

APPENDIX B

Neighbourhood Plan Community Questionnaire

Individual comments to Qualitative Questions

Question 2

Community priorities:

Are there any other factors that you think should be taken into consideration when thinking about planning for the future in our community? Please specify:

- No
- No
- Consider young members of the community and encourage them to stay with affordable housing
- Infrastructure constraints
- School places
- Impact on biodiversity and ecology (the flood zones provide an important habitat)
- Vacant land to the west and south of MK is far more suitable
- I have always lived in a village and do not want any expansion – there is plenty of vacant land in MK so utilise that
- The traffic on Wolverton Road & speed drivers travel through the village. No-one stops at the mini roundabout
- Maintaining the character of the neighbourhood
- Priority should be given to developing the current settlements with appropriate expansion within or close to settlement boundaries. Satellite development should be avoided so as not to create a patchwork quilt of disconnected housing
- Any proposed development should be in or close to existing settlements. H&LL is a largely rural Parish and agriculture and informal leisure should be protected. We must avoid satellite or patchwork developments and urban creep
- The fact that our countryside is fast disappearing. Plans need to be in place for more protection of green areas
- Do not build on flood plains or on greenfield sites.
- We need to acknowledge the demand for housing by the general population rather than just demanding that the neighbourhood remains unchanged.
- Improvement in public transport links - mainly bus services.
- Try and improve the bus service, perhaps twice an hour.
- Needs to be an opportunity for young people to purchase housing and therefore continue in the area-- bungalows need to be offered so again the elderly can stay.
- Affordable housing for all! Look at infrastructure before expansion goes ahead as this has not been taken into consideration when school expansion was approved.
- More housing for people already living in the village but looking to downsize or upsize.
- Better transport for the public. Improved lighting for streets. Introduce faster broadband options to the rest of Haversham. Nearest junction for older parts of Haversham is in Wolverton. We are in an internet age after all!
- More pelican crossings, traffic lights near Haversham School. Better internet speeds so allowing companies easier access to installations.
- Preserving a sense of community in the countryside so that Haversham does not become a dormitory site for MK
- Improving public transportation - buses. There are none in the lower village and very few in the Estate. Upgrading broadband capacity in the village. Keeping the pub as a village facility/requirement. Having a proper village hall.

- Ensuring adequate measures are taken to invest in the infrastructure required for any increased development. Ensuring there is no inappropriate development on the flood plain.
- The Infrastructure is very important factor. The roads through both parts of Haversham are far too busy now.
- The infrastructure is a key factor to be considered for planning for the future because the roads through Haversham are already too busy with traffic from other areas into MK.
- Loss of wildlife habitat.
- Internet broadband speed should be greatly improved in Old Haversham. Electric cables should also be underground, they are unsightly and sag and the electricity poles are subject to damage affecting the service.
- Traffic, with new house also being built in the other villages, traffic through the estate & village will increase.
- Traffic & road loading. Roads currently could not take extra volume especially during busy periods.
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- Parking problems, particularly in the Crescent area and near the school. Despite car park parents are still parking in the street.
- Parking problems, particularly in the Crescent area and near the school. Despite car park parents are still parking in the street.
- Maintain tranquil rural residential area – not another MK city estate!
- A small community shop would be nice. The empty plot of land next to the school that is always for sale would be an ideal spot for a ‘container’ corner shop. Most people chose to live here because it is a village, not a town; we would like to keep it that way
- Let’s make interesting housing. It’s important not to have just more boring ordinary standard houses
- Extending rural communities should be approached with sensitivity. Building should blend with existing architecture. Tightly packed housing does not create a pleasant living space. The number of houses should be commensurate with available roads. No high rise building
- Planning should be to create/extend rural communities. Cramping hundreds of homes without adequate facilities and community hubs dilutes and isolates its inhabitants. Natural resources and uses of land i.e. what effect will new housing put on the flood plains?
- Traffic, traffic, traffic. No current transport facilities. The ‘village’ High Street area cannot be made wider
- Preservation of history. Improved/additional cycle ways and footpaths for access to countryside/river/lakes and woodland. Recreational facilities/opportunities. Maintain ‘buffers’ to preserve historic areas
- Flood prevention. Upkeep of amenities such as roads, drains and footpaths etc.
- We do need to do our bit and it is inevitable that some houses need to be built. I hope they are in keeping with the character of the village
- Addition of cycle paths. Shop of some sort
- To leave it alone as it has been for the last 60 years.
- Bus services. Shop. Doctors surgery.
- Maintain village identity. Avoiding noise and air pollution. Avoiding flood risk. Include local GP facility. Include local shop and or post office.
- How are secondary school places going to be allocated, as there will be a growing number of children – not school places! Traffic at present is extremely high especially at rush hour, what will be done to handle through and resident traffic, as well as building traffic during construction.
- Planning for schools – if there is going to be space in local schools for more intake? How will this be tackled?
- Keeping the character of existing settlements. Keeping traffic levels and speeds as they are. Protecting the rural nature of the area. Keep noise levels down.

- Village shop to help the elderly and better community social centre and activities for the village. Join the village and estate together. Better street lighting between estate and village when walking home from the pub.
- Must keep the village as a village.
- Preserving the countryside.
- Countryside, green belt land.
- A shop and pub would be nice.
- Consider impact on local services – the school can only take so many children.
- Healthcare and schooling – ensure they are developed as the housing is rather than at the end.
- Away from bottle neck areas, around M1 junction.
- Footpaths and cycle lanes.
- Where the houses should be placed, renewable energy, having facilities to satisfy the new residents
- Pressure on local schools & traffic
- 1- The viability of the settlements for the next 50 years. 2 – What we need to do to ensure Haversham remains a place want to live in. 3 – Encourage a sense of pride in our settlements – presently there is virtually no pride & this has deteriorated over the last 10 years. The PC need to pay more attention to the look of the settlements even if this means raising the precept. 4 – Stop people parking on highway verges
- Ensuring that there is going to be the infrastructure in place to support the local community e.g. schools, healthcare, shops, transport, good road links etc.
- Impact on schools, policing, doctor's surgery
- Police – managing crime, doctors surgery, school – expansion ready for the future
- We shall end up with inadequate transport, a clogged up road system. A lack of school places & doctors
- Living in an agriculture area no farms should be allowed planning for housing
- Transport links that do not depend upon owning a car. Fast reliable internet & mobile phone networks / signal. The need to prevent rural becoming urban
- Ours is a rural community coming under much pressure from building & housing. We need to maintain the rural community by not giving in to land owner pressure
- Supporting infrastructure – surgeries, schools, roads, shops. Impact on traffic – already a rat run
- Try to keep as much farm land as possible
- More amenities
- Considering the fact that the villages surrounding MK are unique & shouldn't be changed into large characterless estates. There are plenty of these already in MK! The whole point of people living in small villages with their own character is because they don't want to be surrounded by new housing.
- We shall end up with poor transport, a clogged up road system, a lack of school places & doctors
- Any future development must be sustainable within the current community, rather than enveloping it
- Retaining the character of the village – it does not need to become a second Wolverton or MK
- Empathetic development – for all parts of the parish. Look at the long game – visit other areas e.g. MK & learn from their disasters
- A shop would be useful! Keeping the Green, no large increase in housing etc.
- Ensuring investment in the infrastructure is commensurate with the scale of development. Ensuring that any development does not have an adverse impact on the flood plain
- This is a rural community & should stay that way
- This is a countryside community & should be preserved as such
- The fact that many local residents like things just as they are now and don't actually want any additional housing or otherwise
- I like Haversham as it is & do not wasn't to be part of a large housing estate
- River/flood plain
- There should be shops, centres to be within the community

- The opportunity should be taken to unite the village by building in the gap between the two halves and not extend into surrounding countryside which should be preserved at all costs. Provision needs to be made for a shop the same arrangement as in Castlethorpe.
- Please can we keep our green fields. Don't turn us into a big housing estate with no character. Traffic that use the road. Improved public transport
- It's a village and needs to stay as a village
- No flats
- Cycle lanes. Little Linford Lane to be better maintained regarding trimming and create one way priority to assist flow for residents.
- Keeping countryside
- Preserving the rural nature of the area and not over develop
- Peace and tranquillity of the area
- Future developments to manage flood plain especially Wolverton Road entrance to Haversham Estate
- Space and a village rural feel still being upheld, not packing in as many as possible
- Housing for old and young that's affordable
- Traffic
- Pollution, we have concerns that there may be a larger road built to connect the M1
- Farm land protected. Every person needs food the animals need to graze.
- Infrastructure currently insufficient to support any further development
- Getting residents to have pride / love of our village. Also accept we may have to have some development. Affordable housing
- Joined up thinking with the various partners e.g. when pavement is replaced between village and estate why not put some gas and broadband under the pavement at the same time
- No ugly architecture of new building such as you see in Milton Keynes. Homes of a certain standard important.
- Impact on traffic increase and speed through Haversham
- If the community is going to be enlarged then we need some facilities – shops etc.
- Like the idea of joining together estate and village (although don't like those terms).
- Local transport
- Parking / congestion due to people parking on roads. Internet, waste etc, is suitable
- Space for parking/preventing traffic issues caused by cars parked on roads. Reliability and quality of internet services. Encouragement of eco-friendly/energy harvesting/energy conservation. Bringing middle aged groups into the community better.
- Amenities for and future planning are so important. Whether that be community led or council led.
- Traffic. Effect on local school.
- Impact on the local environment and impact on the young people in the **?
- That the three main current areas of housing (Upper and Lower Haversham and Little Linford) all have some developments. Some development so that only one location doesn't bear the full 'burden' of any development.
- The future of Haversham as an attractive affordable place to live for young people (18-25) and young families
- A focus on what future communities might want as opposed to always the current. The skate ramp is a good example of something future communities would use.
- Instilling/maintaining a sense of community is important if Haversham is to be attractive to young people.
- Public Transport (bus services)
- Affordable homes
- The inclusion of environmentally friendly buildings with methods of renewable energy sources.
- Nature education centre for all including children to help protect areas of natural beauty.
- Impact on existing roads and infrastructure
- Build houses only if we can [...] ones suitable for our community not big 4/5 bedroom detached houses

- We shouldn't assume that other communities should take development and Haversham should not and its 'environment' should be protected at all costs.
- A good mix of high value, medium value and affordable housing is important
- Infrastructure
- Traffic
- Safe places to cross Wolverton Rd for School Children.
- Not overloading current infrastructure
- Sustainability so that what we do now shall be OK for future generations
- Thousands of local people have changed their lives, paid a premium and suffered some inconvenience so that they can live and raise families in quiet rural areas. Our country has been collection of small settlements for thousands of years which suggested this way of living and it is under threat.
- If farms are to continue then they need to still be surrounded by farmland to be able to access straw, forage, avoid close neighbours who find smell, vermin are offensive. Road systems need to be accessible for farm vehicles (i.e. fast grid roads/roundabouts are not appropriate)
- To remain villages it is important to create enclosed new housing with a distinct boundary to try to avoid massive housing infill to Castlethorpe etc., i.e. surround with trees of clever planting to small pockets
- Change is inevitable. It may not be possible to preserve the 'isolated rural village'. It might produce a better result in the long run to actively promote positive well planned development so we don't end up with the piecemeal addition housing resulting in having a large population without much in the way of amenities and facilities.
- The provision of access to and from the proposed development, and the impact it will have on the existing community.
- Infrastructure in place to cope with the increased capacity of the development before it commences i.e. schools, doctors, dentists..
- I would prefer Haversham and Little Linford to stay as they are. Surrounded by fields and beautiful countryside and wild life. Not more houses and traffic.
- Can we make a heritage trail or walk covering our many sites of interest (historical/listed buildings etc)? This would help enhance our community personality/identity.
- Keeping the village 'Life'. Too many villages have now become more like towns where they have been linked by Housing Estates. It upsets the lifestyle people choose a village for.
- What does the village want to be. Attractive to young and modern, old and traditional or family. With this comes the sort of property and look.
- Preserve peacefulness of greenery
- May be divert traffic away from Wolverton Road "Ratrun"
- If more housing the community needs shops but no more pubs /clubs
- The two settlements of New and Old Haversham have different characters which should be kept that way.
- The historic character of the old village – primarily stone, rural setting, a small and close community. It could easily be swamped by new build. The new part of the village would benefit from a pub and small shop
- It seems to me that with today (and tomorrow's) technology more people are working from home – others commuting so prepare for more parking, more cars or vans per house.
- No comment
- Not merge the villages together
- It is important for the community to be able to walk and cycle safely through the village - this includes being able to cross Wolverton Road safely in order to join the only path that connects to Wolverton and subsequently, MK. It is imperative that we provide appropriate housing for elderly members of our community as well as younger members - it is unfair that people should be driven away from the community they have grown up within simply because the housing available is both limited and inappropriate.
- Additional health centre, the road network and maybe a local community run shop.

- Not to overpopulate the village school. Add road safety feature as school is expanding e.g. zebra crossing.
- Busy roads. Can't get out of Beech Tree Close in rush hours.
- I think it is important to maintain a sense of community. In order to do this, it requires that families stay in the village.
- If you increase the housing - improve the infrastructure.
- The general infrastructure. Will hospital, doctors surgery be able to cope? Will the schools be available? Are we to become an urban rather than rural environment?
- To include doctor, schools, hospitals to enable all of these to cope with extra people. Also ensure parking does not become a nuisance.
- No large scale developments.
- Already covered ...
- Any plans should be for and by the community not for any financial benefits
- Don't build on the greenbelt land
- Don't build on the greenbelt land, keep us green!
- Services including road network facilities must grow as the population grows. Increased population without enhanced services is not a sustainable approach.
- There is every reason to protect our community and there is no reason to expand it. There are many open spaces with the building confines of Milton Keynes that satisfy any future requirements for the construction of new homes
- Availability of parking for existing residents and ensuring provision is made for enough parking on new developments
- Only build a small amount of houses to ensure the villages remain as villages. Ensure the villages are kept on a bus route.
- Keep in mind that the old village is not on the main sewage system. This could put some people off buying a property that was newly built. Also where does the MK Council stand if rental properties were not on the main sewers? (Thinking about rental through Housing Associations in particular as we already have some in Haversham.)
- Any impact should be shared with Haversham village and The Estate
- The impact on the current community that additional housing will have, including the groundwork and building phases
- Old Haversham is a small rural village and as such any changes should be done with care! Haversham is not a town and I would hate it to be so. We have many amenities 5 minutes away!
- Haversham badly needs a village hall with a sports pavilion as in Stoke Goldington and North Crawley. It needs extended sports facilities and netball courts. 50-100 houses would contribute planning gain to help fund this.
- How people currently view the project and how it will affect them. Should new areas be developed or old ones regenerated.
- These country roads will not be able to cope with a much larger amount of traffic.
- Limited housing for local people.
- Not sure whether this comes under any of the factors already stated but one of the most important things for me is preserving the beautiful views of the Parish Council land and fields around Haversham.
- Allowing some small-scale housing developments which are respectful to the existing village characteristics, but which allow the village to accommodate new families into the community.
- Better cycle and pedestrian links to MK (employment & railway (Wolverton). Improved play & leisure facilities. Creating a better Haversham for 'our' children – part of a modern, green & more energy efficient place. Keep the 'village' separate from MK as a district place, in terms of built form.
- Small developments that are in keeping with existing housing and would encourage more families to the village.
- How to develop or increase a sense of community as opposed to becoming part of the MK commuter belt i.e. have a separate identity.

- Managing traffic speed and creating safe areas for crossing.
- A surgery.
- I think some of the communication around planning needs to be more positive. Rather than focus on the negatives let's think about some of the good things that might come into Haversham.
- Proposed developments should benefit the local community and not threaten the best characteristics of the area. Haversham should be a good place to grow up in and live in at all stages of life. It should promote a healthy way of life.
- Not wishing to overpopulate village. Add road separately
- New community centre. Good paths. Cycle path.
- Keep any building in keeping with style of current village.
- ensure green space ,road structure
- Road structure a support –avoidance of congestion and preserve safety. Provision for a small shop a little like Castlethorpe.
- Local residents + the environment and infrastructure are the most important thing.
- Affordable housing to keep local people in village.
- The roads are very busy already especially on the road going out to Wolverton and there is no bus service that matches normal working hours.
- Avoiding disrupting current residents
- Careful consideration should be made on how to improve the already struggling infrastructure from drainage-emergency services, doctor, dentist, roads.
- Do it somewhere else! Not interested in any planning!
- Traffic congestion - the Wolverton Road through Haversham can barely cope with the traffic in the mornings. Adding more traffic would increase the risk of accidents.
- Keeping environmentally polluting companies such as the refuse sorting plant in Old Wolverton away (several miles) from inhabited urban developments.
- Provision of facilities. Preservation of the countryside. Emergency services. Doctors.
- Opening of footpaths
- Preserving footpaths
- Building of any houses should be for the benefit of the local community
- Although we must try and protect our rural landscape, we must appreciate the need for new houses as government policy and give others the opportunity to live in the village
- Safe crossing on Wolverton Road
- Too much change too quickly will cause destruction of environment as at Hanslope
- Traffic
- Living on the main road, traffic at morning and evening is hectic
- Extra parking for families with more than one vehicle
- There has only been a handful of new properties built/converted during my 20+ years as a resident. We need to accept change and make the most of opportunities to improve/keep the village alive. The need for our own village hall is high on my agenda for the village as a whole
- Haversham needs a village hall. The current Community Hall in the school is unsatisfactory. Development should be permitted to enable planning gain to build a village hall for the community
- The houses should appear sympathetic to those around them. An extension to existing development is best – or infilling spaces in already developed areas.
- To ensure that all development: 1. is sustainable. 2. provides 'truly' affordable housing. 3. that facilities: doctors, schools, shops, meeting places etc are reviewed to be able to cope. 4. that the green and rural environment is protected. 5. that art, culture, heritage are invested in
- All villages need to grow. We need to encourage a range of age groups with provision of different types of housing. Small developments are needed – there are spaces in the parish that could be developed without harming the overall village setting. Better to do this than have huge developments thrust upon us

- Existing facilities should be retained or enhanced such as the Greyhound pub, Church, Community centre and Country Park. We have already lost 2 shops and POs and it is a long walk to Wolverton (where there is no PO) for some residents.
- Maintaining community space e.g. the Rec Ground and the allotments. Retaining village atmosphere.
- Maintaining community space e.g. the Rec Ground and the allotments. Retaining village atmosphere.
- No.
- The traffic that will increase in and through the village. Lack of facilities.
- 1) Flood management -currently a real issue that must be taken into account with further development. 2) Public transport to ensure that new housing doesn't generate even greater issues with traffic. 3) Maintain countryside feel with smaller distinct developments rather than urban sprawl.
- 1) Flood management -currently a real issue that must be taken into account with further development. 2) Public transport to ensure that new housing doesn't generate even greater issues with traffic. 3) Maintain countryside feel with smaller distinct developments rather than urban sprawl.
- We have poor water pressure and sewage problems (the Estate). Also power cuts. More houses, more problems.
- With the move out of the EU, agriculture and its diversity will increase in importance, to ensure that production is maximised to service the home market. Livestock and arable farming are critical to achieve this.
- Traffic: Haversham is a rat run already. Speed cameras needed. Zebra crossing for schoolchildren. Bad parking on verges/pavements blocking view for drivers.
- Traffic. Doctors. Schools.
- The planning expert at the village meeting made it clear that Haversham was not suitable for large scale developments. Therefore, in Old Haversham modest infilling would be suitable development. Lack of sewer is constricting factor.
In New Haversham therefore four obvious areas of development on existing farmland: 1 and 2:- land on either side of Haversham hill belonging to Lucy Cross and Peter Dunn, 3:- land in Wolverton Road part of Field Farm, 4:- land at Wolverton Road belonging to Lucy Cross.
Small-scale infilling are too small to generate any S106 benefits or social housing. Large scale development will bring much benefits and creating community benefits must be a priority. I have doubts as to whether any form of shops would be financially viable - it would be interesting to consider the financial viability of Castlethorpe shop. But Haversham is just too close to Wolverton for a shop to be financially successful - unless of a specialist non-food type. The Greyhound could be a Community Hub - but it has a number of obvious problems and there is no easy way to solve such a problem unless a new pub/restaurant were built but the cost would be prohibitive for any developer. Any large scale development needs infrastructure and it would be interesting to know if the existing sewer system for New Haversham would support more development.
- Preserving greenbelt land. Concentrating any development around existing settlements in a sensitive way. Maintaining the separation of MK from Northampton suburbs.
- Our community should be a good place for those at all times of life, with educational and recreational opportunities for all. Any development should underpin this objective.
- Developments should be incremental and not large numbers of houses in big estates. Building community facilities for expanding villages e.g. doctors, schools, local shops etc.
- Access to school. Trying to leave The Crescent is very difficult in the morning/afternoon when children are being dropped off and picked up. Some parents can be very rude and inconsiderate to people who live in The Crescent .More housing creates more demand for the school.
- People need houses. In an ideal world it would be good for the youth of the community to be able to stay in their community.
- How do we plan for growth with ever-growing population and in time as in London, villages become towns. People need houses to live and as a consequence, matters that are so important to us are not so important to town dwellers.

- Please try and protect the countryside and rural aspects of our community.
- Protecting residents property values or enhancing them; Protecting or enhancing existing residents quality of life.
- The management of traffic within the area, which [is] already very busy and will be even worse when the school in The Crescent opens for extra pupils in September.
- What facilities will improve. School access. Hospital/medical facilities. Flooding.

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) Havesham 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.

Question 4

Housing:

What should our highest priority be for the types of homes we plan for? Against each of the following categories indicate importance for you, and say why (e.g. downsizing, accommodation for younger people).

- a) 1 or 2 bedroom flats
- b) 1 or 2 bedroom houses
- c) Bungalows
- d) 2/3 bedroom houses
- e) 4+ bedroom houses
- f) Specialist housing for older retired people

[Written responses to the 'why' question are recorded with abbreviations of the respective tick box 'importance' answers. VI = Very important; I = Important; NI = Not important; DK = Don't know.]

Question 4a (1 or 2 bedroom flats)

- I: 1st time buyers
- I: 1st time buyers
- VI: Property for young 1st time buyers. Affordable properties
- VI: Very important if young people want to stay in the village
- NI: More likely to be more than 2 storeys high and not in keeping with property in village at present
- NI: Not in keeping with the village
- NI: Maybe only for social housing, which is not particularly needed in this area anyway
- NI: No to expansion
- I: Keeping costs down so more can get on housing ladder
- I: Younger couples
- NI: Start for young people to get on property ladder (I'd rather not flats in area as it will ruin the landscape)
- NI: Flats are not in keeping with the village look and feel and offer no material benefit over houses in a rural context
- NI: Flats are an unsuitable housing type
- VI: Young people
- NI: The area we live in is a very desirable one and therefore commands high prices, too much for young people trying to get on the mortgage ladder
- I Accommodation for younger people
- NI Accommodation for young people and retired people
- I For first time buyers.
- I These could be most affordable for first time buyers
- NI Not a likely requirement.
- NI Perhaps a small development to cater for people with a certain budget.
- I Gives an opportunity for younger people and older generations to live in area.
- I Young people
- NI Extremely to rent, overpriced and not good enough for children!
- NI The locality has no flats presently. It would be hard to see how that would fit well with the current housing stock and overall look of the area.
- VI For older folk to downsize to and for starter homes
- NI Not in keeping with current settlements
- NI This type of housing does not fit in with the remainder of our village.
- NI too many flats.
- NI Too many flats being crammed into small places creating an overload to the areas.
- I Availability of accommodation for first time buyers or rental. Suitable accommodation for single and older people.

- I To enable young people to remain locally upon leaving their parents home.
- NI 1/2 bedroom flats rarely attract tenants who stay consequently they put little into the community.
- NI Not in keeping with current buildings.
- NA Depends on the style and number proposed. Cheap builds do not give longevity and are not in keeping with the village.
- NI not needed. Green space more important.
- VI Affordable housing especially for young people.
- NI This area attracts 'family' who can are looking for garden for their children to play in. #younger people are not normally looking to move to a village flat.
- I Good to have younger people in the village.
- VI First time buyers & social housing.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- I Starter homes for younger people.
- I Starter homes for younger people.
- VI Lifestyles of young or retired
- NI Flats would spoil the skyline, unless they are kept low – if kept low they would be a good idea as you could fit more housing in a smaller area
- NI Multi-storey buildings not in keeping. If flats were in buildings no more than 2 storeys then ok
- I Low cost for first time buyers
- I Our area attracts young families and retired people. No tall blocks of flats. Need to fit into existing environment
- NI In a rural setting it generally attracts families – retirement settlers. Flats generally for younger/career individuals requiring benefits and facilities we do not have
- NI Blocks of flats affect landscape
- NI Until transport facilities to Wolverton/MK improve, this type of housing will not be attractive to people who are not mobile. Otherwise in upper village only
- I Lack of transport and facilities in 'lower' village but starter properties important for young people
- I For young people
- I Important to have a mixture of housing including affordable housing
- I Easily made available for first time buyers
- NI - We don't need them.
- I – Important for young people to get a foot on the housing ladder.
- NI – Flats generally not part of villages.
- I – So younger people may be able to get on the property ladder more easily.
- VI – Accommodation for younger local people. To enable local people to downsize without having to leave the area.
- VI – Many of the people requiring accommodation are young and single and in a first job / recently left school. Cheaper to maintain.
- NI – Not a "flats" area.
- NI – Flats are ugly looking, dirty and always attract druggies. Bungalows are better safer cleaner easier to manage and look better than flats.
- NI – I feel this is a family village and having 1-bedroom flats will change the dynamics of this.
- NI – The building of flats in this area would not suit the character of the villages. There are plenty of flats and a large planned development in Wolverton close to the train station.
- NI - Simply not required – if you want to live in a flat, Wolverton is a stone's throw away.
- NI – unsuitable for the area
- NI – does not match existing community
- NI – too many vehicles
- NI – these would be out of character with the village & would be more appropriate to Wolverton or MK
- NI – inappropriate property for a village location
- NI – modern properties this size are – in my experience very small & have little / no garden space for residents or parking. Haversham has few 3 storey houses, flats grouped together would not be aesthetically pleasing to our village built environment
- NI – not in keeping with current provision
- NI – we have lived in flats & hate the intrusions

- NI – have hated flat life myself
- VI – young couples / singles – older couples
- NI – most people like an outside door opening on to the street
- I – more affordable for younger people
- NI – Does not suit the aesthetic of the village
- NI – affordable housing, would not encourage flats
- I – Downsizing, first time buyers
- NI – not in character of area
- VI – there is a need for this type of housing for existing younger residents looking to purchase their first property
- I – downsizing for older people, but also access for young people to be able to get on to the property ladder
- NI – flats are not a common / readily recognised housing type associated with a rural community
- NI – not useful or suitable in our parish. Leads to homes in blocks, not appropriate
- I – single people, downsizing, first time buyers etc.
- NI – keep the flats for CMK areas
- I – more 2 bedroom flats, reduce 1 bedroom for single persons. Help younger generation get housing
- Not completed - more 2 bedroom flats, reduce 1 bedroom for single persons. Help younger generation get housing
- NI – why would young people want to live in the countryside?
- NI – Haversham is not a ‘flat’ area and would look out of place and not in keeping with the village of detached/semi
- NI – This is a family area so needs more family houses that are affordable
- VI – Housing is very expensive so new housing should be more easily affordable. Possibly more HA provision helps diversification (?I assume Housing Association – Kieron)
- I – Good for singles and new home owners
- I – Need to keep a mix of housing if you want to keep the village to thrive
- NI – Flats will ruin the look of the village
- NI – Not in keeping with the village. The area is an out of town village and not suited to flats
- NI – Because they don’t fit in with the housing types in Haversham
- NI – Older demographic currently plus lacks services for young, single or new families. Better locations closer to centre.
- NI – Young people prefer to live in an urban environment e.g CMK
- NI – There are flats everywhere in MK
- I – Supply options for younger population
- VI – Encourage young people to stay or join community maintain a diverse age range
- VI – Many elderly people that live in the village want to downsize but there is nowhere for them to go
- I – For young families to grow
- I To have mixed population for community
- I Affordability
- NI not appropriate for the rural setting and family nature of the village
- VI Needed as starter homes for downsizing by older residents who do not wish to leave the parish. Provided they are in small units and not as multi storey square blocks.
- NI not in keeping
- I affordable for local people / community
- I Downsizing. Accommodation for younger people
- DK I don’t know the demand / need for housing of different types. The mix of housing should reflect the mix of demand.
- I Not everyone can manage gardens.
- I to provide for local people and children
- NI Not at all in keeping with existing neighbourhood / housing stock.
- NI Flats would not be right in the area.
- NI Would negatively affect the community spirit (would become commuter accommodation).
- NI Our area is made up of low rise houses. Blocks of flats would not suit the area and will increase the population too much.

