

Responses to Pre-Submission 2nd Draft Consultation 2018 updated following Oakridge Park Consultation

| Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation 2018 | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|
| No. | Comments submitted by | Summary of comments | How the Plan was amended |
| 1. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: Hello, I have just come across a Facebook update about the proposal to extend the disabled car park and to build an additional one that will be where the orchard is growing. I am writing to raise my objections.</p> <p>Whilst I understand that visitors parking in the estate causes problems I do not believe this is the answer. The disabled car park is not full and when it is I noticed they do not all have disabled badges. There is plenty of parking for the country park near Asda but it is not signposted.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that the current car park is signposted and that more pressure is applied to council to adopt the roads, then double yellow lines can be applied through key spots in Selkirk - it is not only visitors who cause problems with parking, but residents as well.</p> <p>I would like to be kept up to date on the proposals. Our estate is beautiful and does not need any more building on it. Please don't destroy a lovely area with this proposal</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC.</p> |
| 2. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I would like to comment on the plans to increase the disabled car park and add an additional car park on Kerry Hill.</p> <p>Both these measures are totally unnecessary and will encourage more people on to the estate which is the opposite of what is needed. We need people to use the perfectly good car park that is already available and stop taking short cuts by trying to park in residential areas.</p> <p>The Parks Trust need to make it very clear where the parking is located and that it is restricted to that area. As a resident of Kerry Hill I am very uncomfortable with the idea of introducing traffic to a single carriageway block paved road. All the houses are very close to this road and many have animals, children or elderly people living there. It is not a suitable area for a carpark as access to Kerry Hill is not easy and it is not designed as a thoroughfare of this type.</p> <p>A lot of the parking issues on the estate arise from the lack of adoption of the roads. Once this is finally complete there will be preventative and legal measures</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC.</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>to stop the inconsiderate and anti-social parking that goes on. This should be the most pressing matter. We do not need to lose valuable, beautiful park land in order to encourage users, it is a well used and well appointed country park and does not need any more parking. I believe this proposal has arisen due to a misunderstanding about the wishes of the residents. We do not want more car parking on the estate, we don't want visitors (unless availing themselves of the never fully used disabled carpark) entering the estate as there is no need to. The parking is perfectly adequate and is not being fully utilised off the estate. The Parks Trust should be making it clear as much as possible that visitors shouldn't drive onto the estate as this is not the location of the parking. Better signage from the main road (perhaps brown signs?) would greatly assist the residents and visitors.</p> | |
| 3. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: Can you please clarify some of my understanding on the recent plan that has been sent out for Oakridge Park and the surrounding area. Is the plan suggesting that you get rid of the Orchid area opposite Kerry Hill and replace this with a car park?</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October. Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> |
| 4. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: My concern is the proposed car park in Kerry Hill. It is difficult to see where and how access will be if approved. Many of the houses in Kerry hill are very close to the road with just a pavement between the road and house. When the door is opened you almost have to step onto the road. Any small children would be likely to run straight out so it is a safety issue. Not sure if this is acceptable for me to raise this here or if I need to send my views on a specific form. Any info on how to see more detail and what/how to give my views would be welcome.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October. Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> |
| 5. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>SNP17 Stantonbury Campus: My question is regarding the relocation of Stantonbury campus (SNP 16) You state it caters for 7-13 but it has always been 13-18,</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, the years '7-13' is in reference to the year groups and not the age of</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|
| | | which is true please? Is the school proposed going to be a campus or a first and middle school? | the children attending. There is no proposal for a change from the current campus to a first and middle school. |
| 6. | Resident of Oakridge Park | SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I've seen the latest draft of the neighbourhood plan and would like to raise an objection to the increased car parking proposed on Oakridge Park. There is already ample parking served by the disabled parking in the middle of Oakridge Park as well as StonePit and Asda car parks which are rarely full. I would much rather further development went on improving the paths in the expanded Stanton Low Park. The plans detailed seem to undo lots of previous planting and planning work - which compounds the changes as both unnecessary and a double cost. Please can you let me know that email has been received and if I need to raise my objection through another route. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19 th October. Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. |
