



THE PARISH OF MURSLEY

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS REPORT

February 2019

Mike King
People and Places Insight Ltd
Mike.king@people-places.co.uk



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HOUSING

Future Housing

- ❖ The Parish was divided in terms of whether further housing was needed, 53% of respondents believed that the 'Parish requires more housing' with 47% stating no further housing is required.

Small Scale Development

- ❖ 30% of respondents felt that there was not a need for any more houses 'In the next 15-20 years' within the Parish whilst 47% stated up to 20 houses. Further substantiating these statistics when all respondents were asked their views on the size of any further housing developments over the next 20 years 91% of respondents either 'Disagreed' (16%) or 'Strongly Disagreed' (75%) with 'Developments of more than 20 houses'.
- ❖ 66% of respondents either 'Agreed' (47%) or 'Strongly Agreed' (19%) that they would support 'Housing development in the Parish over the next 20 years' on 'Brownfield sites'.
- ❖ When asked 'What type of housing would you like to see prioritised in any further developments in the Parish' 30% of respondents chose 'One/two/three bedroom houses' as their 'First Priority'.

Features of New Developments

- ❖ When asked 'If new properties are to be built in the Parish', 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (50%) or 'Agreed' (40%) that they should have 'Off road parking'.
- ❖ In terms of 'What features would you support for any new housing developments in the parish', 92% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (50%) or 'Agreed' (42%) with 'Tree planting'. 91 % of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (47%) or 'Agreed' (44%) with 'Shrubs and hedges'. 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (42%) or 'Agreed' (48%) with 'Green space required in plans' with the same number supporting 'pavements for pedestrians'.

PARISH IDENTITY

Protection of Parish Identity

- ❖ In terms of Parish Identity 98% of respondents stated, 'Protected open space and trees' was 'Very Important' (65%) or 'Important' (33%). 96% of respondents felt it was either 'Very Important' (54%) or 'Important' (42%) for there to be 'General upkeep of the village'. 95% of respondents felt a 'Quiet environment/rural atmosphere' were either 'Very Important' (66%) or 'Important' (29%). 94% of respondents highlighted that 'Easy access to the countryside' was either 'Very Important' (54%) or 'Important' (39%), 92% 'Village identity e.g. feeling part of a community' and 90% 'Local services/facilities (village hall, pub etc)'.
- ❖ In terms of development within the Parish 95% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (69%) or 'Agreed' (26%) to 'Protect Mursley's character e.g. varied historic buildings, rural feel'. 95% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (64%) or 'Agreed' (29%) to 'Protect open ('green') spaces and countryside'. 93% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (66%) or 'Agreed' (27%) to 'Protect environment (trees, wildlife etc.)'. 91% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (29%) to Control development to maintain Mursley's fundamental size and shape'
- ❖ When asked 'If new properties are to be built in the Parish', 82% of respondents felt that there should be 'Dwellings of appropriate size and character for neighbouring area'. ('Strongly Agree' 46%/ 'Agree' 36%)

CONSERVATION, ENVIRONMENT AND GREEN SPACES

Preservation and Protection of the Environment

- ❖ In terms of conservation 88% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (63%) or 'Agreed' (25%) with 'All proposed developments should be scrutinised to avoid any increase in air, light and noise pollution'. 87% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (57%) or 'Agreed' (30%) with 'Mature trees within and outside the conservation area should be protected'. 76% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'Surviving gardens/ green spaces within the conservation area should be protected from development' and the same figure 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'The conservation area should be extended to include some green space adjacent to the built village'. 72% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'The conservation area should be extended to include the Water Tower'.
- ❖ In terms of 'Which of the following ideas concerning wildlife habitats and corridors do you agree/disagree with', 94% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (56%) or 'Agreed' (38%) with 'Persuade farmers to manage hedgerows sympathetically for wildlife, including replanting grubbed-out hedges with typical local species'. 92% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (30%) with 'Protect and conserve all surviving wildlife-rich areas in the Parish'. 91% either 'Strongly Agreed' (68%) or 'Agreed' (23%) with 'Protect the Salden Woods area in the north of the parish from Milton Keynes expansion (Salden Chase proposals)', with the same number (91%) to 'Work with East-West Rail to achieve mitigation and enhancement projects as the mothballed rail track is re-opened'

Improvements to Footpaths

- ❖ When questioned on 'Which of the following ideas concerning paths and the countryside do you agree/disagree with?', 84% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (43%) or 'Agreed' (41%) with 'Improve footpath routes north of the village, avoiding the need to walk along the road'. 75% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (37%) or 'Agreed' (38%) with 'Improve access along all parish footpaths by replacing stiles with self-closing gates'.
- ❖ 72% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (20%) or 'Agreed' (52%) with 'Voluntary team(s) to manage verges, maintain footpaths, collect litter, etc'.
- ❖ Of the respondents to 'Do you believe there are problems with pavements in the Parish?' 53% either 'Strongly Agreed' (25%) or 'Agreed' (28%) with 'Not suitable for wheelchairs/pushchairs/wheeled walking aids'. 51% either 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'Lack of pavement' and 50% 'Poor state of repair' and 49% 'Narrowness'.

Sustainability

- ❖ 77% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (33%) or 'Agreed' (43%) with 'A community improvement fund from a tax levied on new developments' in terms of potential sustainability issues'.

TRANSPORT

Car Ownership and Use

- ❖ The majority of households (67%) owned 2 cars.
- ❖ 95% of respondents are 'Able to park all their vehicles on their property' and 62% of respondents believed that there is 'Sufficient public space near their property to safely park their vehicles'.
- ❖ 97% of respondents use their car to get 'To local services e.g. shops, 95% for 'Work' and 86% for Leisure.

- ❖ Of the respondents to 'Which of the following issues concerning traffic in the Parish do you agree/disagree with', 95% either 'Strongly Agreed' (78%) or 'Agreed' (17%) with 'Quality of road surface'. 92% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (64%) or 'Agreed' (28%) with 'Speeding vehicles' and 84% 'Volume of traffic too high' with specific reference made to Main Street in both.

Traffic Measures

- ❖ Of the respondents to 'Would you support any of the following measures to control traffic in the Parish', 80% either 'Strongly Agreed' (51%) or 'Agreed' (29%) with '20mph zones near the school'.

Lack of Public Transport Use

- ❖ 96% of respondents did not 'Use public transport from and to the Parish'.
- ❖ 84% of respondents would not like 'An additional bus stop'.

Public Car Parking Provision

- ❖ 58% of respondents 'Think more public car parking space should be made available'.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Access

- ❖ 97% of respondents stated that their home does have 'broadband access to the Internet'. 53% of these were 'Happy with the speed' of their home's broadband, with 47% stating they were not happy.
- ❖ 62% of respondents 'Would support installation of a mobile phone mast'.

