilitate maintenance of this. 5. The Poet's Estate provides a weak edge to northern boundary. Allocation of land would set a long term accessible green edge. 6. Site Assessment does not reflect the positive contribution of allocating land. Key areas: access - rated Amber should be Green; drainage rated Amber not a flood risk and SUDS will form part of the offer; 5 pylons lines - just one small electric pylon; noise from M1 and A422, setbacks and boundary treatment can ensure housing area not subject to adverse impacts, and would improve noise impact on Poet's Estate; Economic viability factors are not unique to this site; harm to landscape does not consider open space that can be provided; subject to S106 to provide for education and health facilities, so constraints less than suggested. 7. Concerns that housing capacity at TF Estate over estimated. 8. Deliverability. More deliverable than Tickford Fields Farm and North Crawley site.</p>	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>1. Access could be via the Poets estate, but would require demolition of several houses, or be via Lakes Lane if widened. 2. Development would screen existing houses, but would expose new development to noise & visual intrusion, being closer to M1. 3. Would expose more houses to poor air quality. 4. Access to open space would be a benefit, but does not outweigh disadvantages of site. 5. Current edge satisfactory; proposed housing would be on top of ridge and more visible from M1. 6. Traffic light system evaluates current site. Access is Amber, as no simple direct access to a public highway. Drainage is rated Green. Site specifics is rated Green. Neighbouring impact is Amber - noise from M1 only, not from A422. Harm to Landscape is Amber - site lies in Area of Attractive Landscape, and development on ridge more visible from Ouse Valley. 7. Tickford Field Farm 1200 houses on 45.56 ha equates to 26.3 dwellings per ha, gross. Estimated number of houses takes into account allowances for flood plain, school site, main roads and open space. 8. North Crawly Rd site already has a planning application submitted. Tesco site back on market. Development of Portfields Farm reliant on acquiring houses on Poets for access, or upgrading Lakes Lane.</p>
---	-------------	-----------------------	------------	---	----------------------------------	--

Landowner's agent - Carter Jones - Tickford Field Strategic Reserve Site	Ian Gillespie	Representing Mrs Parry, landowner and Wellbeck Strategic Land/ leading specialist in field of strategic land.	10/07/2015	<p>1. Welcome work undertaken by Steering Group, support allocation of land to TF Estate. 2. Plan is prudent given that Plan MK will roll forward housing requirements to 2031. Should be able to avoid need to accommodate piecemeal development during this period. Only site in town capable of delivering infrastructure requirements. 3. Support proposal for increase of shared ownership dwellings. 4. Sites are known as Tickford Field Estates. Word 'estate' underplays a high quality urban extension. 5. Density should include the insertion of the word 'around' . 6. No requirement for point d) in policy NP2. 7. May be a benefit for emergency vehicular access via Chicheley St. 8. Need flexibility re requiring all dwellings to be located within 400m of bus stop. 9. On site health/wellbeing facility to be discussed with NHS commissioning body. 10. Suggest play area may not be best sited next to school. 11. Not all trees /hedgerows on site of high quality. 12. Relocation of waste recycling considered as part of master planning process. 13. Criterion p) is unnecessary as planning application will need to be accompanied by flood risk assessment. 14. Too early to provide initial framework as per figure 13. Should be noted that this figure is indicative. 15. Amend criterion (b) of Policy NP 5 to refer to provision of 35% shared ownership housing and 65% affordable rent housing. 16. Question whether the whole estate should be 20 mph zone. 17. Design brief not required now. At master planning stage commit to building heights. 18. Constraint in plan as to where school goes. May be better option.</p>	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan as indicated in next column.	<p>1 & 2 & 3. No comment. 4. Retain term Estate. Tickford Fields Farm will be similar in size to Poets and Green Park Estates. 5. Density. NP complies with Local Plan policy H8. 6. Retain Policy NP2 (d) Transport Assessment in Plan. 7. Development Brief does make provision for emergency access from Chicheley Street. However, this is not one of the 3 access roads required by plan. Amend NP2(e) to 'no other access than for pedestrians and cyclists, or essential emergency vehicles, will be allowed from Chicheley Street.' 8.Keep 400 m limit. Para. 7.16 of MK Local Plan specifies 400 m max. 9. Provision required, even if not commissioned GP surgery. 10. NP2(k). The Neighbourhood Play Area should be located adjacent to the school. Change to preferably be located. 11. NP2(l) Change to The development shall preserve <u>the majority</u> of trees and hedges on site. 12. Agreed. 13. Keep NP2 (p). 14. Agreed to add 'indicative' into text. 15. Retain NP5 as 65% social rent. However, Affordable Housing SPD adopted March 2013 specifies 25% of units for rent at a range of rental levels up to 80% of market rents, including approx. 5% at a level broadly equivalent to social rent, so is negotiable with MKC. 16. Retain 20mph zone. 17. Retain Development Brief. 18. Plan now listed as indicative.</p>
Land and property professional - Robinson Hall	A.H. Barr	Robinson Hall	10/07/2015	<p>1. We support policies NP1 and NP2. 2. We agree first three sites listed under policy NP1 should be brought forward as a composite development, rather than just the Strategic Reserve site. 3. The scheme will deliver a small over provision of housing, but the proximity of Newport Pagnell to MK will minimize impact on rural areas by protecting greenfield sites. 5. May be scope to use adjacent land to north east to assist with surface water drainage. 6. Links to major transport networks will not impact adversely on historical town centre. 7. Equally important to ensure development integrates with town via cycle and pedestrian links. 8. Agreed there should be regular reviews of plan to allow for further expansion of town if required. 9. North eastern direction of travel is supported in this regard.</p>	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	<p>1-4. No comment. 5. Land NE includes Anglia Water lakes, not in developer's control. 6-9. No comment.</p>
The Coal Authority	No response made					

