

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

PRESENT: Councillors Ayles, Keane, Stacey, Sweetland & Forgham. The Clerk Mr S Bradbury, Ward Cllr Geary and 1 member of the public were also in attendance.

The public forum commenced at 7.30:

A question was asked about whether the Speed Indication Device was still in use. It was explained that the groundsman had been on holiday so it had not been re-charged and moved for a short while, but it is definitely still in use..

There being no further matter raised the meeting proper started at 7.34. .

		ACTION
1	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE	
1.1	Cllr Markham reason health. Cllr Hinds alternate commitment. Accepted.	
2	DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST by Councillors in any agenda items below	
2.1	None..	
3	APPROVE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING	
3.1	The minutes of the general meeting on the 4 th January 2016 were proposed by Cllr Keane, seconded Cllr Forgham and agreed unanimously.	
4	TO RECEIVE REPORTS	
4.1.	Clerks Report & Review of Actions. (see Appendix A1). Matters arising:	
4.1.1.	Item 2 – Cllr Geary is continuing to talk to the Heads of MKC Planning about the window within which parish councils are able to consider planning applications. The newly imposed 21 day notice period will mean that some applications fall between parish council meetings. MKC Planning are appreciative of the problem and are looking for ways to resolve it. Cllr Geary to report back next meeting.	Cllr Geary
4.1.2.	Item 6 – Cllr Forgham reported that before the new village gates can be fitted MKC will need to arrange for he combined village name/speed limit signs will have to be replaced with stand-alone 30 mph signs. Cllr Forgham to determine timelines	Cllr Forgham
4.1.3.	Item 5 – Cllr Sweetland pointed out that the new chains at the bus stop can be un-hooked and stolen. Clerk to contact contractor. Secretary's note: the contractor has now secured the chains although the chains had not been secured in the old configuration and to do so was not included in the job spec.	Clerk
4.1.4.	Item 13 – Cllr Keane had arranged a meeting with the owner of the Carrington Arms for later this week to discuss the additional parking spaces and use of the village green. He had also noticed that the new brickwork has a crack in it and will bring that matter up also.	Cllr Keane
4.1.5.	Item 15 – Cllr Stacey will further discuss the matters of metal detecting and digging at Castle Field with a contact he has at Historic England.	Cllr Stacey
4.2.	Neighbourhood Plan report (see appendix A2).	
4.2.1.	Matters arising to be covered under item 7.2.	
4.3.	PROJECT REPORT: MKC Flood Alleviation Scheme project report (see Appendix A3)	
4.3.1.	Report not received. Cllr Ayles said that he is unsure what work is being done during the forthcoming period when the road is to be closed at the Dips. He thinks that the culverts are being assessed to see if they will provide sufficient drainage. He was disappointed that the 3 rd bund has been delayed again.	

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016

in the Village Hall

4.4. Report on Rural Campaign Against Satellite Settlements (RuCASS)

4.4.1. A Barrister's letter is being prepared to send to MKC illuminating the shortcomings in process in preparing, issuing and conducting a public consultation on the Plan:MK Strategic Development Directions paper. A meeting is to be held at Olney later in the week to approve the final draft and to look at next steps. The Conservative group have formally requested that the paper be withdrawn. MKC are awaiting the letter and will then assess the relative risks of the consultation continuing or being closed withdrawn.

4.5. FILE NOTE: Advisory letter from MKC to residents about the closure of the road to Haversham from 1 February for a fortnight (see Appendix A4)

4.5.1. Noted

4.6. FILE NOTE: Proposed specification for Conservation Area Improvement project

4.6.1. There is a choice to be made between using stand-alone waste bins at £125 each or to deploy dual waste/recycling bins at £400 each. All agreed that the stand-alone bins should be deployed.

4.6.2. Cllr Ayles asked whether all were happy for the Clerk to go ahead and get costs and further information to complete the spec. All agreed.

4.6.3. The matter of the locked notice board representing a health & safety hazard was raised. All agreed to include resolution of this matter in the spec.

