Milton Keynes Core Strategy Examination
Matter 5: Transport

Post Examination Actions

1. A421 – policy, funding, priority and modelling issues, and in relation to the SLA.
   (To be read in conjunction with Matter 8: Infrastructure.)

The A421 between the Fen Roundabout and M1 Junction 13 carries traffic partially through Milton Keynes and partially through Central Beds.

In terms of Council policy (Core Strategy and LTP3) the dualling of the A421 is an important part of the traffic network. The A421 is therefore, in policy terms, a Council transport priority.

As delivery of the dualling of the A421 is uncertain the implementation of the dualling of the A421 is equally uncertain.

The June 2009 Local Investment Plan 2009 – 2011 (see below) identified the dualling of the A421 between Kingston and M1 J13. Other than identifying the responsible implementation institution (BedsCC/MKC/Developer), an estimate of the total capital cost (£26m.) and that the total capital cost was unsecured, no further implementation information is available. This position still applies today; the delivery and implementation of the dualling of the A421 remains uncertain.

(Reference to T5 in the Project Title refers to Phase 1 of the dualling of the A421 between Kingston Roundabout and the Fen Roundabout which was completed in November 2008 and paid for by the Milton Keynes Tariff.)

Due to the uncertainty of the dualling of the A421 the 2026 Core Strategy MK MMM modelling did not model the A421 as being dualled.

Milton Keynes Council considers the A421 in two ways;

1. that part of the A421 in Milton Keynes as the “local” part of the traffic network
2. that part of the A421 in Central Beds as part of the “regional” part of the traffic network.

Milton Keynes Council expects that part of the A421 in Milton Keynes to be funded (partially or fully) by development adjacent to the A421; in this case the Core Strategy allocation of the Strategic Land Allocation.

(Financial contributions will be required as part of Strategic Land Allocation planning permissions to fund that part of the A421 in Milton Keynes.)

Milton Keynes Council expects that part of the A421 in Central Beds to be funded fully as part of a regional/sub-regional project promoted jointly by Milton Keynes and Central Beds or promoted by SEM LEP.

MILTON KEYNES PARTNERSHIP DELIVERY PLAN 2009
TRANSPORT 30/06/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>Institution responsible</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Total Capital Cost</th>
<th>Funding source identified</th>
<th>Capital secured</th>
<th>Capital unsecured</th>
<th>Tariff Approved / estimated £m</th>
<th>JDOT approved</th>
<th>MKP approved</th>
<th>LEP approved</th>
<th>Members approved</th>
<th>Project Agreed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T01</td>
<td>A421 - M1 J13 to Kingston Phase 2 (remedial of dualling – see also T05)</td>
<td>BedsCC/MKC/Developer</td>
<td>Apr-12</td>
<td>Apr-15</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the uncertainty of the dualling of the A421 the 2026 Core Strategy MK MMM modelling did not model the A421 as being dualled.
(If there is a shortfall in funding for the “local” Milton Keynes part of the A421 dualling, it would be included in the regional/sub-regional project.)
2 Council position on J13a and bridge over M1.

The Council accepts that it no longer requires Core Strategy policy proposals for a new M1 Junction 13a and a bridge over the M1; this position has been superseded by changed circumstances. Therefore, all Core Strategy reference to a new M1 Junction 13a and a bridge over the M1 can be removed.

In this context, the following Core Strategy references to a new M1 Junction 13a and a bridge over the M1 can be removed:

2. Consequential change to CS5: Item 20.

The main reasons for the removal of reference to a new M1 Junction 13a and a bridge over the M1 are as follows:

1. Not supported by the Highways Agency. (Refer to previous representations.)
2. Not supported by Central Beds. (Refer to previous representations.)
3. Not explicitly supported by LTP3. (LTP3: Policy HTo26: Maintain easy access to the M1 Motorway, suggests that it “may be necessary to consider a new junction or increased highway capacity to manage the additional demand for access and egress from the motorway.”. Policy Hto26 is a long term policy and will be dependent on the future increased demand for travel to and from the strategic network. In the interim Milton Keynes Council has no aspirations for a new M1 Junction 13a and a bridge over the M1.)
4. Not part of Council’s development proposals for the DF of the Strategic Land Allocation. (Refer to the Development Framework for the Strategic Land Allocation submitted during the Examination during Matter 6: Strategic Land Allocation.)
3 East-West Rail

3.1 Council response to FLP proposals.

The Council acknowledges the submission by FLP and finds their proposals generally acceptable with a few minor changes. To sufficiently recognise the opportunity that the East-West Rail Link now presents, the following text will be added to Chapter 11 and Policy CS11.