| 7. | Resident of Oakridge Park | SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I have seen plans for an extension to the disabled car park and a new car park in Kerry hill. I am totally opposed to this development as the Parks Trust are unable to look after the disabled car park. I have emailed the Parks Trust and the parish council many times about the miss use of the disabled car park. Planning permission was granted for a disabled car park and it is not used as such. We have excess rubbish, loud noise from the park and cars at night using the car park as a race track. The Parks Trust have done nothing to sort the issues out and the residents have to put up with the noise and rubbish. Many people that live here have to pick other people's rubbish up most days. There has been no thought of what the residents want and the roads are not big enough to take more traffic with the additional cars. If they want to make the car park bigger do it behind Asda as then it does not impose on the residents. I also think that all the roads should be signed residents only parking, as there has been many issues with people having their driveways blocked and not been able to park where they live. This is not acceptable. I look forward to your response on this matter and further updates. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19 th October. Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. The roads on Oakridge Park are not currently adopted by Milton Keynes Council. A residents only parking scheme would need to be implemented by MKC through a Traffic Regulation Order which is not part of the Neighbourhood Development Plan process. |
| 8. | Resident of Oakridge Park | SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I would like to make a few comments about the Draft plan as I have seen it on your web site. The main objection I have is with the idea of a possible future extra car parking area to be built in | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>the Stanton Low Country Park at the far end of Kerry Hill, Oakridge park. This is totally the wrong place, the wrong size and the wrong idea.</p> <p>1, Not only is this not required, as there is sufficient car parking in other areas already that is underused (due to lack of signage) and some of these other areas could be made a bit bigger, easier if required.</p> <p>2, This proposed future new car park would require the building over the Orchard, which although not as extensive as I was first hoping when I moved in, it is at least a lovely quiet part of the country park and is a valuable asset to the community.</p> <p>3, The proposed size of the possible new car park is outlandishly massive. It is much bigger than the new car park off of the Newport road (which is never full).</p> <p>4, The location of this proposed future car park would mean a big increase in traffic, through the estate and tiny side roads. It would be particularly dangerous for extra cars to be coming along the sharp bend outside of the pumping station compound and my house no 48. It is a narrow, tight bend and also at the bottom of a hill.</p> <p>5, which brings me onto the point about the massive water run off there would inevitably be from such a massive car park at a bottom of a hill. A future flooding problem I'm sure.</p> <p>6, We already have a sewage pumping station outside the front of our houses and the caravan park opposite, please don't blight our small corner of the estate with a massive car park as well, where at the moment we have a lovely orchard developing. A slightly bigger Stonepit car park would make far more sense, as there is a crossing already in place, it wouldn't increase traffic onto the estate or down narrow residential roads and it is flat. No up-hill / down-hill roads and paths to navigate.</p> <p>A slight increase in size to the parking facilities in the centre of the estate (presently just Disabled parking I believe) may help a little as well, although this should really be avoided as it would still bring more traffic into the estate.</p> <p>The really advantageous place to put extra cars is in the existing car parking area created by ASDA, doctors and other shops off Newport Road. If this area was extended further it would be beneficial for the whole area and wouldn't impact on people's views, wouldn't cause more traffic onto the estate, would be in an ideal location near the shopping area and right on the edge of the country park and not building over any features or facilities i.e. an orchard. One other thing may be to consider would be that if the stone pit parking area was increased more, then this might be much more</p> | <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>SNP8 – No amendments are proposed to the policy to include the canal towpath. The towpath is in keeping with the natural environment and is not a redway designed for bikes. However, your comments will be shared with the Parks Trust and Canal & River Trust regarding footpath improvements.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>The current policy proposes expansion of the existing car parks at StonePit Fields and the Disabled Car Park, to provide additional spaces. SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>beneficial to mourners coming to funerals at the local cemetery in future.</p> <p>SNP8 Key Links & Connectivity: As for Redways and extra paths. I like the idea of extra paths and it's a good idea to link up the railway walk path to a new path running along the Wolverton Road from the Stone Pit car park, however, I wondered if it would be better still to improve the canal tow path and make that suitable for bikes and wider, so that it links the railway walk path, with the main road by the Black Horse. Nicer route and better access to Linford manor area etc.??? entrance to "The View" and then further all the way to the Redhouse Park Estate"? That would be very handy. As would improving the canal tow paths. While talking about paths, can I ask who is responsible for the tow paths along the canal, and would it be possible to get these improved, widened, etc. so that disabled people in wheelchairs / mobility scooters and families etc. can do so easier??</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park: I also like the idea of reserving the land next to ASDA for a community Hall (Desperately needed) or a café but preferably a community hall.</p> | |
| 9. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I notice there are plans to incorporate a car park at the top of Kerry Hill - I understood this area had been designated as 'Orchard' on the plans we saw for our property. There is a car park on the Wolverton Road, One at Stone Pit Fields a disabled car park on Selkirk drive and more than sufficient parking as an overflow for 'visitors' to the area in the Asda car park. The area behind the surgery is barely touched. I therefore feel the additional car park at the top of Kerry Hill is not necessary - a waste of time and precious monies.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October. Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> |