5

TO CONSIDER PLANNING APPLICATIONS (previously viewed on line by Cllrs)

5.1. **15/03108/FUL** - Erection of wooden cabin Mulberry House 5 Lodge Farm Court Castlethorpe – no objections

5.2. **15/03208/TCA** - Remove one conifer and reduce crown of yew tree by appx 1.5 metres and cut back branches Church View Cottage 14 North Street Castlethorpe – no objections

6

TO RECEIVE REPORT BACK ON PREVIOUS PLANNING APPLICATIONS – no further comments on Section 6

6.1. **15/02656/CONS** - Development of club and community training centre Land At Manor Farm Cosgrove (invitation for comments from Northants CC) **pending consideration**

6.2. **15/02823/MIN** - Variation of condition 2 (Vehicle movement) attached to planning permission 09/00627/MIN - Home Farm Hanslope Road Castlethorpe. **pending decision**

6.3. **15/02971/TCA** - Notification of intention to fell and ground out the stumps of 3 x Apple trees (T1, T2 and T3) - 3 Lodge Farm Court **no objections**

6.4. **15/03001/DISCON** - Details submitted pursuant to discharge of 3 (external materials), 4 (tree survey plan), 5 (tree protection measures) and 7 (construction site fencing) attached to application - Glencote 1 Wolverton Road Castlethorpe **details refused**

7

TO CONSIDER RESOLUTIONS

7.1. A public excluded part 2 of the meeting to discuss matters in accordance with Section 100(A) (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as defined in paragraphs 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act was proposed by Cllr Ayles and agreed unanimously.

7.2. There had been 7 responses to the (second) Neighbourhood Plan public consultation (see Appendix A6). Cllr Ayles had sought advice from MKC and from our planning consultant on responses 1 to 5:

- The comment from Anglian Water about requiring a foul drainage strategy in the event of any planning application for site CS2 (Maltings 2) should be included. Accepted unanimously.
- The comment from previous respondents and the Maltings 2 land owners is supportive and was noted.
- The comments from resident 1 is not relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan and is a matter for MKC Planning Enforcement. Clerk to write to resident accordingly.

Clerk

Clerk

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016

in the Village Hall

- The comments from resident 2 are appreciated but the policy is only specific in terms of pedestrian access. Access by vehicles will become a matter for discussion with MKC Highways if and when a planning application is submitted. It was unanimously agreed therefore that these comments should not cause any change to the Plan. Clerk to write to resident.
 - The comments from resident 3 are supportive and were noted.
 - Representatives of another local landowner had responded at the very end of the consultation period and there had been no time to seek advice on that response so it was felt that no decision could be made at this meeting. Clerk to arrange an extraordinary meeting for 8th February to fully consider this response.
- 7.3. Cllr Keane said that the area behind the Chequers where the garages had been demolished has been left as waste ground and is little used. He proposed that an application be made to Ringway to mark out parking spaces as a 'community project'. Agreed unanimously. Clerk to make application. Clerk
- 7.4. Cllr Ayles had drafted a specific and detailed response to the 'Plan:MK Strategic Development Directions Consultation' that was circulated to Cllrs before the meeting (**see Appendix A7**). He asked that the parish council endorse the response in full as being their representative view and this was agreed unanimously. It was further agreed that the response was in too much depth to circulate to all households. It was therefore agreed that Cllr Forgham produce a draft 2 page letter, based on the agreed parish council response, that could be used by householders to object personally. It was further proposed that a cost of £50 be approved for printing these letters. Agreed unanimously. Cllr Forgham
- 7.5. Cllr Ayles had drafted a response to the 2016/17 MKC budget proposal that he asked the parish council to endorse (**see Appendix A8**). After some discussion it was agreed unanimously that the parish council should:
Oppose the introduction of the new blue receptacles to replace pink sacks
Oppose the introduction of an annual charge for green compost bins
Oppose the proposal to not mix green and food waste
Oppose the proposed reduction in street cleaning
Oppose the charge for use of open spaces
Clerk to write to MKC accordingly. Clerk
- 7.6. Cllr Sweetland had approached companies that are offering government sponsored free loft insulation on premises and had found that this only applies to domestic properties so would not be available for the Village Hall. It was pointed out that users/interest groups had stored equipment in the Village Hall loft space and these would have to be moved onto shelving to lay any lagging. Cllr Sweetland to raise at next Village Hall Committee meeting. Cllr Sweetland
- 7.7. It was agreed that the damaged tree outside of 8 Bullington Road was not the responsibility of the parish council. If MKC will not replace the tree and Open Gardens Committee are prepared to then they are free to go ahead. Cllr Sweetland to respond accordingly. Cllr Sweetland
- 7.8. SLCC/NALC had set up a company named Smaller Authorities Audit Appointments Ltd. to take over the appointment of external auditors from 2017 and had invited parish & town councils to make their appointments through that company. The Clerk had advised that he saw no benefit in not doing so. It was unanimously agreed that the parish council subscribe to this arrangement.
- 8
- FINANCIAL MATTERS**
- 8.1 The RFO Payments Schedule had been circulated by the Clerk since when 3 further payments had arrived (shown in red font in table below). The revised Schedule was proposed by Cllr Ayles, seconded by Cllr Forgham and agreed unanimously.