Barriers

- ❖ Of the respondents to 'What are the current barriers to business development within the Parish', 71% either 'Strongly Agreed' (43%) or 'Agreed' (28%) with 'Access to adequate broadband/fibre' and the same number either 'Strongly Agreed' (37%) or 'Agreed' (34%) with 'Access to adequate mobile network'. Of the respondents who own a mobile phone, 63% were not happy with the 'Mobile phone signal throughout the Parish'.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Access to Other Locations

- ❖ When asked 'Do you drive to the community facilities/shops in any of the following locations on at least a fortnightly basis', 92% answered 'Milton Keynes', 69% 'Winslow' and 59% 'Swanbourne'.

Creative Use

- ❖ Of the respondents to 'Which of the following community facilities do you think the Parish should aspire to provide', 79% either 'Strongly Agreed' (26%) or 'Agreed' (53%) with Community facilities used more creativity, e.g. Church, Village Hall, Sports Hall'.

Increased Parking

- ❖ 76% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (33%) or 'Agreed' (43%) with 'Off road parking by sports field'.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Opportunities

- ❖ From those respondents who felt business development should be encouraged within the parish', 91% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (45%) or 'Agreed' (46%) with 'Pub/café/restaurant'. 89% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (43%) or 'Agreed' (46%) with 'Homeworking' and 82% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (31%) or 'Agreed' (51%) with 'Convenience store'.

BACKGROUND

People and Places Insight Ltd is an organization with the objective to help renew and regenerate localities from across United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland. The People and Places team have worked with National Government, Local Authorities, Town Councils, Business Improvement Districts, Neighbourhood Plan Steering Groups, Community and Town Partnerships, Universities and Retailers on a wide range of projects including;

- ❖ Benchmarking Town Centre Performance
- ❖ Business Improvement District Members Surveys
- ❖ Visitor Satisfaction Surveys
- ❖ Car Parking Strategies
- ❖ Feasibility Studies
- ❖ Business Support
- ❖ Signage Reviews
- ❖ Mystery Shopping
- ❖ Establishing Market Town Forums and Networks
- ❖ Neighbourhood Planning
- ❖ Partnership Development and Training

Mike King is the Director of People and Places Insight Ltd and offers 16 years' experience in research, planning and regeneration projects in both the public and private sector. Mike is a specialist in community consultation, framing research schedules, survey design, analysis and report writing using a combination of SNAP Survey Software, Survey Monkey and Microsoft Office Packages.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Mursley Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and People and Places Insight Limited conducted a two-pronged approach ensuring all residents had the opportunity to complete the survey in the manner which they preferred i.e. paper based and online. Steering Group Members hand delivered one survey per household, and as clearly outlined in the text on the survey and via verbal confirmation, any household member over the age of 16 could complete the survey. Additional surveys could be submitted via the use of an online link or requesting an additional hard copy.

The following report is based on the structure of the survey and the results are based on the **127** fully completed Surveys.

The **N** figure denotes the total number of respondents to each particular question. Commentary under each table refers to 'respondents', which means the respondents to that particular question not the overall survey respondents.

Where qualitative comments have been supplied they are included in the report verbatim so include spelling errors.

SECTION 1: ABOUT YOUR HOUSEHOLD

It would be useful to get some basic information about the people who live in Mursley Parish.

Q1.1. HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE CURRENT MAKEUP OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION ONLY)

	%
Male living alone	4
Female living alone	6
Couple (with no children)	20
Family with young children (pre-school or primary school age)	7
Family with older children	17
Family with grown up children living entirely at home	7
Family with grown up children living away	37
Prefer not to say	2
N=	125

37% of respondents described the current make-up of their household as 'Family with grown up children living away'.

Q1.2. HOW OLD ARE YOU? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION ONLY)

	%
16-20 years	1
21-35 years	6
36-50 years	12
51-65 years	44
66-70 years	18
71-75 years	6
76-80 years	5
More than 80 years old	6
Prefer not to say	3
N=	124

44% of respondents were aged between 51-65 years.

Q1.3. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT EMPLOYMENT SITUATION? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION ONLY)

	%
Full Time worker	39
Part Time worker	15
Temporary employment	1
Seasonal employment	0
Unemployed	0
Unable to work	1
Retired	37
Looking after the home/ Carer	2
Student	2
Prefer not to say	4
N=	124

39% of respondents indicated that they 'Owned (No Mortgage)' their property whilst 37% were 'Retired'.

Q1.4. HOW LONG HAVE YOU LIVED IN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION ONLY)

	%
Less than 1 year	1
1-5 years	19
6-10 years	15
11-25 years	36
More than 25 years	29
N=	124

36% of respondents had lived in the Parish for '11-25 years'.

SECTION 2: OUR VILLAGE

Our Neighbourhood Plan must reflect everyone's views, so we would like to understand your feelings on living in the Parish. Many residents say the Parish is a pleasant place to live, but we want to know what really matters to you and what level and type of development you would like to see.

Q2.1.1 WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ASPECTS OF THE PARISH ARE IMPORTANT TO YOU? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Very Important (%)	Important (%)	No Opinion (%)	Not Important (%)	Not at all Important (%)	N=
Views from or approaching the village	37	46	13	3	1	121
Listed buildings	28	48	20	4	0	121
Open countryside reaching close to the centre	48	40	7	2	3	121
Working farms surrounding the village	34	42	19	4	1	123
Church, cemetery, and their quality of upkeep	38	44	14	2	2	123
Protected open space and trees	65	33	1	1	0	122
Access to major road networks, railways and airports	16	46	20	15	3	119
Local services / facilities (village hall, pub etc.)	46	44	5	5	0	123
Locally available employment	10	30	32	20	8	122
Attractive mix of houses (thatched, timber framed, Georgian, Victorian, modern, etc.)	30	56	10	3	1	122
Village identity e.g. feeling part of a community	44	48	7	1	0	122
Village activities e.g. community groups	34	52	12	1	1	122
Quiet environment/ Rural atmosphere	66	29	4	1	0	123
Easy access to the countryside	55	39	4	2	0	122
General upkeep of the village	54	42	3	1	0	123
Family or friends nearby	21	44	22	10	3	121
Other	45	10	45	0	0	22

In terms of Parish Identity 98% of respondents stated, 'Protected open space and trees' was 'Very Important' (65%) or 'Important' (33%). 96% of respondents felt it was either 'Very Important' (54%) or 'Important' (42%) for there to be 'General upkeep of the village'. 95% of respondents felt a 'Quiet environment/rural atmosphere' were either 'Very Important' (66%) or 'Important' (29%). 94% of respondents highlighted that 'Easy access to the countryside' was either 'Very Important' (54%) or 'Important' (39%), 92% 'Village identity e.g. feeling part of a community' and 90% 'Local services/facilities (village hall, pub etc)'.

