

Question 3

Housing:

What are the three most important factors we should take into account in identifying suitable land for housing development?

- 1) Traffic. 2) Pollution 3) Overcrowding
- 1) Traffic. 2) Pollution 3) Overcrowding
- 1) Access /Traffic routes
- 1) Surrounding infrastructure 2) Maintaining integrity of village 3) Environmental
- 1) Housing density 2) Road infrastructure 3) Preserving characteristics of the village
- 1) Walkable amenities and the avoidance to have to use a car – therefore, the site needs to be sustainable 2) Visual impact within an area that is natural, beautiful and represents a key part of unspoilt countryside in North Buckinghamshire 3) Lack of any dual carriageways – no infrastructure in this area!
- 1) Haversham does not have any suitable land – we need to keep the green fields around ourselves – what is going to happen to traffic flow on Wolverton Road – traffic queues now in the mornings and evenings – rush hour – the roads are not suitable unless a by-pass is sought!
- 1) Traffic 2) Schools 3) Parking
- 1) Preservation of countryside/green space (balance with development)
- 1) Traffic levels 2) Noise 3) Surrounding environment
- 1) Need to still protect wildlife 2) Traffic 3) Landscape keeping in same setting
- 1) Adds suitable and sympathetic housing within or close to settlement boundaries of today 2) Leverage existing infrastructure rather than requiring new roads or bridges. 3) Protects the rural feel of the Parish, in particular the open agricultural landscape
- 1) Maintain and protect rural feel of Parish and agricultural/leisure 'industry'. 2) Any development should be in keeping with immediate surroundings. 3) Limit current and future traffic impact and look for ways of improving ability to move around Parish on foot. No major infrastructure (roads and bridges)
- 1) That sufficient infrastructure is in place to service their needs 2) Safe access 3) Cost factor
- 1) Use brownfield sites 2) Use land that belongs to government near motorways 3) Establish new towns

- 1) Ensuring green belt around the existing village 2) Sufficient road safety 3) Ensuring school maintains a village status.
- 1) Preserving the public walkways and open land space. 2) New development not to encroach on village life. 3) Not to drive additional traffic through the village.
- 1) Do not build on agricultural land. 2) Do not build on allotments. 3) Do not build on grazing land.
- 1) Access to main roads, stations and transport infrastructure. 2) Capacity of schools 3) Utility connection costs.
- 1) Not to spoil the lovely countryside 2) Think of the extra traffic!
- 1) A mix of all uses. 2) A small amount of affordable houses for first time buyers. 3) ??? within existing houses
- 1) What the impact would be on the outlook of existing dwellings 2) The impact of additional traffic at entry/exit points of such developments 3) Can the current services infrastructure (power/water/drainage) cope with extra demand.
- 1) Not spoil the outlook on existing developments 2) The extra amount of traffic that would come with the development 3) Would all the services connected with the new housing cope with the extra demand
- 1) Affordable with a mix of housing 2) Eco friendly 3) Sufficient parking
- 1) Mix of affordable housing. 2) Eco friendly build 3) Ensure enough parking for new builds.

- 1) Accessible infrastructure of roads 2) Keep and manage developments around sensitive landscapes 3) Identify business developments (small shops, post office etc.)
- 1) Is there adequate schooling to adhere (?) to the influx in new children to the area? 2) Do we need to build a new school? A new park. The excess children need to be cared for equally. 3) Apart from that the matter of the fact is we are a growing country. We need to build, everyone should support this and not be selfish!
- 1) The local need for housing. 2) Maintaining a mixed variety of housing stock. 3) Not allowing too high a density of housing on any plot.
- 1) There should be a number of small developments of 10-25 dwellings each 2) Access to main roads when being built and afterwards /disruption to current use. 3) Use office locations rather than ruin farmland
- 1) No adverse impact on the flood plain 2) Easily accessible to local facilities 3) The implications of traffic management in the surrounding areas.
- 1) Infrastructure 2) Use land between present dwellings if possible 3) Move to join the two parts of Haversham to make it one community and helps us to eradicate the conception of 'Us and Them' which appears to exist.
- 1) Overpopulating areas 2) Damage to existing ecosystems.
- 1) Infilling would preserve the linear development in the village. Use land which his already part of the village or which links the two parts of the village. 2) Retention of open agricultural around the village. Preserve the character of the settlement. 3) Traffic – managing the increase.
- 1) Housing development will inevitably lead to an increase in traffic. Haversham Village cannot sustain such an increase. 2) New housing will require new roads which should be positioned away from the village.
- 1) Enhances the existing community.
- 1) Traffic to and from location, traffic management, already issues at rush hour. 2) Making sure we preserve the vibe of the village, keeping that village feel and not turning into another grid area of MK.
- 1) Used Brownfield Sites should be prioritised. 2) Infrastructure – Road capabilities, schools, hospital etc. 3) Not using more green belt.
- 1) Over population in small village 2) Total infrastructure.
- 1) The impact of the area – will it destroy a rural area for ever? 2) How will the roads cope with the extra traffic? 3) The environment – flora and fauna.
- 1) Not to block the views of current houses. 2) Not to affect the views when walking on path (across fields), 3) If there is demand for houses in this area 4) Houses have been for sale in the village for months – not sold.
- 1) Not near nature reserve/woods 2) Not overlooking Ouse Valley 3) Not on the skyline.
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- 1. Land not used by existing community. 2. Unproductive farmland. 3. Landowners prepared to sell.
- 1. Low or unchanged traffic throughout. 2. No large scale development. 3. This is a village in the countryside, let's keep it this way!
- 1. AIA. Most residents chose to live here in a village location, we do not want to increase it in size to become a town or join another town. 2. We have a large variety of wildlife and would like to keep it – too much building would kill that off. 3. Farming is important to this country and could become more so in the near future – losing the farms would be a devastation.
- 1. Not allowing large scale developments that extend over a wide area, i.e. identifying smaller parcels of land. 2. Distribution through the parish area. 3. Working with landowners but not allowing them to dictate terms.
- 1. Make sure we create spaces between clumps of housing – it shouldn't all be crowded together. It should have leisure spaces like grassland and woodland.