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

Payee	Description	Invoice	Amount
S Bradbury	Salary January 2016	per pay slip	£522.08
R.Wontner	Jan 2016 invoice cleaning	per attached invoice 8	£227.70
J.Foakes	SID re-placement	per attached invoice	£30.00
J.Foakes	refund key purchase SG	per attached receipt	£25.54
AH Contracts	Dog bin clearance Dec	per attached invoice 8448	£35.00
Pollards	VH Consumables	per attached invoice 82128	£24.75
R I Lever	Thrupp hedge cut	per attached invoice	£90.00
R I Lever	Plant saplings	per attached invoice	£190.00
R I Lever	replace bus shelter seat	per attached invoice	£130.00
T Cadd Haven Handyman	Replace posts & chains bus shelter	per attached invoice	£2,340.00
Fineprint	Village signs	per attached invoice ref 89532	£1,052.00
P Homer	Repair VH doors	invoice awaited	£130.00
The Printshop	Print leaflets Plan:MK	per attached invoice	£50.00
Tracker Network (UK) Ltd	Pay in advance tracker for sports ground mower + 5 yr subs	per attached invoice	£473.33
Dualway Courts	Clean tennis courts	per attached invoice	£400.00
Grand Total			£5,720.40

- 9 **CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED (*Circulated prior to meeting*)**
- 9.1. Cllr Forgham reported that any news put onto Facebook that was not on the village web site had not been put there by him. The village Facebook pages are not the responsibility of the parish council and are frequently updated by other individuals.
- 9.2. The residents of Fox Covert Lane had written to the parish council for information to say that they are opposing and additional residences using the foul sewage pumping station until Anglian Water take over responsibility for it.
- 10 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS (for noting, or for inclusion on a future agenda)**
- 10.1. None
- 11 **TO AGREE DATE AND ATTENDANCE FOR FUTURE MEETINGS**
- 11.1 The next General Parish Council meeting will be on 7 March 2016 at 7.30 p.m.
There will be an Extraordinary meeting of the parish council on 8 February at 7.30 p.m. in the Village Hall
- There being no further business part 1 of the meeting closed at 9.40
- PART 2**
- 12 **TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** by Councillors in any of the agenda items below
- 12.1. None
- 13 **TO CONSIDER RESOLUTIONS**
- 13.1. Cllr Forgham had circulated a quote to produce a colour copy of the village newsletter for an additional £40 for a 16 page edition (pro-rata increase for additional pages). He proposed that the parish council should accept this quote and place subsequent orders through this new supplier. Agreed unanimously.
There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.50

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL
Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016
in the Village Hall

