

Strategic Land Allocation Development Framework

Supplementary Planning Document

Appendix A : Consultation Statement



www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/udla

November 2013

Consultation Statement

Prepared in accordance with Regulation 12 (a) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (Planning) Regulations 2012

There has been an ongoing process of engagement with the local community and landowners/developers and service providers in the preparation of the Draft Development Framework.

This consultation statement sets out the community engagement that has informed the preparation of the SPD and is an Appendix to the Adopted SPD.

Background

This statement sets out the consultation processes undertaken as part of the preparation of and formal consultation on the Draft Strategic Land Allocation Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the subsequent process to adopt the final version of the SPD. It sets out how the Council has complied with the requirements of Regulations 11 and 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.

Regulation 12 Consultation on the Draft SPD

There have been two rounds of Regulation 12 consultation on the draft SPD, reflecting the substantial changes that had to be made to the first draft version following the adoption of the Milton Keynes Core Strategy in July 2013. Information about the earlier consultation rounds is set out on page 3 onwards.

The revised draft SPD was subject to the following consultation arrangements:

a) The Draft SPD and supporting documents (SEA Screening Statement, Revised Consultation Statement) was available for inspection:

- at Civic Offices, 1 Saxon Gate East, Central Milton Keynes, MK9 3EJ at CMK, Kingston and Woburn Sands
- on the council's website: www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy

b) An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper the 'MK News' stating where a copy of the documents could be obtained and when and where the documents could be inspected.

c) A covering letter or e-mail was sent to consultees, notifying them of the publication of the draft SPD.

d) To ensure all stakeholders had an opportunity to comment but reflecting that the document has already been subject to a considerable amount of public consultation, a period of 8 weeks consultation was allowed for the supplementary planning

document. The consultation ran from Wednesday 31 July to Wednesday 25 September 2013.

e) Drop-in sessions were arranged for the local communities of Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Old Farm Park/Wavendon Gate as follows:

- **Wednesday 4 September, 5.30pm-7.30pm**
At: Wavendon Community Centre, Walton Road, Wavendon
- **Thursday 12 September, 5.00pm-7.30pm**
At: The Memorial Hall, High Street, Woburn Sands
- **Saturday 14 September, 2.00pm-4.00pm**
At: Wavendon Gate Pavilion, Isaacson Drive, Wavendon Gate, MK7 7RZ

Adoption of the SPD

By the close of the consultation period, some 250 written and email responses had been received by the council. Of these, some 214 came from local residents from the surrounding area. The main concerns related to the proposed access roads to the SLA from the A5130, Newport Road.

A report setting out the results of consultation and recommending a number of changes to the Development Framework arising from the consultation responses was considered and approved by Cabinet on 5 November, 2013. Following the close of the call-in period on 15 November, the decision formally took effect. The schedule of responses and the changes recommended to Cabinet is attached at Appendix A to this Consultation Statement.

Previous stages on the preparation of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document

The Development Framework has been prepared by Milton Keynes Council, in consultation with other stakeholders and the main landowner interests. They have provided technical and supporting information to provide the basis for the Development Framework. During preparation of the Development Framework SPD, internal consultation has been undertaken with key Council departments, such as Highways, Education and Development Management, and with external service providers, such as NHS/PCT, emergency services. A Stakeholder Workshop was held in June 2011 with representatives of Council departments and external service providers (notes of workshop attached as Appendix B).

Informal Consultation

During November and December 2011 and January 2012, the Council undertook Informal Consultation with local residents, local Ward Councillors, local Parish/Town Councils, service providers and other interested stakeholders regarding the draft Development Framework for the Strategic Land Allocation.

The Strategic Land Allocation has been identified as part of the emerging Core Strategy as being suitable for sustainable growth and development for a maximum of 2,500 new homes and forms part of the overall expansion plan for Milton Keynes.