| 10. | Network Rail | <p>As you are aware Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order); in addition you are required to consult the Office of Rail and Road (ORR).</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---|---|
| 11. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: With regard to the proposed additional parking marked on your plan, can you please advise me as to why this is necessary, the current parking developed near the ASDA store, on Selkirk Drive (Disabled parking only) and in Stone Pit park are severely under used.</p> <p>This is probably due to insufficient signage to them. To create this new car park would raise certain questions in my mind and I would like to have answered.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.How many parking spaces are proposed for this area? 2.What would the proposed route to this parking area be? 3.Where would the access into this parking are be? 4.The 3 roads leading to this area are all narrow residential areas not designed to take the potential volume of traffic that may be envisaged. One of which is a quite convoluted road with a blind corner on it, another is hardly capable of allowing 2 vehicles to pass, and the 3rd Shepherds Hey/ Selkirk Drive junction already suffers from poor parking on the pavements and road junction by residents, and the corner is being damaged by vehicles already as buses etc, already have to cut across to the wrong side to get past parked vehicles. 5.What controls would be in place to ensure resident access into and from their properties, as there will undoubtedly be roadside parking starting. 6.What waste and noise pollution provisions would be in place to cater for the additional visitors, there are insufficient bins now, and air pollution will be increased. The litter and dog waste dumping would only get worse. 7. I understood that this was to be protected park land and no further development permitted. 8.Could consideration be made to increasing the size of Stone Pit parking area? 9.What provision would be in place to prevent travellers setting up as recently occurred in Stone Pit park. | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>The current policy proposes expansion of the existing car parks at StonePit Fields and the Disabled Car Park, to provide additional spaces. The areas identified are indicative and do not specify numbers of parking spaces.</p> <p>Should the plans be brought forward in the future, each site would be individually assessed through the current planning process managed by MKC.</p> |
| 12. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>SNP18 West of Redbridge: I wish to protest at the proposed building on green spaces west of and behind Redbridge Stantonbury.</p> <p>I have lived on Redbridge for 44 years, and have had the opportunity to benefit from the large open space behind Redbridge, so did my children. We on Redbridge, Stantonbury have no safe accessible green space close to home since the school fenced off the playing field.</p> <p>The children of the estate were able to play football, fly kites, throw frisbies, (shows how old I am) but this safe open space has been denied the local community.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Pan for Housing.</p> <p>Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>We do not have access to safe green spaces like Stantonbury1. Our children now play on the road and the small green space opposite our houses, or on the small green space next to No. 2 Redbridge.</p> <p>LEAP and NEAP feature strongly in your plan, but where are the safe play areas for the under 8's and the older play area behind Woodend School is secluded and prone to vandalism, I cannot imagine children playing there safely.</p> <p>Play equipment has been provided at the ends of Kents Road and Westhill, but is tatty, unsafe and have you noticed, the kids don't play there.</p> <p>So where do they play, opposite my house, in the road, on any green space that is left for them.</p> <p>And where can I go to get a bit of green, it's not always safe to walk the Redways on your own any more, not like it was 20 years ago.</p> <p>I miss walking across the field. Access to and from the new estate will use Redbridge.</p> <p>The drivers speed down this road most times, it can be a busy road in the mornings and evenings, even 30 MPH is too fast when the children are playing.</p> <p>With the building of an estate behind Redbridge, the traffic will use Redbridge to get out onto the grid road system, they won't use the car clogged Walsh's Manor that twists and turns, or Ormond, clogged with cars, they will use the straightest route which is Redbridge, which is on a bus route, has late parents hacking down the street to take their children to the School, and again parked cars.</p> <p>It will become a rat run and become noisy, busy, smelly and congested. Then we have the infrastructure, Doctor, Dentist, School, we have these but are they big enough, and local shops! someone is having a laugh here aren't they, we haven't had any decent shops for what? 15 years, longer?</p> <p>The space will be crammed full of dwellings, right up to my boundary wall. No thank you. It will cause congestion, and a strain on our local community and infrastructure. I strongly oppose any moves to destroy the last bit of green space on this estate.</p> | <p>dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan.</p> |
| 13. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I am contacting you in reference to the proposed car park at the east end of Kerry Hill, Oakridge Park. I would like to object to the location of the car park as the roads leading to it are not suitable for the high level of traffic that this car park will create. The car park off Wolverton Road near to Asda is rarely utilised and I believe that having more clear</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>SNP3 - Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>signage would alleviate this problem. If you require further information please contact me.</p> <p>SNP8 Key Links & Connectivity: Not covered in the plan but worth a mention.</p> <p>Your plan does cover redways but specifically it's a shame that the redways end going north on V7 when you get to Stantonbury (H3). Would it be possible to connect to the front of Oakridge Park / Railway walk?