- I. Younger people from village who cannot afford a house but may want to stay in the village
- I. For those trying to get on the housing ladder.
- I. More affordable accommodation for younger people attracting different communities to the village
- I. Affordability
- I. Social Mix
- I. Flats may not fit area well
- NI. Most families prefer 2-3 bed houses
- NI. Our priority should be to provide housing for families to join and become involved in the community promoting care for the environment and rural living (houses to include garden space).
- NI. Flats attract transient residents and the opportunity for investors to monopolise the local market.
- NI. 1st time buyers or landlords will not commit to a community
- VI. Keeping young people in the village
- I. As the costs for larger properties are too dear for starter homes.
- NI. Not in keeping with the village
- VI. To provide homes for Social Housing
- VI. So old people can stall in their community.
- VI. Accommodation for young adults, single parents, older people
- NI. Not family oriented
- Y. For younger or downsizing for older
- NI Rural area, in my opinion flats are more urban
- I. To keep families in close proximity – avoid long journeys
- NI. Will ruin the look of the village
- I Allow people to get on the housing ladder
- I. Two bed properties are the highest demand. Flats are good for developers and bad for freeholders, leaseholders, and tenants due to increased service charges, anti-social behaviour etc., also high churn due to lack of perceived value.
- NI. Not sure flats suit the type of housing that could sit easily with existing architecture, and environment. Height limit.
- I. Single people or couples
- VI Need places for those just starting out in life and those who have lived here for a long time but are no longer able to keep up a largeish house
- I. Affordability
- I. 1st time buyers or single people
- NI Existing developments in surrounding areas cater for this requirement of housing.
- NI. Concern that the development would spoil the country feel of the village
- NI. Possibly maisonettes, but flats are not consistent with the character of any part of our villages
- NI (quotes his answer 2: What does the village want to be. Attractive to young and modern, old and traditional or family. With this comes the sort of property and look).
- I Encourage young people
- NI. There are plenty in MK area
- NI This is high density housing not in character to the village that won't have enough space for parking and transport. Plenty available in the hub/CMK with far better local amenities
- I. Useful accommodation for both young and old taking less land as long as it not obtrusive
- NI. Not popular, but may become important for care homes
- NI. Don't like em
- NI Would not want to see flats – density of population; increase traffic, lack of facilities
- I bought here to live in a village
- I Downsizing as you get older
- VI These housing types are suitable for younger members of the community and, if suitably built and managed, for our elderly members as well.
- I For people to be able to get on to the property ladder, or for people who want to downsize.
- NI Not in keeping with the current aesthetics of the village.
- NA None
- I It's the most affordable accommodation. People in all walks of life need that at some point.
- DK I would not like to live in a flat and I'm not sure how many really do like it.

- DK Good way of getting extra housing, but not for me.
- NI 2-3 bed houses are better for families.
- I For singles or starters.
- I For people to downsize, if necessary.
- NI Against village expansion
- VI Affordable houses both for younger and older people to bring new life into the village
- NI Flats can incur high service charges, not suitable for disabled/elderly people
- NI I feel it is important to keep the current community feel of the village and this is best served by encouraging families rather than single people
- NI Because families are what makes a community and we want to keep that, that's why people move to Haversham
- I We should provide across the range if at all. To represent and cater for all of society.
- NI Would not be in character with surroundings
- NI There are plenty of single council house tenants in occupation of 3 bedroom houses
- NI Of no importance to us
- I If built I character with the area would be important for first time owners or rental
- VI For young people so they can gain independence from their parents. The maisonettes at the top of Wolverton Road would be an ideal model, rather than big blocks of flats
- NI Changes the landscape of Haversham village and estate
- NI Facilities are usually desirable and Haversham doesn't have a "town" culture so it's unlikely to attract single or professional couples
- NI High rise flats in a village?
- NI I don't think Haversham suits high density/flat dwellings. We have space and there is plenty of flat provision elsewhere in MK.
- NI Flats not in keeping with village characteristics
- VI Affordable and relatively cheap – insufficient numbers for demand
- NI Don't think flats would be right in a village setting
- NI Unsightly blots on the landscape, will increase parking demands.
- I More affordable housing for youngsters.
- I For local young people.
- I For older and young people
- NI We have only recently upsized our house so will not need a small flat/house for a very long time.
- VI Downsizing for the older to allow them to stay local. For youngsters that they also stay local.
- NI More suitable for urban dwelling.
- I Very few already – so helps operate a balanced community. Probably only dwellings likely to be truly affordable for the young.
- NI Not suitable for village.
- NI This is an out of town community without adequate services e.g. buses, shops etc.
- NI Haversham generally is a family community.
- VI For professional people or single people.
- NI Flats in Haversham would not fit in with the style of houses.
- NI Doesn't fit with the village architecture/social demographic.
- VI Downsizing for older people. Affordable for single/younger people/keyworkers. Not everyone wants a garden to maintain.
- NI doesn't fit with the village
- I Lower cost housing
- NI not in keeping style of village
- I it would be nice to have properties that younger people could afford to either stay in the village or newcomers to experience village life.
- VI there are none available for young people at the moment as far as I can see.
- VI to keep the youngsters in the village + for the elderly which would free up their home for another family
- I both for downsizing and young couples
- VI space for younger people
- NI How many stories high will the accommodation be?
- NI Not interested in any development

- NI will become a commuter town with London rail links on doorstep. Haversham will eventually lose community feel.
- I The youngsters from Haversham and Little Linford need affordable accommodation as there isn't any.
- NI Developers in MK can't build flats of sufficient quality.
- NI Creates more traffic and parking issues.
- VI Older age who have lived and grown up here
- VI There are family sized homes already occupied by singles/couples
- I Start youngsters on the housing ladder
- NI Flats with stairs not suitable for older generation
- NI Not really suitable for village environment; likely to be rented by low income families, better suited to city environment
- I Accommodation for young people
- NI Because flats usually end up as undesirable areas
- VI Allow young people to stay in the community
- I A range of houses for all to afford
- DK New homes should include a percentage of 'affordable' homes. Unsure what this element should be. I feel unsure about flats. Houses better.
- I This type of property should be cheaper/affordable and enable single people or two younger people to purchase
- NI Think in this environment we should aim for smaller houses – better for the buyer (freehold) and saves any high rise development
- I For single residents.
- I For young couples.
- NI Not in keeping with a village style of housing.
- NI Not in keeping with a village style of housing.
- NI Flats become an eyesore and are only used for renting.
- I Affordability for first time buyers.
- NI Suggest we need to attract working professionals/people to the area.
- NI Suggest we need to attract working professionals/people to the area.
- NI Perceived non need.
- NI No apparent demand in the parish.
- NI Flats only give developers greater profit from a smaller area.
- NI Eyesores, a lot of cars parked.
- NI The younger generation would live in a flat and I don't think Haversham would appeal to the younger generation.
- NI These properties should be in towns with walking access to Drs etc if they are for 1st buyers or retired. Ability to do away with the car.
- I (J17) Smaller housing units for the retired population; free up their larger houses for families , and benefit the young as being affordable BUT for the older members of the community it can be isolating because lack of transport and shopping facilities that they can easily access.
- NI There is a wide range of housing in the village which is also flanked by extensive affordable housing in neighbouring villages.
- I To provide low cost housing for young people to allow them to live locally.
- VI Downsizing. More affordable for younger or single people, and those less well paid.
- I It is important to have a diverse community of people to sustain villages. It may also release larger, existing homes when downsizing.
- NI Less important, as not suitable for families who will want to live here.
- NI No flats! Houses if any should fit in with the current village.
- VI To help younger people get on to the housing ladder, plus elderly who want to downsize.
- VI We should cater for all people be they single, young and the elderly, single parents and obviously flats are far less in price than houses.
- NI Flats are traditionally occupied by younger and single people. This can be accommodated in MK and Wolverton where there are plenty of amenities for young people.
- NI Less important when possible to have houses.
- NI No like type properties in the area.
- NI Surely only a few would be needed in this area. For the growth of the existing population as opposed to producing individual communities.

- NI People who buy or rent this type of accommodation tend to be relatively transient and care less therefore about their surroundings.

Question 4b (1 or 2 bedroom houses)

- I: Young families
- I: Young families
- VI: Property for young 1st time buyers. Affordable properties
- VI: Very important if young people want to stay in the village
- DK: A mixture of b, c, d, e & f would include a variety of properties and a variety of residences which would lead to a diverse population more able to integrate into village
- NI: Not in keeping with the village
- NI: Maybe only for social housing, which is not particularly needed in this area anyway (are 1 bedroom houses even built?!)
 - NI: No to expansion
 - VI: Keeping costs down so more can get on housing ladder
 - VI: Starter homes
 - I: Older and smaller families
 - I: Start for young people to get on property ladder
 - VI: Suitable for downsizing or for younger people – current lack of this type of housing
 - VI: Downsizing for older people and starter homes for young people. Current housing stock is heavy on larger properties
 - VI: Young families
 - NI: Most families need at least 3 bedrooms so small houses would be of little use
 - I Avoid high density housing. Detached and semi-detached but not too close together.
 - I For older people –retirement homes or for young families
 - I To same extent as ??? (a? affordable for first time buyers)
 - NI Not a likely requirement.
 - I For younger people to start their life on the housing ladder.
 - I Encourages young families
 - I Young families
 - VI Lack of these available now
 - I 2 bedroom for families with one child or single parents
 - I To cater for young/single person families on lower incomes.
 - VI For older people to downsize to and for starter homes
 - I Good starter homes and allowing people to get on housing ladder.
 - I To help the younger members of Haversham to remain in Haversham
 - I Villagers who know can stay.
 - I Villagers who need to downsize can stay in the area they know.
 - VI Helping young people get on the property ladder.
 - VI Very few currently available. Needed by single people and small families.
 - I To help first time buyers.
 - I Starter homes for young and elderly.
 - I Depends on the style and number proposed. Cheap builds do not give longevity and are not in keeping with the village.
 - NI Not needed.
 - VI Affordable housing especially for young people.
 - I 2 bed house families Haversham has a strong family feel as such these will suit.
 - I For first time buyers and small families; hopefully affordable.
 - I First time buyers & social housing.
 - I If you need to downsize.
 - NI I do not agree with any further housing.
 - NI I do not agree with any further housing.
 - I Starter homes for young families with garden area.
 - I Starter homes for young families with garden area.
 - VI Affordable costs and maintenance for small families
 - I It is hard for young people to move into the village or those already here with their parents to stay in the village if the houses are all too big/expensive

- I If balanced with other housing types. Most likely to be affordable.
- I Low cost for first time buyers
- I Affordable starter homes
- I Starter homes for young families
- I Young couples encouraged to buy. Improve community facilities
- I Two bed cottages (pref)
- VI Housing for new couples etc important but should be where transport (limited!) is available. So upper village as it is within walking/cycling/bus (limited) to rail and MK. Lower village no bus, narrow road, uphill and further from station
- I For young people/families
- I Important to have a mixture of housing including affordable housing
- I Single people need housing. Help for first time buyers
- I Houses over flats to preserve the feel of the area
- NI - We don't need them.
- I – Building needs to be kept within the concept of a village location.
- VI – Downsizing without having to leave the area. Starter homes for younger people.
- I – To provide for young families stepping onto the housing ladder.
- I – For elderly people or those downsizing.
- VI – To keep in line with the rest of the village and estate.
- NI – Same as 4a – lots of 1 and 2 bedroom houses would not suit the character of the villages.
- NI - As above (refers to Wolverton). The area requires more family homes.
- I – would be nice to see more established young families
- VI – to encourage families & to allow people living on their own to downsize
- I – downsizing, younger generations ability to purchase
- VI - there is a need for this type of housing for existing younger residents looking to purchase their first property
- I – maybe starter homes
- VI – could allow for elderly to downsize & release larger homes & be more affordable for first time buyers to get on property ladder. Also often associated with rural dwellings in the traditional sense
- NI – does this then lead to social housing? Beechfield close is great & works well. A higher proportion could lead to a decline in our village status
- VI - single people, downsizing, first time buyers etc.
- I – for first time buyers
- I - more 2 bedroom flats, reduce 1 bedroom for single persons. Help younger generation get housing
- I - more 2 bedroom flats, reduce 1 bedroom for single persons. Help younger generation get housing (same 2nd comment BC)
- I – provide variety
- VI – to enable people to have a house that is suitable. Most houses seem to be 3 bed
- NI – does not match existing community
- NI – good for new people to the housing ladder
- I – affordability and in keeping with the village aesthetic
- I – starter homes with garden
- NI – many estates in Bucks & Beds have properties this size, initially they look fine but very quickly fall into decline with rubbish, cars & unkempt housing becoming a norm. these areas soon become ghetto-ised. This would be a travesty for our village
- I – good starter homes
- I – people care about it & the surroundings
- I – a house seems to be more of a home to care for
- VI – young families / older couples
- I – good as starter homes for downsizing
- NI – I think that there is more than enough housing in MK area without building more
- I – more affordable for younger people
- VI – First time buyer
- I – This is a second priority
- NI – Too small for families
- I – Need to keep a mix of housing if you want to keep the village to thrive

- I – For younger village generation to move out of home
- I – Two bed houses are ideal for first time buyers
- I – Because houses of that number will support young people getting on the ladder
- I – Young families
- NI – Young people prefer to live in an urban environment e.g. CMK
- I – Starter homes
- I – Encourage young people to stay or join community maintain a diverse age range
- VI- Allows families to stay close together
- I – For young families
- I To allow local families and people to live locally
- I Affordability to encourage young families / people
- I Encourages young families
- VI Houses too expensive for first time buyers and young
- VI Needed as starter homes for downsizing by older residents who do not wish to leave the parish. Provided they are in small units and not as multi storey square blocks.
- NI there are sufficient
- VI chance for younger people to buy their own house. Downsizing for older people
- VI Starter homes essential.
- I to provide for local people and children
- VI Provides affordable housing for local younger people whilst still able to integrate with existing housing if done right.
- NI Would negatively affect the community spirit (would become commuter accommodation).
- I These are good starter homes and enable a younger generation to integrate into a community.
- I. Younger people from village who would like to settle here perhaps to start a family ensuring facilities i.e. school are used by village residents.
- I. Starter homes
- I. More affordable accommodation for younger people attracting different communities to the village
- I. May attract older families looking to downsize.
- I. Affordability
- I. Social Mix
- VI. Need for lower price (rent and buy) housing to help those most in need
- NI. Most families prefer 2-3 bed houses
- I. For younger people to be allowed to stay in their own villages
- NI. Priority to 3 or 4 bedroom homes to promote families joining the community
- I. Potentially young couples wanting to be part of the community
- VI. Keeping young people in the village
- VI. So youngsters can afford them as a starter on the property ladder
- I. First time buyers, and downsizing
- VI. To provide affordable homes.
- I.A lot of people are single dwellers in a 3 bedroom house. Many would like to downsize- this would free up a number of larger homes.
- VI. So old people can stall in their community.
- VI. Accommodation for young adults, single parents, older people
- NI. Not family oriented
- Y. For younger or downsizing for older
- VI. Affordability to both young and those downsizing
- I. To keep families in close proximity – avoid long journeys
- I. For younger people who want to leave home but still stay in the village
- I Allow people to get on the housing ladder
- VI. Houses are more adaptable and allow people the space they need and the flexibility for families to grow.
- VI For younger people
- VI. E.g. small enclave of small cottage style for youngsters to help youngsters afford to move out or even older people wanting to downsize. Needs to be done as small enclaves (cul de sac) create a limit
- I. Single people, couples

- VI. We need places for those from the village just starting out in life and for those who have lived here a long time but can no longer keep up a large house
- I. Starter homes for young families
- I. 1st time buyers or single people
- NI Existing developments in surrounding areas cater for this requirement of housing.
- I. Would give the opportunity for young people to get on property ladder or for others to downsize, whilst living in the village.
- I. For young first time buyers
- I. Will likely bring young couples and first time buyers/starter families to the villages to participate in community and perpetuate the life of the village
- NI (quotes his answer 2: What does the village want to be. Attractive to young and modern, old and traditional or family. With this comes the sort of property and look).
- I. Encourage younger families
- VI. Attract young people/families or those downsizing
- I. May fit into the village character
- I. There is a need for smaller accommodation for the young and the single
- For young beginning life and families
- I bought here to live in a village and paid a solicitor for searches against such impacts
- VI Currently Haversham has a very limited stock of smaller houses - the bulk being 3 and 4 bedroom, making cost a key factor for young families not being able to move into the village.
- I For young people or for people to downsize.
- NI Popular with commuters that don't really add to the community.
- NI Keep Haversham as it is.
- NA None
- I For the elderly who no longer need lots of bedrooms.
- VI First home or downsizing.
- I Affordability for younger people.
- I Starter homes and downsizing (If affordable. Many 2 beds are not much if any cheaper than a 3 bed.)
- VI To allow the older generation to downsize when children have fled the nest to free up family homes. To get younger generation on property ladder.
- NI 2-3 bed houses are better for families.
- I For singles or starters.
- I For people to downsize, if necessary.
- I Diversity
- NI Against village expansion
- I More suitable for downsizing and accommodation across all age groups and abilities
- I I feel it is important to keep the current community feel of the village and this is best served by encouraging families rather than single people
- NI Because families are what makes a community and we want to keep that, that's why people move to Haversham
- I We should provide across the range if at all. To represent and cater for all of society.
- I For first time buyers
- DA Single council house tenants in occupation of 3 bedroom houses should be forced to share their rented premises with a homeless person
- VI Downsizing or first time buyers
- VI Important for small families, first time buyers or for older people to downsize
- VI In particular 2 bedroom houses for young couples wanting or just starting a family
- I Starter homes are important
- NI Facilities are usually desirable and Haversham doesn't have a "town" culture so it's unlikely to attract single or professional couples
- I Important to have starter homes and accommodation options for people downsizing
- VI Starter homes/homes for downsizing/affordable housing important
- VI Affordable and relatively cheap – insufficient numbers for demand
- VI We need a range of housing for all ages
- VI Affordable to younger people, people wishing to downsize, better for elderly.
- I More affordable housing for young families.

- VI To keep families together in the community.
- NI We have only recently upsized our house so will not need a small flat/house for a very long time.
- VI Downsizing for the older to allow them to stay local. For youngsters that they also stay local –
- not everybody wants to live in a flat.
- I Provides housing for single/couple occupation both young and old.
- VI Very few already – so helps operate a balanced community. Probably only dwellings likely to be truly affordable for the young.
- I First time or downsizing.
- NI This is an out of town community without adequate services e.g. buses, shops etc. You would need a large development to provide enough money to improve the services and facilities. How would these be sustained over time? Local shops have closed I the grid squares of MK over the last 20 years and they are all surrounded by housing developments.
- I For younger people.
- I Attract younger families.
- VI Professional people or young families.
- I This would help younger people to be able to buy houses to start off on the climb of the ladder but of course the price would have to be right.
- I More suitable for families.
- VI Downsizing. Affordable for single younger people/keyworkers.
- NI more commuters
- I lower cost housing
- I More accessible housing
- I as above (it would be nice to have properties that younger people could afford to either stay in the village or newcomers to experience village life). I would rather see houses over flats though.
- VI none available at the moment, houses are very high (prices) for young people
- VI housing for those on the first step of the property ladder is needed within reach, too many 4-5 bed “executive” houses around – not enough affordable housing for starting out.
- VI as above (to keep the youngsters in the village + for the elderly which would free up their home for another family)
- I for young families
- VI space for younger people
- VI housing for younger people is very important and not easy to achieve.
- NI Not interested in any development
- NI Haversham is a rural village filled with families young and old. It needs to be filled with families who are proud of their village and put into it what they get back!
- NI If there was a choice between building flats or 1/2 bedroom houses I believe flats are more of a necessity to the people of the parish.
- VI Family accommodation is most important.
- I First time buyers.
- I To bringing a real well-balanced community
- VI There are family sized homes already occupied by singles/couples
- I Bring in young families to keep Haversham and the school going
- I Great for young local families
- I Families looking for first house in village environment
- I Good for young families
- VI For first time buyers and young families
- VI If we must accept the necessity of housing development then let it be for younger people/first time buyers who are usually overlooked
- VI Allow young people to stay in the community
- I A range of houses for all to afford
- I ‘Affordable’ and ‘starter’ homes would be best – at least a reasonable element. The children of existing residents of Haversham should be considered so that they can afford to buy in the area. This is likely to affect the upper part of Haversham (the estate) more than the old village
- VI To enable younger families/people to purchase – they should be more affordable. Also, retired people could downsize from larger property in the area
- VI Needed for first time buyers, single occupiers, downsizers
- I for young families.

- VI The majority of Haversham's housing stock is 3-bedroomed so to have some smaller more affordable houses would be a good way to enable younger members of the village to stay.
- VI The majority of Haversham's housing stock is 3-bedroomed so to have some smaller more affordable houses would be a good way to enable younger members of the village to stay.
- I affordability for first time buyers.
- NI Suggest we need to attract working professionals/people to the area.
- NI Suggest we need to attract working professionals/people to the area.
- I For single people and older people downsizing
- NI Two bed waste of time.
- NI No apparent demand in the parish.
- VI Suitable for individuals and couples.
- I For young families.
- I Lots of single people, or couples, financially established who want a garden, but who can access Drs etc themselves easily.
- VI Downsizing. More affordable for younger or single people, and those less well paid.
- I It is important to have a diverse community of people to sustain villages. It may also release larger, existing homes when downsizing.
- NI Less important than family homes.
- DK No flats! Houses if any should fit in with the current village.
- VI To help younger people get on to the housing ladder, plus elderly who want to downsize.
- VI A new housing development should allow for all different types of accommodation to meet the requirements of the people.
- NI 1/2 bed houses are traditionally occupied by younger and single people. This can be accommodated in MK and Wolverton where there are plenty of amenities for young people.
- I Not many in village now.
- I Affordable housing for the younger and more manageable properties for the older community.
- I Some needed for 1st time buyers.
- I You need a mix. See 4d,e,f [had no written responses]
- NI People who buy or rent this type of accommodation tend to be relatively transient and care less therefore about their surroundings.

Question 4c (Bungalows)

- I: Downsizing
- I: Elderly downsizing
- VI: Enable elderly to move and stay in their own homes for longer
- VI: Because of age and they should be affordable
- VI: For elderly residents
- DK: A mixture of b, c, d, e & f would include a variety of properties and a variety of residences which would lead to a diverse population more able to integrate into village
- NI: Not in keeping with the village
- DK: Is there a local need!?
- NI: No to expansion
- VI: For elderly to stay in their community
- VI: Shortage locally. Appeal to elderly/disabled
- I: Older couples
- VI: Good for disabled and elderly
- I: Suitable for older generation – but caution required/covenants to ensure not just converted into 2-storey houses
- VI: Downsizing for older people. Having lived in H&LL for many years retirees are reluctant to move away but have no suitable places to move to. Restrict ability for future house conversion though!
- I: People generally living longer but with less mobility
- I: For ageing population
- I Nice to have a mix
- NI Inefficient land use.
- I Retirement homes for disabled
- I Future downsizing?

- VI For anybody who wants to stay in Haversham who cannot, for some reason, want two storeys and would prefer somewhere on the same level.
- VI Encourage older people to move out of larger properties but be able to stay
- I Elderly
- I Lack of these available
- VI We need a flux of bungalows. You get old and sell your house → you move into a bungalow due to being frail → increases independence and lessens the NHS cost
- I To allow for older people /disabled to continue to live in their community.
- VI For older folks
- I Suitable for a wide variety of people and ages!
- VI No stairs, less maintenance and running costs
- NI We have enough
- I So that older people can move out of 3 bed semis and still stay in the village
- VI A few bungalows for older people who will struggle with stairs
- VI Lack of bungalows in the village
- I To allow people to stay in the village when they need to downsize
- I Some bungalows for residents wishing to downsize but remain in the area. This would free up existing housing for families
- I Catering for the ageing population and those who require one level accommodation
- NI Occupancy of bungalows is normally the older generation – there are no facilities to support this age group i.e. transport/shops/GPs
- NI Mainly for elderly so easy access to transport. Upper village perhaps. We have some bungalows
- I For elderly
- I Mixture
- NI Can take up more land than other housing
- I Elderly residents benefit from this type of housing
- I To assist our ageing villagers to remain here and still be important
- NI take up too much land.
- NI Enough of this accommodation in surrounding areas.
- I Housing needs of an ageing village population who wish to stay here. To attract all age groups to the village.
- I To assist local residents downsizing.
- NI Bungalows are a poor use of land.
- I Elderly should be made to feel welcome in the village.
- VI Suitable for older people as well as families.
- I Potential housing for older members of the community.
- VI Retirement home. Old people like villages.
- I For the elderly in our community.
- I For older people.
- I For older people.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- NI Already in existence.
- NI Already in existence.
- I – For disabled or elderly people.
- I – Older people may like to downsize to a bungalow (keep your independence).
- VI – Enables residents to downsize without moving away – which then frees up larger houses.
- VI – For elderly people and those with mobility problems.
- NI – A need to build more houses on smaller piece of land. Lack of building spaces. Not affordable for most.
- VI – For the elderly, those downsizing or disabled.
- VI – Cleaner looking, safer, easy for old people, better maintained and not as high.
- I – For the older people in our village who do not want to leave.
- I – There is a high proportion of people above 60/65 years in Haversham. When the time comes they may need alternative accommodation.
- I – We need more homes suitable for the elderly or disabled.

- I - We clearly have a higher proportion of elderly residents and it's important they have the option to stay in the community.
- NI – Not suitable for families
- VI – older generations ability to stay in the area
- I – good for elderly residents
- NI – but could be included as part of senior citizen housing scheme
- VI – low impact on the landscape
- I – there is a lack of suitable housing for the elderly
- VI – older people need to free up their semis for families to come to the village
- NI – expensive use of land available – maybe suitable for elderly but this niche may be better served by specialist housing
- NI – there is a bungalow for sale in the bottom village which has been for sale for some time. Generally bungalows are favoured by older members of the community. Why would elderly people want to live in Haversham when there is no shop, no bus, no doctors & very little support
- I – for those with limited mobility
- VI – there is a UK shortage & we need them for the elderly generation
- VI – aging population in the future
- VI – aging population in the future
- VI – many established community members are having to move away to find bungalows when their houses become too impractical. This has happened to my parents who had lived in Haversham for 37 years, leaving behind friends & a sense of belonging was very stressful & distressing for them
- I – there is a lack of suitable housing for the elderly
- I – provide variety
- I – not everyone is able to access stairs
- I – largely missing in Haversham, would allow current residents opportunity to move while staying in the area
- I – people like to stay in the village so would allow elderly to stay in the community
- I – this would be functional given the demographic of the village
- I – aging local community
- VI – those wishing to downsize, elderly wishing to stay in village, villagers of any age less able & need to live in single storey accommodation
- I – suitable for a variety of people
- I – good for older people
- I – useful for older people
- NI – poor use of land
- I – for people with mobility problems
- VI – For elderly, disabled, downsizing
- VI – For retired people
- I – We need to cater for our elderly and disabled
- NI – Better to create provision for a community run retirement home. Every village has one in France.
- VI – Not enough in MK for older people to downsize to
- I – Need a mix of housing
- I – Older generation to down size but stay in the village
- VI – Lots of current residents need to downsize and without this type of property people have to move out of the village
- I – Good for the elderly in the village. More inclusive.
- NI – Older requirements
- I – Downsizing and elderly
- I – For the elderly
- I – Elderly people and younger population
- VI – Diversity, age, disability but mixed into general housing not ghettos
- VI – many elderly occupants wanting to stay in Haversham and downsize but can't as there is no choice to.
- I – for elderly
- NI – people don't seem to want them.

- VI – encourages independent living for elderly or less mobile.
- I – People in village wanting to downsize but stay in the village.
- I – Suitable for older residents moving from house but staying in our parish
- VI – Important for residents with restricted mobility, avoiding major alterations to a resident's existing two or three storey house.
- I – variety of housing to meet needs of a variety of people
- I – lack of well-designed bungalows in the area
- VI – Would allow older members of the community to downsize freeing up their housing for other young families who have out grown smaller accommodation.
- I – Helps elderly in community
- I - Benefits vulnerable adults within the community maintain self-dependency.
- I – Great for the elderly/infirm.
- I. Frees up current housing for other families who may wish to buy or bring 'new blood' to village
- I. To allow some elder residents to move into them from three bed homes they occur solely. However this should not be an overriding priority
- NI. These houses are not as attractive for young people.
- NI. Attracting older generation to the village who may not invest as much.
- I. Mainly for the elderly
- VI. For our older folk
- NI. Our village has no buses for the elderly who no longer drive.
- NI. Elderly - Two hills one on each side of the village
- I. The addition of more bungalows will allow the ageing population of the village to move to more appropriate accommodation without leaving the village whilst making available the larger 3 or 4 bed houses to new families
- I. Good for the elderly and disabled.
- I. To release some larger properties
- I. Useful for a range of age groups
- VI. Particularly important for those with disabilities or just older
- I. For old people who can stay in their community and free up a house for young families.
- I. Elderly people/disabled people
- VI. For existing villagers to move into so they can stay in the area
- NI Utilise land better
- VI. Not everyone can climb stairs
- VI Ideal for ageing local community
- VI. For pensioners to move into but still stay in the village which will free up their houses for families
- VI Provide a diverse and inclusive neighbourhood – i.e. encourage older and disabled people to move into area
- I. Not the most efficient use of space but the most desirable retirement housing by far and we have an ageing population.
- VI. The elderly or those with mobility issues need to have opportunities to stay close to their community and free up homes for families or youngsters. However how do you ensure that some have a priority for people with community links like Beech Tree Close -> some percentage social side like warden monitored.
- VI. For disabled and elderly who cannot cope but can live fairly independently
- VI. A mix of accommodation is important. Bungalows better suit needs of people with mobility issues
- NI Not really practical unless disabled.
- NI. Flats – houses – first time bungalows
- NI Milton Keynes is a working town, bungalows although would benefit some, would not be a necessity in a new development as the majority of occupants in a new development would be working families.
- I More suitable for people downsizing
- NI except for disabled people – otherwise a greedy choice of housing taking up more ground area for less accommodation.
- I. In keeping with the village
- NI (quotes his answer 2: What does the village want to be. Attractive to young and modern, old and traditional or family. With this comes the sort of property and look).