The Informal Consultation was an opportunity for local residents, local Ward Councillors, local Parish/Town Councils, service providers and other interested stakeholders to find out about the proposed development plans for the area and to direct any questions about the Development Framework to Council representatives. The schedule of arrangements for the Informal Consultation is set out below:

Between 550 and 650 local residents and other interested parties attended the various drop-in sessions. A total of 178 comments/representations were received following the Informal Consultation; 133 from the Church Farm consultation and 45 from the Wavendon/Woburn Sands consultation. A summary of the responses is included at Appendix C. In addition almost all households in Wavendon, Woburn Sands, Wavendon Gate and Old Farm Park would have received at least one invitation to attend the drop-in sessions and/or to respond to the Informal Consultation questionnaires.

The total number of households in Wavendon, Woburn Sands, Wavendon Gate and Old Farm Park is about 3,400, so the representative response to the Informal Consultation (say 750) is just above 20%.

The main issues that have arisen as part of the community engagement process are set out below:

Main Issues		
Issue	Raised by	Council Response
Need for primary school within Church Farm development	Revise SR4, local residents	The Council's Education Department has indicated that their needs would be better met through the extension of existing schools.
Provision should be made for public transport services to serve Church Farm site	Revise SR4	Nature of public transport provision to serve development should be determined by Transport Assessment.
Vehicular access to Church Farm should be single carriageway not grid road.	Revise SR4, developer (Connolly Homes)	Nature of road to serve development should be determined by Transport Assessment. Expansion of grid road network should be future-proofed.
Need for health facility within Church Farm development	Revise SR4, local residents	The NHS/PCT has indicated that their needs would be better met through the extension of existing premises.
No vehicular access should be allowed from Walton Road	Local residents	The Draft Development Framework states that vehicular access, other than emergency access, will not be allowed from Walton Road.
No vehicular access should be allowed from Newport Road	Local residents	Traffic modelling has shown, to the satisfaction of the Council's Highway officers, that access from Newport Road can be achieved without having an adverse impact on the highway network.
No vehicular access should be allowed from Lower End Road	Local residents	The Draft Development Framework states that vehicular access, other than for existing uses or emergency access, will not be allowed from Lower End Road.
Provision of 80m grid road corridors in land to south of A421 are unnecessary	Developer (Gallagher Estates)	Policy SR5 requires the extension of grid roads into the SLA. The Council's view is that an 80 metre corridor is required to provide for the required landscaping and

		future upgrading to dual carriageway.
There is no requirement for a secondary school to be provided within land to the south of A421.	Developer (Gallagher Estates, Burford Group & Merton College)	The Council's Education Department has indicated that there is a need for a secondary school, as a result of the number of children that are likely to be generated by the development.
There is no requirement for a lorry park or park and ride site to be provided within land to the east of Magna Park	Developer (Gallagher Estates)	The Council's Transport Department has indicated that there is a need for a lorry park and park and ride site in this location.

Stakeholder Groups

Two stakeholder groups have been established for the Strategic Land Allocation: one for the Church Farm site, the other for the sites adjoining the A421.

The Stakeholder Groups provide a forum for representation of local community interests and is the interface between the community, land owners, developers Milton Keynes Council (MKC) in respect of the Strategic Land Allocation.

The Stakeholder Groups also form part of the engagement process for the preparation of the Development Framework for the Strategic Land Allocation and will be a forum for pre-application consultation for future applications in the area.

Strategic Environmental Assessment

An SEA Screening Report was produced to assess the requirement for a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the draft SPD. This was sent to the statutory bodies and made available on the Council's website. Comments received have been incorporated into an SEA Screening Statement.