Appendix A – Schedule of Reports & File Notes

APPENDIX A1 – CLERK'S REPORT 1/2/2016

1. The Clerk has submitted this year's precept request for £27,183 an increase of 2.99% as agreed at last meeting.
2. Cllr Geary was to talk to the Head of MKC Planning about the new 21 day turn around target for receipt of comments on planning applications (from the time that a planning application is entered onto the system). Several parish councils had raised concerns that as they meet monthly at times they will have no opportunity to comment before deadlines are reached.
3. Cllr Stacey had discussed the pressure washing and moss killing at the tennis courts with a local tradesman. As there is a potential health & safety issue the Clerk had authorised payment up to the authorised level.
4. Highways update:
Cllr Ayles and Ward Cllr Green will be meeting with the new Head of Highways at MKC to discuss the outstanding problems.
5. The posts and chains have been fitted around the bus stop having been placed 1 foot back from the old posts.
6. The tenderer for the work to re-surface the path to the railway footbridge would like to meet 'on site' to discuss both this work and the installation of the gates at village entrances. Clerk to obtain available slots from Cllrs (Cllr Forgham?) and arrange.
7. The Youth Club have been informed of the success of the application for the grant to part fund the outward bound event.
8. Village entrance signs have been received and are with O. Sawbridge for framing. The gates have been ordered and a delivery date is awaited.
9. The 30 saplings have been planted at the sports ground in the locations agreed by Cllr Stacey and the Clerk.
10. The Clerk has part-ordered the tracker for sports ground ride-on mower at a cost of £207.50 plus £266 for a 60 month management subscription. Clerk needs to provide serial number to complete order.
11. Cllr Sweetland was to talk with the Chair of the Open Gardens Committee about removal of the diseased tree in Castle Field and to establish whether planning permission is required.
12. Clerk has been in touch with Lloyds Bank and ultimately agreed that he and Cllr Sweetland would need to attend a branch office to arrange the opening of two further bank accounts (to have the s.106 Planning Gain paid into) and to rationalise the current signatories.
13. Carrington Arms & extra parking spaces – MKC have announced that they are going to charge £420 per day for commercial use of public spaces i.e. the village green. Cllr Keane to contact owner of the Carrington Arms to attempt to get him to progress discussions with MKC about use of the green when/if the pub re-opens
14. Village Hall Committee are getting quotes for the re-routing of the (rainwater) guttering at the village hall.
15. Cllr Forgham to provide Clerk with email address so that he can write to Historic England about putting 'no metal detecting' and 'no digging' signs up in Castle Field.
16. The front and back doors at the Village Hall have been re-fitted following problems with shutting them.

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 **in the Village Hall**

No progress on outstanding actions:

- Sports Ground Committee to consider arranging regular cuts by a third party of the Lodge Farm Court hedge, the one between the sports ground and Thrupp Close and that alongside the public footpath at the top of the football pitch. Cost has been factored into the draft budget.
- The Clerk has drafted a policy for complaints handling to be considered at a later meeting. Cllrs Ayles, Forgham and Clerk to identify other gaps in documentation of parish council policies e.g. Emergency Plan.
- Cllr Ayles has been in touch with the Lodge Farm business park owner about looking into including panels on the pavilions at the sports ground as part of the project he is undertaking to erect a solar panel farm.
- Hedge between Village Hall and Church – it has been established that the hedge does not belong to MKC. To be further discussed with land owner. No further update
- Clerk had made no progress in determining a plaque for the rugby posts nor on ordering the litter bins.
- Review MKC fault list inc. state of Sustrans cycle track
- No progress on the fitting of the basketball hoops.

Steve Bradbury
1/2/2016

APPENDIX A2 – NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN REPORT 1/2/2016

The deadline for further public consultation ends at midnight today. Responses received thus far have been collated and will be reviewed at tonight's meeting under agenda item 7.2.

Steve Bradbury 1/2/16

APPENDIX A3 FILE NOTE: MKC Flood Alleviation project report

None received

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016

in the Village Hall

APPENDIX A4 FILE NOTE: Advisory letter from MKC to residents about the closure of the road to Haversham from 1 February for a fortnight

To: The Occupier(s)

Re: Road works at Devils Dip, Wolverton Road

Dear Sir / Madam,

This letter is to inform you that Ringway, the highway maintenance contractor working on behalf of Milton Keynes Council, will be carrying out essential maintenance at the Devils Dip junction situated between Haversham, Castlethorpe and Hanslope.

The work is expected to start at the earliest date of 01st February 2016 and should be completed by 12th February 2016. The work will be carried out between the hours of 09.30 and 16.30 Monday to Friday.

How will this affect you?

We will need to put road closures in place during the periods stated above. The site team will endeavour to maintain access to properties or businesses, however there may be stages of the work in which a restriction in access is unavoidable. Access for emergency vehicles will be maintained at all times. Diversion routes will be in operation, with signs indicating alternative routes. If access is permitted by the gateman, a speed limit of 10mph will be enforced together with the use of hazard lights. Access and egress to Pineham Farm Business Park is available via Haversham.