- VI Accommodation for senior generation
- NI Poor use of available land
- I. Would suit older people. However this is an expensive use of land. They must have a reasonable garden the same size as existing houses
- DK. Bungalows would be nice if there was adequate spare land but are they really a practical solution
- VI. With care warden for the elderly
- I Needed for disabled
- I bought here to live in a village
- NI I'm afraid these are simply a waste of building land when there are so many other needs.
- VI For people who have slight disabilities and prefer to have everything on one floor and for the older generation, friendships made.
- I Gives elderly residents opportunity to downsize.
- VI For the elderly and disabled people.
- VI Disabled and elderly.
- I Suitable housing for elderly.
- I Very good for the elderly and those with mobility problems.
- VI Good for the older generation and disabled.
- VI Better for the elderly.
- NI Take more land space.
- I Ease of access for older people.
- I Older generation may wish to move but wish to stay in the locality
- VI Again for older people
- I No-one seems to build bungalows any more suitable for disable/downsizing
- I To enable the ageing residents of the village to still live in the same community
- I I feel it is important to keep the current community feel of the village and this is best served by encouraging families rather than single people
- I Need housing for the older community that already live here
- I We should provide across the range if at all to represent and cater for all of society
- VI For local older residents wishing to downsize but stay in the village
- NI No need to construct new bungalows. Alternative is to convert the two storey council homes into flats
- VI There is a national lack of new build bungalows, meaning a short for elderly or infirm
- I A small number would also be useful for small family, single parents, first time buyers or rental. Older people to downsize. A mixture of own or rent.
- VI For older residents wanting to stay within the village but cannot manage stairs because of frailty. Also for anyone with disabilities within a family
- NI Not a good use of land.
- DK Is Haversham attractive to a retirement community?
- NI I think for the size of footprint then a house would be preferable to a bungalow
- VI Homes for elderly important
- I High proportion of disabled individuals within the broader MK population, along with ageing population
- I A few only! Elderly people do like them
- VI Better access for elderly or infirm.
- NI Not needed in current market, purchased more by older buyers.
- I Older generation accommodation.
- I For senior citizens, disabled people.
- I My relatives may decide to move to the area when they retire.
- I Very nice but a ground floor flat, if built well, might suffice.
- I Provides suitable accommodation for traditional retired couples and are also in keeping with current housing.
- NI Elderly tend to go for better communal facilities. We have some already.
- I Retired couples in keeping with existing housing.
- NI The services are not available for support, some larger ones for those who are mobile would be appropriate.
- I So older residents may downsize.

- NI Amenities are not readily accessible.
- VI There are a lot of older people coming into the community.
- I A few for older people to move into if they wish.
- VI Great, it could help older people to downsize and let younger people to buy their home but again price would be involved and size, builders seem to think that old people only want one room plus a bedroom and bathroom but we do like to have family over to spend time with not in a cramped space.
- I For family home owners to downsize.
- I Good for those older or with disabilities who cannot manage stairs.
- I downsizing for elders
- VI for elderly/additional needs
- I allows elderly housing, stay in village and downsize
- VI People tend to stay a long time in Haversham, it is nice to have the range of accommodation so that the elderly can still stay and manage in a home of their own when a house is too much to manage.
- VI Important for older or people with mobility problems
- I Again for elderly of the village who may be happy to 'free up' their house
- I older people
- I all housing is important
- I Allows older residents to continue to stay in Haversham where larger houses with stairs become difficult to manage
- VI Older people who have difficulty in climbing stairs need somewhere to downsize in the parish, otherwise they would be forced to move to a different location.
- VI There is a national shortage. Necessary for many old people.
- I There currently aren't enough.
- VI Many old and disabled residents in large houses with large gardens
- VI Many elderly folk find stairs difficult
- VI Lot of elderly people in Haversham and very few bungalows to accommodate them
- NI Waste of space when you could build houses
- NI Do not offer type of housing required by most
- I For elderly hoping to remain in location but requiring easier living conditions
- I Good for the elderly
- I Possibility of downsizing depending on prices
- VI To allow older residents to be able to downsize (if required)
- I Range of housing needed
- NI A waste of land as footprint bigger
- DK Unsure. Bungalows take up more space per resident but could be more helpful for older people. I think a small percentage of bungalows could be acceptable but younger people need houses. Bungalows take up more land
- I For older people living in the area – so they can stay in their community and free up their larger property for a family
- VI Many older people in the area may like to stay here while moving somewhere more accessible
- I for elderly and less able residents
- VI for those who can no longer cope with stairs
- VI We have a high percentage of people who have lived in the village a long time and wish to stay; this would free up larger, older houses for families
- VI We have a high percentage of people who have lived in the village a long time and wish to stay; this would free up larger, older houses for families
- I to enlarge on ease of access for disabled/old people.
- NI tend to be lived in by the older population and we don't have the type of facilities they tend to use i.e. bus service, doctors, community centre.
- I could introduce diversity of buildings and support aging population.
- I could introduce diversity of buildings and support aging population.
- VI For older people downsizing and people with mobility problems.
- VI Suitable for elderly or disabled. Developers won't build, not enough return.
- I For older people, fit in with village area.
- I 3/4 bed houses could be sold to families. They may appeal to the older generation.
- NI Too land hungry.

- NI The footprint of a bungalow is the same as a house and therefore a waste of space.
- I To allow older and disabled residents to live locally. Insufficient stock currently.
- NI Not so much 'not important' as less of a priority.
- NI Don't think this is a good use of land.
- VI Provision for elderly couples.
- I Some older residents may want to downsize in future, and not necessarily move out of village.
- I A lot of elderly people that are living in large houses would downsize to a bungalow + people with a disability.
- I Bungalows are very nice looking buildings that offer good accommodation for the elderly and people who simply want to live in a property with no stairs.
- I Important that elderly people can remain in the village as they age - downsizing to release houses for younger families but remaining in the community.
- VI Offer the chance for residents with two storey homes the opportunity to move to one storey and stay in the village.
- NI Excessive use of land for one property. Some needed for mobility impaired people.
- I Good for people who find stairs tricky. Not many in MK.
- I Their size means that they blend into the countryside better. Good for elderly people to stay in the community whilst downsizing.

Question 4d (2/3 bedroom houses)

- I: Families
- I: Families
- I: Downsizing and young families
- NI: Already a lot of 2/3 bed houses
- DK: A mixture of b, c, d, e & f would include a variety of properties and a variety of residences which would lead to a diverse population more able to integrate into village
- I: In keeping with the village
- I: General mix – maybe
- NI: No to expansion
- NI: We have enough
- NI: Already have such buildings for families
- I: For young people
- I: Required for family homes
- I: Small family homes
- I: For families
- I: For growing families
- VI To consider young families
- I To give younger people the opportunity to stay in Haversham
- I For people who would like to stay in the same village that they were born and brought up in.
- NI Enough already
- NI Enough already
- VI Lack of these available
- VI Extremely important for growing families that need value and affordable rent!
- I Mix of housing stock
- I Can assist people moving on housing ladder
- VI Mainly affordable housing
- I more for the younger generation to be able to afford living in the area they've been brought up in.
- VI Suitable for most families.
- VI To encourage young families to the village.
- I The main category of housing.
- I Families to enhance community.
- VI Greater emphasis needs to be put on roads allowing the number of cars that come with these homes i.e. larger driveways for 2 plus cars.
- I This size of housing will accommodate most families.
- VI Family homes, in keeping with the area.
- I For young families.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.

- NI Already in existence.
- NI Already in existence.
- I Required by small families
- NI We have enough three bedroom houses and 2 bedroom houses are covered in question 'b'
- I Most likely to accommodate young couples/families
- I Standard accommodation for family makers
- I Needed for young people with families
- I Families create ongoing communities. Access to fresh air and rural healthy living
- I Families – enable families to have access to a rural lifestyle for healthy/outdoor children!
- I Encourage families into the area
- VI Attract young families and children. Good school and recreation ground in upper village
- I Families
- I Affordable
- VI Most suitable size housing
- I For growing families
- NI - We don't need them.
- I – Just the right size for a village.
- VI – To enable younger people to stay in the area after starting families.
- VI – Most families may be able to afford.
- VI – Families.
- VI – In line with the rest of the village and estate.
- I – To encourage more families into the village.
- I – For young families who could add a lot to the local community.
- I - It would be great to see more family homes.
- VI – Encourages young families to join the community, as they have space to grow
- VI – families
- VI – young families
- VI – good for families & in keeping with area
- NI – we have a large enough stock of 3 bed houses. Indeed the vast majority of houses in Haversham are 3 bed semis. Some need for 2 beds though
- I – encourage families
- I – an important stepping stone on the property ladder may encourage young families to the village & help with village regeneration
- I – could offer opportunities to young people who want to stay in Haversham. Families would welcome new housing but type & cost would have to be appropriate
- I – first time buyers, downsizing, growing families, social mix
- NI – other house sizes are more important
- VI – younger families
- VI – younger families
- I – most suitable for area
- I – mx of sizes
- VI – area is key & popular with young families – important for future of village
- VI – in keeping with current properties
- VI – this would be functional given the demographic of the village
- I – family homes for local young people wishing to stay within the local community
- DK – lots of 3 beds available in the village – I understand not for sale – do we have more of these? Prefer 3 bed to building 2 bed but lack of garden space / parking etc. and things could look messy. Torn on this one
- I – helps people move up the housing ladder as their families expands
- I – families
- I – room for small family
- NI – too big for singles, not big enough for families
- NI – don't want the village engulfed in a new housing estate
- VI – To accommodate families
- NI – There is enough available, though not necessarily here, and it's expensive
- I – For families
- I – Need a mix of housing

- VI – To encourage younger families in the village
- VI – Affordability in-keeping with the current properties and these are suited to the location/village
- VI – Ideal for families. A lot of families in Haversham
- VI – More affluent families moving to area
- I – Young families
- I – Families
- I – Help families
- I – Families moving in
- I – I am all for expansion, this would have to be backed up with facilities though
- I – For families/growing families
- NI – Already sufficient provision
- I – Great for family groups
- VI – Probably the most popular house but not to the exclusion of 4a. b. or c
- I – Families. In keeping with size of current housing
- I – Variety of housing needed
- I – to give growing local families a chance of staying local
- I – local young families
- I – family homes
- I - family culture is important.
- I – Great for families who bring new life to a community.
- I. Young family homes – potentially brings in new young families to the village
- I. Attracts families/first/second layers
- I. For growing families
- Young families
- VI. For younger people to be allowed to stay in their own villages
- VI. The addition of three bed homes allow young couples and families to join the village community which will hopefully in turn get a growing generation involved in parish matters. This size home is more financially achievable to a wider demographic than the larger homes.
- VI. People who buy these may stay longer in the community.
- I. So they are affordable and not large detached as I have seen on a lot of sites around MK
- VI. Homes for families.
- I. Not as important because many 3 bedroom homes could be freed up if single person dwellers of larger homes down sized.
- VI. Young Families
- NI. Enough already
- VI. Higher proportion need or can afford
- For local families
- VI. To encourage families into the village
- I. Good sized flexible housing.
- I. For families – some eco houses in a small settlement e.g. near trout fishery or top of Brookfield might address dynamic. Possibly windmill with housing inside – small scale enclaves not mass housing in keeping.
- I. For families
- I. We need a mix of accommodation to allow a mix of singles, families, old and young. We already have quite a lot of 3 bedroom houses. But as the community grows we need to keep a balance
- VI. Large enough for family
- VI. Most needed
- I. Demand is highest for this type of housing based on the income/job status and socioeconomic status of the existing community.
- I. Suitable for families
- I. In keeping with the village
- I. Family based properties
- I. Larger families
- VI Family Homes
- I. Similar to current housing stock \ could be made to fit the village character

- This fits a variety of needs and is suitable for new families encouraging the existing family feel of the village. They must have a garden similar to existing houses
- I. There is a need to encourage young families into the village to get involved into the community and increase a community spirit.
- VI. Growing families
- VI Growing families for executive class
- I bought here to live in a village
- I This will help maintain the 'character' of the Haversham estate, providing smaller family houses in line with the existing property 'portfolio'.
- I For growing families who are part of the community and would like the opportunity to stay.
- I Young families.
- NA None
- NA for families that need more space/bedrooms.
- NI We already have mostly 3 bed properties.
- VI Average home size - always wanted.
- I Variety of housing.
- I Most families need at least a 3 bed house.
- DK I think we already have more 3 beds than smaller or larger properties.
- I For families but much better if built in the city.
- VI Requirements for most people.
- VI The size most families need.
- NI Plenty available already
- I Suitable for families
- I I feel it is important to keep the current community feel of the village and this is best served by encouraging families rather than single people
- VI To encourage families
- I We should provide across the range if at all to represent and cater for all of society
- NI Not needed
- NI There is no housing shortage. There are vast amounts of 2-3 bedroom Victorian houses vacant in the North of England and East Midlands
- I Families
- I A small number for rent or own would be useful for people wishing to move into a village
- I For growing families
- I Families are important to Haversham
- VI Family friendly village with good school facilities
- I Good to have a full range of options
- I All type of housing should be available
- VI We need a good mix of housing
- I For starter homes for families.
- NI It is better to get the younger generation in housing.
- I Typical for young families which should be encouraged to join village life.
- VI Helps get young families back and in so doing, generates children for school and support for local facilities.
- I Encourage families.
- I Encourage families who are also mobile.
- VI Family community.
- I A few for first time buyers, but we must consider all the extra traffic this would make. Haversham has to take all the heavy traffic from all the other village's developments.
- VI This would be great for the growing family.
- I Important for families.
- VI Affordable for those who wish to live here in houses but can't afford some of the larger ones.
- I young families
- I style of houses in village
- VI to encourage families
- I there are a lot of these available but they are very expensive
- NI 2 beds are already covered earlier. The majority of housing is already 3 bed and with a policy of 'freeing up' existing stock, then this will go some way to meet demand.

- I all housing is important. 2/3 bed houses are great for younger families wanting to start village life.
- VI Consistency! Most homes in Haversham are 3 beds.
- I Important only if they are affordable. Too many people are becoming homeless because of the lack of affordable rents.
- VI Family requirement.
- I Small family homes.
- I Giving a wide and varied accommodation
- I Need to encourage new young families
- I Again – bring in young families
- I Great for young families
- VI Good for families
- VI For families with children to be able to move into the area
- I If we must accept the necessity of housing development then let it be for younger people/first time buyers who are usually overlooked
- VI Range of housing needed
- I A good mix of housing for all
- I Some. It is getting the balance right. Young people have families. We should try and cater for different needs: young, middle aged, older retirees, but what are the needs?
- NI I believe the area has a more plentiful supply of three bedroom property – BUT we need more smaller properties for both young and older people
- VI We need to encourage young families
- I for families.
- I for larger families.
- NI there are already a good number of these.
- NI there are already a good number of these.
- I family type accommodation.
- I to attract working families to the area.
- I to attract working families to the area.
- VI For medium size family.
- VI To house families. Make them affordable.
- I A mix would be required.
- NI In a village there are few facilities for the young. Parents become taxi drivers, increase in traffic etc.
- I To allow sustainable community development by enabling young families to live locally.
- VI Affordable for couples/young families.
- VI Attract new young families to villages. Also affordable.
- VI Young families will want these in order to move into village and take advantage of the outstanding school.
- VI For young families making a step up from a flat or 1/2 bed property.
- I Families with children require the extra rooms to accommodate to their specific requirements.
- I Village life is suited to young families who can use the good school and settle here and perhaps have the energy to contribute to village life and building a strong community.
- VI Reflects existing nature of village.
- I Accommodating growing families.
- I Good size an affordable for young families who want to settle.

Question 4e (4+ bedroom houses)

- NI: Not a big demand
- NI: Possibly enough in the area
- I: For those who wish to stay but would like a bigger property
- DK: A mixture of b, c, d, e & f would include a variety of properties and a variety of residences which would lead to a diverse population more able to integrate into village
- I: In keeping with the village
- I: Yes – suitable in small numbers
- NI: No to expansion

- NI: We have enough
- NI: I think enough big houses around Milton Keynes
- NI: Some required for larger families wishing to live in a lovely rural setting
- NI: Already large proportion of property available – not where need is
- NI Keep building sizes reasonable
- NI A number exist of this type and would naturally change hands from time to time
- NI Perhaps would be out of the people's price bracket
- NI Enough already
- NI Enough already
- NI Already a lot in Haversham existing
- VI Extremely important! There are large families and they are just not catered for. Need more large house!
- I Mix of housing stock
- I Again another option for people moving up the housing ladder as family expands
- NI A need to restrict plot sizes
- I To stop larger families moving out of the area to bigger homes.
- NI Doesn't accommodate majority of people.
- I We do have a number of houses of this size so not as important as smaller, less expensive houses.
- I The village would then have a mix of housing types.
- I Again for families and for the next generation to grow up in a lovely village.
- I Greater emphasis needs to be put on roads allowing the number of cars that come with these homes i.e. larger driveways for 2 plus cars.
- NI Most people are not able to afford this size of house or need one.
- VI Demand for these types of house in this area.
- I If you have a bigger family.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- NI Already in existence.
- NI Already in existence.
- I Required by larger families
- NI They are not necessary – these houses are adaptable enough to make into 4 beds if needed
- NI Don't want 'executive homes'
- NI Don't care about people who can afford 4 bedroom houses
- NI Would take too much land and would serve a small number of people
- I Upward mobility of achieving families who will hopefully contribute to their community
- I Bring wealth and achieving families into the area and hopefully encourage their input into the community
- I Encourage families into the area
- I Bigger houses for larger families (housing their relatives too). Provide variety so reduce rows of similar houses
- I Mix of residences for balanced communities
- I Keep character of village
- NI Take up more land than smaller accommodation. Families smaller than previous years
- I For families
- NI - We don't need them.
- NI – We do not need large 4 bedroom houses in a village location.
- I – To enable the possibility of large families 'upsizing' without leaving the area.
- NI – Extravagant / not affordable.
- VI – Families.
- VI – Needed for big families and keeping in line with the rest of the village.
- VI – There is a limited number of 4+ bed houses in Haversham. With a growing family we will need somewhere bigger in the next year or so – however we will likely have to leave Haversham as none available.
- I – For families.
- VI - The community is built up of larger houses and it makes sense for this to continue – organic growth.

- I - Encourages young families to join the community, as they have space to grow
 - NI – village does not require larger properties, avoid multi rented out rooms / houses
 - VI – not enough – good for families
 - I – to encourage larger families into the village
 - NI – not right for the estate, maybe old Haversham as larger houses already there
 - NI – there seem to be a reasonable number of larger properties particularly in old village & little Linford. There may be a need for some of this size in the top village
 - NI – plenty of these already. They are mostly unaffordable & create enclaves & insular living
 - VI – growing families, round mix ??
 - NI – other house sizes are more important
 - NI – no thank you
 - I- provide variety
 - I – mix of sizes
 - NI – plenty of options in existing village
 - NI – this is too large for reasonable construction en mass in the village
 - NI – executive homes won't enhance local area
 - DK – torn on this one – we do have an abundance of 3 bed house in the village. Some are / have been extended. I appreciate families are large in size now & 4 bed would be desirable
 - I – helps people move up the housing ladder as their family expands
 - NI – generally an overkill
 - I – for growing families
 - NI – don't want the village engulfed in a new housing estate
-
- I – As long as they have gardens
 - VI – To accommodate families
 - NI – Unpleasant tendency to foster this by developers creates posh ghettos
 - VI – For families
 - I – Need a mix of housing
 - NI – Unaffordable to many
 - NI – Drives unaffordable housing
 - NI – Not a demand for them
 - I – Mix of larger families moving up
 - VI – Mature families
 - I – Families
 - I – Help families
 - I – Multi-occupancy
 - VI – Why not? Families are growing and so are incomes, the area deserves some nicer housing
 - NI – There are lots of expensive houses around here already
 - NI – Growing trend for smaller families means that they are not needed
 - I – Only as affordable housing - not high market housing
 - NI – Tend to be larger homes, you will get more two or three bed homes in the same area
 - NI – Not in keeping with current housing stock. Inappropriate for the nature of Haversham overall.
 - I – Variety of housing needed
 - NI – Local community benefit low
 - I – Larger homes for more permanent families
 - I – Could uplift value of the parish providing homes with space (assuming parking etc. is considered at the same time)
 - I – Great for families who bring new life to a community
-
- VI. Villagers who wish to stay in village currently have no where to move to if they wish to expand
 - I. To allow residents to move 'up' and stay in the village
 - NI. Unaffordable
 - NI. Too many of these in MK
 - NI. Do we need 4/5 beds?
 - I. Although I would say that these should be included I feel the benefits of the 2 and 3 bedroom homes is greater and more achievable to the average working person and therefore helping the current younger generation of the village one day return to start their own family.

- VI. People who buy these may stay longer in the community.
- NI. Too expensive
- I. “Executive” housing does not address the shortage of affordable housing problem.
- NI. There are quite a percentage of large homes already
- NI Enough already
- NI. Out of price range for many
- NI. Encourages commuters who have no interest in village life
- NI These houses would be unaffordable to many
- NI. Frankly large housing being readily available encourages people to have more than 1 or 2 children which is not good for society given increase in population.
- DK. Not sure about creating massive new houses or whether you free up existing larger houses with other options. There could be a small number of larger houses – in keeping in old village e.g. opposite old post office – between church and schoolhouse, Little Linford round back.
- I. For families
- I We need to maintain a mix of families, singles, ages, to have a truly vibrant and balanced community.
- VI People can stay in that type when children grow up
- NI They are retired so they can do what they want.
- VI. Needed to keep families together – i.e. grandparents
- I. To establish suitable quantity of larger housing will cater for families wanting to move into the area. It will also encourage a community of diverse professions, benefitting the community.
- I. Family based properties
- NI. Stop becoming overpriced in other types
- I. This allows for larger families. They must have a garden size similar to existing homes
- NI. There are enough already built and still enough smaller houses with room to extend
- NI. There are few large families – except among muslims
- I bought here to live in a village
- NI These are moving away from the character of the village (unless semi-detached in nature).
- I Families
- NA None
- VI For families that need more space/bedrooms.
- NA This could reduce the amount of extensions, however I suspect you’d get rich developers lots so I’m not sure I’d welcome this.
- VI Large families and multiple generations sharing.
- NI We need some but inevitably they will be more expensive than many can afford.
- I To cater for larger families.
- NI Do we need 4,5,6 beds plus?
- NI Less requirement.
- NI Does not cover enough of the average population to be important
- I I feel it is important to keep the current community feel of the village and this is best served by encouraging families rather than single people
- I Family housing
- I We should provide across the range if at all to represent and cater for all of society
- NI Not needed
- NI Really simple – just build and extension to a home when necessary to do so
- NI Not important to us
- NI This type of house, unless built in character would look out of place
- I For larger families
- NI Housing shortage needs to pass on maximised use of available land
- I Need to have options for families and make Haversham a village that is suitable for people at all stages of life
- I All types of housing should be available
- I We need new housing for all – especially families
- NI These can be purchased anywhere if you can afford them.
- VI We currently have 4 bedrooms and if we decided to move again in the future we’d still want at least 4.
- NI If these was to be a ‘churn’ we may have enough.

- VI Traditionally suitable for established families.
- I Many already but do need some.
- I Encourage families.
- VI Families would be encouraged but they would have their own transport and school is local.
- NI Can be very intrusive.
- NI Do we really need 4+ bedroom homes; they are being built everywhere. The bigger the house can mean 3+ more cars onto our village streets.
- NI Unless you have the land to go with the house we would say no.
- I More for families.
- NI There is adequate supply of larger houses. I do not wish to see additional expensive houses priced out of the reach of many people.
- I families
- NI too many would make for a 2nd 'Old Haversham'
- NI not really necessary in my opinion
- NI not as necessary as houses with fewer rooms
- NI most large 'executive' houses are already being made in other parts of MK as developers prefer these due to the larger profits involved.
- I Helps improve property values.
- VI To stop residents buying houses and putting on extensions that visually do not match up to houses in the street. They are an eyesore!
- NI People should take responsibility for the over population problem we have and conceive less children.
- I Family can be larger.
- VI Family homes.
- NI There are family sized homes already occupied by singles/couples
- NI Too expensive for locals, it would make Haversham a commuter village and generally they don't join in with village life
- NI Local people wouldn't be able to afford these properties
- I Range of housing needed
- I We need new housing for families
- NI I think large homes should be limited or excluded altogether
- NI There is already a supply of this property and therefore I believe this type of housing should be excluded from the Neighbourhood plan
- NI If you can afford a four bedroom property you already have choice
- DK not sure if there is demand but could be suitable for multi-generations.
- I I'm not really sure about this, but it would increase the variety of housing stock.
- I I'm not really sure about this, but it would increase the variety of housing stock.
- VI to attract families with workers that commute to MK and London and use public transport.
- VI to attract families with workers that commute to MK and London and use public transport.
- VI Better designed than social housing, less house on the land.
- VI Established financially and employ people as housekeepers, gardeners, handyman etc. Still likely to be taxi driver for young though!
- NI Sufficient stock already.
- NI Don't wish to see larger houses with extensive grounds, outside the financial reach of most people.
- I Will free up 2/3 bedroom houses as families grow and want to stay in village, especially for school.
- I May need more 4+ beds to attract families to village.
- NI Parking in the upper village at times is very difficult. Larger houses will require off street parking, if multi-occupied.
- VI If we all keep moving - more houses available.
- I Families with children require the extra rooms to accommodate to their specific requirements. Depends on their family and financial standing.
- I Village life is suited to young families who can use the good school and settle here and perhaps have the energy to contribute to village life and building a strong community.
- NI Less important rather than not important. Fewer of these houses currently.
- I Accommodating growing families.

- I Need to ensure no bigger than 2 storeys as otherwise would not fit into the areas in subtle manner. Good for families.