Additional Paragraph 11.14

The Chancellor announced in November 2011 that East-West Rail funding of £270m would be made available providing that the East-West Rail Consortium met two conditions. Firstly, a strong business case for the route was required and secondly a commitment by local authorities along the route to contribute £50 million to the cost.

Further Government announcements in July 2012 have again confirmed support for East-West Rail. Both pre-conditions have been met and the Western section of East-West Rail will form part of the government’s strategy for rail transport, with the project likely to proceed in the period 2014-2017.

Additional Paragraph 11.15

Milton Keynes Council accepts that East-West Rail will contribute to the growth and development of Milton Keynes and provide an excellent opportunity for the Borough in both the local and regional context which will provide significant economic, environmental and social benefits.

Milton Keynes Council is a member of the Joint Delivery Board set up by the East-West Rail Consortium as a means of engagement for the eight authorities East-West Rail will run through.

The Council will seek to engage with Network Rail and relevant stakeholders along the route of the East-West Rail line through the Borough to establish whether any operational benefits or improvements to more sustainable forms of non-car borne journeys can be realised with the implementation of this project.

Policy CS11, bullet point 9.

To engage with Network Rail and relevant stakeholders along the East-West Rail line to identify operational benefits which thereby provides additional support for a more sustainable transport strategy and/or economic growth of the City.

3.2 Make CS11 clear about latest (positive) position regarding East-West Rail

This has been covered by the additions made to Chapter 11 “A Well-Connected Milton Keynes” and Policy CS11 under Action 3.1.

3.3 Does East-West Rail Business Case include South East Plan housing numbers?

The East-West Rail Business Case does include the South East Plan housing figures.
Within the business case, benefits were calculated using the webTAG (the DfT’s appraisal guidance) prescribed methodology. This is based on earlier housing growth forecasts. The objective in developing a business case was primarily to get the scheme included in the DfT’s HLOS programme for Control Period 5 (2014-19). During the appraisal period all competing schemes would have used the DfT’s appraisal guidance extant at the time, and therefore relative to other schemes, EWR would still score highly.

Although current housing forecasts have now reduced, it is unlikely to result in a benefit:cost ratio (BCR) to an extent where the criteria for acceptance by DfT would fall below that deemed acceptable. This is evidenced by a number of factors.

A series of sensitivity tests was undertaken to evaluate a number of different scenarios. One significant test assumed zero planning growth with population and employment growth capped at base year (2008) levels. The forecast BCR was evaluated at 2.52:1 which still represents good value for money. In addition a sensitivity test that assumed a 15% contribution from external sources to the capital cost of the project was carried out and this resulted in a BCR of 11.12:1. The 8 local authorities have agreed in principle to use their collective best efforts to contribute £30 million and reasonable efforts to raise a further £20 million.

Further there are a number of wider benefits that were not captured within the business case such as the opportunities for use of the railway by freight services and long distance passenger services.

Also not undertaken were an analysis of the additional benefits that the western section of EWR could bring in terms of supporting regional GVA and supporting agglomeration and increased business outputs.

Finally with the announcement by the Secretary of State for Transport that funding for EWR is included in HLOS and due to the strong strategic case presented, notwithstanding the changing economic circumstances, the SoS has determined to further enhance the railway by including EWR as part of the national strategic ‘electric spine’, a high capacity passenger and freight electric corridor running from the South Coast through Oxford, Bedford and via the Midland Main Line to the East Midlands and South Yorkshire, with a link from Oxford to the West Midlands and the North-West.

With electrification comes better access to Heathrow Airport, possible long distance passenger trains and use by freight services. The benefits will therefore be even greater and DfT will be recalculating their estimate of the new benefits.

The Business Case for East-West Rail is therefore currently not dependent on the South East Plan housing numbers.
4 Park and Ride

4.1 Reword CS11 regarding Park and Ride; not site specific, flexibility of location.

The Council accepts that it no longer requires site-specific Core Strategy policy proposals for the delivery of high quality transport interchanges (including Park and Ride). Therefore site-specific proposals for the delivery of high quality transport interchanges (including Park and Ride) can be removed; to be replaced by a suitable worded generic policy relating to high quality transport interchanges and Park and Ride.

In this context the Core Strategy policy references to the delivery of high quality transport interchanges (including Park and Ride) can be removed and replaced:

1. Policy CS11: Item 8
2. Consequential change to Policy CS5: Item 18

The main reasons for the removal and replacement of the site-specific proposals for the delivery of high quality transport interchanges (including Park and Ride) are as follows:

1. The policy is site-specific and does not allow any flexibility for the location of high quality transport interchanges (including Park and Ride).
2. The policy background is the un-adopted draft Park and Ride Strategy.
3. Further evidence based investigations are required, leading to Council adoption of the Park and Ride Strategy.
4. Further feasibility and design work and public consultations are required before planning applications can be made.