As with any construction project there will be a degree of noise. Every possible measure at our disposal will be used to reduce noise levels. We apologise in advance for any inconvenience you may experience as a result of these works.

What are we asking you to do?

We kindly ask that deliveries scheduled to arrive within above dates are re-scheduled where possible. To maintain safety when accessing your property within the closure, you are requested to approach the works with caution at low speed and follow any instructions given by the site operatives.

Additional Information

- This work is weather dependent and unforeseen circumstances can arise. Should there be any changes to the proposed start date, duration or working hours, residents will be notified on the information boards situated at both ends of the road.
- Neither Milton Keynes Council nor their contractors will approach you offering to carry out works to your property. Any cold calling of this nature by people claiming to represent Milton Keynes Council or Ringway should be reported to ourselves using the number at the top of this page.

You can visit the Council website to find out more information about all highways and street lighting works, as well as report defects online and make general enquiries visit

www.milton-keynes.gov.uk

Yours Sincerely

Ringway & Milton Keynes Council

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

APPENDIX A5 FILE NOTE: Proposed specification for Conservation Area Improvement

The parish council has had policies to maintain and improve the conservation area in the centre of the village. These policies, and particularly those concerning the design of street furniture, have been incorporated in the draft Neighbourhood Plan which has just completed its parish council consultation.

The parish council now wishes to complete the implementation of these policies and also to improve the village green as a corollary to the adjacent village centre project completed at the end of 2014.

Streetlights.

Policy is that streetlights within the conservation area should be in heritage style as deployed elsewhere in the conservation area and in some other areas of the village. There are 6 lights in a different, modern style which is inappropriate. These are

South Street number SS5. Lamp post.

South Street number SS8. Lamp post.

South Street unnumbered opposite No 13. Bracket on telephone pole.

South Street number SS10A. Lamp post.

North Street. Unnumbered outside 2 The Chestnuts. Bracket on telephone pole.

North Street. Unnumbered opposite the triangle

If possible, these should be LED lit.

Costs are: Lamp post £unknown x3 = £ unknown*

Bracket £unknown x 3 = £ unknown*

* Costs requested from MKC

Waste bins

Policy is that waste bins within the conservation area should be in black and gold heritage style. Two bins have been purchased separately. The proposal is to replace (not increase the number of) waste bins which are in a variety of styles. They are sited:

North Street bus stop (near junction with Bullington End Rd)

Outside the school

One at each of the two North Street bus stops near the Village Hall

Outside the shop

By the bench near Castle Field.

Costs are 6x £125= £750 plus installation (*installation was not entirely trivial as I recall*)

An option would be to choose dual bins separating general rubbish from recyclables. These however cost £400 each. And a decision needs to be made whether this offers value for money to replace one or more of the new bins with this type.

Village Green Improvements

The existing benches have their concrete foundations lifted out of the ground and, although stable, look very unsightly. The parish council purchased a 'Jubilee' bench for the Queen's 60th and has it stored. The recommendation is to purchase another matching bench and locate them both against the wall bounding 1, The Chestnuts.

Cost of bench c. £360 for the same bench inc. delivery

There is also an existing heritage style bin which could be relocated between them.

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

There is an historic plaque on a stone plinth on the green. It is recommended that the plaque is renovated and the plinth relocated either between the benches (and the bin moved elsewhere) or next to the Notice Board so that the plaque is readable from the main pavement.

While renovating the plaque, the historic plaque in Castle Field should also be renovated.

The rest of the green should have all pathway stepping slabs and bench and bin concrete foundations removed and returned to a fully grassed area which should also be easier for MKC to maintain.

The small plaque to mark a tree to commemorate the Queen's 50th Jubilee will be relocated to another site where a new tree will be planted as the original tree has died and was in a vulnerable position.