</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park:</p> <p>Good – OP community café</p> <p>Good – additional footpath development around StonePit</p> <p>Good but needs developing. The introduction of sport style equipment in the park is a great idea and one I've supported for a while. However, I think it needs to be spread around in a "circuit" style approach like at Willen Lake or Loughton lodge. That way you can incorporate it into a run</p> <p>Object: Additional toddler play area. The existing play area off Winchcombe Meadows was developed recently and I would deem more than adequate, do we really need another one so close (and I have 2 kids 2years old and 5 years old) so I'm probably your target market!</p> | <p>before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>SNP8 – it has been agreed to amend the Plan and add this additional location to the policy.</p> <p>SNP22 - Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update:</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC.</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended.</p> <p>Location B has been removed, Location A has been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment.</p> <p>Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported.</p> |
| 14. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>Overall, it's a really comprehensive document and lots of thought has gone into putting this together.</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: Object. Specifically, to the re proposed introduction of a car park at the bottom of Kerry Hill on Oakridge Park for the following reasons: I assume this is in response to residents' concerns about the increase in traffic on the estate since the opening of the Park.</p> <p>Well this proposal is not the solution, in fact it's likely to increase traffic on the estate, specifically in the Northeast corner and particularly on Kerry Hill. This street is a paved side street not meant to support significant volumes of traffic. Some houses front doors</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>SNP3 - Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update:</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>are within 2 feet of the road. A more practical, lower cost, lower impact solution would be to improve signage and put in place parking controls on the residential roads to “encourage” people to use the existing carparks.</p> <p>There are already 3 car parks that can be used (the Parks Trust by Asda, Stonepit Fields and the disabled one on Selkirk), all of which are under used to varying degrees. I understand 2 of these car parks might entail a small walk to the park, but so will the proposed location on Kerry Hill. People always take the easy option and lots have kids so why not convert some of the disabled spaces into family spaces? This is never “legally” full i.e. it’s only full when there is a voting booth in there! I would really like to understand the logic behind this proposal?</p> <p>It will impact on the existing Orchard that is still being established – this is missing from your map / diagram. MKC removed a planned car park off Kerry Hill (at the other end so even closer to the play equipment) as it was designed as a local park for local people (a quote direct from a council member of staff)</p> | <p>to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC.</p> |
| 15. | 2 Residents of Oakridge Park | <p>I am writing to make comments on the Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan 2nd Draft.</p> <p>SNP3 PARKING ENHANCEMENTS</p> <p>Object. Specifically, to the re proposed introduction of a car park at the bottom of Kerry Hill on Oakridge Park for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. I assume this is in response to residents’ concerns about the increase in traffic on the estate since the opening of the Park. Well this proposal is not the solution, in fact it’s likely to increase traffic on the estate, specifically in the Northeast corner and particularly on Kerry Hill. This street is a paved side street not meant to support significant volumes of traffic. Some houses front doors are within 2 feet of the road. A more practical, lower cost, lower impact solution would be to improve signage and put in place parking controls on the resident roads to “encourage” people to use the existing carparks. There are already 3 car parks that can be used (the Parks Trust by Asda, Stonepit fields and the disable one on Selkirk), all which are under used to varying degrees. I understand 2 of these car parks might entail a small walk to the park but so will the proposed location on Kerry Hill. People always take the easy option and lots have kids so why not convert some of the disabled spaces into family spaces? This is never “legally” full i.e. it’s only full when</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>there is a voting booth in there! I would really like to understand the logic behind this proposal?</p> <p>2. It will impact on the existing Orchard that is still being established – this is missing from your map / diagram. Which is there to promote wild life, this was sold as green belt and would be destroyed by a car park, for those not prepared to walk and supposed to be a place for natural beauty not tarmac.</p> <p>3. MKC removed a planned car park off Kerry Hill (at the other end so even closer to the play equipment) as it was designed as a local park for local people (a quote direct from a council member of staff).</p> | |
| 16. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: I have looked at the Parish council's draft plans to include a large car park at the end of Kerry Hill, Oakridge Park. WHY? Stanton Low Park is a protected green belt .</p> <p>The area is where the designated Orchard is to be planted is this now not going to happen. There is plenty of parking for users of Stanton Low where you built the Stanton Low car park behind Asda which is hardly ever used. Also there is a 100% disabled car park on Kerry Hill, again rarely has any cars in it. Can some of these spaces be used for extra parking if there is such a great demand? The size of the proposed parking is ridiculous.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update:</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>The current policy proposes expansion of the current disabled car park and would include a review of the numbers of spaces allocated for disabled parking, should this proposal be brought forward in the future.</p> |