Q2.2. PLEASE TELL US WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS CONCERNING DEVELOPMENT IN THE PARISH YOU AGREE/ DISAGREE WITH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Control development to maintain Mursley's fundamental size and shape	62	29	2	7	0	121
Protect Mursley's 'character', e.g. varied historic buildings, 'rural' feel	69	26	4	0	1	122
Encourage appropriate development around the edge of the village and on farms in the Parish	11	39	9	21	20	121
Improve community facilities (e.g. school, leisure, health etc.)	22	50	22	3	3	119
Promote local businesses	15	40	37	5	3	120
Increase tourism	0	6	54	30	10	116
Protect open ('green') spaces and countryside	64	29	5	2	0	119
Protect environment (trees, wildlife etc.)	66	27	7	0	0	122
Provide off-road parking convenient for the school	25	33	38	2	2	120
Provide off-road parking close to the sports field	28	38	29	2	3	121
Address the issue of speeding vehicles	55	32	9	4	0	121
Address the issue of traffic congestion	49	22	22	6	1	121
Other	50	8	38	4	0	24

In terms of development within the Parish 95% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (69%) or 'Agreed' (26%) to 'Protect Mursley's character e.g. varied historic buildings, rural feel'. 95% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (64%) or 'Agreed' (29%) to 'Protect open ('green') spaces and countryside'. 93% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (66%) or 'Agreed' (27%) to 'Protect environment (trees, wildlife etc.)'. 91% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (29%) to 'Control development to maintain Mursley's fundamental size and shape'.

SECTION 3: HOUSING

We expect the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) will be adopted by AVDC before our Plan is finalised. It classifies Mursley as a 'small village' and therefore proposes no housing site allocations. However, its Policy D3 does support some small-scale development within the village boundary up to 2033. But, with the Government's Oxford – Cambridge Corridor initiative likely to take shape over the next couple of years, we expect AVDC will have to carry out an immediate review of its housing supply policies and its approach to rural development. It is therefore important that we seek your opinions on why, where and how we might plan for new homes in the village.

Q3.1. DO YOU BELIEVE THE PARISH REQUIRES MORE HOUSING?

	%
Yes	53
No	47
N=	121

53% of respondents believed that the 'Parish requires more housing' with 47% stating no further housing is required.

PLEASE NOTE: EVEN IF THE RESPONDENT DID NOT WANT TO SEE ANY FURTHER HOUSING DEVELOPMENT OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS, THEY WERE INSTRUCTED THAT THEIR VIEWS AND OPINIONS ON THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE IMPORTANT.

Q3.2. HOW MANY MORE HOUSES DO YOU THINK THE PARISH NEEDS IN THE NEXT 15-20 YEARS? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION ONLY)

	%
0	30
1-10 houses	19
11-20 houses	28
21-50 houses	17
51+ houses	6
N=	122

30% of respondents felt that there was not a need for any more houses 'In the next 15-20 years' within the Parish whilst 47% stated up to 20 houses.

Q3.3. WHAT ARE YOUR VIEWS ON THE SIZE OF ANY FURTHER HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PARISH OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Garden infill development	7	40	13	17	23	110
Infill, small plots of one or two houses	18	50	8	11	13	115
Small developments (5-10 house plots)	12	47	8	7	26	114
Medium developments (11-20 houses)	4	17	7	24	48	113
Developments of more than 20 houses	1	2	6	16	75	112

In terms of the size of any 'Further housing developments in the parish over the next 20 years', 91% of respondents either 'Disagreed' (16%) or 'Strongly Disagreed' (75%) with 'Developments of more than 20 houses'. 72% of respondents either 'Disagreed' (24%) or 'Strongly Disagreed' (48%) with 'Medium developments (11-20 houses)'.

Q3.4. WOULD YOU SUPPORT ANY OF THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE PARISH OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Backland developments (behind existing houses)	4	27	15	20	34	117
Linear developments (along existing roads)	11	38	12	12	27	113
Elsewhere in Parish (beyond existing village boundary)	9	21	18	19	33	108
Brownfield sites**	19	47	10	11	13	114
Greenfield sites***	3	13	7	18	59	114

77% of respondents either 'Disagreed' (18%) or 'Strongly Disagreed' (59%) with supporting 'Housing development in the Parish over the next 20 years' on 'Greenfield sites'.

66% of respondents either 'Agreed' (47%) or 'Strongly Agreed' (19%) that they would support 'Housing development in the Parish over the next 20 years' on 'Brownfield sites',

Q3.5. ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC LOCATIONS YOU THINK SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT?

47 qualitative comments were supplied when respondents were questioned on specific location which they felt should be considered for housing development. The most commonly referenced location was Cooks Lane with comments including;

- ❖ *Cooks Lane - Linear development opposite and level houses already on site*
- ❖ *Bucks CC owned fields along Cooks Lane*
- ❖ *Along Cooks Lane*
- ❖ *Cooks Lane and Station Road have sites more suitable*
- ❖ *Unused side of Cooks Lane but Halt sign would be needed by Manor Farm wall.*
- ❖ *Maybe the most obvious is the north (?) side of Cooks Lane*

**Q3.6. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING HOUSING TYPES WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE PRIORITISED IN ANY FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PARISH?
(PLEASE CHOOSE YOUR FIRST 3 PRIORITIES BY CHOOSING ONE BOX PER COLUMN)**

	Priority 1 (%)	Priority 2 (%)	Priority 3 (%)
Bungalows	13	9	8
One/Two/Three Bedroom Houses	30	16	8
Four/Five Bedroom Houses	7	7	8
Affordable homes for purchase	19	18	12
Affordable homes for renting	4	6	10
Self-Build Homes	2	5	5
Retirement properties (for over 55's)	8	16	11
Homes designed for disabled living	2	9	5
Eco friendly housing	11	9	10
Social housing through housing association	0	4	9
Sheltered housing for the elderly (a group with a warden)	3	4	14
N=	98	101	105

When asked 'What type of housing would you like to see prioritised in any further developments in the Parish' 30% of respondents chose 'One/two/three bedroom houses' as their 'First Priority'.

Q3.7. IF NEW PROPERTIES ARE TO BE BUILT IN THE PARISH, WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING WOULD YOU SUPPORT? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Dwellings of appropriate size and character for neighbouring area	46	36	11	4	3	116
Low Energy considerations	25	48	23	2	4	114
Unobtrusive solar panels	27	40	25	3	5	113
Off road parking	50	40	7	1	2	116
Public access to potential building sites being considered by AVDC	11	19	54	6	10	108
Developer contributions to the village infrastructure	37	32	12	6	13	114
Right to build register*	9	25	46	6	14	110
Development kept within the existing 'red line' settlement boundary **	42	26	14	8	10	112
Other	46	8	38	0	8	13

When asked 'If new properties are to be built in the Parish', 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (50%) or 'Agreed' (40%) that they should have 'Off road parking' and 82% that there should be 'Dwellings of appropriate size and character for neighbouring area'. ('Strongly Agree' 46%/ 'Agree' 36%)

Q3.8. WHAT FEATURES WOULD YOU SUPPORT FOR ANY NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Mixed property types	34	44	11	5	7	110
Green space required in plans	42	48	5	3	2	113
Green areas for wildlife	45	33	19	3	1	113
Tree planting	50	42	7	0	1	114
Shrubs and hedges	47	44	9	0	1	114
Brick wall boundaries	13	20	48	11	8	109
Dedicated cycle paths	18	33	36	6	6	110
Hedge-planting	41	45	12	1	1	113
Height restrictions for hedges and fences within the village	28	41	23	5	3	112
Pavements for pedestrians	46	44	7	1	3	114
Developments to incorporate pathways to enable walking through, where possible	35	50	10	4	3	113
Other	43	14	36	0	7	114

In terms of 'What features would you support for any new housing developments in the parish', 92% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (50%) or 'Agreed' (42%) with 'Tree planting'. 91 % of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (47%) or 'Agreed' (44%) with 'Shrubs and hedges'. 90% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (42%) or 'Agreed' (48%) with 'Green space required in plans' with the same number supporting 'pavements for pedestrians'.