Homes and Communities Agency	No response made					
Natural England	Charlotte Frizzell	Natural England	09/07/2015	Natural England does not consider that this application poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment for which we would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	
The Environment Agency	No response made					
Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission	No response made					
Historical England	Robert Lloyd-Sweet	Historic England	10/07/2015	1. characteristics of zones useful - more influential to include characteristics that are positive that new development should seek to retain. 2. Integrate historical processes that have contributed character into plan policies making it a material consideration. 3. Identify buildings noted in Conservation Area Review as making a contribution to the character of the area. 4. Review County Council's Historical Environment Record to see whether non designated archaeological sites are known to survive. 5. On page 15 point out whether the area is considered to have any potential for the survival or archaeological remains. 6. Use County Council's urban survey document as evidence base. 7. Specify within development brief how trees and hedgerows are to be retained. 8. Consult County Council's Archaeology Service to identify reasons for designating TF Estate as a heritage interest area. Potential for a Roman road, and minor Roman Settlement. 9. Potential for presence of unidentified archaeological remains on TF Estate. Require applicant to undertake a phased programme of investigation. 10. Ensure layout takes account of remains to leave them undisturbed. Use suggested wording re Archaeological Assessment. (See response for wording) 11. Draw historical buildings on plan for Policy NP3. 12. Explain connection between former Salmons Motor Carriage Works and Aston Martin Cars.	Changes to Neighbourhood Plan as indicated in next column.	1. Main development site will create its own character. The Tesco site abuts the Conservation Area and listed buildings, so will have to take cues from both. 2. Historical information listed on Bucks County records does not contribute materially to the largest development in this plan. It does affect the Tesco site. See comment no 5. 3. The Neighbourhood Plan does not review the Conservation area, as this was done in 2010. 4. The only archaeological finds on TFF site are a confined inhumation, possible remains of Mark Slingsby 1677. On former Renny Lodge site, finds of late iron age/romano british ceramics, 3 ditches enclosures, road side ditches defining line of roman road, suggesting small roadside settlement. It is speculated that a roman road may cross the TFF site. 5. All development sites have the potential for archaeology. The Tesco site and Union St sites have already had an archaeological assessment as part of submitted planning applications 15/01028/FUL and 11/02686/DISCON. 6. Will place this document in our evidence base. 7. Not required.