| 17. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: As a resident of Oakridge Park I am concerned by the plan/proposal for a car park at the bottom of Kerry Hill (Figure 3, page 22 of the plan). This area already has multiple parking areas to support Stanton Low Park (one at Stonepit Park across the road, a disabled car park at the top of Kerry Hill, large car park at the local centre and another adjacent to the local centre for Stanton Low Park itself). None of these car parks are ever fully occupied during the week or weekend and therefore adding another one is not going to solve any parking issues. Also, parking is not an issue around the proposed location of the car park. Additionally, the area currently identified on the map is a quiet green space with a number of newly planted trees, which is now beginning to attract wildlife</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update:</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|
| | | back into the area (hedgehogs, and a wide variety of birds). As a local green space, it should be protected. Finally, Kerry Hill is a brick paved road which was never designed to be the route to and entrance of a car park. The design of Stanton Low Park and its amenities including parking was widely discussed during its development, so I am not sure why this is now being changed only a few years later. | |
| 18. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>SNP18 West of Redbridge: I am very upset and strongly object to see that there is a plan to build houses on the field west of Redbridge. This is a lovely field full of wildlife and mature hedging and trees. A quiet oasis in an already busy estate. This field has been here prior to the current houses being built. This field is used on a regular basis by Stantonbury Campus, running club, local football clubs on a regular basis and this weekend 14th & 15th July, has been used all day for football matches, practise and fun day. I would be pleased to know how many hectares have been calculated on this field.</p> <p>The roads surrounding this field are very crowded and there is a primary school, with the parking issues that this entails. Also, it is a busy bus route. Once again, we strongly object to this new development.</p> | <p>The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Pan for Housing.</p> <p>Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan.</p> |
| 19. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>SNP18 West of Redbridge: I am very upset and strongly object to see that there is a plan to build houses on the field west of Redbridge. This is a lovely field full of wildlife and mature hedging and trees. A quiet oasis in an already busy estate. This field has been here prior to the current houses being built. This field is used on a regular basis by Stantonbury Campus, running club, local football clubs on a regular basis and this weekend 14th & 15th July, has been used all day for football matches, practise and fun day. I would be pleased to know how many hectares have been calculated on this field.</p> <p>The roads surrounding this field are very crowded and there is a primary school, with the parking issues that this entails. Also, it is a busy bus route. Once again, we strongly object to this new development.</p> | <p>The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Pan for Housing.</p> <p>Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan.</p> |
| 20. | Canal & River Trust, Jane Hennell | Thank you for consulting the Canal & River Trust on the 2nd draft version of the Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan. We are pleased to note that you have changed policy SNP22 to reflect our comments made in relation to the 1st Draft. We have no further comments to make at this time. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |
| 21. | Amec Foster on behalf of National Grid | National Grid has appointed Wood 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. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|--|
| | | <p>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. 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 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>Key resources / contacts: National grid has provided information in relation to electricity and transmission assets via the following internet link: http://www2.nationalgrid.com/uk/services/land-and-development/planning-authority/shape-files/ The electricity distribution operator in Milton Keynes Council is Western Power Distribution. Information regarding the transmission and distribution network can be found at: www.energynetworks.org.uk</p> <p>Please remember to consult National Grid on any Neighbourhood Plan Documents or site specific proposals that could affect our infrastructure. We would be grateful if you could add our details shown below to your consultation database.</p> <p>I Hope the above information is useful. If you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me, Yours faithfully, Hannah Bevins.</p> | |
| 22. | Trevor Edinborough, The Griffin Trust | <p>Dear Mr. Davison, Thank you for your response dated 19th July. Your comments were helpful and as you suggested, I have taken up the matter with Milton Keynes Council. They have advised that no housing can be built on the Stantonbury Campus without the freeholder (Griffin Schools Trust) electing to dispose of a part of the site for housing development. GST have no intention of disposing of the land indicated for the</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. Following further dialogue with the Griffin Trust, Policy SNP18 West of Redbridge has been removed from the Plan.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>purpose of building new houses and we suggest therefore that any reference to housing on the Stantonbury Campus be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan. When I discussed this specific issue with MKC they confirmed that there was no requirement to include housing development on the Campus in the SPC Neighbourhood Plan. I look forward to hearing from you,</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Trevor Edinborough.</p> | |
| 23. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>Could you please let me know the outcome so far on Redbridge re community centre/housing. I was unable to attend as I was on holiday.</p> <p>Many thanks Joanne Roe.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Pan for Housing.</p> <p>Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan.</p> |