Question 4f (specialist housing for older retired people)

- VI: Enable people to live independently for longer
- VI: Age
- NI: Quite a few in MK already
- DK: A mixture of b, c, d, e & f would include a variety of properties and a variety of residences which would lead to a diverse population more able to integrate into village
- NI: Not really in keeping with the village
- NI: No amenities
- NI: No to expansion – MK have retirement villages
- VI: For elderly to stay in their community
- I: In keeping with current environment
- VI: There's not enough places
- NI: I do not believe we have the infrastructure for this style of accommodation
- NI: Not sustainable due to lack of services
- VI: We are all living longer, but many lose their spouse. Community living would help many in this category
- I Rising number of retired/elderly people
- I To provide a means of staying in Haversham
- VI To help them stay where they have settled and made friends and not want to leave Haversham
- I Elderly people are an important part of any community and should be given the opportunity to remain in area if wish
- I Lets old people continue to live in their community.
- NI Make bungalows and if they're not independent it's special living then care home.
- NI Not sustainable as very little public transport or local services
- VI Much needed to allow older Haversham residents to downsize and have specialist accommodation
- I To ensure people do not have to leave the area as they get older but this would have to be supported with better facilities.
- NI Various sites in MK cover this type of housing
- NI Too isolated if don't or can't drive.
- I Not enough that is accessible.
- NI Public transport is not good and few amenities available for older people e.g. shops and medical centres.
- I Such people would not have to leave the area in which they have spent time.
- NI Should be sufficient provision in the general housing mix.
- DK Depends on what sort of housing.
- VI We all get old eventually and need help! 😊
- I We are all living longer – we need to look at ways of encouraging our ageing population to think about shared accommodation – better for mental health & combatting loneliness.
- I So they can continue to live in villages (if not in their own homes).
- NI Requires larger building.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- NI I do not agree with any further housing.
- VI Required by disabled or senior citizens with restricted lifestyles
- I Fits village model
- I It has quite a large elderly population – it would be nice for them to be able to stay here when they can no longer stay in their own homes
- I So that older people can move out of 3 bed semis and still stay in the village
- VI Same as for bungalows (a few bungalows for older people who will struggle with stairs) but also with specialist handrails and stuff
- I It might help older people stay where they've always lived and want to remain, to be close to family and friends
- I Bring ageing communities together with local population and schools

- I Look after and future proofing the needs of the ageing population. Bring facilities into the community
- I Enable elderly to remain in the area to be near their family – not village (lower Haversham) – again no transport or facilities
- VI Important to have properties for older people but lack of transport critical as none in lower village
- I Why not
- I Mixture
- VI Sense of community. Allows release of housing for next generation
- I Elderly residents benefit from this type of housing
- I - Because the government is abusing the elderly!!!
- VI – As I said before, older people like to be independent.
- I – All are important, planning for and considering all options is essential.
- I – It's important to have a variety of houses in order to attract people to the area.
- VI – To enable people who have lived in the area to remain in the locality / community.
- VI – Older people need support and specialist care.
- VI – More older people now!
- VI – Nation has a massive elderly population it's needed for them.
- VI – All housing is important but downsizing older people frees up more housing for young families.
- NI – I have family who have lived in these types of developments and they do not actually benefit the residents or their family's long term. The developers are ruthless and it ends up being very expensive.
- NI – Whilst I think bungalows are important, the healthcare facilities are currently quite poor, so it would make sense for specialist homes to be closer to existing surgeries.
- I – Allows a community to develop which might not have
- VI – so that they can stay in their own environment
- VI – allow older generation to stay in the area
- I – plenty of elderly residents in Haversham
- DK – not sure there is specific need
- DK – is there a need, as no shop in the village
- VI – there is a lack of housing that is suitable for the elderly
- I – to allow for older residents to downsize & yet remain in the village. Consider wardened accommodation
- NI - . Why would elderly people want to live in Haversham when there is no shop, no bus, no doctors & very little support. Same as for bungalows unless there is some wardened accommodation the same principles apply
- VI – elderly population growing, not enough suitable housing, shouldn't be isolated from rest of community
- VI – there is a massive UK shortage
- VI – same as bungalows, aging population & people with disabilities, mobility issues, dementia etc.
- VI – same as bungalows, aging population
- I – for reasons stated above
- VI – there is a lack of housing that is suitable for the elderly
- NI – not suitable for location & amenities
- VI – to enable existing residents to stay in the area
- I - largely missing in Haversham, would allow current residents opportunity to move while staying in the area
- I – people staying in the community
- VI – this would be appropriate & in keeping with the current & prospective future demographic of the village
- VI - aging local community
- VI – not just for older retired people. Any village resident may need this type off accommodation regardless of age
- I – if downsizing it would good to stay in the village / estate
- I – to ensure people can remain in the area as they get older. However more investment in the infrastructure would be required

- I – I'm old
- NI – there are plenty of retirement villages in the country
- I – so that the older villagers can move on and sell their no longer needed larger homes to young families who need the space, but still remain in the vicinity
- I – Again! Poor transport makes this not ideal
- VI – Need housing for the elderly and those that need assistance with living
- NI – Unpleasant tendency to foster this by developers creates posh ghettos
- NI – Very expensive for the home owner
- I – keeping people in the village
- I – As a community we need to be prepared to help the older generation
- VI – There is an aging population in the village; efforts need to be made to keep residents in the village
- VI – Primarily older people in Haversham, enables families to stay together
- I – For the elderly
- VI – Diversity, age, disability but mixed into general housing not ghettos
- VI – Gives the older generation a chance to stay when their family and memories are.
- VI – For mixed population.
- I – The care system is swamped, more public facilities not necessarily private.
- VI – Warden control/sheltered accommodation would assist the ageing population
- NI – Tend to be larger homes, you will get more two or three bed homes in the same area
- VI – Older population increases
- VI – Variety of provision needed especially for ageing population
- I – Requirement for the area, a lot of people locally lived here for long periods and are looking to stay.
- VI – To keep older residents in the local area
- DK – New dwellings should be designed for adaptability in accommodating the elderly/medical/disability etc. needs of the specific person.
- VI – Keeps the residents within the parish and frees up housing for other people
- NI – catered for in other parts of MK
- NI. This is being developed in Stony Stratford.
- VI. To meet growing need.
- VI. Growth in elderly population, many requiring support
- VI. WE need t look after our old folk.
- NI. Bungalows in a good community should be enough.
- VI. Releases houses for young families
- I. As our communities has a section of retired people.
- NI. Bungalows which can be adapted more useful
- I. Enables older retired people to downsize and free up bigger houses.
- VI. For old people who can stay in their community and free up a house for young families.
- VI. With an ageing population some sheltered housing should be provided in every community to allow the elderly to stay where they have lived and have friends and family
- VI. For existing villagers to move into so they can stay in the area
- VI. So they shouldn't be forced to move out of the village
- VI. To enable older people to stay in their local area
- VI. I'll need one soon
- VI Sheltered bungalows would be favourable to some residents
- VI. Ageing population
- VI. Haversham and Little Linford tend to have families who stay in or around the villages and see comment 4C above {4c above repeated: VI. The elderly or those with mobility issues need to have opportunities to stay close to their communities and free up homes for families or youngsters. However how do you ensure that some have a priority for people with community links like Beech Tree Close -> some percentage social side like warden monitored} – bungalows sheltered housing could be somewhere like behind the Crescent where there can walk to bus stop/access pub, church, social centre
- VI. To enable them to continue living independently without leaving the area, which they are familiar with

- NI. They are retired so they can do what they want.
- I. So they can be independent
- NI. Although there is an ageing population and consideration must be taken for this community to retire in MK there is suitable accommodation of this facility
- NI (quotes answer 2: What does the village want to be. Attractive to young and modern, old and traditional or family. With this comes the sort of property and look).
- VI. Population demographic is changing upwards
- Mix of residents
- NI. All houses should be made suitable for all people
- NI The facilities are poor for older people unless they can drive. They can choose to live in any new house.
- NI. No point without a better bus service.
- VI. We are here now – more on the way
- VI. Needed
- I bought here to live in a village

- VI This would hopefully prevent older members of the community having to leave Haversham/LLinford at a time when proximity to family and friends is of great importance.
- VI So they can stay in the community that they know and love, people friendship.
- VI Keeps retired people in the community.
- VI So that bigger properties can house bigger families instead of being wasted.
- I For the older community members to continue living locally.
- VI We're all living longer!
- I We all get old and older house cannot always be adapted to suit and warden assistance is often not available.
- VI If we're living longer then we need more to enable us to stay independent.
- VI Not enough being done for the elderly. We need to look after them.
- I Could release other housing.
- I Could be required for people who wish to stay in Haversham?
- VI Older residents need a place to go and it's nice to stay in their village
- I Might free up larger council houses. Elderly often in hospital for longer periods due to lack of housing
- I I feel it is important to keep the current community feel of the village and this is best served by encouraging families rather than single people
- I for older residents
- I We should provide across the range if at all to represent and cater for all of society
- Currently no location would fail to impact the Wolverton Road. Ideally any proposal should therefore avoid Wolverton Road
- VI As most retired people do not want to move too far. They like to keep in touch with everyone they know.
- VI Not only by looking after your own, but older retired people would have increased opportunity to downsize and free up larger homes for younger families
- I We should do more to look after the elderly / retired
- NI Retirement villages already in the Milton Keynes area
- I Because of the ageing population in general
- I Whilst important I fear Haversham is too isolated
- DK Again unsure if Haversham has the right facilities
- VI If we have special housing for the older retired it would release larger homes for families and young people
- NI I think specialist housing is probably more appropriate in areas with greater public amenities and local workforce
- I All types of housing should be available
- I As population continues to age, this type of housing will need to be increased
- VI Houses for current residents to move into when wanting to downsize
- VI As these are probably the people currently building in the parish as it is now.
- VI Elderly housing is very important
- I There aren't many in the area.

- NI Community facilities not currently suitable for 'specialist' housing.
 - VI Very important for the elderly – so can stay in the area.
 - NI No available shops etc. older retired are moving towards 'retirement villages' as time goes on. They would be built and then extended for other users as seen all over established areas of bungalows.
 - I For older people of our village who may want to downsize.
 - NI Amenities are not readily accessible.
 - I A few for older people to move into if the wish.
 - VI This is an important part of the community.
 - VI Sheltered housing.
 - I Important as a concept in this ageing society but I'm not sure Haversham is large enough to accommodate a sheltered housing scheme or similar.
-
- VI keeps retired in village
 - VI keep our community together
 - I encourages community
 - I see bungalows (4c) People tend to stay a long time in Haversham, it is nice to have the range of accommodation so that the elderly can still stay and manage in a home of their own when a house is too much to manage.
 - VI Young and old people could always do with more housing.
 - I Might free up houses for families and keep older people closer to home and community rather than having to downsize and move away from what they know.
 - VI Several elderly people have commented that they wish to stay in the village, is happy to free up their place but there is nowhere for them to move to.
 - VI Allows older residents to continue to stay in Haversham where larger houses with stairs become difficult to manage
 - VI Just because you are old doesn't mean you are less worthy. Opposite in fact . The older generation provide a fountain of knowledge and experience.
 - I There is a shortage.
 - VI Sheltered housing. Many old and disabled residents in large houses with large gardens
 - VI Elderly often require retirement homes or nursing homes
 - VI Lot of elderly people in Haversham and very few bungalows to accommodate them
 - NI Most older people own their house and don't want to move
 - I Rather than large bungalows, specialist accommodation is a much better long term solution
 - I For elderly hoping to remain in location but requiring easier living conditions
 - I Obvious
 - VI Maybe to allow older residents to move into easier to manage accommodation
 - VI For those who are already members of the community for whom a larger house is no longer a requirement and which can therefore be freed-up for younger buyers/families
 - VI So many residents have to move away to live in suitable accommodation
 - I Important for people that live in area to downsize in retirement
 - VI So enabling local people to give up/sell their larger property (freeing it up for a family) but allowing them as retired people to stay in their community
 - VI We need to keep all the population as happy as possible
 - DK again not sure of demand
 - I as above for bungalows (VI We have a high percentage of people who have lived in the village a long time and wish to stay; this would free up larger, older houses for families) but it would depend on the nature of these. I suspect bungalows would be preferable.
 - I as above for bungalows (VI We have a high percentage of people who have lived in the village a long time and wish to stay; this would free up larger, older houses for families) but it would depend on the nature of these. I suspect bungalows would be preferable.
 - VI needed to free up housing for others.
 - VI needed to free up housing for others.
 - VI Over 55 development.
 - VI Lots of older people in Haversham.
 - I Ageing/growing population. Particularly growing population in MK and will quickly become retirement need.
 - VI As the older population grows, you need suitable homes.

- I Older people are always overlooked. They tend to look after their property.
- NI Need to be in town with facilities in walking distance. Ability to give up car but still have social contact.
- I See Q2 J17
- NI Haversham is a small settlement and so such developments would not be appropriate unless on a small scale.
- I Recognised as an important concept in society, but what sort of 'specialist housing' would be appropriate here?
- VI Again, help with downsizing and freeing up existing housing.
- VI Older residents may want to stay in the village when they downsize but not be able to afford to unless there is purpose-built housing.
- DK retirement homes in MK are many. Not required in the village.
- VI Increasing population.
- VI Any specialist housing especially going forward must be essential if we are to relieve the pressure on the NHS that is at present unable to cope with present conditions!
- NI We are close to many larger boroughs and villages that can accommodate this close by.
- I Important to have some to allow people opportunity to downsize and remain in village near family and friends.
- VI So that older people are able to stay within the community amongst people and surroundings that they are familiar with.
- I The ageing community is becoming an ever growing concern!
- NI Tend to be large, gated areas. Would mean that the infrastructure would need to be proportionately made larger. Many other areas can take elderly in (or downsize to bungalows).

Question 6

Housing:

Should we be considering other ways of providing homes in our community? Please specify.

- Don't know
- A mixture of q5
- No
- No to expansion
- I think everyone should be able to get house
- Perhaps designate an area for community self-build to bring in a group of self-builders to work on 5-6 houses together
- Would welcome an innovative way of providing required housing, therefore keen on self-build. Could a community land trust be considered?
- Eco friendly homes/power supply.
- Do not consider blocks of flats.
- Eventually nobody should have to private rent, it's extortionate. All homes equally rented regardless of situation.
- Shared ownership, housing association accommodation would enable younger people, first time buyers to live here.
- It would appear that all aspects have been considered.
- Shared ownership is a good system as people who buy these house can buy the rest off it will be part of the community.
- Underground ?
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- None of the above.
- None of the above.
- Warden controlled homes for those needing special care
- The type of house is less important than the number

- None – there are enough of these in MK
- Give low income people a chance
- Small starter homes for people who are struggling to survive – e.g. homeless, refugees. Plots for self-builds
- Self-build plots for groups to build themselves. Centres/bedsits to support those coming out of care or finding their feet after being on the streets/homeless/refugees
- Shared ownership and self-build
- Yes – organisations similar to housing associations
- Any large homes convert into apartments/flats if possible
- Don't know
- Use old dilapidated houses.
- No – keep new builds within MK estates – not the villages.
- No building above 2 storeys.
- Yes think about eco-homes that are built into the village landscape.
- Self-build would be an incredible option. We have a diverse property archetype already and this would help to continue this appeal.
- Covered in questions
- I don't know what you are expecting here
- Tree houses
- No
- Consider wardened accommodation, 'Alms' type houses for aging population
- No we need to build more homes
- No
- Any thought or scope for properties with 'granny annexe' attached? Some families may wish to live with parents. For some it's a way to get onto property ladder or upsize with parental help
- Do we really need all these new homes or is it a money maker for councils and builders?
- No
- Best estimate
- Buy to live in. Restrict buy to let developments so that starter houses are available.
- Shared ownership would give people on lower incomes the chance to live in a nice area
- Rather than estates of houses, consider small (3-5) clusters of housing to minimise impact on infrastructure and keep the style of the area.
- No
- Shared ownership would help more people onto the housing ladder.
- Priority for young people who grew up in the village/want to move back.
- Council Housing
- For younger couples
- Shared ownership properties are a great way for young people to get on the property ladder in order to start a family.
- Shared ownership properties cannot be rented out preventing an investor landlord situation.
- Small scale development plots Max 50 homes
- Small number of starter homes
- More council housing to re-instate the housing to 'right to buy' over the past 30 years. Social housing with fair rents.
- Providing 3 generation housing projects, as exist in some other European countries, would be a very positive step (mixed housing for the elderly and young families with communal space and facilities)
- I don't want new homes in this village
- Pre fabs
- No
- Community living projects possibly. Compulsory purchase on large or unused gardens/patches of land. Development of poor quality housing in Netherfield, Beanhill, Galley Hill, Eaglestone, Bletchley and other areas.

- Ecohomes e.g. by the trout fishery, top of Brookfield Rd.,
- Free up homes through bungalows for the elderly
- Barns of Randalls using existing buildings some of which are redundant and not farmed, barns of John Marshall's if not used
- No
- I think you have covered it
- If I wanted any of this I would have bought in urban MK not a village
- Currently a major fault with housing in the UK (and especially locally) is affordability. Everything we can do at planning stage must be aimed at addressing this issue, but also give those people who can afford to move up the ladder an opportunity to do so.
- None.
- I can't think of any not already covered in previous questions. Maybe some with an annexe to allow the owner to help care for an elderly relative.
- Turning unused offices/warehouse/industrial estates/shops into housing
- No. Land should not become available within our Parish as there are suitable sites located in nearby Milton Keynes
- Share ownership is a great way to provide affordable housing
- Conversion of redundant farm buildings to houses
- Shared ownership allows younger generation to get on the property ladder & housing associations allows families that can't afford to buy to rent.
- For Local people.
- Focus on sustainable, energy efficient housing.
- Cooperative housing / self-build for groups!
- Self-build plots.
- NA
- Please note that I would be very unhappy to see smaller affordable homes built that were then purchased for buy to let this taking them from first time buyers.
- A variety of different housing means more people will make the community more diverse.
- No caravan parks thanks!
- Keep it local with local builders rather than the 'big boys'
- No. Current facilities and services do not allow for more housing
- No
- No!
- The problem is - where does it stop? When we are building houses in our driveways? We have to tackle the root of the problem---too many people – not enough land to sustain them.
- Local financing and loans should be available on a co-operative basis perhaps.
- ?
- Make new affordable housing to be offered to local community first
- ? Not a very good question!?
- No
- Yes
- No
- No
- Yes if it enables current residents to remain in the village.
- Yes if it enables current residents to remain in the village.
- I don't believe we have space for more houses.
- How can we match home seekers with current home owners e.g. elderly to help with everyday social care? Think outside the box!
- How can we match home seekers with current home owners e.g. elderly to help with everyday social care? Think outside the box!
- Yes - use existing empty house.

- Yes - use existing empty houses.
- A lot more brown sites and renovation of buildings than using green fields.
- All suggestions helpful. A certain amount of freedom to choose for people.
- Lack of self-sustaining communities and co-operatives.
- ?
- Yes. After the 2nd World War prefabs were built. Inside they were very nice with fitted kitchen etc. With the availability of today of special building materials, one could build a large number in landscape gardens that would answer shortages and the homeless in our communities and look attractive.
- A self build is a way to get people who would like to settle in the village - perhaps give something back and build a strong community. People who were brought up here should have the opportunity to stay and rent if necessary but private landlords should be able to accommodate this.
- No.
- ? Some community retirement accommodation.
- I'm not sure but I know the traffic can be bad. I struggle to get out of the Crescent some mornings. It's got busier in the 5 years I've been here.
- Self build would not burden the council.

Question 8

Traffic:

If we are not to make traffic on our roads any worse in our own Plan, what general locations around the parish would be best for us to look at?

- A bypass?
- Possible bypass
- Traffic will be unavoidable, try to encourage bypassing main routes through Haversham. Need a zebra crossing for children walking to school!
- A substantial increase in property anywhere in the Parish would worsen traffic
- Land around old Haversham
- You tell us! ...Oh, there are no 'suitable' locations that will have no impact on traffic
- See previous answer 3 Housing (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!) the traffic is diabolical on Wolverton Road and getting worse by the year! Clearly a bypass is needed!
- Wolverton Road, roundabout by Brookfields + speed – maybe a speed camera
- Ring road to keep MK commuters off our roads
- ?
- Prefer none
- Don't know, but I know traffic has got worse since I lived here five years ago
- Extending side roads off Wolverton Road in New Village. Between old and new villages. Land on main road in old village but not beyond settlement boundary on Little Linford side
- Towards Wolverton end of new village. Small development of bungalows shouldn't impact traffic very much
- Restrict traffic flow through villages i.e. Linford Lane is vastly over-used by vehicles cutting through from Gayhurst to avoid Newport Pagnell
- Zebra crossing on Wolverton road , more footfall now going into the ever expanding road
- Pedestrian crossing on Wolverton road for safer access to the school
- Impossible. Haversham has become a 'rat run' for large vehicles. The prohibitive lorry signs are ignored. Traffic cameras/ speed cameras are most needed

- The premise of this question is flawed. Traffic always gets worse when population increases. The key issue is to provide trunk road access.
- Existing road through Haversham as ???
- Any new development will generate additional traffic but the land on the left of the Castlethorpe road between Crossroads Farm junction and the lay by could be a possibility.
- The piece of land at the top of Haversham estate round left hand bend near lay-by.
- Need to look at the mini roundabout (Wolverton Rd). Need a zebra crossing or traffic lights as it is very busy and will get busier as community grows.
- Wolverton Rd very busy needs traffic lights or zebra crossing in Haversham village.
- Wolverton Road heavy traffic already.
- Ha ha it's all busy so doesn't matter!
- Limited number possible as small plots in Haversham Village and Little Linford with less impact but off-road parking vital. Any development of the 'Estate' will make a current traffic issue worse.
- Use several locations so there is not too much pressure in one area. 1. Area overlooking the river bottom of Wolverton. 2. Field opposite houses at top of Wolverton Road. 3. Fields at top of hill between Estate and Village. 4. Field in village opposite old PO.
- I don't know the area well enough to make suggestions.
- It is not possible to build further houses without some worsening of traffic. Other village developments locally have already added to our problem.
- ?? not qualified to decide or comment.
- New infrastructure outside of existing community.
- Any building in the old village would require measures to manage traffic. Vacant areas in and between the estate and old village.
- An area towards the M1 motorway.
- Not sure any location are any more suitable than others but traffic is a problem already and whatever development that is done CANNOT MAKE THIS WORSE.
- Unsure of a good solution.
- Newport Pagnell and Wolverton.
- It is impossible!
- Over by the M1.
- Getting the traffic to allow local people priority on coming out of side roads and their own drives. 5mph around Crescent (many children playing on roads).
- Little Linford Lane or road to Gayhurst from Little Linford.
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- I do not agree with any further housing.
- Run school bus from station car park for children to be dropped then shuttled to the school.
- Run school bus from station car park for children to be dropped then shuttled to the school.
- Communal off-road parking – unused allotments/Crescent central grass area. No on-road parking or on grass verges if property has driveway – monitored by a traffic warden
- None, preferably
- Traffic is already pretty busy through the village – we should not be building to the size that this would increase at all
- Traffic is going to get worse wherever new development is placed
- Little Linford
- The roundabout at the junction with Brookfield Road is offset and presents a hazard when drivers drive at speed and forget to give way at the roundabout
- All of our existing roads are narrow, being country roads. Some portions of road could be widened? Any new roads would have to be cut through farmland and/or wet land which I feel is unacceptable. I do not know which locations to build would be best
- Do not know
- Field below lower/last bus stop on Wolverton Road

- Has to be mainly 'upper' Haversham as High Street has very narrow road, properties within one metre of highway and historic linear village – this leaves (a) land between upper/lower (b) land around upper Haversham (c) Manor Farm land and buildings
- New main road north of houses direct into CMK avoiding Little Linford, Haversham High Street and Wolverton Road
- The outskirts of village. Sufficient parking to be made available
- Land at the back of Hall Farm so access can be made from existing routes from Newport Pagnell
- N/a
- Wolverton Road. Manor Drive.
- Add road between High Street and V8 at Oakridge Park.
- T-junction at top of Wolverton road. Top of old Haversham, towards Little Linford.
- The junction at the top of Wolverton Road out of Haversham – it gets very busy at times. Little Linford Lane – Narrow road, junction may also be better as a roundabout with increased traffic.
- Area between Gayhurst and Little Linford / Haversham village.
- Narrow country roads should be widened.
- None
- None
- Not sure of question - look at for housing or for solving traffic? Wolverton Road traffic is already bad and getting worse morning and evening peak.
- Main High Street zebra crossing for families and children to easily cross the roads.
- Zebra crossing.
- I live on Little Linford lane and it cannot cope with more traffic. We have lived here for 3 years and there have been over 5 accidents outside our house. One of which resulted in our neighbour being hospitalised, his van written off and the responsible car demolishing our hedge. We have asked the council to consider introducing a 30/40 mph limit. The road through new Haversham is very congested during rush hours so in my view the only option would be to create a new road (if there was large scale development).
- Little Linford lane (I am biased as it's my road). We have experienced several collisions since living here already, one crashing into our hedge and injuring our neighbour.
- Exit Haversham to Wolverton
- Haversham to Wolverton
- The back of Haversham school
- Fields behind school
- Wolverton Rd is already very busy, look at zebra crossing
- None – would need new roads
- You can't have additional development without additional traffic! Haversham can't be cut off from the rest of the outside world. Most traffic that uses our roads is commuter traffic from other large settlements commuting into MK. The one advantage the Gallagher development proposal was that it had enough size to pay for major road improvements thereby diverting traffic away from our houses. The only other thing you can do is to introduce ????? to deter drivers as a result of longer journey times
- Junction at top of Wolverton road down to the old village. At peak times this is very busy – visibility is not good
- Old Haversham
- All roads
- Wolverton road
- Any roads will make this area worse
- Those that are on existing bus routes. Those that join highway by way of pre-existing routes. Deter through traffic to allow for additional housing traffic without overall increase
- 1. The field at the bottom of the estate next to no. 2 Wolverton rd. 2. The field opposite the flats on Wolverton rd. 3. Possibly the 'triangle' in the village. 4. Land at the old fishery, vicarage spinney
- Infrastructure – more than one road to ease congestion
- There aren't any that will have no major impact

- There aren't any that will have no major impact
- Some kind of ring road around the villages – not a major road through them
- Wolverton Rd
- This will be impossible as there is only 1 road through Haversham & due to Haversham's location in relation to MK
- Traffic will always be a problem as traffic needs to come through to MK
- Entrance / exit of 'estate' – Hill down to village
- Parking (off road). Allowing space between developed areas to support flow. Junction between Haversham estate & village. Roundabout linking Wolverton.
- I am no planner but any road suggestions made would contradict everything I have said before. Any road built in the Haversham surroundings would be detrimental to the local wildlife & nature
- I am not in a position to comment on this
- Over recent years the traffic through Haversham estate has increased, especially early a.m. & late afternoon. This will only get worse with property expansion / more housing. Traffic calming solutions might help but commuters to MK don't have a good alternative route
- Remove traffic calming but install speed restrictions & cameras. reduce speed on feeder roads
- Need to absorb small groups of houses rather than put all the extra traffic in a single area
- The hill between the village & the estate
- Between New Bradwell & Blakelands
- Nowhere would make less traffic or keep it the same!!
- Fields
- I don't feel there is an answer to this question. The main through roads into and out of Haversham are already busy and crowded at peak times.
- Identify rat runs and provide alternate routes for traffic
- Bottom end of High Street in Haversham village
- Outside Old Haversham – between Old Haversham and Newport Pagnell
- Little Linford Road, Gayhurst Road, Haversham
- Wolverton Road and Haversham High Street junction. Haversham High Street during peak rush hour periods.
- Haversham High Street (as a rat run from junction 15 of M1). Junction of Haversham High Street and Wolverton Road.
- Don't know
- Don't know
- Don't know
- Alternatives to Wolverton Road as a route to Milton Keynes
- Wolverton Road through road than other villages to Milton Keynes (rat run)
New link road to MK from Little Linford to Oxley Park at top of Bradwell Hill
- Traffic along Wolverton Road would be at a standstill in mornings if more houses.
- I have no idea, the Ouse causes a problem for potential sites for roads
- Do not pass the plan, traffic already awful.
- Our problem is from outside the village already, roads used as rat runs
- If more people live in our parish then the roads will be used by more traffic. Stop the roads being used as rat runs by Northampton folk.
- The existing traffic levels require management, with developments in this parish almost certain to make this situation worse. Speed limits are widely ignored with no police enforcement. Chicanes in the lower village are acceptable to this respondent. MK Council and Parish should discourage parking on pavements. This does not help traffic flow and impedes pedestrians.
- Speed restrictions on the High Street – dangerously speeding at present will likely cause an accident or fatality.
- Difficult to imagine that any development wouldn't make traffic problems worse. Some location which would encourage use of routes other than down Wolverton Road.
- Increasing housing is bound to increase traffic somewhere. Maybe we should just accept that.

- The Crescent traffic and Manor Drive is awful. Difficult for emergency vehicles to get through. Road through Old Village also difficult to pass at rush hour.
- Avoid main roads such as Haversham Road and High Street, go nearer to Gayhurst Road
- We need to avoid Wolverton Road, as it is already a thoroughfare, instead, look to tie in developments to the Gayhurst to Newport Pagnell road as this can cope better with an increase in traffic
- I would suggest towards Newport Pagnell to the far side of Little Linford.
- The field behind the bus stop on Wolverton Rd going towards Wolverton at the bottom of the Crescent.
- Wolverton Rd
- Land opposite Beech Tree Close – that at the bottom of the Crescent where the sheep are sometimes kept. Any new traffic would not pass through the Estate if heading to MK/Wolverton.
- The 'Triangle' in the Lower Village
- Possibly the fields on the hill between upper and lower Haversham
- The land on the Wolverton Rd just before the flood plain (just as you leave the village would likely have little impact if there were few houses.
- Land at the top of Wolverton Rd., before going toward Hanslope.
- Infill infields between old and new Haversham use planning gain to improve roads and junctions
- None
- On right of Wolverton Rd., set well back above bungalow
- Closer to the M1 so that main transport links can feed off into this direction and not through Haversham old village or estate.
- A new M1 junction and improve Linford Lane (the bridges)
- Top of Wolverton Road
- Any building will make traffic worse
- Don't Know
- Surely any development is going to increase traffic?
- Possibly linking upper and lower Haversham. Consideration needs to be given to the farming community.
- Part of Wolverton Rd North – Western side is not built up.
- The triangle for infill in the village
- Traffic will increase wherever you build.
- France
- Any location needs traffic calming/parking
- Those areas already close to main routes so minimal disruption and further road building
- Hanslope, Deanshanger
- The field in old Haversham opposite the old post office.
- Odd numbered side of Wolverton Rd. towards the crossroads
- This is hard to answer as traffic management will change with development.
- Not mass housing
- Trout farm
- Field opposite old post office
- Behind crescent and back off road between church and school
- Top of Brookfield and Keppel and Rowan in crescent shape
- Back by school house up to church, not farmed.
- Wherever you build there will be traffic implications
- Perhaps we should look at improving roads and access
- In between old and new Haversham
- The road that links the two villages
- To look at access link to M1, Northampton and the MK links. Currently only access is through either Newport or Haversham (for MK) or Hanslope/Castlethorpe (for Northampton) I suggest developing land between Olney and MK as this would be cost efficient.