- 1. Least possible interruption to village way of life.
- 1. Size of development. 2. Traffic impact. 3. The impact on our landscape and wildlife.
- 1. Not using flood plains for buildings or roads. 2. Protecting the biodiversity of our landscape. 3. Road planning should have considerable thought. Traffic calming measures (already too fast through New Haversham). Zebra crossing – main road near school roundabout.
- 1. Protecting the land – ensuring any new builds are sympathetic to their surroundings: biodiversity, environment. 2. Roads – ensure that suitable traffic management solutions in place for the increased traffic. 3. Ensure housing is sympathetic to existing housing – element of organic planning to grow and enhance existing communities.
- 1. Traffic. 2. Community facilities. 3. Protecting current settlements.
- 1. Any new builds to be kept as a linear development in village area. 2. Haversham/Little Linford has become a commuter traffic ‘rat run’ and therefore access onto main roads through the area should be given serious deliberation. 3. Who is really going to occupy the new developments? Locals? Buy to let? Young families? Homeless?
- 1. Plan transport links to protect ‘village’ and so enable additional housing to be absorbed with minimal traffic impact. 2. Improve access to areas of employment, recreation avoiding residential areas. 3. Avoid areas without mains drainage and flood risk
- 1. Not using greenfield sites, develop brownfield sites. 2. Developments to be respectful to existing villages
- 1. Not on flood plain. 2. Not too many new houses in small area. 3. Road networks and access
- 1. Ease of access. 2. Provision of schools, doctors etc. 3. Cost of the homes
- 1. Ensuring new builds fit into the present landscape. 2. Do not engulf the villages so that developments join into Wolverton/Newport Pagnell/MK. 3. Build on available sites within the villages!
- 1. Access – not making existing routes more congested – but ensuring new routes ease any increase of traffic. 2. Small developments that are sympathetic to the buildings already in the area. 3. Acknowledging it’s going to happen so getting in first with a suitable compromise
- 1. That the land is not being used for agriculture. 2. That any development does not put unnecessary strain on the roads.

- 1) To re-develop Galley Hill and Fullers Slade with better modern housing. 2) Not to develop on any land, too much is being used at the moment. 3) Use old dilapidated housing only. Are you aware of what new buyers are doing with current housing?
- 1) Brownfield sites if possible. 2) Disruption to people’s lives. 3) Listen to local people, not outsiders.
- 1) Minimise impact on existing settlement, e.g. views, noise, traffic, type of residents. Also consider impact on existing property values. 2) Type of housing to fit with current village identity. 3) Sufficient facilities e.g. GP, shops, schools etc.
- 1) Road access, there is a lot of traffic, bro. 2) Current rural views, open fields are quite nice. 3) Local wildlife, don’t take my deer, its nice to look at (when it appears).
- 1) Access – will the current infrastructure be suitable for increased amount of traffic? 2) Protecting wildlife and habitats. 3) Protecting the landscape/green space – its quite picturesque around here, don’t ruin it.
- 1) Keeping the character of existing settlements.
- 1) Avoid green areas – use brownfield sites. 2) Avoid building on flood areas. 3) Preserve the parks and recreation areas.
- 1) Infrastructure.
- 1) Infrastructure.
- 1) Preserving the rural aspect of existing housing. 2) Generated traffic flows. 3) Keep it low density – give the houses gardens large enough!
- 1) Beware of the flood plain! 2) Beware of crossing for one side of the estate to the other side. 3) I love the idea of unusual looking houses as long as it fits in well with the village and estate.
- 1) Join village and estate together. Build on hill down to village.