| 24. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>SNP18 West of Redbridge: I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposed housing on the back of Redbridge on the playing field i.e. West of Redbridge. I find this totally unacceptable, as do all the residents of Redbridge.</p> <p>We have no safe green space for our children to play. Families and football clubs play football on the field, it is recreational for people and sporting events. We have all this social media about obesity in our young children and you are contributing to our future children's obesity!</p> <p>Plus, how busy it will make Redbridge with all the traffic for the safety of our children. We have a school for very young ones in Redbridge, it will make it so dangerous for these young children. I'm sure you can find another suitable plot of land to build on which will not disrupt families.</p> <p>Another interesting fact everybody has denied responsibility for the field and boundary. We had an issue with a brick wall that had been built and when it became dangerous everybody denied responsibility (see attached letter) resulting in us all having to fund a fence/brick wall.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Pan for Housing.</p> <p>Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|
| 25. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>SNP18 West of Redbridge: Don't support. I very much object to the proposal concerning West of Redbridge. The playing fields are the only bit of green we have left in Stantonbury. There is nowhere for children to play football tournaments or countless other groups that use the field for a variety of different activities if the proposal goes ahead.</p> <p>Also, the amount of traffic from building the houses would be very dangerous to our already busy road. We have a young first school just down the road and the journey to & from school will be very hazardous & dangerous with the amount of traffic this will impose. Also, we are already struggling with our local Dr's & dentist to get appointments, this would be made a million times worse if these new houses goes ahead, we can't cope with any more additions.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Plan for Housing.</p> <p>Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan.</p> |
| 26. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements: Your "Response to pre-submission consultations" stated that additional parking at the local centre is for the medical centre - can the policy wording not reflect this to say "Oakridge Park medical Centre" as I am concerned this policy wording will allow expansion of Asda.</p> <p>Stanton Low does not require additional car parks on Oakridge Park as the current car parks to the West of Asda and Stonepits are under-utilised, these need better signage. Improved parking for Stanton Low will only attract more visitors causing noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>SNP9 Infrastructure Delivery: There is no need to provide new leisure facilities at Stanton Low (as we already have them), spend the money on older estates that would benefit more. A community facility for Oakridge Park would be welcomed though.</p> <p>SNP10 Location of Facilities: Strongly object. Stanton Low Park was subject to extensive planning consultation within the last 5 years and it is unnecessary to be redesigning this area so soon.</p> <p>There was an approved development brief and master plan for Oakridge Park and the broad guidelines of this should be adhered to. The open amenity green can already be used as informal cricket pitch if people wish, but a formalised ground and gym equipment is unacceptable in this location and will detract from the sites natural beauty. Oakridge Park already has a toddler play area off Winchcombe Meadows designed for younger children (which was upgraded in the last 5 years) so why is another required? This surely is not in line with the Council's play standards which have been</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>SNP3, SNP9, SNP10 & SNP22 - Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policies, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update:</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed; SPC will share residents views regarding signposts to existing car-parks with The Parks Trust & MKC;</p> <p>SNP9 Infrastructure Delivery – no amendments to the policy;</p> <p>SNP10 Location of Facilities – no amendments to the policy;</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended. Location B has been removed, Location A has</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>applied to the estate within the last 10 years and will just attract more people.</p> <p>The larger Stanton Low play park has play equipment suitable for younger children so it is just not necessary. If outdoor gym equipment is required it should be scattered across the park, probably on the lower footpath route down by the canal, this will mean that people have to run/walk between equipment. The park has been extremely popular with high visitor numbers who cause noise and disturbance until late in the night. Providing additional facilities close to residential properties will harm residential amenity even more than at present.</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park: Expanding facilities in the locations shown on plan SNP22 is inappropriate and I object strongly to this policy.</p> | <p>been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment. Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported.</p> |
| 27. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to make representations on the second Draft Stantonbury Neighbourhood Plan. I can advise that I have reviewed the plan and attended one of your exhibition sessions. On the whole, I generally concur with the approach and direction of the Plan, however, I have specific concerns relating to</p> <p>Policy SNP3 Parking Enhancements:</p> <p>Whilst aiming to tackle existing parking problems within the Parish area, draft Policy SNP3 also seeks to identify an area to the eastern end of Stanton Low Park, an area just to the north of the existing disabled parking area along Selkirk drive, and an area at Stonepit Fields for the provision of additional parking.</p> <p>As a resident of Oakridge Park, it is acknowledged that Stanton Low Park has become a very popular destination for visitors including those from further away, who will frequently travel by car. This has led to some on-street parking within the estate. However, a significant proportion of these visitors are primarily there to use the substantial and well equipped children's area, situated towards the centre of the park. It is therefore contended that these visitors would not be minded to use any additional formal car parking to the eastern edge of the park due to its lack of proximity to their intended destination (i.e. the children's play area).