- Not anywhere along the Wolverton Road. Traffic is too congested at peak times and for health and safety reasons this should not increase.
 - Crossing on Main Road, better calming particularly near school (Manor Way).
 - Improving the A5 and A308
 - As far away from Haversham as possible
 - Little Linford towards Newport Pagnell
 - Small infill only
 - Add three further cul de sacs to Brookfield Rd. Alternatively extend Rowan Drive, Keppel Ave., and Chalmers Ave up to the Castlethorpe Road. Alternatively infill the Green
 - Haversham Estate
 - “?”
 - I don't know
 - Don't know
 - Don't know
 - Traffic will be worse with any amount of building
 - I'm afraid there is only one obvious answer here, which is to build on the southern edge of the estate and around to the end of Brookfield Road - please see attached plan. This will ensure the bulk of the traffic from new build housing is exiting the village at the very edge limiting the impact on the village further up Wolverton Road. It think it inappropriate to build to the North or in Little Linford.
 - Top/bottom of Wolverton Road, maybe reduce entrances with give way signage, try to stop large lorries going through that do not need to due to satnav directions.
 - Traffic leaving Haversham and entering Haversham needs to be slowed down before there's an accident. Residents of Beech Tree Close cannot get out.
 - None.
 - I think a zebra crossing on the main Wolverton Road is essential. It's awful on school runs/at rush hour.
 - What?
 - Don't really understand this.
 - Access to the V6 to CMK is already causing problems and tailbacks. The access to old Wolverton industry is poor and tailed back due to traffic lights at the narrow bridge.
 - None. Keep the countryside and farms.
 - Internal parking on roads - make new homes have plenty of parking space.
 - A difficult one this - any housing must bring more traffic so ... can we invent more access roads?
 - Wolverton Road.
 - Wolverton Road.
-
- Between Haversham Estate and Old Haversham, by the farm
 - None around this Parish
 - Wolverton Road, particularly a pedestrian crossing
 - The main road (Wolverton Road) traffic is back to back morning and night, and when the M1 has accidents all traffic goes through the village. Children's crossing would be good.
 - Everyone has a car each, therefore, any housing would create more traffic
 - Not sure but it must avoid making Wolverton Road worse than it already is
 - Without provisions of getting traffic journeys better through Wolverton Road and into the grid system. Without bottle necking along Grafton Street up to Monks Way. I think this is a lost cause. Especially in light of the traffic caused by the A508 recently
 - On the hill between Wolverton Road and the High Street/pub. This land has a number of options for road access, introducing a roundabout on the hill would also slow traffic
 - In the village, opposite the old post office box (in a house) and in the estate the top of the hill as you turn left towards Castlethorpe
 - To be honest I believe that any new roads around our Parish would be disastrous for Haversham

- Stop all traffic along bridleway from Mill Road to The Black Horse. Potential 30 mph speed limit throughout village. Look at remodelling junction at Wolverton Road/High Street.
- A new motorway access which might help to alleviate traffic within the villages
- Roundabout at Crossroads Farm
- Ensure there is adequate off-road parking
- Maybe more parking areas for existing houses
- Bletchley
- Unknown but may be Bletchley.
- One house anywhere would increase the traffic.
- Small-scale infill if suitable.
- It is not so much location - but access to viable alternatives to the car therefore close to good bus services or Wolverton station (but needs better links for cycling etc.)
- Land on the way out of 'the estate' on the way out to Hanslope on the left. Land on the right as you approach the estate from MK on the Wolverton Road after the bridge. Land between the two halves of the village on the hill.
- Top of Wolverton Road.
- NA
- Wolverton Road/rat run.
- Do not know.
- I think just a few houses being built maybe on the field at the top of Brookfield but it must be controlled – we can hardly get out of drives and roads because of traffic.
- Don't know but the traffic on Wolverton Road is sometimes very heavy and additional vehicles would not be acceptable.
- Between school and Church
- Wherever housing goes it will have an impact so maybe if houses were "staggered" and extra traffic drip fed into the system it may not be as bad as building in a bottle neck area e.g Linford Lane proposal
- Unless somewhere between the old village and Little Linford or the new village and Castlethorpe, anywhere else will have more impact on High Street and/or Wolverton road.
- Towards Newport Pagnell end, hopefully the traffic would go out towards the motorway end.
- Both old and new Haversham
- Wolverton
- New Bradwell
- Top of village on way to Hanslope –further away the better!
- If more houses are built in the parish then the only solution is to build another road to connect with the rest of MK.
- Old Wolverton roundabout- extra lane perhaps.
- Anywhere that would diminish rather than add to the rush hour 'rat-run' through village and estate
- Edge of Haversham – land opposite Beech Tree Close – it is slightly higher and doesn't seem to flood. Land at end of Brookfield Road, but not using Brookfield Road as access
- None in our area!
- It's NOT about location, it's how it's done, silly contra flows and ill thought out junctions are the cause of congestion (see Hanslope and Castlethorpe). The speed humps we have are excellent!
- None
- None
- There are no options for easing traffic unless a complete new road is built
- Corner by the Greyhound
- Straightening the hill road down to the pub. Bypass – to make the village roads a safer place to be
- New grid road into village would solve traffic and keep the village traffic free. Bypass. The nasty bend on the hill between two villages needs straightening as most cars seem to cut corner
- My preference would be development in Haversham Estate. I would leave Old Haversham and Little Linford

- Ideally, identify space in the more modern area of Haversham, also build small number of houses in various locations, therefore reducing the impact of additional traffic
- I think this is unavoidable! More people – more traffic. But a small growth in population could be managed on existing roads
- Don't know
- Link the two sections of the village together
- Any locations are going to increase traffic if no further roads are planned. I suppose that locations at the Wolverton end of Wolverton Road and the Newport Pagnell end of the High Street might minimise the increase in the centre of the village.
- Any locations are going to increase traffic if no further roads are planned. I suppose that locations at the Wolverton end of Wolverton Road and the Newport Pagnell end of the High Street might minimise the increase in the centre of the village.
- The main roads into and out of the village should have speed cameras and a limit of 20mph!
- Not sure.
- 1) Only develop in areas adjacent to more major roads. 2) Find smarter ways to alleviate pinch points in Haversham, Linford, Hanslope etc. 3) Reinstate Castlethorpe train station and look at other opportunities along this line, London to Birmingham.
- 1) Only develop in areas adjacent to more major roads. 2) Find smarter ways to alleviate pinch points in Haversham, Linford, Hanslope etc. 3) Reinstate Castlethorpe train station and look at other opportunities along this line, London to Birmingham.
- Field on the right as you enter Haversham from Wolverton - it does not flood, used just for sheep. Field opposite church -used for horses only. Fields next to lake no flooding.
- Not Wolverton Road Haversham.
- Not Haversham.
- Difficult to see any areas that would not make traffic worse.
- No obvious locations are available where traffic volumes would be manageable.
- ?
- None. All local villages are rat runs. Need desperate traffic calming measures - that's before you build 100s more houses.
- Not in our parish. None.
- Small infill terraces, 2/3 houses.
- This is a huge issue. Haversham is a gateway to MK and significant development are taking place in Hanslope and that will increase village traffic flows.
- Avoid developments on Wolverton Road and New Haversham. I guess that means development should be in Old Haversham or away from main roads.
- Don't know, but am concerned about access for emergency services.
- Nothing additional around manor Drive/Crescent as school extension will already increase traffic. Additional crossing facilities on Wolverton Rd would be essential with any increased traffic.
- Land between Little Linford and Haversham.
- Hard question as our parish is all single carriageway or lanes. If any new housing, roads would have to be redesigned drastically to avoid blockages. Also flooding to be considered in Linford lane.
- The roads have got to be redesigned and enlarged first and we need to ensure that they connect to our workplace before any new housing estate is built. 8am to 9am road blockages throughout parish and MK.
- Around the Crescent and existing larger developments. Build on the nucleus instead of sprawl.
- Any development will lead to increased traffic. The ameliorating traffic measures will be critical.
- Preferably nowhere.
- Add housing to the areas that have already got new houses; use cul de sac so no need for any traffic other than inhabitants.

Question 10

Community facilities:

New building developments may bring with them additional financial resources that can be used for the benefit of the community.

What enhancements or changes to existing facilities would you like to see?

- A separate social and community centre for the village.
- A 'stand alone' community centre, away from the increasingly severe confines of the school.
- Improving the maintenance of existing facilities eg the allotments, grass cutting on verges etc.
- Improving the maintenance of existing facilities eg the allotments, grass cutting on verges etc.
- A local shop.
- Traffic management, speed camera, traffic calming.
- More of what's working well ...
- More of what's working well ...
- The skate park seems to attract adults in the evening.
- Tennis courts.
- We don't want any developers money. Haversham has all the facilities it needs. Stop lining developer pockets in exchange for things we don't need.
- Traffic calming. Zebra crossing for village children going to school.
- A local store would be nice.
- Repairs to church. Resiting Community hall and making it cheap to hire. Improving play ground.
- None.
- Don't know.
- Continue to expand the school facilities and make them available for community.
- N/A
- None- other than maintaining what already exist? Cricket pavilion on the Rec Grnd.
- Road improvements and speed restrictions.
- Road improvements and speed limitation devices. Potholes filled.
- A shop such as a co-op. The community centre might benefit from some internal enhancement.
- Development of community facility separate to school. Improved pathways between village and old Wolverton to make walking and cycling safer (especially for schoolchildren). Improved footpaths.
- Football and cricket pitch suitable for league games.
- A shop would be nice!
- Local shop, selling a small selection of staple items. The local pub is not fit for purpose or indeed family friendly
- Local store. Improvement to the local pub including parking and outside space.
- Local shops would be helpful (there used to be corner shop opposite the school some 30yrs ago)
- Extension of the redway network into Haversham. Provide toilet facilities at parks in MK
- The parish would need to be very sure before going down this route.
- May not be a good idea.
- As the roads in the village are busier- double parked –people parking on pavements etc. need to make sure that the Rec Ground has suitable facilities for all ages.
- Expand play area if area grows but need to cater for all ages.
- A local shop or Tesco express- something of that nature
- Music licence for Greyhound pub!
- Increase safety on crossing roads etc. for school children. Closer amenities.
- Small shopping area
- Given recent extension to the school, the existing community facility has been rather subsumed and hindered from offering a good range of facilities. A new separate Community facility would be a blessing!

- Pub upgraded/cleaned and better service and menu.
- Investment in the Greyhound PH is required although I realise this is not Council's responsibility. Mains drainage within the village.
- None
- None
- Better exercise area in park
- A village hall with good facilities for community activities. Sporting facilities i.e. field pitches and changing facilities. Improve lighting (street).
- An improvement to street lighting in the village.
- We as a community are currently sleep walking into the loss of a village pub. We need to be more proactive if we consider this a resource we would like to keep e.g. PC ownership. Not permitting daft planning decisions which will force its eventual conversion to housing.
- Refurbishment of the pub.
- Road surfaces & potholes dealt with properly not just patched & coordinated with other services. Bus service for all the village not just part.
- None
- An outdoor swimming pool (In my dreams!!).
- To buy the pub and make it a local shop & community centre/pub locally run. Horse riding centre, training 4 people like in Loughton.
- Better maintenance of paths, litter, dog muck (some people pick it up but leave it in bags!). Keeping back alley way access to Wolverton Road clear of stinging nettles etc.
- A community run shop or similar.
- None – school has just been extended. Local village shop/post office.
- A local shop, scout/brownie group.
- Extension of Social Centre to include indoor squash, tennis and bowls facilities
- A small shop near community centre
- As mentioned, a small shop would be nice, but I don't believe we need any development to obtain this
- Better purpose built accommodation for the social and community centre
- Social centre not attached to school
- A village shop and post office
- Developers should be expected to build, at the same time as the houses e.g. a surgery, shop, community hall, business units. Not build all the houses first followed by the rest sometime down the line. Independent Community Hall for a variety of recreational use and meetings
- Experience shows that this is a bottom priority for developers which will be left to last or cancelled unfortunately. But... Dedicated standalone Community Centre (at least two rooms). Surgery
- Enhance local pub
- A standalone village hall
- Proper village hall if between upper and lower – good for community. Improved and new paths/cycle ways. Footbridge over river by lakes – accessing Bradwell/Bird lake etc
- Doctor's and local shop/post office
- A small shop
- The mobile library is under-used – maybe dispense with it! Distribute MK Citizen to Haversham and Little Linford
- Community sport facilities e.g. tennis courts
- Get rid of the old goal on the rec and replace with two smaller goals. A public art wall in the rec
- Better re-surfaced roads.
- Improve the pub.
- New sailing club house.
- Improvements to the social centre. Events for younger people in the village so there is something to do.
- We need red routes for cyclists.
- Better kept allotments (secure!)

- A shop creating a better village. Cricket ground. Football ground and establishing a team. Free access to the sailing lake and sailing club to become more involved in the village and estate. Better bus timetable.
- New social community centre (not sharing with the school).
- Shop and post office.
- A pub. A coffee shop. A convenience store.
- A local shop would be great. More money for the community centre would also be good, I have a toddler and a new born and would like to attend baby / toddler groups locally and meet more people in the local community.
- Redevelopment of Dovecote lakes club house (and even residential if possible, it would make a wonderful development.
- Cycle lanes.
- Areas to park and picnic.
- Road humps. Cycle and foot paths.
- Renewable energy infrastructure & better sewerage infrastructure
- New sewerage system, better drainage
- A small shop. Basic amenities
- Health centre
- Anything that would bring the village together as a community
- A more purpose built community centre instead of a shared facility. A shop
- Replace / improve park gym equipment
- Shop
- A new social centre, current arrangement out dated & does not fit in with the school needs & safeguarding requirements
- A convenience shop
- N/A
- Enhancement of public transport links to Wolverton & MK
- Improvements to the approach to the church. A footpath / bridle track up the hill towards 'Broadacre'. A parish speed camera in the village
- More efficient street lighting, especially in the High Street. Not enough lights
- A local shop
- Perhaps a small community shop / post office
- A convenience shop
- Improved street & roadside maintenance
- More from community centre – events, clubs
- I'm not sure
- A local shop
- A shop
- Investment in the Greyhound pub is required but this is not the council's responsibility
- Some sort of village shop & post office
- A village post office / shop
- Village hall separate to school buildings
- Pre school. Village shop/Post Office. GP Surgery
- Shops. Café's.
- A shop. Creation of play streets as in London. A seated shelter in the Rec.
- Community centre made more usable. More for young children. Better transport. Side roads and pavements repaired.
- Roads off the main road are in need of tarmacing
- New social centre/village hall used all the time
- Improvements in public transport links
- Social centre that can be used during the day. Corner shop/Post Office.
- Road humps for speeders

- We don't use any community facilities but the pub in Old Haversham could benefit from an overhaul, it could be an amazing community meeting point
- Improve the Greyhound pub, extend or refurbish
- No enhancements to be made
- Convenience store (small)
- Better recreational area for children
- The 'enforcement' of Wolverton Road being a non HGV route!
- Separate community venue away from school
- Better buses
- Footpath maintenance
- Improved street lighting in the lower village
- An improvement to public areas i.e. grass verges, common parts, also removal of old telephone box, Haversham looks unkempt compared to Castlethorpe for instance.
- Change of pub landlord
- Difficult to imagine as we have got used to having no facilities for so many years, other than the social centre and playing field which are both excellent and need preserving. More paths to help us enjoy the surrounding environment
- A local shop
- A stand-alone community hall would be fantastic. It is very difficult to build community spirit and engagement around the existing social centre while it is part of the school.
- Better parking and the school/community centre. Better road structure
- Better traffic structure with focus to offer cycling. I would like to see a permanent limit to the size and capacity of the primary school.
- A proper garden area at The Greyhound with good play facilities for children
- I think the Greyhound is not utilised by villagers as much as it would be if it were perhaps given a facelift.
- Some form of small shop
- Shops
- The Greyhound is not somewhere I would choose to spend my time – I wish it was a nicer pub, where the village could spend time. If work was put in, it could be a lovely pub with local quizzes, nice food etc that could bring people in from further afield.
- Improve road junctions and traffic calming in Old Haversham
- Very satisfied as things are
- Hard court tennis
- Mains gas and sewage to old village
- Further traffic calming old village
- Pedestrian crossing on Wolverton Rd and near Greyhound pub
- Less traffic on the roads through new links associated with such developments
- Increase funding for social centre and increase playing fields equipment
- If we build more properties we could do with a social centre not allied to the school
- Because of the proximity to CMK any consideration to improve/expand existing facilities should be considered very carefully. The Social Centre is poorly supported at the moment. Enhancement would bring extra running costs that the social centre would find it difficult to support placing a financial burden on the Parish.
- Keep improving school facilities as need arrives – including preschool needs
- Focus on improvements to Haversham School
- Improvement to junction by the Greyhound. Very dodgy right turn after coming down the hill.
- Improvement at the Junction at the top of Wolverton Rd (Northern)
- A more frequent bus service
- Improvements to bridleways and footpaths
- A new social centre/village hall that can be used throughout the day/evening
- A small shop to provide for the immediate area
- Biodiverse wilderness and less development.

- A cricket pavilion style community centre – located somewhere near existing school/centre site – so accessible – done to architecturally enhancing to village accessible by both ends eg road in behind the crescent ???? with bungalows
 - More use of church for user groups – maybe small library, stamps, etc or pub
 - The church is a large building with kitchen and toilets – take a pew section out
 - Would like to see more of St. Mary's for wider community
 - Build a community centre independent of the school
 - Increased maintenance of the existing infrastructure. Pot holes and footpaths could all benefit
 - Facilities for older teenagers. Enhancements to existing landscaping
 - Pavement between Little Linford and Old Haversham
 - Mirror for traffic to make crossing the hill road between the Havershams safer for walkers using the footpaths.
 - None
 - Give the Greyhound some cash or buy it so it can be developed into a true centre for the community. The rec is good facility underutilised
 - Cycle path network extended to Hanslope and Little Linford
 - None needed in my view
 - Create a coffee shop/tea shop from the pub
 - A new community centre with recreation facilities
 - Don't know
 - Don't know
 - Fine the way it is – that's why I bought here
-
- Unhindered public access (by foot or bicycle) to the amenity lakes. Vehicular access to the allotments (perhaps a car park) via Wolverton Road.
 - Zebra crossing.
 - A shop.
 - None.
 - None.
 - Better transport links to the centre of MK/hospital etc.
 - More play equipment in the Recreation ground
 - Toilet facilities on Rec grnd.
 - None. Something should stay the same.
 - Improvements to entry and upkeep of allotments.
 - Better care of allotment upkeep!
 - A village shop come post office would be nice. I see its been done in Castlethorpe
 - None –financial resource is not a priority in this Parish, we have a nice play park, nice walks and good community
 - Shops, pubs, social buildings would be nice to have but wouldn't survive economically. Public transport
 - Traffic calming to slow down through traffic in Haversham, especially off the estate end (southern end)
 - A community centre (standalone) that could be used all day and not restricted by school use as present
 - A new social and community centre would be excellent. Especially if the housing is going to increase in number
 - Access to a local shop would be good to save driving to Tesco for basics which is not good for the environment
 - No changes or enhancements. Haversham is a rural village surrounded by beautiful countryside and farm land.
 - Further investment into both the recreation ground and the community centre.
 - Pub improvements. Use of community centre during the day. Better recreation ground.
 - New village hall with sports pavilion

- Village shop (viable if there were more houses)
- Little Linford Church is an important and valuable building which while remaining a church could be much more widely used as a public meeting place. All we need is imagination!
- Stay as they are.
- Better social facilities.
- A larger playground.
- A bus service.
- Community shop – although understand possibly not financially viable - incorporated in existing pub.
- Redevelopment of Randall's farm buildings. Possible employment uses on farms/new centre. Something that links both halves of the village. Better support for young families & children – creche/nursery!
- Community shop!
- A community hall separate from the school.
- More community based activities and social centre more freely available.
- ?
- Some more trees on the green and a stop to people parking on the grass on Wolverton Road and also on the pavements.
- Zebra crossing
- Separate Social Centre. Redway from Haversham village to V6 roundabout
- Separate Social Centre.
- A separate social centre away from the school
- More sport facilities for teenagers.
- Think every village should have a duckpond ☺ – maybe on The Green (Crescent), add some great crested newts to stop building! Just one point rankles is “Village” –“Estate”, smacks of class distinction and we should all be one. Maybe a few houses up the hill to make a link between the two?
- Possibly better use of the Rec with tennis courts. A Village Hall but would require too much development.
- Better transport/village shop
- Zebra crossing, Wolverton road for school children crossing
- A village shop/coffee shop to stop having to go to Wolverton
- Road improvements, zebra crossings, play areas upgraded
- The Greyhound pub requires a lot of attention/interior and exterior. New social and community centre away from the school. More bins around the village /especially the park
- A separate Community Centre. A shop- as if you don't have a car, internet or are disabled it is a huge problem getting to the shops.
- A local shop.
- Purpose built Community Centre
- A purpose built Community Centre
- Standalone Community Centre, completely separate from the school
- So why build houses for financial resource? Not needed
- 1. Children's nursery/playgroup for pre-school children. 2. Shop!
- Don't know
- Village hall, recreational ground in both parts of the village
- There should be road calming in Old Haversham High Street as cars drive too fast. Extend 40mph limit from The Barns to encompass Little Linford
- 1. Proper, structural road calming in Haversham Village High Street. Extend 40mph through to Little Linford – to Newport Pagnell. 2. A new community space as I understand that the social centre cannot meet our needs – which will increase with more housing. 3. I would like to see improvements to the Greyhound Pub and grounds – but believe this may be outside the Parish Council's remit. 4. The planters holding the Haversham and Little Linford signs should be

replaced with something far more in keeping with the villages' rural community. 5. All the 'green space' needs better management and needs enhancing. Stop cars parking on green verges.

- A separate social and community centre for the village.
- A 'stand alone' community centre, away from the increasingly severe confines of the school.
- Improving the maintenance of existing facilities eg the allotments, grass cutting on verges etc.
- Improving the maintenance of existing facilities eg the allotments, grass cutting on verges etc.
- A local shop.
- Traffic management, speed camera, traffic calming.
- More of what's working well ...
- More of what's working well ...
- The skate park seems to attract adults in the evening.
- Tennis courts.
- We don't want any developers money. Haversham has all the facilities it needs. Stop lining developer pockets in exchange for things we don't need.
- Traffic calming. Zebra crossing for village children going to school.
- A local store would be nice.
- Repairs to church. Resiting Community hall and making it cheap to hire. Improving playground.
- None.
- Don't know.
- Continue to expand the school facilities and make them available for community.
- N/A
- None- other than maintaining what already exist? Cricket pavilion on the Rec Grnd.
- Road improvements and speed restrictions.
- Road improvements and speed limitation devices. Potholes filled.
- A shop such as a co-op. The community centre might benefit from some internal enhancement.
- Development of community facility separate to school. Improved pathways between village and old Wolverton to make walking and cycling safer (especially for schoolchildren). Improved footpaths.
- Football and cricket pitch suitable for league games.
- A shop would be nice!

Question 11

Community facilities:

New building developments may bring with them additional financial resources that can be used for the benefit of the community.

What additional community facilities would you like see being developed from any such money?

- Youth Club?
- Youth Club
- Dedicated space for community centre. Local shop. Community centre more available for day time use.
- Local community shop
- Pavilion at recreation ground
- More poo bins for dogs
- More facilities for children/teens
- Shop
- Walks/nature reserve
- Community owned village shop
- Traffic calming scheme to prevent villages being 'rat runs' + excessive speeds through and between settlements. Extended availability of Social Centre – not convinced entirely new building is sustainable but perhaps a 'portacabin' type structure in recreation ground or somewhere else for daytime activities??
- Local shop, selling a small selection of staple items. The local pub is not fit for purpose or indeed family friendly
- Pre-school nursery. Local shops. Public phone box
- Pre-school/ nursery would be beneficial to prevent long journeys to outside towns. Public phone box would help.
- Extension of the redway network into Haversham. Provide toilet facilities at parks in MK.
- Try two... a set of goals so kids can actually play a match! –nets would also be useful!– same for basketball!
- Need two goal posts ie a set so kids can actually play - also goalposts need netting!
- Small shops local to the area. New junction box closer to us for improved connection and more choice of providers.
- Increased activities at local social centres. Small shopping area so local businesses (small) can develop. Better bus service
- A new community centre with outdoor space and car parking.
- New village hall so that SC does not have to work with the school.
- Increased community facilities e.g. shop, medical centre.
- An independent Community Centre building would be a great advantage to the village.
- None
- None
- A hall that could be used during the day for community activities independent of the school.
- A new village hall separate from the school.
- I like our facilities, if we need anything, nothing is too far away to need to bring something else into the village. Why I love living here.
- None
- An equestrian centre for the locals & other people to use. Enhance the bridle way system & put new route in.
- Village shop run by the community. Community hub with a coffee shop – general get together area.
- Local shop.

- Local shop.
- Village shop, Post Office, library
- None. This is wrong!
- I'm happy with the village as it is and would rather go without other facilities than have more development here
- A village shop would be welcome but highly unlikely to be financially viable. Wildlife conservation areas/woodlands for community access
- Swimming pool
- Increased bus service and stops. Traffic calming – reduce speed limit to 20mph through villages; Zebra crossing; Traffic lights; Speed monitoring. Adequate playgrounds for all ages. Sports and recreation for health and outdoor pursuits. Multifaith building. Community shop and/or café to bring community together
- Community shop and/or café to encourage community. Increased buses/stops. Pub. Adequate schools and playgrounds for population increase. Sports and recreation – to encourage health and outdoor pursuits in countryside living. Religious buildings to support all faiths. Traffic calming – 20mph safe zones; zebra crossings; lights etc. Parking
- Local shop
- Village/community orchard. Tennis courts
- Develop more green spaces/specialist facilities for very young children and multi-function tennis/5-a-side football space. Maintain small copse/field for biodiversity
- Doctor's and local shop/post office
- Day care centre for elderly and infirm/disabled would assist carer for respite!
- If homes increase then Haversham will need some retail shops to support new residents. Public art wall – art installations
- Tennis court
- A decent school.
- Local shop & post office. Local GP. Small art / craft / music venue.
- Gym and swimming facilities. A space to conserve British wildlife – save the bees.
- Community garden so people can grow fruit and veg if they don't have the time / money for an allotment. Also it would be quite cool to have bees that the village could get honey from.
- A supermarket. A post office. Youth centre / community centre.
- A village shop.
- Village shop & post office.
- Enter the village and estate in Britain in Bloom to make the village and estate look picturesque and proud.
- New social community centre (not sharing with the school).
- A bigger community centre. More equipment in the park.
- A local shop would be great. It would be good to make improvements to the pub so that it would be used more by the local community.
- A local shop would be useful in Haversham. A woodland centre. A surgery.
- Car park for travellers.
- Gym, sport and leisure.
- More to offer recreational areas, picnic, sport and leisure.
- New social centre – a corner shop / post office
- Social centre, shops
- Something for the youth (8yrs – 16yrs). Maybe a youth club
- Local shop
- A new community hall that could act as a multi-function space / new crèche / PC office
- Making the Rec more attractive place to use – change from just a field – maybe a community garden, more attractive to walk around, more / better footpath links to the old village – especially away from the road
- Maybe a shop
- A convenient doctors

- N/A
- Traffic calming measures on the high street. Provision of a local shop
- Not a new village hall. Idea is good but who is going to fund the maintenance and up keep of it? It would be costly & could eventually become a millstone for the parish. No cricket pitch – who would maintain it? We struggle to find people to play once a year for the annual match
- A proper village hall, unrestricted by school activities with scope to be a more attractive community resource
- A local shop
- Better public house, shopping facilities – grocers / convenience store
- Better public house, shopping facilities – grocers / convenience store.
- The beautiful walks across the fields, the excellent school, the Crescent Green where children can play safely and always be seen
- A convenient doctors
- Stand-alone community centre, local shop, pub parking
- Local shop etc. (café). More poo bins (end of Brookfield road by field entrance, crescent green, top of Wolverton road
- Health centre is the most important building not currently in existence within the parish
- Doctors / health centre
- Doctors surgery & shop
- Pre school. Village shop/Post Office. GP surgery
- Doctors or Health Centre
- Separate social club with possible room for a doctors surgery
- Small shop
- Addition of a shop/Post Office
- Zebra crossing. Social centre. Corner shop/Post Office.
- Shop or shops to serve locals
- Tennis club with three or four courts
- Local convenience store
- Alternative through route for traffic to Milton Keynes
- If we must have development here, Doctor's Surgery and shops.
- It would be easy to create a wish list although only a significant development will provide the necessary funding.
- Improved street lighting in lower village and a pavement continuing along the High Street up to Little Linford.
- Traffic calming/flow.
- A local shop would help older and much younger people in particular who might find it difficult to travel to shop. Depending on the side of the enlargement a Doctor's Surgery?
- Preschool. Very sad there are no facilities at present.
- A proper community centre not shared with school so a football or sports club could be run.
- A local shop and sports facilities such as tennis courts.
- A post office.
- Some form of free postal/delivery collection point.
- Shared skip/waste collection. Shared cost of clearing public footpaths/the road behind The Crescent.
- None that would increase the burden on the Parish Council.
- Parks
- Improvements to roads
- Addition of a corner shop/cash point.
- Shop
- Access for walkers to river (North)
- The paths and roads are important
- Indoor short mat bowls

- Local shop that sells locally sourced food products and a variety of essential items
 - Nature education centre
 - Better public transport
 - More funding for education facilities
 - Social and Community Centre
 - we could do with a social centre not allied to the school
 - None at moment
 - Improvements to public transport
 - A new community facility would be welcome but would need to be as large as current combined premises and would need a car park.
 - A shop?
 - A post office?
 - A community shop and post office
 - Safe crossing on Wolverton Rd
 - Shop
 - Better maintenance to bridleways and footpaths
 - A shop/post office
 - Dog friendly area on the rec ground for winter months when river is flooded and fields are too muddy to walk in. No other areas to take dogs in the village. The rec ground hardly used during these months.
 - Biodiverse wilderness and less development.
 - A decent separate community meeting place separate from the school
 - I believe a separate community centre that could also be more used during the day would be beneficial
 - Youth scheme
 - Youth facilities
 - Community centre that's independent
 - Additional community centre to take pressure of the existing school hall, and sharing the facility with residents. Currently the school hall is regularly used at weekends/evenings which I am sure the school would require for their own benefit.
 - Social centre events for the community
 - Tea room
 - A belisha crossing on Wolverton Rd in Haversham
 - None
 - None
 - Local shops, doctor surgery, library
 - None needed in my view
 - A village shop in New Haversham
 - It would be nice to have an independent social centre
 - A new community centre with recreation facilities
 - Don't know
 - None!
-
- An upgrade to the footpath from the estate down to Wolverton industry Roundabout. This should be a pedestrian/cycling redway - it is frankly ridiculous that this has not been addressed in the past! Also, a pedestrian crossing over Wolverton Road -both north and south of the Brookfield Road roundabout - let's stop half the residents feeling like outsiders by forcing them to cross one of the busiest roads in MK without assistance!
 - Community local shop.
 - None.
 - None.
 - Zebra crossing on Wolverton Road. It's so unsafe for kids, teens and families or elderly who find it hard to cross in a hurry.