- 1) Not building on greenbelt and preserving countryside. 2) Facilities – more houses mean more schools, medical centres and shops. 3) Safe roads and parking.
- 1) Countryside. 2) Overcrowding. 3) Facilities.
- 1) The proximity to other houses – i.e. not too close!
- 1) Impact on traffic and local services (e.g. school) 2) Consider the impact on the existing residents. We moved here because we love the peace and quiet (we lived in a huge new build estate previously) and would be devastated if the area was to lose its existing character. 3) Growth should be measured and organic – I would prefer to see smaller, more considerate developments on the outskirts of the villages. Not huge developments that swamp the community.
- 1) Organic growth of existing developments. 2) Traffic (especially rush hour consideration). 3) Outstanding planning permissions.
- 1) Use land already allocated and approved for future development.
- 1) Furthest away from bottlenecks such as Little Linford Lane.
- 1) Away from areas close to Little Linford as no infrastructure and traffic. 2) Not in areas of beauty. 3) Haversham to Wolverton was more suited to new homes.
- 1 – How does it affect current residence, 2 – how it affects the overall landscape, 3 – does the land flood
- 1 – Traffic, 2 – Facilities e.g. school, shops, hospital, 3 – wild life
- 1 – No impact on current infrastructure (schools, traffic)
- 1 – Using brown field sites only
- 1 – Sustainable development that adds value to the existing settlements, 2 – Find out what landowners are willing to sell land, 3 – Limit development to a moderate size. The naire should have asked the direct ‘where do you think additional housing should be located?’ – missed opportunity (but went on to complete Q8 – BC)
- 1 – Environment – what impact will future development have on the environment – physically – damage to habitats, wildlife. 2 – Access – will current road networks need to be upgraded, re-routed – (would also cause damage to wildlife if re-routed upgraded), 3 – Loss of green space around the current village boundary – people move here to be surrounded by green space not more houses!
- 1 – not near me, 2 – don’t dehome cows (B17)
- 1 – in fill
- 1 – only small amount of houses – in filling
- 1 – only a small amount of land should be available for development
- 1 – I am opposed to any developments, 2 – So there are no factors for consideration, 3 – the river is the barrier
- 1 – Smaller developments that can reflect the character of the village / parish rather than overwhelm it. 2 – a reasonable proportion of smaller properties & affordable housing to enable people to start on the housing ladder. 3 – * utilising land that has the least agricultural value (not financial value)
- 1 – The location within our parish. There are several areas which could be options. 2 – The type & design of any proposed building. 3 – Traffic: what impact any development will have on the already ‘rat run’ road system
- 1 – Current use – neglected & derelict land. 2 – Impact on surrounding areas (built or natural). 3 – Infilling where possible
- 1 – keeping as much farm land as possible
- 1 – Scenic landscapes, 2 – Traffic, 3 – Surrounding housing
- 1 – The impact on surrounding residential areas. 2 – Minimum impact on environment & green areas. 3 – adequate infrastructure to cope with additional housing / residents traffic
- 1 – The impact on surrounding residential areas. 2 – Minimum impact on environment & green areas. 3 – adequate infrastructure to cope with additional housing / residents traffic (same 2nd comment BC)