It is suggested that Policy CS11: Item 8 is reworded as follows:

8. The highway network will be served by high quality transport interchanges well located to transport nodes and the strategic highway network, and by Park and Ride sites on the edge of the city and in close proximity to the strategic highway network.

4.2 Consistency between CS5 and CS11 regarding Park and Ride.

The proposed rewording of Policy CS11: Item 8 and the consequential rewording of Policy CS5: Item 18 ensures consistency between CS5 and CS11 regarding Park and Ride.
5 Order CS11 policies in order of priority.

The Council accepts that CS11 policies should be presented in order of priority. This does not require the introduction of any new policies, simply the reordering in order of priority of existing CS11 policies.

The main reasons for the reordering in order of priority are as follows:

1. To explicitly show the priority and hierarchy of transport policies.
2. To confirm and be consistent with the Council’s corporate transport priorities.
3. To be consistent with the priority of policies set out in LTP3.

It is suggested that Policy CS11 be reordered as follows:

1. Policy CS11: Item 1: - **Grid Roads**  
   Remains as Item 1

2. Policy CS11: Item 2: - **Public Transport**  
   Remains as Item 2

3. Policy CS11: Item 3: - **Walking and Cycling**  
   Previously Item 4

4. Policy CS11: Item 4 - **Smarter Choices**  
   Previously Item 6

5. Policy CS11: Item 5 - **Highways and Traffic Management/Technology**  
   Previously Item 3

6. Policy CS11: Item 6 – **Infrastructure Management**  
   Previously Item 7

7. Policy CS11: Item 7 – **Development Planning**  
   Previously Item 5

8. Policy CS11: Item 8 – **Transport Interchanges**  
   Remains as Item 8. (New wording: see 4 above.)

9. Policy CS11: Item 9 – **East West Rail**  
   New Item 9. (See 3.1 above.)
6 Grid Roads

6.1 Council evidence about difficulty in retrofitting WEA city street layout to a grid road layout.

The adopted Milton Keynes Local Plan (Doc No. LP1) set out the Council’s requirements for the Western Expansion Area (WEA) and established the principle of the city street within the expansion areas in order to encourage greater use of public transport, cycling and walking.

The principle was carried forward in the WEA Development Framework and in the outline permission granted for the WEA in 2007 (Ref: 05/00291/MKPCO). A reserved matters application was submitted in 2008, but was subsequently delayed.

During this period, elected members expressed their concern at the city street concept and requested that grid roads be introduced along with the city street into the development. The introduction of grid roads into the new expansion areas is supported by the Milton Keynes Local Transport Plan 3, adopted in June 2011.

Negotiations between Milton Keynes Council and Redlawn/Gallagher on this issue has resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) relating to a re-design to the highway network in the WEA, which ensures that the grid network principle is extended into the site and that the grid road corridors are protected for further expansion should the need arise. The MoU was also the subject of discussion with Milton Keynes Partnership and it was agreed that the changes would not require a new outline planning application, a pre-condition by Redlawn/Gallagher associated with the re-design.

The Reserved Matters Application 08/01289/MKPCR was then approved in December 2011 in line with both the city street principle and the MoU agreement with regard to the extension of grid road network.

This remains the current position with regard to the WEA.

Attached for information are copies of:

2. Development Control Committee Report (7 December 2011) for Reserved Matters Application 08/01289/MKPCR.

Both of these reports contain copies of the Memorandum of Understanding.

6.2 Council evidence/support for grid road network.

The grid road network is an integral part of Milton Keynes, outlined in The Plan for Milton Keynes (Doc no. B54) as a key component for achieving the principle of easy access and movement. The grid road network is what gives Milton Keynes its unique and iconic character.

The Plan for Milton Keynes (Doc no. B54) and The Milton Keynes Planning Manual (Doc no. B53) both outline the reasoning and support behind the development of the grid road network.
At the time of Milton Keynes’s initial development the grid road network was seen as providing a flexible transport system that was connected into the regional road network. It provided a transport network that allowed:

1. Good general accessibility for the dispersed land uses of Milton Keynes
2. Easy movement by private car and their penetration to every point in the City
3. The function to carry traffic smoothly and easily
4. Safe and environmentally attractive communities with minimal nuisance from the noise and pollution of main traffic routes
5. For expansion and the ability to accommodate changes in the location and intensity of development, routing of public transport or changes in transport technology.

Whilst growth is putting increased pressure on the grid road network and changes to the way people travel round the city must be introduced, the grid road network has become a unique and iconic part of Milton Keynes’s character and there are a number of benefits to continuing and extending them into new development areas, as have been outlined in MKC/10.