- Toilet facility at the Rec Grnd. Wolverton Road crossing point.
- Road crossing on Wolverton Road.
- We don't need money - we need to keep our countryside.
- Village store.
- Possibly a local store of some kind.
- Money is what it always comes to – no additional community facilities could make up for loss of countryside/wildlife/community/more traffic
- A community centre (standalone) that could be used all day and not restricted by school use as present
- Possibly a corner shop with post office facilities
- Possibly a doctors surgery
- As in question 10 a new social and community centre and possibly a shop with post office facilities. Even some kind of health facility like a doctors surgery operating part time in conjunction with a bigger practice
- Doctors surgery
- Doctors Surgery
- We do not need facilities. We have Wolverton, New Bradwell, Newport Pagnell, Stony Stratford – all five mins away with plenty of facilities!
- New village hall with sports pavilion
- Village shop (viable if there were more houses)
- Little Linford Church is an important and valuable building which while remaining a church could be much more widely used as a public meeting place. All we need is imagination!
- Proper sewage system
- A proper war memorial (what other village has no war memorial)
- A cycle path from the village to Little Linford
- The Community Centre.
- Social club for all age groups with maybe exercise & fitness classes, WA etc.
- Picnic benches.
- Small shop & post office.
- Library facilities.
- As 10 above (Redevelopment of Randall's farm buildings. Possible employment uses on farms/new centre. Something that links both halves of the village. Better support for young families & children – creche/nursery!) plus Good bus service linked to other transport hubs e.g. Wolverton Station/CMK.
- A local community-manned shop possibly linked to a community facility separate from the school.
- Social centre.
- ?
- It would be nice if we had some kind of shop.
- Village Hall and shop.
- Tennis court – lowish maintenance and two or four can play – don't need two teams. What about a community supported, well located, small shop (cf Castlethorpe) so residents don't need to drive for a few basic items?
- Separate social centre
- Under-fives playgroup
- Separate Village Hall maybe – hire out for private functions not limited by school - but then who would run it?
- A shop.
- Doctors surgery. Local shop
- Play area
- Village shop. Bakers.
- Also a shop provides communication to those residents who are lonely. Need something for the more aged population to enjoy and network - avoid loneliness.
- Sports club.

- Purpose built Community Centre
- Perhaps a local shop?
- Small meeting room – by-near-attached to St Mary’s Church, for church and village use
- This all comes down to money, the gains made would not benefit the local community as we would stand to lose so much
- 1. Shop! 2. Nursery for pre-school children. 3. Zebra crossing to main road/school
- Don’t know
- Community shop. Sports facilities
- New village hall/shop/improved pub. Decent sports fields
- Improving land around the Greyhound? How could we improve the Greyhound?
- 1. Proper, structural road calming in Haversham Village High Street. Extend 40mph through to Little Linford – to Newport Pagnell. 2. A new community space as I understand that the social centre cannot meet our needs – which will increase with more housing. 3. I would like to see improvements to the Greyhound Pub and grounds – but believe this may be outside the Parish Council’s remit. 4. The planters holding the Haversham and Little Linford signs should be replaced with something far more in keeping with the villages’ rural community. 5. All the ‘green space’ needs better management and needs enhancing. Stop cars parking on green verges.
- A separate social and community centre for the village.
- New Community centre; Village PO and shop.
- Not sure
- New public house in new development area! More public transport.
- New public house in new development area! More public transport.
- Try using the money we’ve already got to sort out traffic.
- A lot more play equipment than 2 swings.
- Post office perhaps attached to church or pub.
- Library and more social facilities.
- None.
- Tennis court.
- A purpose-built community centre, with indoor sporting facilities. A new secondary school to serve community.
- A dedicated village hall. A small convenience store.
- None- other than maintaining what already exist? Cricket pavilion on the Rec Grnd.
- With all the cuts in Council’s budgets and social services, do not think any money spare.
- The growth of MK has meant vicious cuts to ll parts of the Council’s budget and social services. There will be no money available!
- Shop please-co-op or good independent shop such as at Castlethorpe.
- Satellite Dr surgery. Community shop. Football, cricket etc. pitches. Tennis court. Dog friendly area. Make more of the river that runs through the village.
- Maintenance and continuation of public footpaths.
- Newsagent/post office.

Question 12

Landscape and nature:

Are there any parts of the landscape in the Parish you particularly enjoy being in or using?

Please tell us which.

- Rec. Ground
- Recreation Ground
- Love all the rural walks
- Nature Reserve. Generally being in village surroundings
- Park nature reserve
- Ouse Valley Park and all flood zones
- The allotments was secured by a 99 year lease back in the 1970s, supposedly guaranteed NOT to be built on – BUT it was sold out by the Parish Council for social housing – so not much of a guarantee then!
- All of it
- Walk by ? also see animals in field (no sheep 2 years – why?):
- The areas between Old Haversham and Little Linford both around the Ouse and up the hill and including Little Linford Wood and Swan Way area
- All of it! We are blessed to live in a beautiful location and should ensure it is protected for future generations
- Ouse Valley Park.
- Public footpaths around the village through the fields linking us to Ouse Valley Park
- Ouse Valley Park
- River walk.
- Ouse valley parks
- The riverside walks
- River walks
- Riverside walks
- River/canal walks
- Canal walks
- River
- Overlooking fields and lakes around upper Haversham
- All rights of way particularly between Wolverton Road and Little Linford wood, including the wood. The River Ouse linear parks from Stony Stratford to New Bradwell.
- Walk across the top of the village. Entrance half way down the hill and Swans Way.
- Walks around the sailing lake and local footpaths.
- Public footpaths for walking, riverside pathways.
- Rec
- Rec
- River area, woods near Little Linford, outside at Old Haversham.
- River walk and canal side walks. Public footpaths on farmland around the village. Linford Woods, Churchyard, St Marys.
- Riverside walks, Canalside walks, Linford Wood walks/public footpaths.
- Ouse valley, #little Linford woods.
- Haversham sailing lake, fields up and around the woods.
- The hides by the railway arches and river, the sailing lake, the church ruins & beyond, the pathways across the fields opposite the old post office, Little Linford Lane & lakes & woods.
- All of it.
- The nature reserve near the viaduct and the aqueduct/canal area. Stanton Low is beautiful too.
- The lake, Little Linford Woods.
- Area by the viaduct.
- Hill Farm fields, fields around the Crescent.

- Recreation ground.
- Recreation ground.
- River walks
- Fields north and west of Haversham
- Yes, I regularly walk with my family and dog through the fields at the end of Brookfield Road, and enjoy seeing the wildlife there – I would be devastated to lose that. We are also members of the sailing club
- Little Linford Wood
- Linford Wood and public footpaths
- We have beautiful countryside all around the village and it is enjoyed by so many, walking across the fields to the railway and down to the river
- Along the river by the viaduct. The paths through the farmland beyond old Haversham. The fields at the end of Brookfield Road leading to Lodge Farm. The Recreation field. Walks to Castlethorpe from Haversham
- Farmland behind housing leading down to Lodge Farm units. Viaduct Nature Reserve. Recreation ground and walks down to St Mary's Church/Pub. Walks to Castlethorpe from Haversham
- Haversham sailing lake/club
- Riverside walks. Footpaths across fields
- Sailing club, the lakes and riverside footpath, cycle paths, other bridleways/footpaths to Linford Wood and beyond to Hanslope etc
- Bridle paths and Little Linford woods. All lakes and walks around canal. Haversham recreation ground
- Farmers' fields
- The linear park along the Ouse to Stony
- All of it.
- Riverside walk.
- All open spaces!
- I enjoy using Haversham Lake to sail and to also go for walks and camp there.
- Walk ways by the river Ouse and Grand union canal.
- Recreational parks and walking routes.
- Farmland around our house. Riverside and gravel pits.
- The 5 arches view when the sun goes down is amazing.
- Down the hill. Renew the rest area.
- Park. The walks around the river.
- Little Linford wood.
- Little Linford wood – it's magical and should be accessible to more people.
- Linford lakes.
- Little Linford woods.
- The river as it is a good walk with dogs
- River walk & footpaths at the back of Brookfield
- Love walking out into the countryside from any point in the parish. Don't want to lose that
- The Rec
- All walks over the important agricultural land
- Sailing club big asset to the village
- Viaduct area
- No
- All of the landscape & local Redways, the fields are wonderful for walking
- Enjoy the river
- The walks around Andy Paten farm (Hill farm) give fantastic views. They are unspoilt & a fantastic positive living in Haversham
- Haversham sailing lake & its environs due to it being a secure site, it is safe to walk alone

- The Swan's way tracks, all of the footpaths in & around Little Linford wood. All of the tracks in the immediacy of the village. The river walks & the new flood plain nature reserve
 - Walking the public footpaths & Haversham Lake. Walking by river & wetland areas again when fully accessible
 - The walks along the river & nature reserve
 - The Green, the Crescent, Rec, Linford Lakes nature reserve
 - The Green, the Crescent, Rec, Linford Lakes nature reserve (
-
- Enjoy the river
 - The Rec.
 - Fields of the top of Brookfield road, riverside walks
 - Fields at end of Brookfield road. River & water reserve
 - Country park – being able to walk in the local countryside
 - The farm land between Crossroads farm and Linford wood
 - I love all the walks we have around Haversham / parish, we walk all over from Haversham to Tatthall End etc. across fields / roads. We / I just enjoy it all. To lose any of it would be a very sad emotional day
 - Walks by river & lakes
 - Walking around the fields & riverside to Cosgrove / New Bradwell, short walk through the Rec & estate
 - Walks around the lake & local footpaths
 - Agricultural land to the north has recently become primarily arable, but is still a valuable wildlife area
 - The north area by brook & wooded area
 - Little Linford woods & surrounding footpaths & bridle paths
 - Little Linford woods area & footpaths, bridleways
 - River area
 - Park area and nature reserve near the seven arches bridge
 - The field paths in the village. The path to the pub from the Rec.
 - The river and park. Open fields and walkway (walking or driving passed them on the way to Newport). The village. The views across the fields.
 - The area around the viaduct
 - River walk. Canal. Bluebell woods. The Green. Little Linford weir.
 - River areas. Fields to the Crescent (water tower) fields to the back of Brookfield Road.
 - River walk. Green. Fields.
 - Little Linford woods. Walk at bottom of Haversham by Ouse with parking.
 - River Great Ouse Valley. Farmland walking tracks.
 - Old Haversham/Linford
 - The lakes and river walks. The walks around the area. The quiet roads for cycling and walking.
 - Local parks, footpaths leading to the canal (along the river)
 - Network of footpaths around lakes, river and fields
 - The river for walking and cycling
 - River. Rec. Walks. Woods.
 - Haversham hill. The brook by the clay pigeon field.
 - Public footpaths
 - Walking areas.
 - The riverside walk from Haversham to Wolverton and on to Stony Stratford.
 - Sailing club. Ridge walk to west of High Street.
 - Sailing club.
 - The views.
 - The green, the playground, the playing fields, the paths both by the river and north into the countryside.

- Riverside paths.
- All paths and walks.
- We love using the Rec Ground and walks across the fields to the old village from there. Little Linford Wood is our favourite family spot to visit and is a rare gem in a world of 'manufactured' community spaces.
- The green on The Crescent. The fields/access road around The Crescent. The viaduct/nature area.
- The Crescent green. The fields behind The Crescent. The viaduct. Cycling along Wolverton Road to Hanslope.
- The fields and the walk to The Greyhound.
- Picnic site near the river and river paths.
- Walking across fields to Cosgrove or around the village
- The surrounding fields/woods
- Field and footpath at the end of Brookfield Rd.
- Walks towards Cosgrove across the nature reserve.
- Little Linford Wood
- Footpath from Haversham to Castlethorpe (via Railway)
- Around the sailing lake
- Little Linford
- All public footpaths
- River walks
- Woods and Lakes
- Haversham Lake
- Little Linford Wood
- Views and public footpaths across from old Haversham and Crossroads Farm
- Area around Haversham Weir
- River
- Waterparks
- Flood Plain walks
- River walks
- Recreation Ground
- Manor Drive
- Between Haversham Castlethorpe and Hanslope
- River
- Linford Wood
- Footpaths
- Riverside walk
- All of it
- The riverside
- The fields around Brookfield Rd., Chalmers Ave., Rowan Drive, Keppel
- Walks around the river
- Floodplain
- Bridleway through Linford Wood
- River walk
- Bluebell woods
- The Green
- Public footpath next to crossroads farm
- Little Linford Weir
- The fields off Brookfield Rd
- Little Linford Wood
- As farmers we rely on straw and forage from adjacent fields to us at Crossroads and land opposite although we appreciate that land opposite may need partial development. We appreciate

being surrounded by farmland and wildlife corridors, hedgerows – for nature, and to run our business

- think the whole surround to Haversham and Little Linford is beautiful countryside with lots of nature enjoyed by lots of cyclists, walkers
- Walking round the sailing club lake
- Nature reserve near the viaduct
- River walk
- By the River
- The area proposed to be developed is open countryside with a wide range of species. It is enjoyable walking through existing footpaths and environment with the river walks and network of [stops]
- Countryside walking
- Playing in the park
- River walk and bird reserve
- The wonderful footpath network – especially the panoramic views from the footpath between the Hill Rd. and Linford nature reserve wood.
- Walks by the River
- Ouse valley walk and River
- All of them, that's why I don't believe development is necessary
- Ouse Valley Park
- Ouse Valley Park and Allotments
- All the footpaths and bridleways are very beautiful in the rural landscape with great biodiversity which development will hurt
- The agricultural fields/walks and Little Linford Wood create an incredible amount of wildlife/birds/wild plants
- Land around the lake
- Land around the river
- The Swans Way and surrounding footpaths and Bridleways and Little Linford Wood
- The Crescent Green
- We could do more riverside – after gravel works
- The Crescent Green
- All of it
- River walkways
- The Country Park is particularly pleasant (even with prison camp barbed wire all around it!). The fields at the end of Brookfield Road are an excellent place to relax and enjoy a walk.
- The Country Park and land at bottom of Brookfield Road (farmers fields)
- The Park. River and nature reserves. Cornfields off of Brookfield Road.
- All
- All
- The river.
- With a child, we are regularly at the park. We enjoy walking round the fields too.
- All walking in the area.
- The lakes.
- I love the walk alongside the river and up to the canal.
- River walk. Recreation ground.
- All landscape and nature is important. Walking around the sailing lake and to Wolverton and back.
- Bridleways and footpaths.
- Footpaths over some fields and paths to canal and river walks.
- By the canal.
- Ouse Valley Park
- I really enjoy walking down the river Ouse and also the fields behind Chalmers Avenue. It is important place for regular walkers.

- Park area – brilliant facilities for children. New skate park is good. Good open field for sports. Countryside walks all around
- We love to walk our dogs as most residents do at the top of Wolverton Road, along the local footpaths and walkways
- The countryside and walks down to the shooting range and also around the tracks and lanes to river Ouse are so important
- The green spaces in particular the riverside walk and wildlife wetlands
- Riverside walk and the fields, access at top of Brookfield Road
- The countryside to the north of the Parish and all the open spaces surround Haversham – Ouse Valley
- Riverside walk through to Manor Farm is beautiful
- The river walks
- The Ouse Valley Park. The recreation ground at Manor Drive
- Fields at end of Brookfield, great walks and the reason I purchased the house
- The fields at the end of Brookfield Road
- We enjoy all the footpaths and bridleways also walking by the lakes, around the sailing club and linear parks. Linford woods.
- The footpaths and bridleways through the village. In particular the bridleway along the River Ouse from Mill Road and up past Hill Farm.
- Sailing Club, footpaths around the village, Linford Wood, reservoirs
- Linford Wood, the river walk.
- The public footpaths, the Green in the Crescent, the social centre and the allotments.
- The fields and land behind Wolverton Road with skateboard park.
- Public footpath between Haversham & Castlethorpe.
- Public footpaths. Old Wolverton Nature Reserve. Canal towpaths.
- The Recreation Ground was one of the main reasons I moved to Haversham. It's great for families.
- Ouse Valley Park is a lovely walk.
- The bridle paths.
- Footpaths leaving the village through fields towards Little Linford.
- The river. The network of paths towards Castlethorpe & Linford Wood.
- The fields between Haversham & New Bradwell and the riverside walks.
- The access through the triangle off the High Street to the fields. The path around the yachting lake.
- The river, gun fields and recreation ground.
- Down by the river.
- The green in the Crescent is particularly nice – it's lovely to watch the children play in the Summer where they are safe.
- Riverside walk.
- Riverside path and footpaths.
- River & Nature reserves. The Park. Cornfields off Brookfield
- All of it - fields, river ,lakes
- New nature reserve, the skate board ramp, field behind Brookfield Road.
- The wetlands and river. Sailing club
- Down by the river
- The river
- Ouse Valley Park. Walk out of Wolverton that separates village from rest of MK. Acts as a green belt boundary.
- Playing fields. Nature reserve and river.
- Rec. Green. Stanton low. Walkways.
- The Green in the Crescent. Children play freely alongside other neighbours in the Crescent. Without it where would they play freely? Definitely not the park now you introduced the skate park!! Drinks/drugs- not suitable!!!! And it's not used by children!! Disgusting!!! (L27)

- The Green in the Crescent- children have made new friends and have increased their fitness levels by playing regularly on the Green. Also the walk to Little Linford woods is very educational.
- All of it!!
- Riverside and footpaths
- Riverside walks
- Great countryside all round our community, fantastic wildlife – park and field area really great for kids
- Recreation ground/play ??? Nature reserve
- Recreation ground. Surrounding fields
- River walks
- Nature and river walks
- All the fields, river, rec, Green, bird reserve, 'gated road', Little Linford Lane, Little Linford Wood
- Linford Wood. River meadows
- Linford Wood. The river
- Walking to Little Linford Wood and surrounding areas
- The footpaths and bridleways from Little Linford, across the 'Prairie' to the woods, then on to Haversham. Old Haversham to the church. Little Linford, Church Lane to the church (green verges on the estate become damaged by parked cars!)
- Countryside around Little Linford
- The nature reserve by the river.
- The wildlife reserve by the river.
- River walks.
- The allotments. The Rec Ground when we had small children.
- The river area.
- The village looks scruffy from either approach, the overgrown hedges and sides of path, broken walls.
- Rural footpaths and bridle ways to north of Old Haversham village. Linford Wood. Haversham Lake. Viaduct cycle route.
- Rural footpaths and bridle ways to north of Old Haversham village. Linford Wood. Haversham Lake. Viaduct cycle route.
- Walking round the river.
- Walking round the river.
- Little Linford Woods. Wolverton viaduct river/wildlife area/ nature reserve. Haversham lakes. Footpath across fields, Haversham to Castlethorpe.
- Public footpaths across farmland to Castlethorpe and Linford Woods.
- Every square inch.
- All bridleways and footpaths to lakes, fields and woodland.
- Public pathway looking over fields - do not want to look over houses.
- The floodplain nature reserve. The bridle path leading to Little Linford Lakes.
- Bridleways across local farms. Linford Lakes.
- Local footpath and path by river.
- Along the river and walks through the viaduct. Little Linford need (?) also.
- Views across the fields behind the Crescent to the viaduct. Enjoy all the surrounding fields and views up towards Little Linford, and farms.
- The green - Church grounds, picnic area and the back lane surrounding The Crescent.
- Enjoy all parts of parish. We are lucky to have what we do but be so close to MK/city, rail and M1 road.
- We live in a beautiful area with woods/hills, lakes, fields with cattle and the beautiful and colourful changes of season. I personally am very happy to walk and view. We are so fortunate.
- Area along river near St Peters Church and Little Linford Wood.
- All of the footpaths. Ouse Valley Park. Little Linford Woods.
- All of the surrounding green areas.
- Surrounding fields and riverside walk. Recreation ground.

- I use all the local parks and walkways in and around Haversham, Wolverton and surrounding villages.
- The nature reserve; beside the lakes and river.

Question 14

Landscape and nature:

Do you think that we need any more footpaths or changes to existing ones? Please specify.

[Written responses to the 'please specify' question are recorded with abbreviations of the respective tick box answer. Y = Yes, N = No, NA = not answered.]

- N: Renew pavement surfaces
- Y: The footpaths are overgrown a lot through the summer so cannot be used
- Y: Footpaths by Linford Lakes I've never used due to lack of parking, but would like to. Not sure what is accessible to public – not clear.
- Y: Better signage and maintenance – some very overgrown
- Y: Footpath from Little Linford to Old Village
- Y: Journeys on foot between settlements are dangerous, especially Old Haversham to Little Linford
- Y Complete the resurfacing of all footpaths in the village.
- Y River walk
- Y Extend redway system into Haversham.
- NA Not sure would need to look at the existing structure first.
- NA Not really sure
- Y Better condition is required of them
- Y Footpaths can be quite narrow and close to the road. Can feel dangerous walking along the active road.
- Y Easier access through the fields where public have the right of way. Easier access for prams, wheelchairs small children, even dogs.
- Y Access off-road to join High Street with Swans Way and Mill Road – and thus into a broader network of rights of way. Access across the River Ouse. Join New Bradwell to Oakridge Park along the river.
- Y Looking to change existing stiles on footpaths to make more accessible for people with mobility problems
- Y More footpaths needed.
- Y Important that footpaths are well maintained, there is good access and that they are well signed.
- Y Additional, well signed footpaths would be of major benefit to the village.
- Y A cross country route to Wolverton round the back of the estate/avoiding Wolverton Road would be nice. A connection to the redway network would also be good.
- Y Both footpaths through High Street could be improved; many are overgrown.
- Y The track in Stanton Low from the weir to the 12th century Church is really rough to cycle on – if it could be resurfaced that'd be great.
- Y The path to wood from Haversham gets very muddy near the cross roads & needs fixing.
- Y Better footpath across the fields to Old Village.
- Y Existing railway access path to viaduct open to public
- Y Some more would be nice – also the ones we have get more regularly maintained
- Not changes but existing footpaths need to be maintained and managed so usable at all times e.g. path from Rec to old village not ploughed over
- N Not applicable

- Y It would help if the existing ones were better maintained especially the hedge trimming which seems non-existent at present
- Y The footpath that leads to the Greyhound from the recreation field. The steps over the wall opposite the pub. I am unable to use it because it is too steep
- Y Country paths need more maintenance, some unpassable
- Y More footpaths for dog walkers/maintained better than existing
- Y Easier access to riverside walks/footpaths across fields
- Y More formal link to Linford Nature Reserve and walks and extend riverside walk/cycle paths along river/lakes to Little Linford particularly
- Y Path out of Haversham Village to Little Linford would be good
- Y If more development
- Y The path that runs alongside Wolverton Road needs some pedestrian protection – the road is a fast road, the path narrow and when cycling or walking with children they are particularly vulnerable. Either path widening or a barrier between kerb and pedestrians
- Y The footpath into Haversham via Wolverton Road has no crash barriers to protect pedestrians and is very poorly lit
- N – Widen path along Wolverton road and improve lighting.
- Y - A resurface here and there wouldn't go amiss.
- Y – Upkeep on public footpaths around the village – new signage would be helpful.
- Y – Footpaths linking River Ouse near New Bradwell with Haversham Lake, Little Linford and Haversham village.
- Y – Linford wood.
- Y – Linford wood.
- Y – Formalise existing paths that aren't actually rights of way (e.g. around field edges). Better access to North side of river. What makes the network of paths (formal & informal) enjoyable is that you are quickly in the countryside. Keeping them but surrounding them with a housing estate would destroy them as leisure routes.
- Y – The Wolverton road is getting busier every day. We need a zebra crossing to the school. Every mum agrees whose child goes to Haversham. Also maybe more footpaths so we don't have to walk along the busy road to get to train station / shops.
- Y – I live on Little Linford lane and save for the footpath immediately outside our house (which leads to Church lane in one direction and ends at the phone/post box at the other end), we have no access to footpaths. It would be nice to be able to walk to the lakes or Haversham but it is too dangerous to walk on the roads.
- Y – We are blessed with an 80(ish)m footpath in Little Linford. We'd like this extended to allow movement between other public rights of way.
- Y – Little Linford lane. Little Linford to Haversham.
- Y – Gayhurst to Haversham has walkers and very dangerous to all on road.
- Y – Little Linford to Haversham. Gayhurst Road to Haversham.
- Y – back road of Crescent, to fields off Brookfield close
- Y - better footpath links to the old village – especially away from the road
- Y – I don't like how noisy all those gates are, oil them or something
- Y – cycle / Redway Haversham to Wolverton
- Y – cycle path from Haversham to the river
- Y – a number of our current footpaths are at times impassable due to the selfish actions of farmers whose land they pass over. Gates / styles are particularly bad. We have a good network of footpaths – maintenance is the problem
- Y - a safer route up the hill to Broadacre for walking & horse riders
- Y - Some of the footpaths / rights of way are not clearly marked or left clear for walking. Planted over
- Y – More access to the adjoining fields. Most important a widening of the footpath from Haversham to the river walkways
- Y – more footpaths

- Y – more footpaths
- Y – more to open the link between the villages and the surrounding fields
- N – any additions would be a contrivance, and detract from the natural surroundings
- Y – improvements / access to walks to village & west & north side of estate
- Y – ensuring styles are more accessible for people with mobility problems
- N – but keep existing routes & retain hedges
- N – keep existing ones in good order
- Y – We need to establish a contiguous network of footpaths & bridle ways in & around the civil parish. Some existing FP's lead nowhere
- Y – keep them clear of overgrown plants to allow pushchairs / wheelchairs to use them
- Y – better access to both sides of the river
- Y – Create some circular routes, make some more favourable to cycling.
- Y – More access to the river. Information and maps on present ones.
- Y – Little Linford to Haversham
- Y – More footpaths over agricultural land and better maintenance of existing ones
- Y – A path from Mill Road down through the village would improve safety and give walking access to the village
- Y – Better footpaths around the gravel pits (lakes)
- Y - Safer crossing of footpath at corner top of Wolverton Road and at bus stop. Consider zebra crossings
- Y – A path away from road into Wolverton.
- Y – Keep sightlines clear e.g. footpath halfway down Haversham hill - when crossing from the field at the back of the recreation ground traffic coming up the hill can't be seen because the hedge and vegetation isn't kept cut back.
- N – But ones we do have need more maintenance.
- Y – footpaths on roads and in fields must be properly maintained
- Y – Some way of getting to the riverside paths without having to walk down Wolverton road where the traffic is very intrusive and polluting (though I know that I contribute to this problem when I drive out of Haversham!)
- Y – More, and more accessible to cyclists/ pushchairs.
- Y – Make them cyclist friendly.
- Y. Footpath across the Triangle would need re-routing if used as one of the development plots.
- Y. Improvements to pavements/grass verges
- Y. Better footpath up to New Haversham from the Viaduct
- Y New footpath needed at Western end of old Haversham
- Y New works along river North bank
- Y Path going out of old Haversham towards Linford
- NA As long as they are well maintained
- N. Current footpaths are sufficient and just need to be maintained
- N. If existing paths maintained they are adequate
- Y. Keep the hedges trimmed such as the one near the bus shelter
- Y. Better and more visible signposting
- Y. I believe that there used to be a footpath from Wolverton Rd. which went behind the bungalow and past the top of Keppel, Rowan and Chalmers to join up with existing paths
- Y. A path from the end of Brookfield Rd down to the river would be great to avoid walking by the road, plus a footbridge across the river
- Y. Wider footpath to Wolverton to be used as a cycleway
- Y. Better care of footpath to gun club
- Better care of bridleway around pineham farm – lots of rabbit holes
- Y. As a smaller farm acreage our footpath is a concern as we have cattle grazing for over half a year, we can't keep cattle out of the fields – not used much but it would be tricky if it were extended on eastern arable fields so worry about greater promotion of our footpaths.
- Y. Link between Haversham and Newport Pagnell along fields