</p> <p>Whilst an addition to the existing disabled parking area along Selkirk Drive would be well located for visitors to the play area, is it intended that this would remain only for use by Blue Badge holders? This is not specified within the draft Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the existing Stanton Low Park designated parking area, accessible directly from Newport Road, adjacent to the canal and recycling centre, is very infrequently overused. The existing parking area serving</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>The current policy proposes an expansion to the current car park allocated for disabled parking, this would include a review of the number of disabled spaces to allow for non-blue badge holders in addition.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>the Asda and other local stores and Doctors surgery are unrestricted and are also not frequently at full capacity. Both of these locations provide suitable spaces to accommodate additional park visitors, should those visitors be prepared to park slightly further away from the play area (as would be needed to make the proposed car park justifiable).</p> <p>Without a clear evidence base setting out a need for additional car parking spaces to address and identified current shortfall, the proposed allocations would appear to simply remove valued open space which should be protected, preserved and enhanced. This would be contrary to national guidance to preserve open spaces and the countryside set out in the NPPF. It so hoped these points will be taken into account in your review of the consultation comments and the Plan revised to remove these unnecessary and inappropriate car parking allocations, that seek to meet a need that has not been identified, quantified or justified.</p> | |
| 28. | Patience Stewart, Anglian Water | <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Stantonbury 2nd Draft Neighbourhood Plan. The following response is submitted on behalf of Anglian Water. I would be grateful if you could confirm that you have received this response.</p> <p>SNP2 Local Green Space Designations: The policy as drafted states that development within the designated green spaces will only be allowed in very special circumstances. However, no further guidance is provided about what would constitute very special circumstances in this context. It is therefore suggested that Policy SNP2 should be amended to include reference to the circumstances in which development would be permitted in the designated local green spaces included utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water. Should you have any queries relating to this response please let me know.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>SNP2 – The policy has been amended to reflect the following: <i>Proposals for development not defined elsewhere in the plan, that is incompatible with the importance of Local Green Space as an attractive publicly accessible area will not be allowed unless there are exceptional circumstances, where the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any harm.</i></p> |
| 29. | Resident of Stantonbury | <p>Stantonbury has no green areas left and there is nowhere for people to walk their dogs or for the kids to play. The playground is behind the school & in the bushes where the parents can't see their children. It is always full of drunks, perverts & druggies.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> |
| 30. | Resident of Oakridge Park | <p>As a resident of Oakridge Park I am concerned of your proposal/plan to build a large car park at the bottom of Kerry Hill (figure 3, page 22 of the plan). Questions that come to mind after reading the plan/proposal for another bigger car park:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there a need for a large car park? <p>This area has multiple parking areas to support Stanton Low Park (one at Stone Pit across the road, a disabled</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>Further consultation is being undertaken with residents on Oakridge Park with potential options</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>car park at the top of Kerry Hill, a large car park at the local centre, a middle car park near the playground and another adjacent to Asda for Stanton Low Park). I have observed for past few weekends none of these car parks are ever full, so why the need for a large car park? And you can park on the numerous parking bays on the estate.</p> <p>If there is a need for an additional car park, why not extend the car park beside Asda – the Stanton Low car park and make it bigger or extend the disabled car park or expand the middle car park on the estate by the playground and playing fields and access to the lovely walks by the bridge. Expansion to an existing car park is cost effective than building a new one from scratch and destroying the trees and wild life on your proposed new car park, see my next point.</p> <p>2. You plan to build a car park at a secluded narrow end of the park.</p> <p>The council spent thousands of pounds to plant over 30 new trees which have now established and is an ecological friendly to wildlife like hedgehogs and woodpeckers and birds are prevalent. Your plans to rip the trees and build the largest car park for the estate on a narrow part of the park where it is far away from the local centre, playground and fields and the bridge which is in the centre of the park it does not make economic nor ecological sense, not to mention the impact to the peace of mind and tranquillity of the residents. This narrow park is a local green space and should be protected which I sure was at the forefront of planners intentions for this estate.</p> <p>3. Safety concerns for the residents</p> <p>This proposed car park is secluded and at the end of the estate and not overlooked and far away from the main road. Your plan to build the largest car park in the estate may well attract unwanted behaviour during the quiet hours and will increase traffic flow to the estate – given that visitors are not aware of children and the nature of the unmarked road surfaces.</p> <p>The design of this park and its amenities was widely discussed during its development and we were told the park will remain a park and council planted trees and encourage wildlife, I am very saddened to hear of this proposal just a few years since we moved in. Please also note Kerry Hill is a brick paved road and was not designed to be the route and entrance of a large car park.</p> <p>We are always informed that the council budget is tight, therefore may I suggest to the parish council to consider more cost effective and practical proposals without the need for more concreted/tarmac surfaces.</p> | <p>before finalising the policy, closing date 19th October.</p> <p>Update: SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. The current policy proposes expansion of the existing car parks at Stone Pit Field and the car park allocated for disabled car park, to include a review of the numbers of spaces allocated for Blue Badge holders.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | I look forward to hearing from you – I hope the parish council will rethink and quash this proposal. Council monies can be used in other much needed services for elderly and children. | |