Previous Regulation 12 Consultation on the Draft SPD

The draft SPD was subject to the following consultation arrangements from Monday 16th July to Friday 5th October 2012:

a) The Draft SPD and supporting documents (SEA Screening Statement, Consultation Statement) were available for inspection:

- at Civic Offices, 1 Saxon Gate East, Central Milton Keynes, MK9 3EJ at CMK, Kingston and Woburn Sands libraries.
- on the council's website: www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/sla

b) An advertisement was placed in the local newspaper the 'MK News' stating where a copy of the documents could be obtained and when and where the documents could be inspected.

c) A covering letter or e-mail was sent to consultees, notifying them of the publication of the draft SPD.

d) To ensure all stakeholders have an opportunity to comment and to accord with the Council's parish protocol, a period of 12 weeks consultation was allowed for the supplementary planning document. The consultation ran from Monday 16th July to Friday 5th October 2012.

e) Drop-in sessions were held in the communities most directly affected by the proposal as follows:

Date	Venue and event
Tues 17 July	MK SNAP, Bourton Low, Walton Drop-in exhibition, 5.30-8pm
Weds 18 July	Wavendon Community Centre, Walton Road, Wavendon Drop-in exhibition, 5.30-8pm
Thurs 19 July	Memorial Hall, Woburn Sands Drop-in exhibition, 5.30-8pm
Saturday 8 September	Memorial Hall, Woburn Sands Drop-in exhibition, 2-5pm
Tues 11 September	MK SNAP, Bourton Low, Walton Drop-in exhibition, 5.30-8pm
Sat 22 September	Wavendon Community Centre, Walton Road, Wavendon Drop-in exhibition, 2-5pm

An exhibition with information taken from the draft Development Framework was provided in the Woburn Sands library for the duration of the consultation exercise.

Additional consultation on the location of the secondary school

The draft Development Framework for the Strategic Land Allocation showed a site for a secondary school on the SLA.

The need for and location of a secondary school campus to serve the SLA has been the subject of discussion at the Core Strategy examination in July 2012. At the examination, Milton Keynes Council states its position as requiring a site sufficiently large to accommodate provision for 5 forms of entry (150 places per year group) of

secondary school places plus sixth form for the pupils it believes will live in the 2,500 new homes planned for the SLA. The council also considered that the right place for the site would be within the new community itself.

The landowner, Gallagher Estates, objected to the requirement for a secondary school to directly serve the needs of the SLA, considering that the SLA would not generate this amount of demand for secondary school places.

The Inspector overseeing the Core Strategy examination encouraged the council and the landowners and developers of the SLA to continue to discuss the secondary school issue and to try to reach agreement as to the best way forward. Out of these discussions, one of the developers, Gallagher Estates, suggested a possible alternative site for the school. The site suggested was the land to the west of Newport Road which, at the time, was identified as open countryside.

An additional consultation was therefore arranged to tell local residents about the possible alternative site and to give them the opportunity to offer their views. The additional consultation material about the secondary school was made available at the drop-in sessions on 8, 11 and 22 September listed in the above table and an extra drop-in session for the secondary school issue was arranged at Wavendon Community Centre on the 6 September.

Summary of Comments received during the Regulation 12 consultation

Some 150 representations were received from a variety of stakeholders. A summary of those representations is attached at Appendix D.

Core Strategy Main Modifications

Following the close of the Core Strategy Examination hearings in July 2012, the Inspector prepared a draft list of main modifications required to make the Core Strategy sound and legally compliant.

One of the main modifications recommended by the Inspector is to increase the extent of land that is allocated for development in the Strategic Land Allocation by the addition of land to the west of the A5130, Newport Road and the addition of a number of small areas of land to the eastern edge of the allocation.

The implications of the Core Strategy Main Modifications for the Strategic Land Allocation and the Development Framework had to be taken into account alongside the analysis of comments on the Framework in preparing a revised version of the document. .

In order to update local residents and other interested parties in south east Milton Keynes of the main modifications and, specifically, the implications of the main modifications on the Strategic Land Allocation a series of drop-in sessions was arranged ahead of the actual public consultation on the Main Modifications which started in mid January 2013.