- Y. Farmer continues to try and improve the boggy ground on footpath
- Y. Link Haversham to the Redway Network
- More and more are walking and jogging. More access from the river and new lakes from the North Banks
- Sorry I do not walk
- Y. Maintain and clean what we have its forgotten.
- Footpath rear of the Crescent to Bus Stop Wolverton Rd is forgotten by MKC every year – over grown nettles.
- Y The current field edge, which runs from the end of Brookfield Rd up to join the footpath at the top, should be converted to a recognised footpath. The current footpaths running across the field to the railway line should be upgraded to bridleway. The old lower entrance to the Castlethorpe/Park path (across the shooting field) should be opened to stop having to walk all the way up to Lodge Farm and then back down the same distance on the other side!!!
- Y To have another footpath opposite the one that goes to the Country park.
- Y Needs to be maintained better -always full of nettles and brambles and thorny bushes.
- Y Bushes need to be maintained (chopped).
- Y Footpath from village at side of road (inside hedge) to bridle way.
- Y Connection between upper and lower village over fields, away from road.
- Y Path from Wolverton to Haversham needs widening for use with bikes
- N There is no need to change the existing network of footpaths
- Y Parking of vehicles on/across footpaths should be policed and stopped
- NA Not sure about this
- Y Safer ways to cross Wolverton road and cutting back of nettles etc
- N But that is dependent upon any changes made during building
- N Some footpaths would be better re-routed around the side of fields instead of diagonally across the middle. Much more pleasant to walk by a hedge!
- Y Maintained better, clearing the brush back & the state of the walkways.
- Y On Wolverton Road the footpath needs to be redone. Also entrances to field road to be cleared for easy access.
- Y Better upkeep of paths.
- Y Better upkeep of paths.
- Y Footpath between Haversham High Street and Mill Road to enable villagers access to pathways through Linford Lakes.
- Y Link us to the MK green network - along the river & over it towards the 'Black Horse' at Linford. Cycle path out of the old village in both directions.
- Y A path leading to Little Linford & the lakes.
- Y A footpath and cycle way up the hill from High Street to Little Linford and Mill Lane. Cycle ways to connect us to Newport Pagnell and MK/Wolverton and the Black Horse/Canal.
- Y Service road rear of the Crescent.
- Y Footpaths need to be kept better especially the one from the rec down to the village- it seems to have disappeared.
- N just protect current ones
- Y Most of the existing paths need improvement.
- Y Footpath down to the Greyhound pub from estate to old village requires a lot of attention. The bushes need to be cut back to allow for more room. It's a dangerous road and path is way too narrow!
- Y Cycle path needed to Wolverton.
- Y Bridleways be kept clear.
- Y Access to Haversham Lake for all not just residents of old village
- Y Would be useful to extend the eastern riverside walk further into New Bradwell. Also to link this path to the village via a footbridge
- N Going where?!
- Y More would give different walks

- Y Would give alternative walks
- N There are plenty of footpaths throughout the Parish but people still manage to walk where they want!!
- N There are loads of footpaths and bridleways in the Parish. The main trouble is people don't keep to them and think they can walk round field margins
- Unsure. The footpath network is good
- Y Possibly – certainly feel they need to be maintained and have improved signage. Also, literature could be produced to encourage more people from the wider area to use. Walking routes, nature notes etc. Add to website
- Y Better footpath linking village and estate.
- N We have wonderful ancient footpaths that should be maintained and celebrated.
- N We have wonderful ancient footpaths that should be maintained and celebrated.
- Y More footpaths to link villages.
- N We certainly didn't need to close the road for 4 weeks to repair footpath that didn't need it! Try spending money on zebra crossing for school children and elderly.
- N Not to shut the road for 4 weeks to dig up a perfectly good footpath to pay 4 men to sit in vans for 4 weeks asleep.
- Y The road from Haversham to Newport Pagnell road. We need a footpath up the hill.
- NA There must be a footpath from the old village towards Little Linford.
- Y More pedestrian access - Hanslope to Haversham.
- N (don't know as don't use often)
- Y People often have to walk on roads.
- Y Paths should be marked more clearly. It would be useful to have a book or leaflet that displayed all the different footpaths. Good footpaths are enjoyable for walking but traffic is so fast one needs to be so careful.
- Y A path along the river would be lovely. Also a path up 'the cut' out of the old village - could there be a safe path up the hill in the field?
- Y Maintain existing better. Provide circular routes.
- Y Would welcome more footpaths as the area becomes more and more intruded upon and also care of present ones important.
- Y Some way of getting to the footpath going to Castlethorpe from Haversham
- Y Paths beside the road between old Haversham and H-cum-Little Linford where the road is very steep.

Question 15

Landscape and nature:

How important is it to use our Neighbourhood Plan to try to find ways of improving the natural environment of the Parish?

If you think it's important, where in the parish should the improvements be?

[Written responses to the 'where in the parish' question are recorded with abbreviations of the respective tick box 'importance' answer. VI = Very important; I = Important; NI = Not important; DK = Don't know.]

- I: Resurface pavements
- NI: Neighbourhood Plans across the country have proved pretty useless and ignored at higher level
- I: Facilities and amenities for locals
- VI: Dog bins repaired and emptied more frequently. Street cleansing more frequently
- VI: Haversham by the Greyhound Pub
- VI: Ouse Valley and the Northern Agricultural Area
- VI: It is vital our plan recognises the natural barrier of the Ouse and the importance of the Ouse Valley
- I: Not sure
- I: Not sure as live on outskirts of community
- VI A great improvement would be a reduction in 2 and multi car ownership. Retired couple with a car each! Dog ownership out of control!
- NI Providing matters are not made worse.
- DK I didn't think it's possible we need to develop to provide more housing
- I Maintaining rights of way from over/under growth. Finding devices to stop fly-tipping often at the entrance of rights of way across fields. Litter picking regularly + dog/litter bins regularly emptied. Protecting River Ouse linear park.
- VI Find ways/money to maintain/cut back foliage on path down the hill to the village.
- VI Further road restrictions would help, road narrowing for instance.
- VI Any area it all needs protecting.
- VI In any overgrown areas, neglected footpaths and by the footpath between the estate and old village. Hedgerows and verges need attention.
- VI Haversham Village has a tired, run down, look to it. The stables adjacent to the lake is not a thing of great beauty.
- I Traffic management, sustainable transport.
- VI Hedges and verges, they are impeding visibility for motorists, walkers, cyclists & horseriders an accident waiting to happen.
- I Keep the area free of litter. If everyone just picked up the litter outside of their own houses what a vast improvement.
- VI More trees in Manor Drive, rec & wildlife area.
- VI Vacant area not occupied by allotments. Road verge down to village
- VI Don't spoil it by building on it!
- VI Maintaining all hedgerows so beneficial for wildlife and landscape
- VI Creation of wildlife meadow and woodland areas
- VI Shrubs, trees, flowerbeds could be used in any unused areas. Generally the estate and village are well cared for and the community takes pride in where they live. Existing footpaths could become 'rights of way' so they cannot be subsumed by building
- VI Encourage more community engagement. We have an excellent, proactive and committed social committee but I do think we are missing a central location (limited by school hall)
- VI Community orchard in lower Haversham 'village'

- VI More formal link to Linford Nature Reserve and walks and extend riverside walk/cycle paths along river/lakes to Little Linford particularly + making a 'buffer' zone around lower village so character and history maintained as has been done in rest of MK
- Ensure hedges/trees are well kept (safety reasons)
- VI – Generally, all over the Parish, especially the footpaths, very hard to walk on these, especially Wolverton Road.
- VI – All available spare land – add planting to encourage wildlife.
- VI – Plant more trees and high carbon absorbing plants, climate change is not going to reverse itself.
- VI - Not sure but it is very important to preserve the natural environment particularly during a time when climate change is such a prominent issue.
- VI – Along the River Ouse.
- VI – Habitat creation, more nesting sites for swifts, owls, bats; more trees (not just replacing ones that have been cut down).
- VI – Between estate and village and exit out of estate towards Hanslope.
- I – Make more of the lakes – we don't use them as they are difficult to access (in terms of footpaths).
- VI – We see a large amount of wildlife; from game birds, hares, deer and small birds which is a pleasure. Any improvement on this would be fantastic.
- VI – try & maintain the village feel & diversity of nature while expanding
- I – ensure that upkeep of footpaths is kept
- VI – cut all verges including those between settlements. Trim all hedges. Other items that improving the natural environment requires land & that's failed on previous attempts
- VI – ensuring that any future development doesn't damage the current green spaces, encouraging more wildlife not damaging it with new developments
- Area between the bridge on Wolverton road & the viaduct. Triangle near T junction at Crossroads farm. Wide verge along 'Broadacre' fence line
- VI – vital – tree planting, a parish rubbish / environment team. Discussions with local farmers about hedgerow cutting & leaving some areas wild
- VI – get rid of the stinking Wolverton re-cycling centre
- VI – continue to support the already wonderful environments we live in
- No comment - continue to support the already wonderful environments we live in (same 2nd comment BC)
- I – the overall area in general
- I – highlight heritage of Haversham & its role on the edge of MK
- VI – protecting surrounding agriculture & fields. Keeping footpaths cut back (by the bus stop on Wolverton rd. & path into fields at top of Wolverton rd.)
- VI – in all of it! Preserving the natural environments that surround are an integral part of the parish
- VI – Haversham estate
- I – ensuring footpaths are clearer for people to walk on some of the paths in Haversham
- VI – don't smack houses down on top of green land
- VI – north area
- I - better litter picking on verges
- VI - Planting The Green and the grassy areas on Wolverton Road. Ban all parking on grass verges. Limit car ownership by imposing a PC fee for more than 2 cars.
- VI - I like the parish as it is
- I – A review of local villages should be undertaken to compare and identify what's missing
- VI – Footpath at the top of hill
- I – Opinions of the residents matter beyond all else, so the Neighbourhood Plan should be used to highlight areas of improvements
- VI – Footpaths at Crossroads Farm. Recycling plant – noisy and pollution
- VI – We can have our input and some control over what happens
- VI – Pathway through all the village all the way to Mill Road

- VI – Resisting dense developments, keep the village feel
- VI hedgerows, some need better maintenance
- I Look at the road verges and hedges to make them safe for car users.
- VI Some way of getting to the riverside paths without having to walk down Wolverton road where the traffic is very intrusive and polluting (though I know that I contribute to this problem when I drive out of Haversham!)
- VI Making the village more unified and less just rows of houses along main roads.
- I I would like to see more effort to encourage essential species like bees and butterflies. Wild flower planting in areas such as the Rec ground would be great to see.
- VI Patches of area for wildlife throughout the parish.
- VI Rather than one location I would suggest a string of environmental pockets to enable wildlife to flourish.
- VI footpaths / shared open spaces
- I. Sustaining or increasing Biodiversity
- I. Ensure any new developments fit in with the landscape.
- VI. There are areas in the village that should not be developed due to their importance to the village
- VI. Places to walk
- VI. The Greyhound pub could do with a little modernising
- VI. Areas designated as protected nature reserves such as the sailing lake and the Little Linford Wood.
- VI. More trees in existing green areas
- I. Don't know specifics
- VI. More hedging and tree planting. Only one tree planted on the Green since 1980 but six removed. More wood planting to encourage bio-diversity.
- VI. More footpaths
- VI. A bench or two strategically placed would be great too.
- I. Continued improvement to riverside area
- VI. Litter prevention down by river
- VI. Public footpath at the top of hill
- I. Preserving natural environment. Preserving as much natural environment as possible i.e. hedgerows, planting more spinneys or trees to shield new developments could create new attractive areas
- VI. By not increasing traffic flow/directing high volumes and link roads through the community
- VI. More footpath signs. Develop a heritage/nature site walk
- I. Not improvement but continual care of the Ouse Valley area is important
- A general tidy up and maintenance of current facilities
- VI. Keeping and improving green areas e.g. hedgerows and maybe planting woodland
- VI. Retaining the historical and rural character of the village. The traffic is heavy at peak times – perhaps the plan can address this without adding to it.
- VI. Footpaths and Bridleways should be protected and maintained and hedges should also be maintained to provide a habitat and thoroughfare for nature.
- VI. Consideration for those with houses
- I. Riverside
- I I think it is important to have a neighbourhood Plan but I expect that where realistic and necessary improvements are required they will generally be met with NIMBYism.
- I Improve grass verges.
- VI Hedges, Grass.
- I We moved to a village so we could be surrounded by green space - not houses!
- VI I love the trees, bushes, grasses etc but can we stop them covering road signs and keep cut back at road intersections. The cross over point from the estate to old Haversham can be dodgy in summer.
- VI Leave it alone. Build somewhere else.

- VI No developments, maintain countryside
 - I It's important that the parish consults the residents and gains wide opinion
 - Vi Not so much "improve" but the plan should protect and preserve the natural environment
 - VI Every area deserves such consideration
 - VI Ensure the pathway between the old and new Haversham is maintained and kept clear of overgrown hedges etc
 - VI The path between the new and old parts of Haversham. There has to be a better way of managing the bank and overgrown areas to keep a safe and natural balance between the path and hedges, bank etc
 - VI Keeping Haversham environment from changing as that's only reason we moved here
 - I No particular area, just to keep the environment as natural as possible
 - DA Its stunning as it is!
 - I If we can make the natural environment more resilient and more diverse then we should do so. Focus on safe habitats and crossings for wildlife.
 - I The natural environment is already good. It is important to maintain what we have and not significantly diminish what we already have
 - NI This is beyond the remit of a village plan.
-
- VI Around the flood zone.
 - I More plants, nature areas & walks.
 - VI Keep cars off the grass.
 - I Suitable parking to prevent erosion of verges through incorrect usage.
 - I 1) Enhance the MK links beside the river from Little Linford to the viaduct. 2) In each new housing area. 3) Create a decent pitch to play the annual cricket match!!
 - VI Better parking. Slow down traffic through the old village.
 - I Pleasant pathways to link both parts of the village other than the road and pathway. Link the yachting lake and river to the existing linear park at the viaduct.
 - VI Access and tidiness of pathways.
 - VI It would be good to have the verges and hedges kept better down to the village.
 - I Grass areas
 - VI Currently alright but preserving what we have.
 - VI Quality of roads all over the parish
-
- VI Clearing of the land (The Spinney, as it used to be) adding a seat on this area as a resting place for those tackling the steep hill
 - VI More seats to enjoy the view
 - VI Any development should only happen for the use of local Parish people
 - I What is going to happen to the quarry at the bottom of Wolverton Road?
 - VI More footpaths would give different walks
 - VI Not so much improving as retaining
 - NI National Planning Policy and Milton Keynes Local Plan cover this through SSSI, Wildlife site and ancient woodland sites
 - NI Milton Keynes and National Planning Policy cover this through SSSI, wildlife sites and ancient woodland allocation
 - VI All the green space would benefit from better management and enhancement. Stop cars parking on the grass verges would be a good move! The Parish Council website could promote.
 - I Keeping paths clear of overhanging branches eg between estate and village, and tidying up section on RH side as you approach the village which used to be very nice.
 - VI In the general maintenance of verges and footpaths and areas such as the allotments
 - VI In the general maintenance of verges and footpaths and areas such as the allotments
 - VI This depends on the area that has been found to be of particular importance.
 - VI Don't know.

- VI Traffic management. (Dead wildlife on the roads.) Flood management. Encourage wildlife in open areas e.g. owl boxes.
- VI Traffic management. (Dead wildlife on the roads.) Flood management. Encourage wildlife in open areas e.g. owl boxes.
- VI Wherever possible I would like to see the planting of trees including a community orchard.
- VI Traffic!!!
- VI All over.
- VI Path (14). Tree planting /replacement in 'new' Haversham.
- VI Improve bridleway s and countryside footpaths to encourage local residents to use them. Salcey Forest in Northampton has been a great success with fairly basic development such as better footpaths, café, playground etc.
- I In that I'd like the natural environment as it is now to be maintained (but enhanced if possible). The 'triangle' has been raised as an issue.
- I By the river to prevent the car park and surrounding areas flooding, when the weather is bad.
- I Safe walking areas. Off road parking areas.
- I Improvement to walking i.e. Haversham to Little Linford - no footpaths. Improvement to Church Lane Little Linford -potholes! Car park for visitors that wish to visit our parish and walk to view the fields and woods and animals that we take for granted.
- I Mostly important to preserve but could the road to St Peters Church be a bridleway instead of road for dirt bikes and cars.
- Ouse Valley Park. Used to be scenic - now an odd mix of barbed wire rubbish collection and randomly dumped machinery.
- I Wherever they can maintain the individuality of the area.
- VI Ensure the preservation of the Nature Reserve.

Question 16

Working life:

Most of the land in our parish is actively used for farming.

Do you think that the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to protect this current pattern of land usage?

Do you have any comments that support your view?

[Written responses to the 'any comments' question are recorded with abbreviations of the respective tick box 'should seek to protect' answer. Y = Yes, N = No, DK = Don't know, NA = not answered.]

- Y: Vital! Prosperous rural economy – part of a core principle of the NPPF
- Y: Losing the open spaces will generate more traffic, the roads are too congested as it is
- Y: Support local farmers + protection of green spaces. Part of character.
- Y: Character of Haversham
- Y: I moved here to be near farming area as feels like in country but not too far from MK for work
- Y: We need to do our bit to protect British Farming – especially with Brexit
- Y: Food production security is becoming more and more important with Brexit. This is a well maintained agricultural area which MUST be protected
- N: Business should be kept apart from residential living
- Y Maintain local produce and preserve the natural land and wildlife
- Y No building on Greenfield site, farm bridleways
- N Farming is not a 'protected' right. It must allow for demands, including housing.
- Y All actively used land should not be considered for development to maintain the rural aspect of the village/estate.

- Y The farmland should be kept as it is because it is used to maintain the lovely aspect of the estate and village.
- NA You can't help that society is growing. Maybe use it as a last resort?
- Y We are not only a rural community but also a facility for the people of MK to come and enjoy beautiful countryside.
- Y In an expanding MK it is important to protect farming and a rural landscape for future use.
- Y We live in a rural area and it should be protected. But to build houses, Haversham will have to use farm land.
- Y This is Haversham's identity.
- Y The location of the village set in attractive countryside and surrounded by well maintained agricultural land is its main attraction.
- Y The village has long been associated with farming, both arable and pastoral and this should continue.
- Y Anything that improves the 'community' should be within the scope of the plan.
- Y It's someone's hard work that has gone into the land, someone's life.
- Y We should support the British farming industry thereby supporting our wildlife and countryside.
- Y If this land is lost for housing it will be lost forever. We are all encouraged to buy British but if we build on all our agricultural land we will have to rely on more imports.
- Y We have a large working farms - we should do all we can to support them.
- Y But housing is still important (got to build somewhere).
- Y Because everyone still needs to eat. If we build more homes over agri land we import more & prices rise.
- Y Providing land is used productively
- Y Farming is important to this country and could become more so in the near future – losing the farms would be a devastation
- Y As much as is possible but any new development will have some impact. Should identify brownfield sites first, if there are any
- Y Better than nothing
- Y Our farming community is under huge pressure with many farmers committing suicide or going bankrupt. Farming is a hard life. Should we be actively engaging with them? and buying local – local shop. Rather than large plots of land and new estates, use smaller plots broken up by farmland. This would protect large wild life corridors
- Y We need to support our farming community, actively engaging with them and buying local. New houses should blend with the natural surroundings rather than forcing a 'super estate/s' into the area putting pressure on the habitat and resources
- Y Farmers and developers can be a potential toxic combination for a community – we choose to live in a rural area because that's what it is and should remain so
- Haversham/Little Linford are/were agricultural villages. Most land is very productive
- Y Village life falls hand in hand with farmland around it
- Biodiversity relies on hedgerows and field to sustain animal species – the fact that these fields/hedgerows are well established means they are home to lots of varied flora and fauna
- Y – Because it is their business and livelihood. Why ruin someone's life?
- Y – If you don't protect the land in our Parish, we will be swamped by greedy people wanting to build everywhere, thus overhauling the idea of a village lifestyle.
- Y – Protecting people's livelihoods and sources of local food is important.
- Y – The character of the parish should be retained, with minimal change or damage to the environment.
- Y – What attracted me to the village was its rural, farming aspect, outside Milton Keynes.
- Y & N – Not used for farming but yes should be protected.
- Y – The farmland is what gives the area its charm. I understand this will eventually erode and I am fine with that but at a moderate and organic rate. We personally know some local farmers and while I'm sure they'd be happy of the average (?) they'll receive, I know they would be sad to lose their livelihoods.

- Y – Protecting the income sources of local farmers in imperative.
- Y – We should maintain if possible but the village does need to grow
- Y – farmers need somewhere to farm
- Y – because the parish is a rural parish & should remain
- Y – farming is part of the local community – provides work / livelihood for local people
- Y – houses are ugly
- Y – we will be more dependent on farming / growing our own food with Brexit so who's going to tell my grandchildren that we sold off local farm land so MK council hit a short term plan
- Y – If this ceases to be the case we will cease to be a rural area. The current open space & rural landscape is very important to me
- Y- farming the land around here is almost the domain of one farmer. That should remain as farm land and not be built on willy nilly on bits of land and newly acquired holdings
- Y – we live in the countryside we need fields!
- NA – yes we should be more self-sufficient as a country / county especially with Brexit
- NA – yes we should be more self-sufficient as a country / county especially with Brexit
- After Brexit I'm guessing that Britain as a whole will need to start growing / supplying more here locally. Encourage farmers not to sell their land for large housing development
- Y – to the extent that it does not prevent suitable development
- Y – active use, key to 'feel' of village life
- Y – it is the heritage of this area
- Y – local economy & to disrupt the use of the land would be to deface the parish as it now finds itself
- Y – it's why I love living here
- Y – too much development in countryside per se. Protect wildlife etc. Can urbanisation inc. flooding risk in parts of the parish?
- As a lover of nature & our environment I would be unhappy to see the village expanded & eventually joined up with MK which seems to be happening in surrounding rural areas
- Y – it is important that food is produced close to large cities to minimise transport costs
- Y – land needs management
- Y – too easy for urban blight to creep
- Y - ?? where do you think otherwise you can build a house
- Y – The general growth of MK should be limited so that developers find surrounding land less attractive
- Y – All the fields around Haversham need to be kept this way
- Y – The farm land supports the look/environment of Haversham and much of the land backs onto current houses, areas not suited for development
- Y – As it is a village and surrounded by fields it should be kept that way
- Y – Population growth and climate change are putting pressure on land and food production. We need farmland.
- Y – The farming area here is important and helps to create the rural setting of Haversham
- Y – Future proofing agricultural land for future generations.
- DK Farming seems to be becoming less viable, I believe farmers know best about this.
- Y Food production is extremely important.
- Y To keep its rural feel
- N If new homes are needed then we have to look at agricultural land.
- Y Failure to maintain agricultural use will lead to pressure for development.
- Y As far as possible, though it seems inevitable, that if we have to accept housing development it will have to be at the expense of loss of some farming land.
- Y We are a rural community but are on the edge of a large ever growing town and need to protect our individuality and country feel.
- Y If we disturb the balance of our landscape we risk losing the essence of what we are about. The Paton family in particular are very visibly supportive of local community values and regularly help

social centre activities but also invite groups such as school children to understand the importance of farming.

- Y It is important to keep the farmland as it keeps the area a calm and pleasant place to be. Farming is also very important for wildlife especially the bees.
- Y It is the reason I live here. I cannot cope in a built up environment (medical reasons). A countryside farming environment is one I can live within.
- Y It maintains the feel of community and ruralness in the village and surrounding areas – building on this would remove that
- DK. I said 'don't know' as some small parcels of land may need to be used for development. So 100% protection would prevent any development.
- Y. If it is profitable for the __ ? tax men? We should keep the land
- N. Farming does not improve the natural environment and does not provide many jobs
- Y. If we lose our farmland why would people like living in the countryside
- Y. We like our local produce.
- Y. It is important to protect and support our local farming community in order to keep the supply of fresh healthy local food in the area, particularly as we leave the EU and food may be sourced cheaply across the globe with less regard for quality.
- Y. It would be a great shame to lose the rural feel in the area.
- Y. Make sure no more business units are built unless [they] blend in with the environment.
- Y. Farms can diversify by providing small business units
- N. Brexit will have a major impact (disastrous?) on the viability of farming.
- Y. Farming maintains the landscape and is important to the country's economy. They make a huge contribution to village life.
- Y. We all need to eat.
- Y. Agriculture very much characterises the feel of the village. We are close to nature and have very easy access to the countryside which is being managed by farmers.
- Y. We still have an identity separate from MK developments which we wish to keep.
- Y. I live here because it's a rural environment. I would like to continue living there
- Y. Havesham is a village surrounded by fields and farms and should stay this way
- Y. Particularly in view of recent foreign policy I think that permanently destroying farmland and wilderness to build homes is short sighted. It is a time when we need to be more self sufficient, not incapable of this.
- Y. We are a family farm with the intention of continuity of farming, 2 youngsters actively involved, working for neighbouring farms, Newport young farmers, shoots, etc., we rely on not having immediate neighbours and intend to increase livestock numbers -> obvious muck, smells at times
- DK. While agriculture is important, so too is providing other types of employment and providing housing and facilities
- N. Private land owners should do what they like
- Y. Agriculture should be encouraged within the local community Education of the use of land and the benefits the future generations will benefit from will depend on the actions of ourselves. Encouraging agriculture and the diverse species it encourages can only be a positive thing.
- Y. Preserves the natural countryside views; our farmers are v good at maintaining footpath network; our farmers are good at managing and reducing flooding which would be increased by further building.
- Y. As far as possible; otherwise consider building a new village with separation from existing villages, not just join them together.
- Y. We live here because of the rural and historical character of the village. If we wanted a city, then MK is close by and available and we would move there.
- Y. Do we want to become another Bradwell or Willen?
- Y. Farmers are very concerned about their land
- Y. I was born and grew up at the Mill
- N I think it is unreasonable and probably unsustainable. Yes it would be lovely to be surrounded by farmed countryside but we live on the very edge of a major town which is growing all the time.

Better to be realistic now and look at ways of allowing diversification, limiting the impact as we go. Of course with recent political events UK farming may enter a new period of growth.