| Comments received from Stantonbury (Redbridge) Consultation July 2018 | | | |
| 31. | Resident of Bradville | I have a lot of concerns about plans to build behind Naseby Court – the orchard area. Depending on the plans for the road and housing it will totally alter the environment, affect the wildlife and change the nature of where I live. We had zero consultation before today. It is just not true to say we were consulted as part of phase 1. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |
| 32. | Resident of Bradville | Copse Stanton School. Under a Deed of Covenant 1975 registered with the Land Registry with MKDC. I understand comes with a stipend annually to look after same. How will this be sold for housing! | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |
| 33. | Resident of Stantonbury | Garages at top of Redbridge – these have been a disgrace and falling down & very dangerous for 25 years. Would support re-development as 2 storey housing. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |
| 34. | Resident of Stantonbury | Re:- Rowle Close planned development. This plan does not improve the surroundings for existing population. It involves increased traffic. It removes green space. It replaces garages with parking spaces. It means residents live in a car park. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |
| 35. | Resident of Stantonbury | I do not want this lot of houses (West of Redbridge) | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Plan for Housing. Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan. |
| 36. | Resident of Stantonbury | We do not want homes, the field is continually in use. Road, also a bus route is too busy and parked cars etc, childrens school (Wood End) close by. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. The land at West of Redbridge is currently |

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|--|
| | | | designated in the Milton Keynes Local Plan for Housing. Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan. |
| 37. | Resident of Stantonbury | I do not want a new development on our playing fields. I have lived here 42 years and value the green fields. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. The land at West of Redbridge is currently designated in the Milton Keynes Local Plan for Housing. Following further research, the land ownership has now been confirmed as the Griffin Trust. Further dialogue with the Griffin Trust has established no intention to build residential housing on this site, therefore the policy will be removed from the Final Draft Plan. |
| 38. | 2 residents of Stantonbury | Registered disabled – people park across drive – request double-yellow lines outside property. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted and your issues passed to MKC Highways. |
| 39. | Resident of Stantonbury | I congratulate you for those nice improvement plans for the general collective well-being, but I am at the same time embittered by the fact that I could have a fight on my hands to protect my property (garage in Rowle Close). The main drive for me to purchase my maisonette in Stantonbury 18 years ago was to be able to house my vehicle as well as myself and I'd like that to remain unaltered. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |
| Comments received from Oakridge Park Consultation October 2018 | | | |
| 40. | Resident | Remove Kerry Hill from SNP3 Parking Enhancements. Remove Location B in SNP22 Stanton Low Park. Support trim trail as more sensible option. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. |

| | | | |
|-----|----------|--|--|
| | | | <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended.</p> <p>Location B has been removed, Location A has been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment.</p> <p>Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported.</p> |
| 41. | Resident | <p>Remove location off Kerry Hill and Disabled Car Park in SNP3 Parking Enhancements. Remove Location B in SNP22 Stanton Low Park. Prefer a trim trail. Public toilets by medical centre would enhance park.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended.</p> <p>Location B has been removed, Location A has been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment.</p> <p>Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported.</p> |
| 42. | Resident | <p>No amendments to policy SNP3 Parking Enhancements. Remove proposals for Location A. I would support if it came to it, the disabled car park to be re-designed for more parking. However, the car park off Newport Road needs to be encouraged to be used, sign posts.</p> | <p>Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted.</p> <p>SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed.</p> <p>SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended.</p> <p>Location B has been removed, Location A has been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment.</p> |

| | | | |
|-----|----------|--|---|
| | | | Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported. |
| 43. | Resident | No amendments to SNP3 Parking Enhancements. No amendments to SNP22 Stanton Low Park. No trim trail – install a hub (gym equipment) next to children’s play area. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended. Location B has been removed, Location A has been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment. Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported. |
| 44. | Resident | No amendments to SNP3 Parking Enhancements. No amendments to SNP22 Stanton Low Park. | Thank you for your response, your comments have been noted. SNP3 Parking Enhancements has been amended and the location to the rear of Kerry Hill removed. SNP22 Stanton Low Park has been amended. Location B has been removed, Location A has been amended to support either additional play facilities or outdoor exercise equipment. Support for a trim trail around the perimeter would also be supported. |