SECTION 4: BUSINESS

We would like your views on existing businesses, and the possible development of future businesses in the Parish. For example, these might be in connection with local agriculture, or more retail outlets. We would also like your views about encouraging home-working and new businesses.

Q4.1. DO YOU CURRENTLY OWN YOUR OWN BUSINESS/ BUSINESSES?

	%
Yes	23
No	77
N=	115

77% of respondents stated that they do not 'own their own business/businesses'.

Q4.2. FROM WHERE DO YOU OPERATE YOUR BUSINESS/ BUSINESSES? (PLEASE CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY)

	%
Home	69
Other premises in the Parish	0
Other premises outside the Parish	31
N=	26

From the 23% of respondents who do own their own business/businesses, 69% operate from 'Home'.

Q4.3. DO YOU THINK BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED WITHIN THE PARISH?

	%
Yes	69
No	31
N=	111

69% of respondents stated that 'business development should be encouraged within the parish'.

Q4.4. WHAT SORT OF BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT DO YOU THINK SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED WITHIN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Homeworking	43	46	11	0	0	81
Tourism and Leisure	8	27	52	10	3	77
Office Based Business	9	38	33	17	3	78
Retail	4	28	38	22	8	74
Small Scale Industry	5	22	25	29	18	76
Agricultural/ Food Production	19	42	26	8	5	78
Service Trades E.g. Plumbers, Electricians	21	50	24	5	0	78
Post Office	30	49	16	5	0	80
Convenience Store	31	51	12	2	4	83
Pub/ Cafe/ Restaurant	45	46	8	1	0	80
Online/ Web Based	29	39	29	4	0	70

From those respondents who felt business development should be encouraged within the parish', 91% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (45%) or 'Agreed' (46%) with 'Pub/café/restaurant'. 89% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (43%) or 'Agreed' (46%) with 'Homeworking' and 82% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (31%) or 'Agreed' (51%) with 'Convenience store'.

Q4.5. WHAT ARE THE CURRENT BARRIERS TO BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Traffic Flow (congestion)	26	21	33	15	5	80
Parking	34	32	23	6	5	79
Transport Links	11	36	33	17	4	76
Suitable Business Premises	16	50	29	4	1	80
Access to adequate broadband /fibre	43	28	24	5	0	79
Access to adequate mobile network	37	34	23	6	0	79
Planning restrictions	11	16	67	7	0	75
Other	10	0	90	0	0	10

Of the respondents to 'What are the current barriers to business development within the Parish', 71% either 'Strongly Agreed' (43%) or 'Agreed' (28%) with 'Access to adequate broadband/fibre' and the same number either 'Strongly Agreed' (37%) or 'Agreed' (34%) with 'Access to adequate mobile network'.

SECTION 5: CONSERVATION

Although not in the realm of the Neighbourhood Plan, we are interested in understanding what features of the village and surrounding countryside should be protected from development, positively conserved and enhanced and how should this be done.

The Mursley Conservation Area was designated in 1991 to recognise the area of the village with special historic or architectural character where features should be protected, and any further development strictly controlled.

Q5.1. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS CONCERNING CONSERVATION DO YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
The existing village conservation area is correctly drawn.	17	24	33	21	5	112
The conservation area should be extended to include the Water Tower.	39	33	15	9	4	117
The conservation area should be extended to include some green space adjacent to the built village.	44	32	13	9	2	116
Surviving gardens/green spaces within the conservation area should be protected from development.	55	21	13	10	0	119
Mature trees within and outside the conservation area should be protected.	57	30	8	5	0	117
All proposed developments should be scrutinised to avoid any increase in air, light and noise pollution.	63	25	11	2	0	113

In terms of 'Which of the following statements concerning conservation do you agree/disagree with' 88% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (63%) or 'Agreed' (25%) with 'All proposed developments should be scrutinised to avoid any increase in air, light and noise pollution'. 87% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (57%) or 'Agreed' (30%) with 'Mature trees within and outside the conservation area should be protected'. 76% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'Surviving gardens/green spaces within the conservation area should be protected from development' and the same figure 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'The conservation area should be extended to include some green space adjacent to the built village'. 72% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'The conservation area should be extended to include the Water Tower'.

Q5.2. ARE THERE ANY OTHER NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS IN THE PARISH THAT SHOULD BE PROTECTED/CONSERVED?

25 qualitative comments were provided. Specific reference was made to the 'Ridge and Furrow Fields';

- ❖ *All green open spaces, ridge and furrow by the water tower on Whaddon Road*
- ❖ *Ridge and furrow field near water tower*
- ❖ *Ridge and furrow fields like the Whaddon Road field which has been proposed for large scale housing development*
- ❖ *The ridge and furrow fields in particular the Whaddon Road Field which has had provisional plans for a large scale Housing estate for the future*
- ❖ *land with ridge and furrow lying between tower and the village centre to conserve views in and out of conservation area*
- ❖ *Ridge and furrow between the lane and water tower, church hill lane and salden lake*

SECTION 6: GREEN SPACES & ENVIRONMENT

The location of Mursley village within a very rural parish should give residents easy access to countryside for exercise, enjoyment and improved wellbeing. We are interested in how access to green spaces within the village and surrounding area can be improved.