Estimate for works £ unknown

Summary of Costs

Streetlights	~£10,000
Waste Bins	£750 (plus recycling option if decided)
Bench	£360
Works	£unknown

DRAFT

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

PPENDIX A6 - Responses to the (second) Neighbourhood Plan public consultation

1. Anglian Water. They have asked that a new Policy statement is added to the Malting 2 site that "A foul drainage strategy is submitted with the application which demonstrates that infrastructure capacity is available or there will be sufficient capacity to serve this development". We are seeking advice whether this would simply be attached to any planning application or whether it requires a Policy change.
2. Land agents on behalf of land owner Maltings 2 are supportive.
3. Resident 1 comments about restricting further commercial development at Lincoln Lodge and also about the location of the bridleway there. Again, we are seeking advice.
4. Resident 2 opposes Maltings 2 on the basis that vehicular access would be difficult through Maltings Field. It is not clear yet whether Highways would want vehicular access on this route though the parish council has a draft policy statement that there should be at least good quality (hard surfaced and unimpeded) pedestrian access. We are seeking advice whether the detail of this access would be for the Neighbourhood Plan or be dealt with under a planning application.
5. Resident 3 supports the draft NP.
6. Representatives of a local landowner have indicated that they may submit a response but this has not been received at time of writing.

Because the consultation does not technically finish until midnight and the next Ordinary Meeting is not for a further 5 weeks, an Extraordinary Meeting will be called.

Philip Ayles
1st February 2016

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016

in the Village Hall

APPENDIX A7 - Response to 'Plan:MK Strategic Development Directions Consultation'

Question 1	Workshop Outputs for a longer term Vision	(a) the Workshops were poorly advertised and so did not have a representative attendance and in particular the second part of the workshops on spatial planning options was fatally flawed (b) these bullet points are just platitudes that would apply to almost every Borough in the country. A more focussed and distinctive Vision will hopefully be developed by the MK 2050 Futures Commission.
Question 2	Form of Vision for Plan:MK	Some expansion of the Vision is important so that readers will understand what the Vision means.
Question 3	Other Opportunities	Plan:MK is a Local Plan. Some of the bullet points may have a place in a Local Plan (such as the integrated transport system or better transport links, development of a logistics hub, Lifetime Homes or non-retail development of CMK - though this last would presumably be part of the CMKTC Neighbourhood Plan not Plan:MK). However, others are out of scope either geographically, such as Cranfield which is in Bedfordshire, or are reputational not planning matters.
Question 4	The next 'big thing'	One would expect this to come from the MK 2050 Futures Commission and for this consultation to put options to residents as well as invite ideas.
<p>Before any of the following Questions are asked, the 'robust evidence base' on population forecasts and need for new homes described on page 3 should have been done. It is meaningless to answer question on growth without knowing the population forecast. For example, the MK 2050 Futures Commission described three scenarios from 2015 to 2050; growth of 75,000, 150,000 and 250,000. The spatial planning solutions would be completely different in each scenario so these questions are all 'cart before the horse'. Furthermore, the consultation document refers frequently to the Vision workshops. It is already accepted (at Executive Scrutiny Committee) that these were poorly advertised and so were not representative particularly of the rural parishes. Whilst the output can be considered, it should not be given any special weighting.</p>		
Question 5	Continued Outward Expansion	Given discussion with Aylesbury Vale are already taking place, this is an obvious direction.
Question 6	Sensitivity of Areas	Clearly, existing settlements area sensitive including Whaddon, Nash etc. Given the traffic load on the A421, consideration should be given to link dualling to relieve even current loads but it is likely that new developments would link down to this providing Aylesbury Vale agree.
Question 7	Final Extent of	This depends on by when and what the is the forecast