- 1 – More bungalow style housing for elderly community members who can no longer cope in a house but would still want to live in Haversham and the surrounds & be part of their established community. 2 – No high rise buildings / flats
- 1. – only a small amount of land should be available for development
- 1. – ensure it would not produce high density development, 2. – Have suitable access & traffic management, 3. – Adjoin existing development
- 1. – areas within current developments without expanding the footprint of development vs. green spaces. 2. – Impact on existing house residents – outlook, privacy, house value. 3. - The sustainable lifestyle of the community – keeping the current village feel.
- 1. – Heritage – similar style, 2. – Community – village feel, 3. – Facilities, shop etc.
- 1. – limited impact on the local wildlife & natural surroundings. 2. – Low housing density – it will cease to be a village if land is over crowded with housing. 3. – ensuring that geographical & natural protection, i.e. flood plain – are preserved
- 1. – impact on existing infrastructure. 2. – access to any suitable land. 3. – type of proposed development
- 1. – on the edge of the parish. 2. – connectivity to existing major road routes, therefore develop near to them not in midst of village. 3. – Protection of natural balance – wildlife etc.
- 1. – keeping a village environment with no large housing expansion, i.e. very limited or no expansion at all in Haversham, may be a few retirement homes for downsizing
- 1. – no adverse impact on the flood plain. 2. – easily accessible to local facilities. 3. – no adverse impact on traffic management
- 1. – extends existing housing. 2. – refurbishing spoiled land. 3. – not creating even worse traffic problems
- 1. – extend existing housing. 2. – refurbish brown ex industry areas. 3. – only build near existing adequate roads
- 1. – as far as possible use brown sites or sites of poor agricultural land. 2. – provide housing for offspring of existing residents
- 1. – that we don't spoil our beautiful rural countryside, wildlife habitats etc. 2. – that the infrastructure can cope with the increase in numbers of people, traffic etc.
- 1. – not to build on our rural countryside which once built on cannot be replaced. 2.- the local road infrastructure struggles to cope at times now, so more housing will escalate this problem. 3. – try not to add on to our villages to create huge housing estates
- 1. – not to change our green belt. 2. – keeping our agriculture. 3. – flooding
- 1) Road/traffic access – short and long term 2) Real need for housing!! (social having a village with no real amenities and poor transport
- 1) Flood plains 2) Local parks are kept 3) Big enough space for housing
- 1) Not outside village boundaries 2) Infill where possible 3) Linking the two halves of the village.
- 1) Not to spoil our landscape 2) Once it's gone we can never get it back 3) To leave some green and natural land for future generations.
- 1) Identifying Brown Field sites 2) Keeping the existing social sites i.e. The Greyhound and Social Club 3) Provide adequate transport i.e. buses for areas identified
- 1) Traffic 2) Infrastructure 3) Existing homes should not be overlooked
- 1) Not overlooking or intrusive on current homes 2) Provision for additional roads/access 3) Utilising derelict land, not remaining farm land
- 1) Not overlooking or imposing on the current houses in Haversham 2) In a location where additional roads can be put in to support with traffic from Hanslope
- 1) Protecting areas of beauty from development 2) Nature reserves to be protected 3) Selecting most suitable for development that allows for infrastructure
- 1) Protecting characteristics of current settlements 2) Protecting agriculture 3) Protecting sensitive landscapes

- 1) Protecting the characteristics of the current settlements 2) Managing traffic 3) Avoiding harm to biodiversity
 - 1) Access 2) Not building on land of outstanding natural beauty 3) Wildlife
 - 1) Suitable access for new home owners and cars etc 2) Pollution 3) Safety on the roads if traffic level increases
 - 1) Managing the flood plain 2) Protecting footpaths
 - 1) Flood plain 2) Maintaining existing agricultural/grazing areas 3) Maintain existing communal amenities
 - 1) Infrastructure, roads 2) Least visual impact
 - 1) Traffic 2) Preserve 'green belt'
-
- 1) Biodiversity 2) Pollution 3) Future benefits to this community
 - 1) Location 2) Current use 3) Not losing the current rural setting
 - 1) Keeping a village style to village and not over developing 2) Keeping our open spaces.
 - 1) Use infill between houses to prevent increase in village size 2) Access from new housing into existing highways
 - 1) With the MK Plan already providing the additional housing needed over the planning horizon there is no immediate pressure for development in the parish 2) That does not rule out proposals for creative and sympathetic small scale development in the parish, compatible with the Neighbourhood Plan 3) The triangle in lower Haversham is a hostage to fortune, neglected, untidy and with a decaying fence and wall on its boundary with the road. A developer may justly claim its use for housing removed an eyesore while meeting housing need.
 - 1) Access 2) Congestion / parking 3) Number of dwellings and specific types i.e sympathetic to existing.
 - 1) road infrastructure 2) traffic levels
 - 1) environmental sensitivity 2) land to be used e.g. is it flood plain
 - 1) keeping intrusion on the lives of current residents to a minimum
 - 1) Balancing need for housing against loss of land for other purposes. We need houses so they have to go somewhere. We have to accept some inconvenience if others need somewhere to live. (sorry, that probably belongs in 2)
 - 1) Preferably unproductive land 2) Keeping integrity (views etc.) of existing properties 3) Avoiding traffic build up in existing roads.
 - 1) Location 2) Impact on traffic
 - 1) Impact on existing neighbourhood communities 2) Damage to biodiversity/wildlife/nature 3) Traffic impact.
 - 1) Flood risk 2) Infrastructure (roads, internet, waste etc.) can accommodate new buildings 3) Views / green space not lost.
 - 1) Environmental risk (no building in flood risk areas etc.) 2) Does not impinge on the existing views obtainable from existing dwellings 3) Suitable infrastructure to support increased traffic and facilities created to support any new developments.
 - 1) Impact on surrounding area, vista and population 2) Road access not turning local roads into busy highways 3) Access to schools, doctors, dentist.
 - 1) Traffic 2) Not destroy identity of village.
-
1. Impact on current traffic through the village.
 2. Ensure community spirit continues
 3. Ensure Haversham doesn't become 'lost' within overdevelopment.
1. Proximity and impact on current communities
 2. The impact on the biodiversity
1. Infill
 2. Adjacent to existing houses
 3. Directly accessible from main roads so as not to increase traffic in existing estate roads