Q6.1. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IDEAS CONCERNING GREEN SPACE FOR EXERCISE AND ENJOYMENT DO YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
More publicly-accessible open space	22	35	30	10	3	120
An alternative arrangement for a village green	18	23	42	11	7	119
Community orchard/wildlife meadow with paths and seating	31	35	28	5	1	120
Allotments	20	36	34	7	3	117
Young people's recreational activities (i.e. skateboarding)	13	25	34	16	12	119
Wild flower patches in suitable areas, e.g. the churchyard, village green and selected verges	34	46	13	7	0	121

In regard to ideas concerning green space for exercise and enjoyment, 80% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (34%) or 'Agreed' (46%) with 'Wild flower patches in suitable areas, e.g. the churchyard, village green and selected verges'

Q6.2. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IDEAS CONCERNING PATHS AND THE COUNTRYSIDE DO YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Develop a further short footpath circuit to the east of the village	24	46	21	5	3	119
Improve footpath routes north of the village, avoiding the need to walk along the road	43	41	12	2	3	119
Improve off-road links to National Cycle Network Route 51 that runs north of the village	31	33	31	3	2	118
Improve access along all parish footpaths by replacing stiles with self-closing gates	37	38	19	4	2	118
Extend the bridleway network where possible to take horses off the major roads	39	34	23	1	3	116

When questioned on 'Which of the following ideas concerning paths and the countryside do you agree/disagree with?', 84% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (43%) or 'Agreed' (41%) with 'Improve footpath routes north of the village, avoiding the need to walk along the road'. 75% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (37%) or 'Agreed' (38%) with 'Improve access along all parish footpaths by replacing stiles with self-closing gates'.

Q6.3. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IDEAS CONCERNING WILDLIFE HABITATS AND CORRIDORS DO YOU AGREE/DISAGREE WITH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Protect and conserve all surviving wildlife-rich areas in the Parish	62	30	7	2	0	120
Protect the Salden Woods area in the north of the parish from Milton Keynes expansion (Salden Chase proposals).	68	23	8	1	0	120
Work with East-West Rail to achieve wildlife mitigation and enhancement projects as the mothballed rail track is re-opened.	49	42	9	0	0	117
Persuade farmers to manage hedgerows sympathetically for wildlife, including replanting grubbed-out hedges with typical local species.	56	38	5	1	0	117
Promote the planting of new copses and the incorporation of features like skylark plots and uncultivated margins in local farming.	49	39	11	1	0	118

In terms of 'Which of the following ideas concerning wildlife habitats and corridors do you agree/disagree with', 94% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (56%) or 'Agreed' (38%) with 'Persuade farmers to manage hedgerows sympathetically for wildlife, including replanting grubbed-out hedges with typical local species'. 92% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (62%) or 'Agreed' (30%) with 'Protect and conserve all surviving wildlife-rich areas in the Parish'. 91% either 'Strongly Agreed' (68%) or 'Agreed' (23%) with 'Protect the Salden Woods area in the north of the parish from Milton Keynes expansion (Salden Chase proposals)', with the same number (91%) to 'Work with East-West Rail to achieve mitigation and enhancement projects as the mothballed rail track is re-opened'.

Q6.4. WHAT OTHER PLACES OR FEATURES IN THE PARISH SHOULD BE PROTECTED/CONSERVED FOR THEIR WILDLIFE VALUE?

18 qualitative comments were supplied with a variety of responses which are available in the Appendix document.

Q6.5. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING IDEAS CONCERNING SUSTAINABILITY WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE PROMOTED WITHIN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Wind energy schemes	9	14	24	25	28	116
Solar energy schemes	17	29	29	14	12	118
Voluntary team(s) to manage verges, maintain footpaths, collect litter, etc	20	52	26	2	2	118
A community improvement fund from a tax levied on new developments	33	43	18	3	3	115

77% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (33%) or 'Agreed' (43%) with 'A community improvement fund from a tax levied on new developments' in terms of potential sustainability issues'. 72% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (20%) or 'Agreed' (52%) with 'Voluntary team(s) to manage verges, maintain footpaths, collect litter, etc'.

Q6.6. IF YOU EITHER 'STRONGLY AGREED' OR 'AGREED' WITH THE PROMOTION OF 'WIND ENERGY SCHEMES' AND 'SOLAR ENERGY SCHEMES' PLEASE SPECIFY THE LOCATION(S)

Wind Energy Schemes:

A few comments cited the 'Water Tower';

- ❖ *Water tower*
- ❖ *Water tower across to radio mast*
- ❖ *Near the Water tower*
- ❖ *Something near the water tower would seem appropriate*

Solar Energy Schemes:

A few comments referred to 'roof tops' of private houses;

- ❖ *House roofs.*
- ❖ *Roof top of houses*
- ❖ *individual property roofs*
- ❖ *installations on the roofs of individual houses*

SECTION 7: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Sustainable Community Facilities are essential to meet the needs of local people. A Neighbourhood Plan might for example seek to provide more recreation, education or health facilities over the next 15-20 years. It must be noted that new facilities would almost certainly have to be funded/ delivered by new housing development rather than public funds. Your answers will help develop the policy and proposals in the Plan.

Q7.1. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THE FOLLOWING FACILITIES IN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Daily (%)	More than once a week (%)	Weekly (%)	Monthly (%)	Less than once a month (%)	Never (%)	N=
Church	0	3	7	7	57	27	118
Pub	0	9	19	23	31	18	119
Sports Field	6	8	13	8	26	39	118
Village Hall	1	3	13	16	61	7	119
Other	5	16	26	0	32	21	19

19% of respondents use the 'Pub' on a 'Weekly' basis.

Q7.2. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING COMMUNITY FACILITIES DO YOU THINK THE PARISH SHOULD ASPIRE TO PROVIDE? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Allotments	22	34	35	3	6	116
All weather bowls green	3	19	48	22	8	116
Off road parking by sports field	33	43	16	4	3	117
Off road parking area within the village	30	38	17	11	5	116
More facilities for older children	11	38	35	12	4	114
Community facilities used more creatively, e.g. Church, Village Hall, Sports Hall	26	53	18	1	2	116

Of the respondents to 'Which of the following community facilities do you think the Parish should aspire to provide', 79% either 'Strongly Agreed' (26%) or 'Agreed' (53%) with Community facilities used more creatively, e.g. Church, Village Hall, Sports Hall'. 76% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (33%) or 'Agreed' (43%) with 'Off road parking by sports field'.

Q7.3. ARE THERE ANY OTHER COMMUNITY FACILITIES THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE BUILT IN THE PARISH? IF SO, PLEASE NAME THE FACILITY AND THE LOCATION

A 'village shop' was the key theme to emerge with comments including;

- ❖ *Community run shop*
- ❖ *Farm/convenience shop*
- ❖ *Shop.*
- ❖ *Village shop*
- ❖ *Butcher*

SECTION 8: INFRASTRUCTURE AND CONNECTIVITY

Services to our homes have a strong impact on life in the Parish. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot influence the delivery of infrastructure and connectivity, but we would like to have your opinions on the current performance and future requirements of these services.

Q8.1. DOES YOUR HOME HAVE BROADBAND ACCESS TO THE INTERNET?

	%
Yes	97
No	3
N=1	118

97% of respondents stated that their home does have 'broadband access to the Internet'.

Q8.2. DO YOU NEED YOUR HOME TO HAVE BROADBAND ACCESS TO THE INTERNET?

	%
Yes	86
No	14
N=	3

86% of respondents said that they do need their home to have 'Broadband access to the Internet'.