The drop-in sessions were held as follows:

- **Wavendon**

- Monday 3 December from 19:00 until 21:00
- Wavendon Community Centre, Walton Road, Wavendon

- **Walton**

- Tuesday 4 December from 17:00 until 19:00
- Britten Grove Community Centre, Britten Grove, Old Farm Park

- **Woburn Sands**

- Wednesday 12 December from 19:00 until 21:00
- Memorial Hall, High Street, Woburn Sands

Consultation on Main Modifications, 15 January 2013

Following consideration and approval by Full Council on 9 January 2013, at the Inspector's request, a schedule of proposed main modifications that are considered necessary to make the Core Strategy sound and legally compliant was published for public consultation for six weeks.

A number of drop-in sessions were again arranged and staffed by Development Plans Team Officers. The sessions arranged were as follows:

- **Woburn Sands**

Memorial Hall, High Street, Woburn Sands
Thursday 24 January (7pm-9pm)

- **Wavendon**

Wavendon Community Centre, Walton Road, Wavendon
Monday 28 January (7pm – 9pm)

- **Old Farm Park/Wavendon Gate**

Heronsbrook Meeting Place, Wadesmill Lane, Walnut Tree
Wednesday 13 February (7pm-9pm)

Core Strategy Adoption

Following the consultation on the proposed Main Modifications, the Council received the Inspector's final report on **30 May 2013** confirming that the Core Strategy document, with the main modifications approved in January 2013, is sound and legally compliant, and capable of adoption.

Cabinet on 19 June 2013 recommended that the Core Strategy document, with the main modifications approved in January 2013, be moved to Full Council for adoption.

Full Council on 10th July 2013 adopted the Core Strategy.

Following the adoption of the Core Strategy, the draft SLA Development Framework has been revised to reflect and respond to the changes to the Strategic Land

Allocation arising from the Main Modifications, notably, the inclusion of the land to the west of the A5130, Newport Road.

A further round of consultation on the revised document is considered necessary in order to give local stakeholders the opportunity to consider and comment on the changes to the Development Framework.

Appendix A

Strategic Land Allocation Draft Development Framework Responses to Revised Draft consultation, July-September 2013

The following table shows:

1. The responses received from statutory consultees, ward councillors, parish councils, MKC officers and landowners
2. A summary of the comments made by residents responding to the consultation, arranged by issue and showing the number of responses raising that particular issue.

214 written and email responses setting out objections to various aspects of the proposals were received from residents during the consultation period. Responses have come from residents in the surrounding area, notably Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. The main issues of concern were the proposed access roads into the SLA to the east and west of the A5130 Newport Road and the impact of additional junctions and traffic from the SLA on traffic queues and safety along that road. This issue has also been raised by the parish and town councils in the area.

Three drop-in consultation sessions were held during the consultation period, at Wavendon Community Centre; The Woburn Sands Memorial Hall and at the Wavendon Gate Pavilion. The consultation documents were available on the Council's website and at libraries in the area close to the Strategic Land Allocation.

Comments from statutory consultees, ward councillors, parish councils, MKC officers		
Respondent	Comments	MKC officer response Recommended changes to the Framework are shown in bold
MKC Councillors		
Cllr Peter MacDonald, MKC	My only comment is that we would be losing a valuable 9 hole golf course at Wavendon and therefore what would replace these facilities	<p>The text in the Development Framework at page 36 was negotiated between MKC, the landowners and Sport England before the Core Strategy Examination:</p> <p>The DF states that prior to the physical redevelopment of the 9 hole course land, the landowners will bring forward proposals for enhancement of the golf facilities to the south of Lower End Road to contribute to the aims and objectives of Milton Keynes Council's up to date planning policies, sports and leisure policies and national planning policy, subject to the proposals being commercially viable and also having regard to the other financial commitments that may be required from the landowner under the MK Tariff arrangements, Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy, if appropriate.</p> <p>The proposals will be informed by an up to date assessment of the supply and demand for golf facilities, at the time of physical</p>