1. Impact on current infrastructure (i.e. roads, traffic flow through village).
 2. Impact on community – is everyone happy (within reasons – new development is inevitable and needed)
 3. Impact on environment
 4. Impact on current village – will it change community outlook?
1. Access
 1. Infill gaps in current developments
 2. Using planning gain to improve roads and traffic
 3. Avoid the flood plain
 1. Does not obstruct our lovely countryside
 2. Traffic
 3. Noise
 1. Smaller homes for young couples at reasonable prices.
 1. Preserving and protecting habitats for wildlife
 2. Maintaining countryside that surrounds the existing houses to protect views, walks, and wellbeing of current residents.
 3. Not to remove or impede the rural setting in which our village currently exists by overpopulations or busy traffic.
 1. Current use
 2. How many homes
 3. How it affects existing homes
 1. Traffic implications
 2. Sufficient schooling and leisure facilities
 1. Suitable connection to main road
 2. Not three storey proportions
 3. Only a simple development
 1. Sympathy for current development
 2. How it would affect the character of the village
 1. Need for social housing
 2. Need for affordable housing.
 1. Impact on traffic flow
 2. Impact on community
 3. Impact on biodiversity
-
1. All new developments should be small
 2. Tucked between/behind existing housing
 3. Distributed equally in small pockets in both parts of the community
 1. The most important factor to take into consideration is traffic, and how it effects the residents. Any additional road traffic has a detrimental effect.
 1. Traffic
 2. Affordable Housing/Starter Homes
 3. Sympathetic to Village Life
 1. How it fits into its surroundings
 2. Not harmful to its surroundings
 3. Not ruining quality of life to existing dwellers
 1. Doesn't change character of the village
 1. Traffic
 2. Infrastructure
 3. Not overlooking current homes
 1. Impact to green land
 2. Traffic
 3. Facilities

1. Look first to the existing poor quality housing, maximise use of space and quality in these areas as they are already urban areas.
2. Ask what is the central holistic plan for housing in the UK. If it is to simply keep swelling the population and reactively building poor quality housing where does it end? If no-one can answer this do everything possible to stop the same problems associated with large poorly planned developments from affecting our area and stop large scale developments here.
1. Current use of land e.g. fishing lake trout farm not in use, field opposite old post office (i.e. will it take too much out of food production/agriculture? Yes if you take whole fields out. Take small bits.
2. How easily it can blend into existing settlements or its environment/heritage
3. Avoid massive road structures/grid roads/roundabouts – create small road entrances e.g. near bus stop as you enter village from Wolverton direction behind crescent – bungalows or small road down from field linking church and school
1. Effect on Agriculture
2. Road Access
3. Land not prone to flooding or subsidence
1. Suitability – for example not on a flood plain
2. Potential for good access
1. Not near the river
2. Around existing development
1. Not on Flood Plain
2. Near the village

1. Consideration for the existing community, the impact a development will have and the benefits that can be achieved from the development
2. Access to transport network, Milton Keynes is predominantly a satellite town with the majority of occupants working in London, and other major towns and cities. Currently the existing provision is at capacity and would not cope with any increase.
3. Effect on the existing agricultural industry and the impact on the habitat of species occupying the existing land.
1. That the infrastructure capacity is sufficient in the surrounding area to cope with the demand of the development.
2. Demand of housing on traffic
3. Consideration of existing housing in place
1. Preserving footpaths and the character of the landscape
2. Identifying 'scraps' of land and 'brownfield' sites rather than building on our beautiful countryside
3. Ensuring that any building does not increase flooding.
1. Affordable housing/starter homes
2. Traffic
3. Sympathetic to Village Life
1. Area/Location
2. Necessity
3. Thoughts and Feelings of Community Concerned
1. Maintain boundary to Milton Keynes
2. Keep off floodplain
3. Don't build where unnecessary i.e. in the Greyhound Garden.
1. Impact on existing homes
2. Transport links
3. Community facilities
1. Not crowded; some garden around each property
2. Affordable NOT luxury 4/5 bedroom houses
1. Should fit into the existing village characteristics
2. Should be within the village envelope