Q8.3. ARE YOU HAPPY WITH THE SPEED OF YOUR HOME'S BROADBAND?

	%
Yes	53
No	47
N=	115

53% of respondents were 'Happy with the speed' of their home's broadband, with 47% stating they were not happy.

Q8.4. HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE YOUR HOME'S BROADBAND IMPROVED?

A number of comments cited 'faster broadband';

- ❖ *More reliable and faster*
- ❖ *Increased speed*
- ❖ *Faster and more reliable*
- ❖ *I would like to have faster than 2Mb per second down here at Salden*
- ❖ *Improvement of speed*

'Fibre optics' were also referred too;

- ❖ *Connection to Fibre Optic cable service*
- ❖ *Fibre to be installed to all areas of the village. Our broadband speeds on Whaddon Road are so slow that sky will not provide the service to us as they deem the speeds to be*
- ❖ *Fibre optic*

Q8.5. DO YOU HAVE A MOBILE PHONE?

	%
Yes	96
No	4
N=	119

Nearly all of the respondents (96%) 'Have a mobile phone'.

Q8.6. WHAT IS THE NAME OF YOUR NETWORK PROVIDER?

102 comments were supplied. 24% of respondents stated that 'Vodafone' was their network provider with 19% stating 'O2' and the same figure 'EE'.

Q8.7. ARE YOU HAPPY WITH YOUR MOBILE PHONE SIGNAL THROUGHOUT THE PARISH?

	%
Yes	37
No	63
N=	114

Of the respondents who own a mobile phone, 63% were not happy with the 'Mobile phone signal throughout the Parish'.

Q8.8. HOW WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE YOUR MOBILE PHONE SIGNAL IMPROVED THROUGHOUT THE PARISH?

Qualitative comments centred on the general need to improve the 'Mobile Phone Signal';

- ❖ *A signal would be good. We are in a black spot and rely on a home booster*
- ❖ *reliable signal needed throughout village*
- ❖ *Would like to make a call anywhere in my house and village*
- ❖ *Stronger signal - often have to walk outside the house*
- ❖ *Improved signal, it is very weak at time*
- ❖ *By better service through phone masts to the east of the village*

Q8.9. WOULD YOU SUPPORT INSTALLATION OF A MOBILE PHONE MAST?

	%
Yes	62
No	38
N=	107

62% of respondents 'Would support installation of a mobile phone mast'.

Q8.10. ANY OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE AND CONNECTIVITY PROBLEMS YOU HAVE WITHIN THE PARISH?

13 comments were supplied and are all available in the Appendix document.

SECTION 9: TRANSPORT

As our community grows, it potentially places pressure on the transport network. We would therefore be interested to understand your views on the current transport system, and what that transport provision should look like in the future.

Q9.1. WHAT IS YOUR MAIN MEANS OF TRANSPORT FOR EACH OF THE ACTIVITIES BELOW? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Car (%)	Motor Cycle (%)	Taxi (%)	Bus (%)	Bicycle (%)	Walking (%)	N=
Work	95	0	0	0	0	5	81
Leisure	86	1	0	1	1	12	111
To Local Services E.g. Shops	97	0	0	0	0	3	115

97% of respondents use their car to get 'To local services e.g. shops, 95% for 'Work' and 86% for Leisure.

Q9.2. HOW MANY VEHICLES DOES YOUR HOUSEHOLD HAVE?

	%
0	1
1	18
2	62
3	10
More than 3	9
N=	120

The majority of households owned 2 cars

Q9.3. ARE YOU ABLE TO PARK ALL YOUR VEHICLES ON YOUR PROPERTY?

	%
Yes	95
No	5
N=	96

95% of respondents are 'Able to park all their vehicles on their property'.

Q9.4. IS THERE SUFFICIENT PUBLIC SPACE NEAR YOUR PROPERTY TO SAFELY PARK YOUR VEHICLES?

	%
Yes	62
No	38
N=	90

62% of respondents believed that there is 'Sufficient public space near their property to safely park their vehicles'.

Q9.5. DO YOU THINK MORE PUBLIC CAR PARKING SPACE SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE?

	%
Yes	58
No	42
N=	113

58% of respondents 'Think more public car parking space should be made available'.

Q9.6. WHERE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE CAR PARKING SPACES?

50 comments were supplied. A key location to emerge was the 'Playing/ Sports Fields';

- ❖ *By the sports fields The road is narrower there than in Main Street and a solid row of parked cars (mainly for football matches) can be quite dangerous. Off-road parking there would solve that problem, whilst also providing additional and accessible parking for both the school and the church whenever required*
- ❖ *Near the sports field*
- ❖ *In the vicinity of the sports field*
- ❖ *By the playing fields. The car park is inadequate it even fills if a dozen people are using the all weather surface. There should then be double yellow lines put in place to prevent parking opposite Taylors corner and up to Tweedale Close. Entering and exiting the village along station road can sometimes be a challenge on Saturdays when matches are being played*
- ❖ *At the playing fields*
- ❖ *For football visitors*

The 'School' was also mentioned;

- ❖ *Off road parking for staff working at the school , for parents with children at the school , and for patrons of the pub*
- ❖ *by the school*
- ❖ *parking for both the school and the church whenever required.*
- ❖ *School and recreation ground*
- ❖ *I would like to see a car park built behind the pub, with a path through to the school .*
- ❖ *The school needs more safe car parking or more car sharing/minibus service providers.*

Q9.7. DO YOU DRIVE TO THE COMMUNITY FACILITIES/ SHOPS IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON AT LEAST A FORTNIGHTLY BASIS? (PLEASE CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY)

	%
Swanbourne	59
Stewkley	21
Wing	16
Milton Keynes	92
Winslow	69
Aylesbury	27
N=	119

When asked 'Do you drive to the community facilities/shops in any of the following locations on at least a fortnightly basis', 92% answered 'Milton Keynes', 69% 'Winslow' and 59% 'Swanbourne'.

Q9.8. DO YOU COMMUTE FOR WORK TO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS ON AT LEAST A FORTNIGHTLY BASIS? (PLEASE CHOOSE ALL THAT APPLY)

	%
Milton Keynes	72
Buckingham	25
Aylesbury	28
Bicester	9
N=	32

When asked 'Do you commute for work to any of the following locations on at least a fortnightly basis', 72% answered 'Milton Keynes'.

Q9.9. DO YOU USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT FROM AND TO THE PARISH?

	%
Yes	4
No	96
N=	116

96% of respondents did not 'Use public transport from and to the Parish'.

Q9.10. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Daily (%)	More than once a week (%)	Weekly (%)	Monthly (%)	Less than once a month (%)	Never (%)	N=
For Work	0	0	0	0	25	75	4
For Leisure	0	0	0	20	20	60	4
For Access to Services	0	17	17	0	17	50	4
For Shopping	0	0	0	40	20	40	4
Other							

Three quarters of respondents (75%) to 'How often do you use Public Transport', 'Never' use it 'For Work'. 60% of respondents 'Never' use Public Transport 'For Leisure'.