				13. Include suggested wording for policy NP3. 14. For Policy NP4, clarify how a detrimental impact on surroundings would be assessed. (See wording suggested)	continued/...	8. Have consulted MKC Archaeological Officer. 9. Archaeological survey required by NP2 (p) 10. Current evidence shows no signs of there being any significant finds requiring preservation on site. Change Neighbourhood Plan to include wording suggested by Historical England. 11. Historical buildings are shown on plan for Policy NP3. 12. Change Neighbourhood Plan to show connection between Carriage Works and Aston Martin. 13. A survey, including trial trenching, has already been done. No need for further wording. 14. Very cumbersome wording suggestions. 1 & 2 assumes that the site will affect Conservation Area and/or heritage assets, which many may not. Item 3 requires an evaluation of Character Areas as part of item 1 above. The steering groups hold that the area will create its own character. Change Neighbourhood Plan to say, the impact of development will be determined based on protecting heritage assets and their setting, enhancing the character and appearance of the locality, and protecting the amenity of surrounding properties.
Network Rail	No response made					
Highways Agency	No response made					
Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003	No response made					
Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority	No response made					

NHS Commissioning Body replacing the Primary Care Trust.	No response made					
A person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(b)	No response made					
A person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(c)	No response made					
Sewerage and water undertakers	No response made					
Voluntary bodies	No response made					
Bodies representing interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in np area	No response made					
Religious organisations	No response made					
Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the np area	Alan Terhoven MD email: Alan.Terhoven@eu.nampak.com	Nampak Plastics	22/06/2015	Nampak Plastics have a large vehicular fleet, which may prove problematic to Nampak and residents.	Meet with Nampak as requested. Highlights of meeting included in Consultation Statement above. No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Covered by need for a Transport Assessment as discussed in NP2 and NP3. It may require an alteration to Howard Way and Jenna Way junctions with North Crawley Road.
Bodies which represent the National Grid	Julian Austin n.grid@amecfw.com	Amec, Forster and Wheeler	01/06 15	National Grid has identified that it has no record of high voltage electricity assets and high or intermediate pressure gas pipelines and apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area. There may be low pressure apparatus on site	No change to Neighbourhood Plan	
Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the np area	No response made					

Resident Comments	Contact Name Consultee	IP Address or email	Date letter/link emailed	Comments	Action taken by NPTC in response	Amendments to NP
Survey Monkey response 1	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	8 07 15	1. Understand the need for a larger development, but concerned traffic at Tickford Roundabout will not cope unless improved. 2. Traffic towards town centre and parking supply on Tickford site of town will also be a problem. 3. Location of local centre deep into the Tickford area would affect viability - consider location near North Crawley Rd. 4. Provide an amenable route to the existing public footpath towards Chicheley. 5. Place preservation orders on valuable trees in the area.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	1. Covered by Transport Assessment. 2. Town Centre parking improvements contribution required by NP2. 3. Alternative positions for Local Centre shown on Development Brief Plan. 4. Footpaths will be integrated into development. 5. TPO at detailed planning stage.
Survey Monkey response 2	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	7 07 14	I support the provision of houses on the Tickford Field Estate Site	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	
Survey Monkey response 3	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	29/06/2015	Principles of the plan very good. Concerned re bottleneck of traffic on North Crawley Rd and A509. Nothing in plan to remedy this. Need better direct redway access toward Willen.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Transport Assessment will address highway issues. There are contributions to redways in the plan.
Survey Monkey response 4	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	12/06/2015	Consider the impact of new housing at Tickford Fields on Children's Centre Services at Tickford Meadows. Will increase demand on a small centre	No change to Neighbourhood Plan. If further capacity required, MKC can be built into pre-school on TFF. Extra hours will be required, not additional building.	Tickford Meadows includes information service which gives parents access to support and advice including family support, health services, childcare, preschools, schools, housing associations, employment services, job centre plus, MK Act, Relate, CAB and many more.
Survey Monkey response 5	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	15/06/2015	I am in favour of the plan.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan	
Survey Monkey response 6	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	12/06/2015	1. Plan well thought through. 2. Important to push Tesco site. 3. Tickford Farm sites need to ensure right infrastructure of shops, doctors, schools and roads. 4. Never consider building on Bury Common	No change to Neighbourhood Plan	1. Covered by Transport Assessment. 2. Town Centre parking improvements contribution required by NP2. 3. Alternative positions for Local Centre shown on Development Brief Plan. 4. Footpaths will be integrated into the development. 5. TPO at detailed planning stage.
Survey Monkey response 7	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	08/06/2015	Understand the need for more homes to provide infrastructure. Infrastructure should be in place first.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan	Covered by NP2.
Survey Monkey response 8	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	08/06/2015	1. Environmental agency should improve river frontage. Weeds and silt layering. 2. Make adjustments at roundabouts. 3. Stop lorries parking.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan	1. Not in control of Neighbourhood Plan. Refer to Environmental Agency. 2. Addressed by Transport Assessment. 3. Parking regs. not in scope of Neighbourhood Plan.