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

	Outward Expansion	population. However, it would seem that the A421 would be the natural boundary to the south.
Question 8	Treatment of existing settlements	Great Linford and Loughton were part of a nationally designated new town. It is not morally right to equate their position to that of settlements in the expansion area. Such settlements are an asset to the Borough and should be protected by a green buffer.
Question 9	Scale of Development east of M1	The development identified in the Topic Papers was reasonable but this proposal will impact adversely on Moulsoe and North Crawley and impact our neighbour, Central Bedfordshire. The scale of the impact on Moulsoe and North Crawley would be such as to destroy their character.
Question 10	Final extent of development	No more than in Topic Papers
Question 11	Treatment of existing settlements	If the limit described in the Topic Papers were maintained, there would be only minor impact on Moulsoe. If the expansion were to include Moulsoe and even North Crawley, then, as Answer 8 above, such settlements should be seen as an asset to the Borough and protected by a green buffer.
Question 12	Size of new settlements	There should be no rural satellite settlements. See points made separately below.
Question 13	Possible locations	There should be no rural satellite settlements. See points made separately below.
Question 14	Final extent	There should be no rural satellite settlements. See points made separately below.
Question 15	Intensification of urban area	This would be a good policy (a) because it ties in with the need to redevelop some of the most deprived areas in MK (b) because MK is too sprawling which affects services (especially transport) and detracts from creating an MK character and (c) because the low density is wasteful in an urban environment. Intensification is the favoured option because it improves MK whereas the other options create problems which have to be mitigated.
Question 16	Types of redevelopment	All listed options should be considered except impacting the grid roads which are a principal asset in MK.
Question 17	Other areas for redevelopment	Not known
Question	Other	Existing rural villages should consider taking modest

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

18	approaches	development which will retain their rural character, improve their sustainability and contribute to meeting the Borough's documented housing needs. This should be reflected in Neighbourhood Plans and development should be encouraged by the protocol proposed by MKC Planning but not yet implemented to give parish councils a place in the decision making on the use of S106 / tariff monies as it would be, by right, with CIL.
Question 19	Thoughts on directions of growth	The big issue is, as already said, the lack of an evidence based project of population growth beyond 2031 and, if this is not possible, one has to question the wisdom of this exercise which is pointless without data. Quite apart from the options, one also has to consider the impact on the existing urban infrastructure of doubling the population with a major upgrade of the grid roads but, worse, the so called intelligent transport consultation offers no real or qualified approach. Almost all Planning presentations on this consultation have had questions about the additional infrastructure needed for any of these solutions but no answers and it is essential that this is evaluated as part of a feasibility assessment of the four options. Finally, MKC Finance have said that every 1750 houses costs MKC a net £1m pa so how is this growth to be funded not only on the capital account but also on revenue costs.
Question 20	Order of preference	Intensification of urban MK is the most attractive option and should be developed as far as possible. If evidence based population growth forecasts exceed this then the next most attractive is on the south side in collaboration with Aylesbury Vale but ensuring that proper green belt protection is given to existing villages. Expansion to the east should only be modest and protect Moulsoe and North Crawley. Satellite settlements are highly disruptive and expensive and should not be pursued but instead sensible and acceptable (by way of Neighbourhood Plans) growth should be proposed for rural parishes.

Further Comments

- This whole consultation is meaningless without a projection of how the population will grow. Whether and where houses are built in practice depends on how many of them are actually necessary to meet population demand. No evidence-based housing demand exists beyond 2031 and there has not been any MKC debate or decision. Half of new UK housing demand originates from immigration but whatever government is in office or whether or not the UK remains in the EU, it is highly likely that levels of immigration will be reduced, with a consequent reduction in housing demand.
- A doubling of the size of Milton Keynes is totally contrary to current central Government plans to re-balance population and economy between the North and the South. The South-East of England is

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

already the most densely populated territory in Europe, with exception of Malta, and our infrastructure is struggling to cope even with the current population levels.