- Y Support local farmers. Good educational purpose.
- Y Once agricultural land goes, it's gone forever. The landscape and wildlife changes -we will never get that back.
- Y We all need to eat- lose farmland - lose food.
- Y We may well need our agriculture when we leave the EU.
- Y Support and keep British farmers. Very very important.
- Y Food production is vital
- Y Farming is a large part of this area and should remain. Too much farming land has been used for development. We should support our farmers
- Y It's what makes Haversham a beautiful community. It's what the people who have bought their houses moved here for!! A piece of country life, quiet and simple for their children
- Y The land within the MK boundary continues to be used for expansion of housing stock. Do we need to continue to the surrounding villages?
- Y I chose to live in a village with fields around me
- Y There is a plentiful supply of land suitable for new homes within built up confines of the new city. There are council tenants renting homes with spare bedrooms.
- Y Absolutely Yes, this should be protected because once it's gone, it's gone for good
- Y Farming land in a number of areas of Milton Keynes has been lost to large building sites (Broughton, Wavendon) just one example
- Y Yes, as my husband's family lost their farm in 1970 to the development of Milton Keynes. I think we should look after the farm land we still have, with an increasing population we need quality farm land to use in food production
- Y Yes but we need compromise
- Y This will ensure biodiversity in terms of plants and wildlife
- Y We need farms to produce our food! To not protect our farming land would be lunacy!
- Y It is important to protect the way of life the bio diversity of the areas. Also strategically for the country and strong, independent agricultural economy is important.
- Y Agricultural land should be and is protected against development
- N Farms are businesses producing food. As such and as per DEFRA/Government planning policy should be actively encouraged to diversify in farm buildings. A local plan cannot have a role in protecting agricultural land. Agricultural land use has to periodically change to reflect national need for food and energy and for farms to remain viable.
- Y As if local farming goes, things are in the supermarkets will soar upwards.
- Y Once open land and farm land is used for buildings it can never be retrieved back.
- Y Being surrounded by farmland was one of the reasons I moved to the village.
- Y If it is lost it will be lost forever.
- Y Farmland should be protected where possible through maintaining existing village boundaries.
- N If we do build – it *must* change the agriculture. We don't have brown land to redevelop!! More important to make sure agricultural land can be used efficiently still. The agricultural land & parks are important to keep the village 'defined' - in a green context – distinct from other villages.
- Y Small cottage industry.
- Y The fields are well managed and provide an income. They are also an amenity that is well used by local people and horse riders. The paddocks provide local equestrian facilities – could these be developed?
- Y We are a countryside village and British farms are of utmost importance to the economy.
- Y Why would we want all of the farming to go? We will end up a concrete jungle, let Haversham keep some of our green fields and cattle.
- DK I don't know enough to answer yes or no. While it's important to preserve the open landscape and village setting, one cannot protect farming unless it is economically viable.
- Y support local
- Y farming important to community and provides protected green space

- Y but maybe a bit could be used for housing in small pockets
- DK It is important that farmers provide the livestock and food grains to the country but where any land is surplus or not used properly, perhaps these could be sensitively used for housing e.g infills.
- Y Farming land is very important for all our community. It is very important to me as it is one of the main reasons we moved to a rural location away from a concrete and brick jungle.
- Y Farming not only provides a valuable food source it also enhances the community - employment, May Day festival.
- Y We should support our farmers more.
- Y Having enjoyed the real peace, beauty and walking facilities for 48 years we want to continue
- Y We seem to be losing our farms at an alarming rate nationally. Land – and its food potential is our only real asset
- Y Why would you live in this Parish otherwise?
- N Most of it is flood plain and is protected anyway!
- Y Once lost, lost forever
- N Farms are a business not a museum. Government/DEFRA Planning Policy actively encourage farm diversification. It is not the role of the Local Plan to protect agricultural land
- N Farms are businesses as per DEFRA/Government planning policy should actively be encouraged to diversify. A Local Plan should not have a role in protecting agricultural land. Old farm buildings should be considered for housing
- Y I am against major development on existing farmland. The Neighbourhood Plan is good but, this aside, I am opposed to development in the 'Northern Expansion Area'
- Y The rural landscape and land for agriculture must be retained. I am opposed to any idea of developing the 'Northern Expansion Area'
- Y We live here because it is a rural community. Without our farmland we would be just part of the MK sprawl
- N Some farmland may not be so easy to cultivate and may be able to be used in another way.
- Y We would like to continue living in a village surrounded by a rural area and for it not to become engulfed by a new estate, therefore losing its rural identity. We also need to retain our agriculture for the community's benefit.
- Y We would like to continue living in a village surrounded by a rural area and for it not to become engulfed by a new estate, therefore losing its rural identity. We also need to retain our agriculture for the community's benefit.
- Y Large parts of MK have been built on, let's not ruin a peaceful village by adding houses/flats that will take over our farms.
- Y Very important. We feel it's important to maintain a feel of village life and the countryside rather than be subsumed into an urban conurbation. The environment we live in is an important part of our heritage which must be maintained for future generations.
- Y Very important. We feel it's important to maintain a feel of village life and the countryside rather than be subsumed into an urban conurbation. The environment we live in is an important part of our heritage which must be maintained for future generations.
- Y Part of landscape of this parish is farmland. Expansion of large areas of housing, merging into MK city will completely change the landscape.
- Y Livestock and arable farming will be increasingly important as we move out of the EU. Home produced products will be critical.
- Y Stop large developments. Stop developers making fortunes out of poorly built ugly houses!!!
- Y Farmland more important to village than 100s of ugly houses.
- Y UK nearly starved 3 times in last 100 years. We need to be more self-sufficient and we need land so that planting/animal care can be a 'tap'. No land - no food.
- Y Farmland in this country is fast disappearing and should be preserved wherever possible. Not only is this an environmentally responsible attitude but also preserves the visual benefits. We all enjoy having these land areas so close to where we live.
- Y It will retain the feel of the villages and surrounding community.

- Y Changing this would change the character of the village. Any housing development would need to be on a small scale.
- Y I moved to the village 29 years ago because looking out of 3 bedrooms you could see the agricultural fields and wildlife.
- DK We need farming communities but we also need housing.
- *N As the population grows we have got to accept that people need somewhere to live. I see it that it is of greater importance to subscribe to this fact. We cannot keep saying we agree -but not here in our parish!
- Y It is and should remain a rural community.
- Y It's a rural community - people choose to live and work here because it is not a suburb or overdeveloped.
- Y In order to protect our countryside from development.
- Y The less housing growth, the better.

Question 17

Working life:

Do you think that the Neighbourhood Plan should seek to encourage new enterprises into the community with new small business units?

Do you have any comments that support your view?

[Written responses to the 'any comments' question are recorded with abbreviations of the respective tick box 'should seek to encourage' answer. Y = Yes, N = No, DK = Don't know, NA = not answered.]

- N: Village not suitable for small business units
- N: Not in keeping with the village
- N: New businesses bring more heavy traffic
- N: Don't see it helping – keep Haversham as the community it currently is. Central MK more
- DK: I do not see the Parish as a major employment area and think the small number of units we have is probably sufficient
- N: We are close to much more suitable locations
- N not multiple, just a local store.
- N New businesses would result in extra traffic e.g. lorries and vans etc.
- N Should allow for mixed use without seeking to encourage it. Business will go where it will, the best that the Neighbourhood Plan can do is not discourage it.
- N No place for this type of development.
- Y I want to start my own small business and that would make it possible as long as it was small and affordable with a kitchen and toilet.
- Y Local businesses to supply work for new home owners to reduce journeys/traffic.
- Y More people are working from home. This should be encouraged. Also use of units in redundant farm buildings.
- Y It is important to create a community and encouraging new facilities and opportunities can keep an area vibrant.
- N It creates far too much heavy haulage vehicles on our currently busy village roads.
- N Business units at Haversham and nearby villages are already bringing too much heavy traffic for our local roads to cope with.
- Y Increased opportunities for working within the village needed.
- N This would have an adverse effect on traffic.
- DN If business units can support businesses that promote the wider aims of the community then yes but I am not sure we just need more generic units. MK has plenty of these.
- The current roads are not coping with the commuters through to Hanslope Park Foreign Office nor through to the increasing development in Northampton. Once that is tackled your proposal may be considered.
- Y I have worked in a rural setting & it's very relaxing. With the stresses of modern life we should do what we can to reduce stress.
- Y Yes, Plan:MK actively wants local farm shop to be built. We should try & make this happen.
- N More traffic.
- Y It would help new start-ups or people who work online from home.
- N Factory units not required – increased traffic and noise
- N This is a village next to a city!
- N There are plenty of small units (empty) in MK
- Y It will help breathe some life into this stagnant retirement estate and wake it up
- Y Small business units could support the local community and keep families in the local community by being able to work nearby
- Y Encourage local employment (cut down our need for transport). Support small enterprise. Community involvement. Job creation

- Y Local shops such as bakery/butchers to allow locals to shop in the area, in particular elderly residents, then won't have to travel for goods
- DK The only viable area for small business units is on Manor Farm
- Y Small low cost units should be available – such as Manor Farm that would be available to community
- Y Keep village communities alive by using/employing local people in them
- Y Depending on nature of business
- Y Café, small shop, hairdressers etc.
- N – Definitely not.
- N – It will spoil the village.
- Y – Inclusion of small workshops for artists and crafts people would bring some employment and visitors and would be fitting for the area. Add coffee shop / tea rooms and would also become a community meeting place.
- Y – I would like a shop.
- Y – It would be nice to have something like a small shop for essentials.
- Y – This will help create employment in the community.
- Y – Promotes community relations.
- N – Not a business unit area.
- N – We don't want to become part of any town.
- DK – Depends where.
- DK – Where?
- N – It would change the feel of Haversham.
- Y – Anything that brings some investment and life to the community should be welcomed (within reason!).
- N – The village doesn't really need additional business other than amenities. Wolverton is going through a vast re-development and smaller businesses should be pointed there to make it a success.
- N – Would not be in keeping and only add traffic and required improved infrastructure missing.
- Y – Post office, shop
- Y – Independent shops would be a nice addition if traffic is contained / controlled
- Y- It broadens the appeal of the parish and introduces interest
- Y – encouraging sustainability of our community for the future by encouraging new business into the area
- Y – I want a corner shop
- Y – already exists on a small scale
- Y – conditional on the fact that they would seek to employ local people as far as possible & that they would not be those requiring frequent transport visits thereby worsening our traffic problem
- DK – we already have some small business units, Crossroads farm, Field house farm (the old dairy). Hall farm barns at Little Linford were supposed to be changed to small business units by the new owners but are now a dwelling
- N- keep industrial areas out as they are ugly and attract crime
- N – plenty of small units in existence already under utilised
- N – it's not an industrial or business area and there are plenty of small business areas already in north Milton Keynes
- N – they would spoil the landscape – people move to villages to get away from that kind of development on their doorstep like the rest of MK
- Y – local trade improves community feel
- Y – if the area is going to be developed some cafes, shops, butchers etc. would / could maintain village feel. (Olney / Stony feel)
- N – this is a residential and natural environment, ill-suited to modern business consumption or metropolitan lifestyle
- N – I can't be sure but I assume premises are available in the area already. MK / old Wolverton etc.

- Y – MK has been successful in the past in developing integrated residential & industrial communities. This could continue but businesses would need to be small as transport links are insufficient to sustain large businesses
- DK – Pineham farm development has created (our estimate) 250 vehicle movements a day. That's a lot of extra traffic
- DK – the units at Pineham farm have a huge number of cars & lorries etc. visit each day – far more than we expected
- N – I think large warehouses would spoil our environment.
- Y – Additional enterprises are needed to support the village, i.e. local shop
- N – Not appropriate
- N – MK is 10 minutes away, Newport is 5 mins away, Wolverton is 5 mins away, plenty of scope for business
- Y – Within existing facilities like multiple use of farm yards
- Y – Local jobs, don't just want areas for housing
- Y It will bring jobs and money into Haversham.
- Y Small artisan / craft workshops.
- N Quite a few already.
- Y SME's are vital to our economy and should be encouraged.
- N Only small scale units e.g. work - live studios.
- Y Add variety to the village. Might discourage people from running businesses e.g. vehicle repair from their houses and taking up precious parking spaces.
- Y I think if there is a demand for them, they should be included.
- Y It's important to ensure the future of the village and having businesses based in the village will remove the 'dormitory village' feel.
- Y to provide jobs so you don't need to travel so far for work – bring back the shop and post office.
- DK If done well it could be successful and beneficial to all but it has a high risk of negative impact to the local area.
- N There are enough business estates nearby!
- N It would increase traffic
- DK. Not necessarily 'industrial units' but perhaps small office places in 'houses' i.e. not looking like an office but looking like a house so that it blends in with the surrounding properties.
- Y. This should be limited but considered. We are in good reach of Wolverton Station so this could attract new people to the village.
- Y. Will bring jobs, but should be small scale only (e.g. farm business centres).
- N. The amount of traffic is the problem that this would bring especially to the village
- Y. Although I feel that some small community amenities would be greatly welcomed such as a small shop or post office, I would oppose larger chains or too many businesses to avoid any excess in traffic.
- N. Roads do not support such enterprises
- DK. Any new developments must blend in with the environment
- N. Causes increase in traffic
- Y. Use farms like has already been done at Pineham Farm. Small diversification.
- Y. Some of the farms have developed 'mini industrial estates' More employment prospects required in rural areas with enhanced IT capabilities.
- Y. Not sure how this would fit in – it would need to be very low key and not harmful to the landscape or biodiversity.
- N. I would like to see those enterprises that actually benefit the community i.e. a shop, not those which only generate additional traffic
- N. Traffic issues
- Y. We have a lack of manufacturing industries, especially small scale craft businesses. People are seduced by pictures of mass produced cheap items on line. Would be helpful to nurture and support relevant traditional skills so these don't disappear.

- Y. brings local employment and helps farms diversify to survive and keep farming and to maintain farming landscape and way of life
- Y provide local work
- Y Give people a chance to start their own business
- N. Existing demand is low provided within local areas already i.e. old Wolverton industrial estate. MK is within 5 miles which provides all commercial requirements.
- N. It is a village – not a town. MK centre is 5 mins away with plenty of areas and empty standing buildings to accommodate new businesses
- N. Milton Keynes has plenty of them empty so no.
- N. Haversham is residential – business units would affect the overall demeanor
- Y. Small, easy to rent spaces might encourage small spaces which will increase local prosperity
- DK. Depends on how disruptive this would be
- N. There is plenty of space in Milton Keynes which is close and has better facilities and transport connections for business
- Y. Small businesses located in unused farm buildings would be ideal depending on amount and size of vehicular traffic incurred.
- Y. More and more people are working from home
- N. To keep village residential
- [NA] Its mostly residential
- Y Again, as part of supporting farmers diversification I think it is necessary to allow conversion of farm buildings/building of sympathetic units. Lodge Farm seems to be a good example of this. I do not think it appropriate for industry (even light industry) to be attached directly to areas of housing. It will absolutely necessary to manage traffic created as a consequence of new enterprises.
- N New business brings more traffic e.g. extra refuse.
- N This is a village. Not suitable for any industrial estates. Cannot get out of my road as it is!
- DK It would depend where these are. A few units on the edge of a farm are different to 30 units elsewhere. The traffic levels may need to be considered, esp deliveries etc.
- Y It's always good to help new small businesses, for them and the customers.
- N Build small business units somewhere else. Leave Haversham and Little Linford alone.
- N I think this should be mainly residential. There is enough industry including small ones in the area.
- N This is a rural, residential area and hopefully will remain that way.
- Y It will help bring jobs to locals and also money into the area. This will help things like a local shop
- N There are plenty of business premises available throughout Milton Keynes
- N Please don't spoil Haversham and make it a commercial busy town. It is unique and special and a wonderful community. There is plenty of scope elsewhere in MK.
- N It would make more traffic and possible pollution
- N There are employment land allocations within nearby Milton Keynes
- Y Things like artisan bakers or such like would do well
- N I do not think we need small business units in our villages
- DK I feel once you let one of two businesses in it would set a precedence for further businesses to follow and that could be a disaster.
- N This would change the village. Wolverton provides these already
- N Businesses bring more traffic and larger HGV's. The main Wolverton Road is not suitable for this traffic
- Y Yes. I want Haversham to develop a distinct identity and places where people can work or meet up that are local will both enhance the community and reduce traffic
- Y Redundant farm buildings are ideal for small business units and are positively encouraged by MK local plan re farm diversification to help farms remain viable economically and to offer work locally.
- N Don't need business units, there are plenty nearby.
- Y Small businesses in unused farm buildings, subject to size of vehicle traffic.

- Y Avoid industrial style units, however buildings sympathetic to existing characteristics could provide a means of encouraging enterprises which could change the community.
- Y The buildings that exist on Randall's farm un-used. Good to offer a mix of uses in Haversham – just like a traditional village. Gives locals a chance to develop ideas & wealth for community.
- Small cottage industry.
- N There are other farms around the Parish which provide units e.g. Pineham Farm and already at Randall's Farm.
- N There are many empty warehouses in MK that could be used.
- N Many small companies run from homes in the village already.
- N Traffic issues.
- DN It would depend on the types of businesses - a small shop would be beneficial.
- Y No objection to small-scale business opportunities (media – creative – office – homebased businesses needing offices) but not warehousing - distribution bringing high levels of increased traffic. Welcome employment opportunities.
- N Suppose it depends, a small shop or quaint business - good - but offices not good.
- Y Would love a workshop in the village for my crafts.
- Y New enterprises could provide local jobs for local people or if units were available local residents may work to set up their own business.
- Y Depending on size of the unit.
- Y A corner shop.
- Y I think it is important to encourage business into the area, but building small business units would have to be done sympathetically and not stand out like a sore thumb.
- N What is the desire? Milton Keynes is filled with empty office space! In time these will become derelict I'm sure!
- Y We need something to bring the community together more often – so people can network and feel valued.
- Y Provided they are environmentally friendly.
- Y To support local enterprises and create jobs for our young and semi –retired.
- DK ?
- N Haversham is a semi-rural retreat from the industrial life most of us have led. Perhaps a local garage or shop might be our limit
- N You would have more traffic and use the local land for building these units
- N Not suitable for small village
- N We already have small business units in the locality and more would mean more traffic coming through Haversham and we have too much now
- N Already contributing to heavy traffic
- N I have no objection to small business units per se but there are many which are un-used and under-used in the area which become waste and wasted ground. In the long term, no
- Y The plan must follow NPPF (para 28) policies for farm diversification, to improve rural economic growth and jobs in the local area
- Y Small business units should be encouraged in the village to help keep the community together and provide local jobs
- N We should remain residential. There are many other places (e.g. Kiln Farm) to use
- N What the Neighbourhood Plan might include is homes that have a work space too i.e. 'office' for people to work, that might double up as another 'useful space'. This area is not for industrial units
- N Although I think we could cope with some extra traffic due to housing development, I am not sure that would be the case with added businesses. MK is such a short distance and has ample provision
- N Possibly more traffic and lorries would be involved on the already busy parish roads.
- Y Post office/bank/shop
- Y Low cost business premises, starter business.
- Y Important to provide wider opportunities for employment-not just the city centre (with its parking issues). Also part-time workers and home workers.

- Y Important to provide wider opportunities for employment-not just the city centre (with its parking issues). Also part-time workers and home workers.
- N Keep industry in industrial areas ie Old Wolverton.
- DK Lots of empty units in CMK. Rates too high for modest enterprises. Rates should be based on profits. Lots of people use their houses for this reason.
- Y We live on business park which is a development of rural land. An alternative to farming.
- Y We live on a farm immediately next to a small business park and we coexist with the farm and businesses in a harmonious manner. It works as long as the developments are sensitive and businesses involved have longevity.
- Y Good idea if small scale, especially if new businesses gave part-time employment opportunities' to residents
- N I don't think this mix of use is suitable for residential villages.
- N Not keen for lots of new businesses. Increased traffic from school expansion, any new development in the village (and surrounding villages) will already increase traffic.
- N Traffic flow through the village at peak times is difficult at the best of times, as it is used as a rat run to avoid other routes.
- DK Dependent on the business!
- Y The UK is built not on conglomerates but small companies employing 6 or 10 or 20 persons! This is the strength of the UK.
- N This is easily accommodated nearby - lots of units in MK, New Bradwell, Stony Stratford etc.
- N Can't see need for this in a housing area - happy to be persuaded if it has other benefits.
- DK It would depend on the location.
- Y I feel that private enterprise should be encouraged to support an individual's independence.
- N MK is 10 minutes away and has alone could want or need.

Question 18

Other issues:

Are there any other local planning issues or anything else that you think the plan should tackle?

- We are unique in MK. Keep it that way.
- Morning and evening traffic so bad
- Plan should be driven by finding suitable locations for development and not driven by developers or self-interested landowners
- It is vital that the Parish keeps control of any development to ensure it meets our needs. Large developers who are only interested in profit are NOT WANTED HERE
- Resurfacing of footpaths in particular Brookfield Road
- More frequent hedge trimming along footpaths. More no dogs signs along footpaths and recreation field behind the school. Also the paths behind the Crescent to the bus stop.
- I'm not convinced that the rat run through the villages is being managed effectively. But this appears to be a regional issue.
- Next time permission is given for housing or school expansion – FIRSTLY planners need to look at the infrastructure - roads, parking etc – as not sufficient thought given to this and it will be bedlam when the school re-opens in Sept '18.
- If permission given to any new build or school expansion – need to invest in infrastructure as this has NOT happened with the expansion of the village school. Road to school and Wolverton Rd will be gridlocked in September '18.
- Definitely improving every aspect of walking to school, crossing roads with children.
- The proposal to build large numbers of houses in the parish and servicing the traffic with roads over the flood plain should be fought at all costs. The linear park along the River Ouse should be protected vehemently.
- Broadband and internet communications is a vital issue in the village. Speeds are low and service intermittent. The PC should champion a project to get fibreoptic connectivity to all the parish.
- 1. Possibility of mains drainage. 2 Mains gas.
- Primarily traffic!!
- Overcrowding for profit.
- Traffic particularly in the old village is a great cause for concern. Lack of mains drainage adequate pavements on both sides of the road.
- To restrict the passage of heavy vehicles through the village.
- Traffic management both quantity and speed through all parts of the village.
- Speeding through the village
- You should consider the fact that 491 new houses are currently in planning in Hanslope. Potentially 1000 cars with a large percentage going through Haversham to get to MK – so you need to look at what is happening in neighbouring parishes to see how it will affect us.
- Broadband speed is so bad. Nature reserve for the area.
- Mainly parking around the school area.
- Mainly parking around the school area.
- Repairing roads and pavements throughout Parish
- Valuing village life and quality of life ahead of money and turning to town life
- Keep us a village – we do not want to be a town or joint to an already existing town
- I don't think we should pay any attention to anyone over 60 as it was the old farts that screwed us on Brexit (Recorder's note: age range ticked was 45-64)
- Tree planting and green open spaces to enhance any new builds. Builders should be forbidden to build on flood plains or near nature reserves
- Wolverton Road – traffic calming and crossing. The Haversham Village School is more than doubling in size – we need a safe place (or 2) to cross and a 20mph zone (which means drivers should actually be under 30mph through the village!)

- Traffic speed needs to be seriously addressed
- 1. Traffic calming to reduce speeding through narrow High Street – which has no traffic calming unlike upper Haversham. 2. Improve drainage to reduce flooding and cesspit problems in lower village. 3. Ensure planners control number and style of houses not the developers
- Cycling access along Wolverton Road
- New housing ruins the landscape and animals.
- Just don't make anything worse!
- The case for a wind farm (or solar farm) should be re-examined, as renewable energy is the new way to generate mass power.
- Use of renewable energy sources - if the size of our community is going to increase there should be some use of renewable energy sources for power.
- Traffic racing through villages (installation of speed cameras and speed monitors).
- New social and community centre.
- We are very concerned about the traffic on Little Linford lane. We have young children and are quite frightened by the speed at which cars travel down the road and the weight of the traffic during rush hours. We have already made our own representations to the council as to why a 30/40mph limit should be introduced and await response.
- Sustainability. All new homes to be of the highest standards, with power generation, power recovery and electric vehicle charging.
- Bring the discussion of windmills back
- Very few bins in Haversham – need more
- As previously stated this questionnaire has ducked the question of where new development should be located. It's something that all parishioners should have a say in. how are you going to recover this omission?
- Thinking about planning for energy for the future – consider renewable energy sources – e.g. wind turbines
- Maintenance of side roads
- Prevent 100's of houses being built in the surrounding fields
- Is this a plan to ease us into accepting a huge housing development or a proper stand against greedy farmers who have sold out
- It should strive to maintain the identity of the old village. It should review the current housing stock & endeavour to create a more diverse one. It should provide a robust defence of our 'ruralness'
- Traffic. The parking of cars on the grass verges in the top village
- Just the traffic load
- Any future large development would destroy the community feeling forever
- The unauthorised use of non-public footpaths. Dog fouling the roads and paths
- The main development of MK must be highlighted to remain within its natural boundary, The parish cannot continue to say no to all development, change is inevitable & should be managed
- Apologies – I love our village the way it is. I do understand the importance of housing & business, but fear that whatever happens no matter how much our LNP gives us control we will have to leave Haversham
- Mains drainage for the village could be tackled
- It would have been great to have the windfarm - maybe solar panel farming could be an idea.
- A safe route for cyclists to connect MK's red way system rather than running the gauntlet of the high traffic levels on the road
- Q 19 why split the village into two areas addresses are Haversham only. Perhaps building houses to join the two would stop this so called divide
- Through traffic. Bus timetable.
- Restriction HGV on roads to prevent the wearing out of roads.
- Parking. Restriction of HGV's. Smoother roads to promote local cycling. LED street lighting. More accessible allotments. Allowing smarter developments i.e. loft extensions, basements etc. Flood prevention.
- Roadside parking

- Any development should ensure fully adequate parking spaces and not 'minimum' per household.
- While I understand our population is growing and housing is needed to tackle this issue, our countryside needs to be saved not destroyed.
- I feel that the most important aspect here is to preserve the rural countryside that surrounds the village whilst providing a healthy and nature oriented style of living for young families. The inclusion of protected natural areas, nature reserves and nature education centres would aid this and should be included in the plans.
- Perhaps a pedestrian crossing between the roundabouts in Haversham on Wolverton Rd.
- No local post office – Wolverton closed down. Castlethorpe and Stony Stratford are the nearest. Haversham closed down years ago.
- Our main problem is the need for affordable housing. More barn conversions and more executive rural homes is NOT the answer. We should not building houses to increase peoples' portfolios.
- I think that filling in some of the gap between the two very separate parts of the village may help to connect the community more effectively than is currently the case.
- My main issue is the dramatic increase in traffic, with an increase in pollution, noise. The roads are designed as rural roads and can't cope as they are currently used. Any additional population equals an even greater increase to an already out of control situation.
- Traffic calming on the Wolverton Road
- Stop building in our countryside
- Traffic management should include a zebra crossing at Wolverton Rd
- The waste recycling plant at Old Wolverton needs to be monitored more closely because of noise/pollution levels
- Milton Keynes council manage their housing waiting list in a slow and unusual manner. This needs efficient management.
- Obviously we are biased – I need to include a priority to maintain as much farmland as possible otherwise greedy developers[will] land bank and make it impossible for farmers to buy farmland in area
- Priority for local people particularly young and old with local links
- The corner by Greyhound with tall hedges
- M1 junction proposal between 14 and 15, restricting access maintained through Haversham i.e. no lorries/HGV as existing with consideration for all other local communities.
- Traffic is a big concern
- Traffic Calming
- Can we consider a bi-pass
- Improved bus services and fibre optic to the village
- Use of our village roads for through commuting traffic
- No
- Parked cars!
- All local planning should be very much focused on the needs of the many (infrastructure/schools/housing) this will be especially the case when (not if) the community expands to meet the housing need. We need to be looking at local facilities such as Doctors surgery and local shop for example.
- Please can we have some sort of mechanism to make crossing the road to school safer. It's such a busy road. Especially difficult for parents with buggies/prams and walking kids. My concerns for any future building is largely around transport/roads/pressure on facilities. There is a small unused plot of land in between houses in the old part of the village that has remained 'wild' for years.
- I understand that we have a shortage of housing but we also have a shortage of countryside. We need to save our countryside and support all out British Farmers.
- The grass areas in front of the houses in Wolverton Road, too many residents parking on it. This needs to be addressed
- There are no issues

- The plan must address density of new developments, and not allow “mass residential soul-less brick boxes” with tiny gardens
- Improvement in the bus service
- Roads on the estate are in need of resurfacing
- The speed in which commuter traffic flows on Wolverton Road towards New Bradwell and vice versa
- Haversham needs a number of small developments on multiple sites as in any other village to keep the pub and support a shop and people to run social centre, parish council, church etc. Every other village has grown with attractive small developments. Pretty with trees and gardens. Consider brown field sites and joining the two separate parts of our village. New houses mean new people and young people deserve houses they can afford. They should not hog the houses! Surely architects can design houses that are an attractive addition to our village.
- Traffic management.
- 1) Sort out drainage & flooding problems in old village. 2) Traffic calm to reduce vehicle speeds & discourage rat running through the village. 3) Scupper opportunities to access Gallagher development land to the NE. 4) Decide how many ‘houses’ we actually want – we need to be able to defend a number as reasonable - against developers.
- Traffic.
- Problems of flood plains and poor drainage.
- Traffic speed.
- Parking.
- Infrastructure.
- I’m concerned about the number of vehicles parked on roads rather than in driveways or garages and access for emergency vehicles.
- Be more considerate to planning law for people already living in the village.
- Parking along Manor Drive is a joke! Used by residents of Wolverton Road and provides no end of near miss accidents or having to reverse back into main road. This should be a no parking area!
- There isn’t a lot to do for youngsters. They need a separate community centre and a netball/basketball court. Skate board ramp has been a success! More amenities are needed.
- No.
- Zebra crossing to Wolverton Road!
- We need a crossing on the main road. It is not safe taking children to school
- Safe crossing (zebra) on Wolverton Road for school children
- For a suburban/semi-rural area street lighting is excessive. Consider turning (some) off at midnight or reduce power. Some animal life is badly affected – and it would be a rare treat to be able to show children the Milky Way
- Can’t think of any
- The use of old farm buildings for housing development. Consider the additional benefits of larger developments, keep the pub going, bring back shop, sports facilities and more (hopefully). Enthusiastic residents to keep the village a social and happy place to live
- Haversham needs to consider whether old farm buildings should be considered for housing developments/brown field sites. Larger developments should be appropriately designed for the good of the village to bring back shop/keep pub open and bring sporting facilities into village
- Better bus service
- The speed of the traffic needs to be addressed.
- Flood prevention and management as this is already an issue in Haversham which the council are not taking seriously. Restrict use of permitted development.
- Flood prevention and management as this is already an issue in Haversham which the council are not taking seriously. Restrict use of permitted development.
- Traffic!!! Parking!!!
- Speed camera.

- Encourage more brownfield development. Repair/rebuilding of existing settlements. Encourage people to build 'granny annexes' without punitive rates and CGT.
- Help prevent large developers influencing planning policy by acquiring local land. Development should be planned sympathetically and not just using available land.
- Increased traffic calming on Wolverton Road near Manor Drive and/or a pedestrian crossing. Speed bumps round Crescent.
- I think that if we see planning issues arise that we should consider talking with the client or applicant to discuss other ideas or usages that may help with ideas on land that may be used for other purposes - such as car parking.
- Traffic flows. The key issue to be that nobody is negatively affected by development.
- More support for the Parish Council and involvement of local people with local community activities.