Survey Monkey response 9	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	07/06/2015	1. Provide new access of bye-pass to North Crawley Road. 2. Ban lorries in town centre. 3. Retime bin lorries. 4. Improve bus services.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	1. Subject to Transport Assessment. 3. Waste provision MKC responsibility. 4. Bus route in NP7.
Survey Monkey response 10	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	04/06/2015	1. Concerned that traffic on A509 will impact on new planned developments in Sherington. 2. What about schools in villages that must feed into Newport Pagnell Schools	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Sherington development very small, approx. 40 homes which will not impact significantly on the A509. Any additional development in Sherington could be catered for at the new primary school if necessary.
Survey Monkey response 11	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	02/06/2015	Core Strategy required 450 homes not 1400. This will swamp Newport Pagnell	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Scale of development will create needed facilities.
Survey Monkey response 12	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	01/06/2015	Most of proposals seem sensible. Worried about extra 15 homes on Police Station site feeding into the Town Centre.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Too small to have any significant impact.
Survey Monkey response 13	Unknown - optional to provide	Redacted for privacy	01/06/2015	Would like to see Carnival's use of the meadow specifically mentioned.	No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Not built development within the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.
Resident Comments received by email.	Contact Name	Email Address	Date letter/link emailed	Comments	Action taken by NPTC in response	Amendments to NP
email response 1	Tracy Cussell	redacted email	01/06/2015	1. If NPTC say no to the Core Strategy what could MKC do? 2. Who will the builders be? 3. Will the roads be wide enough? 4. How do I get my children onto the housing register?	emailed response from the Town Clerk dated 1/6/2015 in answer to these questions. No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	1. Neighbourhood Plan must conform to Core Strategy. 2. Unknown at this time. 3. Includes roads wide enough to take buses on main development. 4. Not pertinent to Neighbourhood Plan.
email response 2	Mike Bowley	redacted email address	08/07/2015	1. Understand the need for a larger development, but concerned traffic at Tickford Roundabout will not cope unless improved. 2. Traffic towards town centre and parking supply on Tickford site of town will also be a problem. 3. Location of local centre deep into the Tickford area would affect viability - consider location near North Crawley Rd. 4. Provide an amenable route to the existing public footpath towards Chicheley. 5. Place preservation orders on valuable trees in the area. 7. Although it is stated that Bury Field is protected from housing this should equally apply to car parking. 8. Perceived criticism of charity shops - not justified by the actual density present. A positive commentary on the overall balance of the town would be better.	Minor change to Neighbourhood Plan.	1. Covered by Transport Assessment. 2. Town Centre parking improvements contribution required by NP2. 3. Alternative positions for Local Centre shown on Development Brief Plan. 4. Footpaths will be integrated into development. 5. TPO at detailed planning stage. 7. Not specified but paragraph 7.1 says Bury Common is to remain as Common Land. 8. Re wording paragraph 5.3, delete sentence 'it is fair to say this makes Newport Pagnell a charity shop destination.'

email response 3	Stuart Watt	redacted email address	08/07/2015	After reading your comments on MKWeb news page about building new homes in Newport Pagnell, I'm failing to see how building a new primary school will benefit local people when the secondary school is already oversubscribed.	Stats on school number presented to Mr Watt as well as plan to extend Olney Campus. No change to Neighbourhood Plan	Process included consultation with schools. Following discussion with Olney Town Council, it proposes to extend Olney campus.
email response 4	Rachel Waterson	redacted email address	10/07/2015	Concern raised by residents in Redhouse Park. Ousedale School not zoned for our residents. We should be in Newport Pagnell as closest to us, and closer than other zoned area	Responded with emailed reply that zoning MKC function not ours. Meeting set up between Great Linford Parish and Newport Pagnell Town Council to discuss this matter. No change to Neighbourhood Plan.	Catchment areas are the responsibility of MKC Education, who was consulted on this plan.