3. Should not damage the rural landscape
 1. Maintain the character of each part of the village
 2. Each new dwelling should have the same size plot and garden similar to current properties
 3. Locate in New Haversham nearer the school with better transport access, by adding three further cul de sacs to Brookfield Road
 1. Cost
 2. Infrastructure
 3. Position
 1. Cost
 2. Infrastructure
 3. Position
 1. Situation. Use of infill sites as against prime agricultural land
 2. Infrastructure i.e. drainage, sewage
 3. Accessibility – effect on local traffic
 1. It's present use – especially farming
 2. Provision for local working, from home or small business premises
 3. Haversham appears to be a useful route connecting MK and Northampton – plan for through traffic
 1. Farming
 2. Preserving beautiful scenes
 3. Need
 1. Don't know
 1. There is no road infrastructure to support development
 2. Impact on traffic (MK is becoming a bottleneck with the silly direction of adjusting perfectly good roads
 3. Respect for residents who bought here to be in a village!!! Not lost in a development.
- 1) Safe access onto Wolverton Road for travel into Wolverton/MK. 2) Connection to the existing housing - this is vital for a population to remain a community rather than scattered 'ghettos'. 3) It is no good attempting to 'infill' small pockets of land and expect the quantity of housing required as a result. The estate must be expanded in a credible way, with suitable access to both the community facilities and healthcare/retail services to the south of Haversham.
 - 1) Not to be built right on top of existing houses.
 - 1) Not to overlook or encroach existing dwellings. 2) Not to take away walkways for dog owners. 3) Manage traffic through villages.
 - 1) Don't want any. 2) Hardly any. 3) It's a village.
 - No building in Haversham.
 - Village is not suitable for housing development.
 - No factors - no houses.
 - 1) Impact on traffic in/through the village. 2) maintaining a village environment rather than a MK overspill.
 - 1) Is the land suitable for housing. 2) Can we upgrade the infrastructure to cope. 3) Will the new houses benefit the area.
 - 1) Not a flood plain. 2) No impact on biodiversity.
 - 1) Does it flood! Some residents in nearby villages already suffer from this despite the builders being warned by locals at the time of building new estates. 2) How will it affect local agriculture. We may become dependent on this when we eventually leave the EU. 3) What access is available to the local employment centres of MK, Northampton and Bedford.
 - 1) Does not flood. 2) Ensuring access in and out of estates are safe for motorists and pedestrians.
 - 1) Not on flood plains. 2) Traffic. 3) Noise.
 - 1) Access to present facilities.
 - 1) Sufficient parking spaces off road. 2) Not high rise building. 3) Not intruding on present housing.

- 1) Traffic. 2) Local neighbourhoods.
- 1) Traffic. 2) Community facilities.
- 1) Traffic, 2) Having a negative impact on the existing settlements, 3) Ensure there are adequate facilities to cope with an increase in houses
- 1) Brownfield usage
- 1) Not affecting flood areas, 2) Should not affect house prices of current houses so don't block views etc, 3) Should be kept separate as a new estate so not to overload current roads and facilities
- 1) Countryside/Wildlife. 2) Community, 3) Traffic Management
- 1) Don't build where there is no infrastructure – roads etc, 2) Spoiling the landscape, 3) Save our greenbelt land and the beautiful countryside
- 1) Roads should be accessible – this is **not** the case here, 2) Community and rural element to Haversham – **don't spoil it**, 3) Protect the wildlife/bats and birds that have made their home here
- 1) Necessity, i.e. is it necessary outside of the MK Boundary, 2) Impact on current homes, roads, services, 3) Greenbelt – retained or lost
- 1) Road structure (traffic flow)
- 1) Protecting the countryside from housing development, 2) To build new homes on disused/vacant land within Milton Keynes only, 3) To encourage the redevelopment of brownfield land
- 1) Brownfield, not greenfield, 2) Any new housing must complement existing housing without overcrowding existing communities, 3) Local ecology must be preserved and override other factors
- 1) Ensure not to build on the Ouse Valley Park area, 2) Ensure to maintain adequate green areas, 3) ensure valuable farmland is maintained
- 1) Not being within the Park's Trust land and the flood plain, 2) Keeping the existing green spaces, i.e. the recreation ground and green on The Crescent, 3) Avoiding bad junction , i.e. the top of Haversham and turning right down to old Haversham, would be a bad area to negotiate traffic
- 1) Any new development should have road access direct to the main road and not through an existing estate as current roads cannot handle additional traffic, 2) Impact to green spaces and walks, 3) Safety, traffic light crossings on the main road?
- 1) Traffic flow, 2) Limited impact to green spaces, 3) Balance of impact between upper and lower Haversham
- 1) Traffic, 2) Pollution, 3) Noise
- 1) Protecting the characteristics of the current settlements, 2) Protecting sensitive landscapes and heritage, 3) Avoiding harm to bio diversity
- 1) Traffic Management, manageability of location and building works traffic, 2) Biodiversity, 3) Maintaining the look and style of the village
- 1) Road access and traffic impact on village roads, motorway etc, 2) Infrastructure (available already, e.g. schools, doctors surgeries etc) 3) Overall impact on surrounding villages e.g. property prices/loss of arable land
- 1) Adding more houses in the "village" for younger families, 2) Maybe waste ground opposite old village post office to seating areas with trees, village pond and play equipment with 30-40 houses (2, 3, 4 beds) group around and behind with lovely green space in the middle, 3) A mix of houses that families that have always lived here can afford, not just for rich commuters.
- 1) Infrastructure, i.e. roads & services (local) to be able to function with higher demand. 2) Neighbourhood Encroachment
- 1) Traffic 2) Environment 3) Services to cope with new housing.
- 1) The need for local land for local people 2) Small sites 3) Brown field - ex manufacturing where possible
- 1) Housing for local people 2) Brown sites 3) Checking out empty buildings, houses, factories, etc.