- The urban part of MK was designed for a population of 250,000. The urban infrastructure will need to be expanded if the population is going to increase significantly above this level, regardless of whether or not the additional population is located within the existing urban boundary, as residents will inevitably use facilities within the urban area. In particular, the existing grid road infrastructure has been reported (by MKC Highways) as only having capacity for about 15% more traffic. Another obvious candidate would be expansion of the hospital and perhaps the railway station since a large number of residents commute out and another large number commutes in.
- From a purely financial perspective, the Head of Finance at MKC has said that for every 1,750 houses built (the current housing target), MKC faces a net increase in cost of £1million. While there will be offsetting economic benefits, this will be outside the MKC budget i.e. in the private sector or in public services not administered by MKC such as the NHS. This begs the question of how the increase in population can be financed?- 2 -
- More housing in the urban area would have many advantages both in social integration and in public transport infrastructure. MK is just too spread out and loses coherence. A tighter centre would give greater opportunity for an integrated transport system. This should be the preferred option because it will enhance the Borough whereas most other options detract from it to a greater or lesser degree.
- Development to the south and west also has a number of benefits mainly because Aylesbury Vale Council also wishes to develop there on adjacent land. The benefits of scale from the two authorities working together in terms of road infrastructure (e.g. link dualling the A421) would be significant though, again, protection must be offered to existing villages such as Whaddon, Nash, and Beachampton by a green belt. Another benefit of developing on this route will be proximity to the new East-West railway between Oxford and Cambridge.
- In the case of potential rural satellite settlements, the plan does not offer a green belt around the existing villages, leading to a complete loss of identity. The parishes would be transformed from rural villages into urban estates. The size of the proposed settlements is disproportionate – together with existing villages, it would make the new settlements twice as big as the largest existing parish in MK. It would compromise the unique character of MK with its mix of city, market town and rural village.
- In the case of Castlethorpe and Hanslope, a new settlement of this size would overwhelm the existing infrastructure and a new local centre would have to be built. This would leave the existing historic village centres derelict. The school buildings would be abandoned and the local shops, which have served us well for countless years, would probably be forced to close.
- A new road would have to be built. There are only two practical access routes; from the A508 and from Wolverton. The A508 route would either have to be along the existing Yardley Road which hasn't the capacity and would desecrate the historic canal bridge, pub and floodplain bridges. Or a new road would have to be built from the A508 to the new settlement which would have to cross the railway, canal and the River Tove.
- On the Wolverton route, the existing road through Haversham would not have the capacity – it already gridlocks in the mornings - and would be an unfair traffic burden on the residents. So the only possibility would be a new road probably from the roundabout with the Old Wolverton Road. This could follow two routes both of which have significant drawbacks. A route west of Castlethorpe would be along the Tove river valley and quarry workings, now wetlands, which would be an

CASTLETHORPE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Parish Council General Meeting held Monday 1st February 2016 in the Village Hall

environmental disaster. A route east of Castlethorpe would pass through or very close to the “top secret” grounds of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office at Hanslope Park.

- It is also worth considering the construction phase. It would be essential that the new road was built *before* housing development starts. This is because a satellite settlement is unlikely to build at more than a rate of 1,000 houses a year and even that is probably ambitious. The impact for existing villages of construction traffic using the existing inadequate roads for an extended period of 10-20 years is totally unreasonable and unacceptable.
- One of the points mentioned in the plan is the possibility of a new railway station to serve the north of Milton Keynes. In the specific case of Castlethorpe, the existing station land has been sold and planning permission has been granted for low cost housing. In any case, there is no nearby land for parking. Of course, it would be possible to construct a new station further north but to what end? Not only would there be unlikely sufficient local demand for a station beyond Wolverton but there is not enough capacity on the West Coast mainline and any increase in capacity would depend on how it is affected by HS2, which is too far in the future to be knowable.

APPENDIX A8 - Proposed Response to Budget Consultation February 2016

1. **Pink sacks.** The parish council does not consider this to be a satisfactory proposal. We understand that enough blue bags (probably two) for the average week collection will be issued to each household. However, there are weeks when a much higher recycling quantity is needed such as the Christmas / New Year holidays or family celebrations. It isn't practical to give households enough blue bags to cope with their peak loads (either in terms of cost to MKC or storage space by the householder) so where will the recycling rubbish be stored? An option might be to allow householders to buy pink bags to supplement the blue bags at peak times from, say, the refuse site operators but some estimate of take-up would be needed. Otherwise, households will simply place their excess recyclables in the black bags.
2. **Green bins.** There would be a substantial fall-off in green composting. This could be estimated from the previous level when a £10 pa charge used to be made. A significant reduction is not environmentally acceptable and could result in fly-tipping.
3. **Street cleansing.** While halving of cleansing seems possible, MKC and its contractors must commit to responding to calls for additional cleansing. If necessary, this could be channelled through parish councils to provide some filter but otherwise the cleanliness of our streets will decline and this tends to have a knock on effect to other forms of antisocial behaviour. It is not reasonable to expect residents to take up this task. It is also disappointing that the much vaunted interfacing of street cleansing with landscaping will be weakened.