		redevelopment of the land. This will be based on identified, justified and required sport/leisure facilities for golf set out in an up to date Sport and Leisure Strategy authored by MKC within six months of the physical redevelopment or a golf assessment provided by the developers and agreed with MKC.
Cllr Jenni Ferrans	Section 3.4 - private amenity space is provided for houses and should also be provided for flats.	The statement in the blue box at section 3.4 is taken from Policy CS12 (3) which refers to “private amenity space for houses”. This bullet point doesn’t really relate to landscape and open space strategy, and so would be better to delete. Advice on private amenity space is provided in the Residential Design Guide which should be read alongside the Development Framework. Recommended change – delete third bullet point in blue box at start of section 3.4
	The level surface street diagram should be annotated "restricted circumstances only - see residential design guide".	Recommended change – delete figures 3.9 & 3.10
	<u>Main access.</u> I am concerned that 2400 homes will all lead out onto the A421, and with only the A421 to lead away from the area, no north-south roads except the city street and through traffic was not supposed to be encouraged along that stretch. ie two grid road exits from the district as a whole, where an urban estate area normally has 8 exits from the roundabout - and is rarely as big as this. And that road is very very busy at peak times and in the morning the right of way from the new housing will be blocked by the traffic. It seems to me that congestion is likely, and that will cause rat running. Therefore we should require the insertion of the infrastructure in the new roundabout to permit traffic lights to be added later, even if the traffic lights are not added at this stage. There will be best part of 1000 new homes in the vicinity of Newport Road, and, since that end is the	The detailed transport assessment that will accompany the planning applications for the land south of the A421 will consider what mitigation/ management is required to allow the roundabouts on the A4212 to function effectively. The access on to Newport Road from the main part of the SLA is planned to be a secondary access. Current proposals are for

	<p>nearest to the city, and the A421 is busy, that will, in reality, be their first choice of exit and we need to provide for it. Ideally the first stretch up to the estate entrances should be treated as a single-carriageway grid road, possibly with a roundabout junction leading to the estates. If that's really not possible, then I would support the proposed treatment with service roads to the houses but really good visibility splays should be provided at the service road exits as the look of the road will hide the scale of the housing from road users and people won't expect the traffic.</p> <p>Similarly with Church Farm, although 400 houses is small for a "grid square", it still needs competent, clearway exits, and since it has only one, I would support that the grid road be built to single-carriageway standard to the estate entrances, at least.</p>	<p>the opening of that secondary access to be phased so that it will not be opened to vehicular traffic until the Kingston roundabout improvements are complete and the A421 is fully dualled.</p> <p>A drawing showing the proposed access to Church Farm will be added to the Development Framework. The proposal is for a single carriageway road, designed for speeds up to 30mph to access the site, but future proofed to protect the grid road corridor for widening and further extension to the east should this be required in the future.</p>
	<p>Clear "green space" separation be provided between the new development and Wavendon village.</p>	<p>An extensive landscape buffer is included in the Development Framework to protect the setting and character of Wavendon, in line with the recommendations of the Core Strategy Inspector.</p>
	<p><u>Pedestrian access</u> I'm not clear whether it's expressly stated that the existing rights of way from Church Farm to the urban area must be maintained. Can this be stated please, to make sure they have safe pedestrian routes from all parts since they will have no facilities.</p>	<p>Page 42 paragraph on Bridleways and Footpaths states that "<i>within the Church Farm site, new footpath links should be provided from the development to the public bridleway on the western edge of the site.</i>"</p> <p>Recommended change – include bullet point in section 2.12 under Facilities to state that "Church Farm site should connect to existing rights of way in order to provide pedestrian access to facilities."</p>
	<p><u>Main facilities</u> it seems odd to have the neighbourhood centre of the western end so far in, rather than closer to the centre of that housing area. In keeping with the old designs it should be backing onto the Newport Road, with safe transit across the road for those</p>	<p>The position of the western neighbourhood centre is indicative. The key locational requirement is that it should be located along the main spine road.</p>