- 1) Avoid ruining the countryside views from existing housing 2) The impact of traffic through the local villages 3) Increased demand for local schools.
- 1) Try to have small developments of just a few houses - not a large estate bolted onto what we have already
- 1) Not expanding the current village boundaries 2) Sympathetic to existing characteristics 3) Provide small increases in village population which do not place undue burden on the limited facilities.
- 1) Good transport links so encouraged not to use our cars more than necessary 2) Ensure good links to open space facilities & enlarged school 3) Provides improved quality in the village & a variety of housing - as a traditional village.
- 1) Do not expand on current village boundaries 2) Sympathetic to existing housing 3) Small developments.
- 1) Impact of increased traffic 2) Preservation of the rural community in the old village and in the estate 3) How would any development encourage integration into the existing communities and not become separate or dominate? i.e. number of dwellings built.
- 1) Not encroaching existing houses or home owners 2) keeping traffic to a minimum from new residents 3) preserving our green spaces.
- 1) Not to forget a doctor's surgery at least 2) room for a shop.
- 1) Small scale developments that are integrated rather than overwhelm the present community 2) Access routes for construction vehicles, residents and parking 3) No point in identifying large sites if there is not sufficient infrastructure to support quantity of new housing (school, road capacity, recreation facilities etc.).
- 1) Not to disturb walkways 2) manage traffic in village 3) Not to disturb dwellings
- 1) Not expand but try and find sites within current developments
- 1) if interferes current green land
- 1) Natural sprawl e.g. building out from existing developments. 2) Limiting the village and estate e.g. filling the in the gap between Church and play park 3) Access without making already busy roads busier.
- 1) Blending into surroundings and not over powering current housing 2) Facilities for the incoming residents eg school infrastructure 3) Attractive looking houses that enhance the look of the village
- 1) Impact of extra traffic. 2) to be in keeping with surrounding countryside/setting. 3) that the land can sustain the houses(not on floodplains etc.)
- 1) Traffic management, how much it creates and its flow. 2) Low in numbers, 10's rather than 100's. 3) Building should be in keeping with whatever part of the village it is located.
- 1) Areas that do not impact already on the busy roads 2) Areas that do not already have houses 3) Take into consideration the flooding areas.
- 1) Environment 2) protecting rural jobs
- 1) Not on flood plain 2) Not going to make traffic unmanageable 3) Suitable number for existing services.
- 1) Avoiding flood plains 2) Avoiding disrupting current residents 3) Don't build any more.
- 1) Surrounding in which they are to be built 2) Impact on existing properties 3) Access.
- 1) Traffic/congestion/noise 2) Space/environment 3) How it affects current residents.
- 1) Traffic congestion and pollution 2) Loss of habitat for animals 3) Loss of value to existing houses.
- 1) Infrastructure, transport availability. 2) Land with existing planning permission should be developed before any further land is released. 3) All development should be green and environmentally friendly.
- 1) Properties to complement the surroundings. 2) Care and consideration of existing residents. 3) Care and consideration to countryside.
- 1. Traffic. 2. A good Community Hall and grounds to facilitate a real village atmosphere
- 1. Traffic. 2. Infrastructure. 3. Preserving existing property 'space' and amenities