Q9.11. WHETHER OR NOT YOU USE THE SERVICES, HOW WOULD YOU RATE PUBLIC TRANSPORT IN THE PARISH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Very Good (%)	Good (%)	No Opinion (%)	Poor (%)	Very Poor (%)	N=
Frequency of service	0	5	56	22	17	111
Number of stopping points	2	21	66	7	3	111
Bus shelters	6	20	59	12	2	111
Routes/ destinations available	0	5	62	20	12	111

When asked 'Whether or not you use the services, how would you rate public transport in the Parish' the majority of respondents had 'No Opinion'.

Q9.12. WOULD YOU LIKE AN ADDITIONAL BUS STOP?

	%
Yes	16
No	84
N=	93

84% of respondents would not like 'An additional bus stop'.

Q9.13. WHERE WOULD YOU LIKE TO SEE AN ADDITIONAL BUS STOP?

12 comments were supplied which are available in the Appendix document.

Q9.14. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING ISSUES CONCERNING TRAFFIC IN THE PARISH DO YOU AGREE/ DISAGREE WITH? (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Volume of traffic too high	60	24	14	3	0	119
Speeding vehicles	64	28	5	3	0	118
Parking close to junctions	39	31	27	4	0	114
Quality of road surface	78	17	2	3	1	115
Car parking on the pavements	39	12	39	6	3	114
Low visibility	22	24	44	10	1	110
Narrowness of roads	19	15	47	17	2	113
More consideration needed by HGV /Farm traffic	45	29	19	6	1	115

Of the respondents to 'Which of the following issues concerning traffic in the Parish do you agree/disagree with', 95% either 'Strongly Agreed' (78%) or 'Agreed' (17%) with 'Quality of road surface'. 92% of respondents either 'Strongly Agreed' (64%) or 'Agreed' (28%) with 'Speeding vehicles' and 84% 'Volume of traffic too high'.

Q9.15. IF YOU PROVIDED A RATING OF 'STRONGLY AGREE' OR 'AGREE' FOR ANY OF THE OPTIONS CONCERNING THE ROADS IN THE PARISH, PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS:

Volume of traffic too high

'Main Street' was the most cited location in terms of volume of traffic being too high. 'Rush hours/ School drop off' being highlighted as problematic times.

Speeding vehicles

'Main Street' was the most commonly referred to location concerning speeding vehicles with this being a problem 'Anytime' often cited. 'Whaddon Road' was also mentioned.

Parking close to junctions

'Station Road', 'Whaddon Road' and 'Main Street' were the most cited locations in terms of parking close to junctions as being problematic.

Quality of road surface

99 comments were supplied, 65% of which referred to 'Main Street' as having an issue with road surface quality.

Car parking on pavements

'Station Road' and 'Main Street' were noted as being problematic concerning car parking on pavements.

Low visibility

47 comments were supplied, 50% of which referred to 'Main Street' as having problems with low visibility.

Narrowness of roads

36 comments were supplied, 39% of which referred to 'Main Street'.

More consideration needed by HGV /Farm traffic

'Main Street' was the most commonly cited location regarding more consideration needed by HGV/ Farm traffic.

Q9.16. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS IN TERMS OF TRAFFIC ISSUES IN THE PARISH?

A full list of comments is provided below;

- ❖ *Constant pavement parking on Station Road makes pushing a wheelchair impossible. I have to push elderly parent on the road.*
- ❖ *HGV/Farm traffic too large for village. Tuckwells now too much volume and speeding - they should not be able to come through village or at least should pay an excess tax to road upkeep.*
- ❖ *Maybe need double yellow lines near village hall on main street as there is a bottle neck. Consider a village bypass.*
- ❖ *school buses parked on road create 100% lack of vision when departing roads close. Commercial vehicles parked opposite green man*
- ❖ *The surface of main street is a disgrace*
- ❖ *The 30mph speed limit should be extended at the Swanbourne Road end of village. Many surrounding villages have 40mph limits before the 30mph*
- ❖ *Require more speed enforcement camera*
- ❖ *The path and road are too narrow where Station Road meets Main Street. Cars parked along the road cause traffic issues.*
- ❖ *Whaddon road is too busy for a housing estate/ more houses*
- ❖ *Community speed watch is a great idea. Continue in the spring get more people involved if poss.*
- ❖ *Parking on pavements should be banned at all times*
- ❖ *All-day parking in Main Street by school staff (and some parents) impacts nearby residents every weekday during term time; family, visitors and delivery vehicles cannot park nearby. During wet weather passing vehicles drive at some speed through large areas of standing water, that is thrown up onto the pavement*
- ❖ *Usually HGV and farm traffic are very considerate. Vans and private cars not so considerate.*
- ❖ *Make it 20mph*
- ❖ *Farm traffic could avoid peak times travel.*
- ❖ *Cars parked overnight from pub visitors regularly block our drop curb so we are unable to leave our driveway before 10am*
- ❖ *The farm traffic contributes to pot holes and to the speeding. They sometimes are going so fast, no concern for villagers.*
- ❖ *Main street relatively clear outside school hours and holidays*
- ❖ *Police should be requested to give tickets to cars parking on pavements. It is dangerous for pedestrians/wheel chair users*
- ❖ *Farmers - large farm vehicles speeding - too large for width of roads!*
- ❖ *cars parked at top of beechams which gives drivers of vehicles for access to and from main street*
- ❖ *Could the school encourage more car sharing or a provide a local mini-bus service or off road parking?*
- ❖ *Village has become a through route for commuters between Milton Keynes and Aylesbury*
- ❖ *generally a lot of traffic going too fast through the village*
- ❖ *vehicles continuously speed. h&s issue.*
- ❖ *Yellow lines required to stop parking close to junctions.*
- ❖ *Anyone who drives a car drives through other communities.*
- ❖ *Parking/congestion to do with the school is now serious. I would like to see a car park behind the pub with a safe path through to the school.*
- ❖ *Tuckwell vehicles are destroying the road surface and now that Bonham has opened a grain storage facility Station road will also suffer*

- ❖ *Why not kill two birds with one stone? Create marked parking bays through Station Road and Main Street to accommodate the required number of cars. Position bays in such a way that they create traffic calming points in the village to slow the traffic*
- ❖ *Reduce traffic*
- ❖ *Need more speed restrictions, but giving due consideration to the needs of the farmers, so as to not make life too difficult for them, they were here before many of us were!*
- ❖ *The Tuckwell farm traffic on mains st in general is too high volume, speeds, often drives riskily, noisy at night. It is no longer just a local farm but an industrial contracting business operating with young drivers operating without duty of care/consideration & at all times of the day & night.*
- ❖ *Potholes repairs not resolved.*
- ❖ *Consider bypass as the village is getting more and more busy*
- ❖ *Consider a village bypass*
- ❖ *very busy*
- ❖ *Parking on the side of the road should only be allowed if the road can still be used with 2 way traffic (too many cars restrict the access on the High St)*

Q9.17. WOULD YOU SUPPORT ANY OF THE FOLLOWING MEASURES TO CONTROL TRAFFIC IN THE PARISH (PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Speed bumps	20	21	7	24	28	110
Pinch points (chicanes), as in Stewkley	23	30	11	13	23	112
20 mph zones near the school	51	29	9	5	6	114

Of the respondents to 'Would you support any of the following measures to control traffic in the Parish', 80% either 'Strongly Agreed' (51%) or 'Agreed' (29%) with '20mph zones near the school'.

