1.4: Does it take appropriate account of the sub-regional and wider context, including cross-boundary impacts?

a) The CS takes an inconsistent account of the sub-regional context with reference to Aylesbury Vale:

The CS explicitly refers to the South West Development Area (SWDA) as being no longer required\(^i\) because it is not deliverable\(^ii\) and indeed it is identified as a Threat\(^iii\), and with this we agree. The issue is further cemented in the Statement of Common Ground between Aylesbury Vale District and Milton Keynes Councils, and is consistent with the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Plan\(^iv\) and the aspirations of Vale communities such as Newton Longville\(^v\). However, the possibility of MK growth encroaching into the wider sub-region persists elsewhere in the CS, and could be interpreted as implicitly including Aylesbury Vale\(^vi\).

These inconsistencies send mixed messages to Vale communities and developers, who could find it difficult to plan and invest soundly and sustainably. For this reason, NBPPC has requested that Policy CS6 and supporting paragraphs be deleted\(^vii\).

b) The CS takes inadequate account of other cross-boundary impacts, e.g. supporting infrastructure in the Vale:

A Southern Relief Road / Bletchley Southern Bypass is envisioned in CS11 and the Local Transport Plan (LTP3)\(^viii\) as an environmental benefit for Bletchley. However there is no acknowledgement that this project could also be an environmental disbenefit for the Vale\(^ix\). The even longer-term dualling of the A421 to the M40\(^x\) raises similar spectres. In other words, while the cross-boundary structural impacts have been identified, the environmental and therefore political ramifications have not, nor is there an outline mechanism to deal with them.

CS6 could therefore be replaced with a policy that identifies where such conflicts might occur and provides guidance on how such conflicts can be managed through joint working – see our answer 1.5.

\(^i\) Page v, second paragraph f, first sentence  
\(^ii\) Page iv, second paragraph d  
\(^iii\) Table 2.1  
\(^vi\) App D Vale of Aylesbury Plan, page D43  
\(^vii\) Revised Proposed Submission October 2010, comments by NBPPC: RPSP274, 278, 279, 280 and 283  
\(^viii\) Page 67: Project code HTo22. Note that the CS still makes reference to LTP2!  
\(^ix\) Revised Proposed Submission October 2010, comments by Newton Longville Parish Council: RPSP413, and by Stewkley Parish Council: RPSP422  
\(^x\) CS11 point 7; and LTP3 (page 67, project code HTo20)
1.5: Does the Core Strategy provide clearly articulated and justified guidance about the way in which cross-boundary issues and joint working will be addressed?

No.

While the most clearly articulated guidance for joint working is included in CS6, we have no hesitation in requesting that it be deleted, because the guidance was not justified. Its fault in this regard was its endeavour to dictate the outcome in MK’s favour, prior to the commencement of any joint working.

And while LTP2 contained a Joint Statement with neighbouring authorities, this does not appear to have been taken forward in LTP3.

The emphasis on the duty to cooperate in the NPPF suggests that there should be a CS policy dedicated to this requirement. And given the underlying localism agenda, parish/town councils should be explicitly included in the joint working. Such a policy should therefore include, but not be limited to, the following considerations:

- The meaningful inclusion of Parish/Town councils in joint working arrangements
- The impact on MK of any developments in neighbouring authorities that are part of that authorities’ own growth strategy
- Investigation and mitigation of the combined impact (e.g. traffic) of planned growth of MK and other areas (e.g. Aylesbury) on all communities, i.e. recognising the need to model and mitigate impacts holistically rather than in isolation or by simple aggregation
  - Traffic impact studies should incorporate rural road systems, which have never been undertaken outside MK in adjoining authority areas.
  - Traffic studies should consider the transition from the grid system to more traditional road networks.
- Cross-border supporting infrastructure, e.g. the Southern Relief Road and guidance on how to deal with the conflict of benefits and disbenefits (see our answer 1.4b)
- The opportunities and challenges of the proposed East-West rail link
- Public transport provision
- Other impacts such as light pollution
- Development of complementary and consistent Wind Turbine policies

---

xii LTP2 Appendix B
xiii Paragraphs 178-181
xiv Response to Matter 5 Qu 5.2iv by Stewkley Parish Council
xv Even though this is already addressed in LTP3
xvi Wind Turbines SPD, comments by NBPPC: WT160