- 1. That it isn't prime agricultural land. 2. That it doesn't flood. 3. That it is linked to the present community
- 1. Not to use local agriculture land. 2. Not to use local countryside. 3. Agreement by local community
- 1. Suitable transport links. 2. Visual impact on village
- 1. Housing (affordable) for those brought up in the area
- 1. Not using greenfield sites. 2. Not using farmland
- 1. Not using greenfield sites
- 1. Traffic. 2. Roads. 3. Amenities
- 1. Above the village and away from flood plains
- 1. Range of housing to ensure existing residents can continue to live here in later life and young people can stay. 2. Affordable housing. 3. Re-use of old farm buildings. Rough land in centre of 'old' village
- 1. Enough housing to make living in Haversham affordable for families who have lived here for generations. 2. Re-use of farm buildings to make into houses. 3. Tidy up the rough area of ground in old village with nice village green with houses round it
- 1. Landscape. Will the new homes fit into the existing development? 2. Access to roads and public transport. Is there pedestrian access? Would those without cars be able to get around? 3. Traffic is a major concern for the villages. We should minimise the effect of additional traffic from new homes. Traffic in Haversham, Little Linford etc. is becoming worse and worse. We have to build where cars will not unduly add to this problem
- 1. Planned in areas where there are facilities and very good access to transport and roads, and space for cars, and for small gardens. 2. Areas where there can be enough space for a very good landscaping so that the new homes will blend into the existing environment. 3. The new homes should not overlook or affect privacy of existing homes and their owners
- 1. Infill plots – e.g. piece of land in Old Haversham with fallen stone wall to road frontage. An eyesore and ideal for a small development. 2. Land adjacent to the village – leading to natural development rather than in middle of nowhere. 3. Suitability of access to the school, railway station.
- 1) Affordable housing for young families
- 1) Not suitable for anything else. 2) Looks like a village eyesore. 3) Fits in well with existing development and is affordable and not luxurious.
- 1) Minimise the effect on the current village and occupants. 2) Traffic implications. 3) Ensure it blends in and compliments the current village layout and style.
- 1) Minimise the effect on the current village and occupants. 2) Traffic implications. 3) Ensure it blends in and compliments the current village layout and style.
- 1) Ample space between house building. 2) Consideration of surrounding structures including brickwork.
- 1) Access to schools, doctor's etc.
- 1) Prioritise brownfield sites and infill and keep style and design in keeping. 2) Traffic management given the continued growth of MK and flow of traffic through/between developments. 3) Flood prevention. Flood prevention. Flood prevention.
- 1) Prioritise brownfield sites and infill and keep style and design in keeping. 2) Traffic management given the continued growth of MK and flow of traffic through/between developments. 3) Flood prevention. Flood prevention. Flood prevention.
- 1) Use brownfield site first. 2) Use non-crop-producing field. 3) New development will not cause service problems for older properties.
- 1) Amount of traffic. 2) Consideration for existing residents. 3) Keeping our rural areas.
- 1) Traffic. 2) Consideration for existing residents. 3) Keeping rural areas.
- 1) Impact on current rural settlements. 2) Destruction of wildlife habitats. 3) Compact development rather than sprawl.

- 1) Former industrial areas should be utilised first. 2) provision of adequate ground drainage, utility supply and telecoms are critical.
- 1) Don't destroy rural areas. 2) Don't build expensive housing to make developers more money. 3) Don't give planning unless all agreed facilities are in place first. No backtracking on original plans.
- 1) Brownfield sites first. 2) Loss of village community. 3) Loss of countryside farmland and nature.
- 1) Traffic. 2) Local amenities.
- 1) Infilling. 2) Types of housing. 3) Connection and utilities.
- See Q2 [long answer]
- 1) How it affects the natural landscape surrounding. 2) How will the infrastructure for the community be affected. 3) The extent of the development - if it is large, it will be detrimental to a small village.
- 1) Preserve greenbelt land and concentrate on brownfield sites as much as possible. 2) Impact on the local countryside and ecosystem. 3) Impact on the traffic flow of any developments. The recent relatively small development in Hanslope has caused chaos at rush hour with road closures and parked trade vehicles.
- 1) Access and road capacity, and disruption to current residents. 2) Look for small-scale development possibilities, not huge estates. 3) no point in identifying large sites for houses if the accompanying infrastructure can't be put in place.
- 1) Preserving landscape, especially near the river and floodplains. 2) Well thought through transport links as to not overload existing roads. 3) Integration into existing villages.
- 1) Traffic (safety and overcrowding on roads) 2) How it will affect current landscape/views. 3) Whether it can provide additional community facilities.
- 1) Not to over expand development. It is a village. People move here for that reason! 2) Connection between upper and lower village should be sensitively thought out. 3) Not to be overdeveloped! Like Deanshanger is now!!
- 1) Infrastructure. 2) Finance to pay for this. 3) Safety.
- 1) To ensure that infrastructure is in place to accommodate. 2) To ensure that suitable land has the highways in place to allow people to come and go to work and to take their children to school. 3) To ensure that the Council has the finance to pay for the infrastructure required.
- 1) Proximity to amenities- school/station etc. can we build a nucleus around the school that might support a shop? 2) Minimising fast traffic through the village. 3) Protection of the rural nature of the village walks and open countryside rather than urban sprawl.
- 1) What impact the location will have on existing residents must not be negative. 2) Will the land make a suitable site for new residents?
- 1) Proximity to existing houses -not close by. 2) The potential (sic)
- 1) Keeping as much green space as possible. 2) Facilities taking into consideration the needs of high occupation i.e. shops, surgery. 3) Maintaining a level of individuality in the community.
- 1) The impact on traffic. 2) Protecting sensitive landscapes. 3) Avoiding harm to biodiversity/protecting agriculture.
- 1) Protection of the countryside. The less impact, the better. 2) Minimising pollution through less roads and traffic. 3) The less noise and light pollution the better.