Q9.18. ARE THEY ANY OTHER TRAFFIC RELATED MEASURES YOU WOULD SUGGEST?

A number of comments referred to controlling 'Speeding';

- ❖ *Speed displays coming into village that flash up your speed with smiley or frowny face*
- ❖ *Speed awareness displays*
- ❖ *Electronic speed signs more prominent signs around school area*
- ❖ *Reducing the speed to 30 or 40mph with traffic measures on the approach to the village*
- ❖ *Speed restriction to 20mph.*
- ❖ *A speed camera permanently sited in main street*
- ❖ *Working speed cameras*
- ❖ *Change the current speed warning flashing sign to the type that rewards good driving with a smiley face, village ponds with ducks, make cars park on road not path*
- ❖ *Enforce speed limits within village - more fines. Police surveillance*

**Q9.19. DO YOU BELIEVE THERE ARE PROBLEMS WITH PAVEMENTS IN THE PARISH?
(PLEASE CHOOSE ONE OPTION PER ROW)**

	Strongly Agree (%)	Agree (%)	No Opinion (%)	Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)	N=
Lack of pavement	20	31	30	16	3	113
Poor state of repair	22	28	32	18	0	108
Narrowness	23	26	33	16	2	108
Not suitable for wheelchairs / pushchairs / wheeled walking aids	25	28	40	8	0	110

Of the respondents to 'Do you believe there are problems with pavements in the Parish?' 53% either 'Strongly Agreed' (25%) or 'Agreed' (28%) with 'Not suitable for wheelchairs/pushchairs/wheeled walking aids'. 51% either 'Strongly Agreed'/'Agreed' with 'Lack of pavement' and 50% 'Poor state of repair' and 49% 'Narrowness'.

Q9.20. IF YOU PROVIDED A RATING OF 'AGREE' OR 'STRONGLY AGREE' FOR ANY OF THE OPTIONS CONCERNING PAVEMENTS IN THE PARISH PLEASE PROVIDE DETAILS:

Lack of pavement

55 comments were provided. The key theme to emerge was that there was a lack of pavements in 'Station Road';

- ❖ *From Station Road to sports field*
- ❖ *Station Road path beyond playing field gate on both sides*
- ❖ *Going out of village along Station Road*
- ❖ *Station Road from beginning of playing fields to Pavillion Car Park*
- ❖ *Top of station road to football field and taylors corner and church lane.*
- ❖ *Station Road leading up to Pavilion car park*
- ❖ *Main Street joins Station Road*
- ❖ *to pavilion and along Station rd when cars parked there*

Poor state of repair

39 comments were supplied and 31% of these referred to 'Main Street' as having pavements in a poor state of repair.

Narrowness

'Main Street' and 'Station Road' were the key themes to emerge from the qualitative comments;

- ❖ *Outside Yew Tree House, 61 Main Street and outside The Thatch, Main Street*
- ❖ *Pavement narrow on bend from Main Street into Station Road. Pedestrians left very close to passing traffic. Children look particularly vulnerable when using this stretch of pavement.*
- ❖ *main street - both ends*
- ❖ *Main Street opposite village hall*
- ❖ *From Station Road to Main Street*
- ❖ *Along the top part of main street*
- ❖ *station road into main street*
- ❖ *top of main street joining station road*
- ❖ *round the bend between station road and main street*
- ❖ *parts of main street and station road*

Not suitable for wheelchairs / pushchairs / wheeled walking aids

'Main Street' and 'Station Road' were the key themes to emerge from the qualitative comments;

- ❖ *Station road to High Street, Main Street & Cooks Lane*
- ❖ *From Station Road to Main Street*
- ❖ *station road into main street*
- ❖ *Main Street . Uneven surface.*
- ❖ *top of main street joining station road*

Q9.21. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS CONCERNING PAVEMENTS IN THE PARISH?

- ❖ *A few general comments were supplied;*
- ❖ *We should register the pub as a community asset, or one day we will lose it.*
- ❖ *Some paths are very overgrown by weeds. Outside St Marys house path slopes too steeply across its depth. too steep for a wheelchair or mobility scooter.*
- ❖ *Don't pave over the verges of fill in the ditches as this would destroy the character of the Village*
- ❖ *Some overgrowth of privately owned hedges overgrowing already narrow footpaths. Bins blocking pathways. Cars blocking pathways - regularly need to go into road.*
- ❖ *They are used for car parking. Along station road. There is no advantage to road users in doing so as there is still no room for 2 cars to pass. Prams and wheelchair users and those on crutches are forced to use road*
- ❖ *they need resurfacing!*
- ❖ *a pavement allowing walking south of the village to Stewkley lane - ideally a pavement along the road to Swanbourne (or cycle path)*
- ❖ *none needed down church lane*
- ❖ *I am very concerned about the lack of footpath and therefore the safety at the Swanbourne Road end of the village.*
- ❖ *A path connecting Mursley to Swanbourne would enable people to walk to Swanbourne shop thus enabling the shop to remain open and also contributing to easy exercise for Mursley residents as no need to drive there!*
- ❖ *Very poor, not suitable for wheelchairs/pushchairs & wheeled walking aids*

Q9.21. DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS ON ANYTHING AT ALL, RELATED TO THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN OR THE PARISH?

From the 25 comments provided, a few comments centred on the need to 'Keep Mursley a Village'.

- ❖ *Keep Mursley as it is*
- ❖ *Great work by team. We must keep this as a village as long as possible.*
- ❖ *I would just like to say that Mursley is a beautiful, rural village with a strong sense of community. Most residents will have chosen to live here for that very reason - and to enjoy the peace and beauty of such an environment. There has already been a huge amount of development (or approval for development) in our immediate surrounding areas. This provides access to additional housing, shopping and schools etc. We are well located and have good transport links to towns and cities for employment etc. I feel very strongly that we should do our best to preserve the traditional and rural nature of our village, not just for ourselves, but also for future generations who would like to have the choice to live in a quiet, peaceful environment surrounded by countryside and wildlife. There have been, and will be, massive areas of development across our country and I acknowledge that this is a very positive thing. However, I also feel that an equal amount of energy should be allocated to protecting our countryside and the very nature of small rural villages like Mursley.*
- ❖ *Encourage responsible, and proportionate growth*