	who want to use it from both sides.	
	<p><u>Housing</u> The section on housing should make reference to the preference for having small family houses overlooking play areas, particularly local play areas, which is in the residential design guide as a preference</p>	The Residential Design Guide should be considered alongside the Development Framework. It is not considered necessary to repeat guidance already contained in the Design Guide.
	<p><u>Land uses</u> I do not understand why the lorry park is being located so far from the A421. Would a site closer to the Park and Ride not be more appropriate, so that facilities there could serve both? And there is no mention of the park and ride in the land uses section. Surely it should be included?</p>	A lorry park would not provide an attractive frontage to the A421 at the entrance point to Milton Keynes. The Park and ride site is referred to in the Movement Framework section.
	<p><u>Facilities</u> Walnut Tree surgery is currently discussing expansion to cover Walton Grange and any further housing adjacent to it. if it is also to take Church Farm this needs to be discussed with them now! I am not clear that there is space, and there is nowhere else that Walton Grange residents can get to.</p> <p>The rest of the area surely needs at least a small GP surgery? it's a long way from Broughton Gate and it's not clear that they can get there by bus.</p>	Discussions are ongoing with the NHS as how best to serve the SLA.
	The part about centres seems to be mixing up local and neighbourhood centres. In other contexts we use Neighbourhood to mean bigger than Local. Can we find some other term? (or maybe just say small retail sites?). For the Local centre, 2000 out of 3000 total seems a lot for one shop. The most successful neighbourhood centres have a range of shops and are not too dominated by one shop. 1000 might be more appropriate.	<p>The retail hierarchy in the Core Strategy recognises the following hierarchy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Shopping Centres • District Centres • Town Centres • Local and Village centres <p>Neighbourhood centres are not therefore a recognised term, so the best description of this centre is a local centre, the role of which is “to provide convenience shopping and service facilities in order to reduce and minimise car dependency and to ensure ready access by non-car owning households and other people with limited or impaired mobility.”</p>

	<p>Local centres that face grid roads are appropriate where there is an adjacent underpass. Otherwise they do fine with their back to the grid road but signage on that back to attract passing traffic. I suggest we remove the bit about facing the grid road, or we will encourage pedestrian crossing of the road at grade. Servicing should be separated from the public realm as per RDG.</p>	<p>In terms of the size of the shop, the number of dwellings planned is similar to a settlement such as Olney or Stony Stratford but not as big as Wolverton. MKC aims to have at least one general convenience store in each local centre. Other stores in local centres are typically a takeaway; hairdressers; post office, often provided in conjunction with the general store and a pharmacy – often provided in association with a surgery or health centre.</p> <p>If the supermarket size in 2000sqm gross then the amount of net tradeable floorspace will be less than this. The net amount of tradeable floorspace varies by operator but the size range quoted would be attractive to a Lidl, Aldi Tesco, Morrison’s store etc. If a developer wanted to develop a number of smaller shops in a local centre that could be considered, but it would be for the developer to bring those forward.</p> <p>The Development Framework does not state that the local centre should face the grid road. The design of the local centre will be a matter to be determined at planning application stage. The Fen Roundabout has been designed with an underpass which will enable pedestrian/cycle crossing of the grid road.</p>
	<p><u>Density</u> it seems inappropriate to me that Walton Road’s density is lower than the Wavendon and rural edges. Walton Road will be fully encompassed within the urban extension. Swapping over the densities would seem more appropriate!</p> <p>Safety and Security should surely mention Secure by Design.</p>	<p>The density of the Walton Road character area is related to the existing density and character of Wavendon village. The Wavendon/rural edge character area reflects the densities of Old Farm Park and Wavendon Gate. They still allow for a range of densities within the main part of the Church Farm site and the land north of Wavendon. Swapping over the densities would not enable the required capacity of the SLA to be achieved.</p> <p><u>Recommended change – include additional sentence in paragraph on page 52 under heading ‘Safety and Security’ to read: “Developers should follow best practice guidance in ‘Secured by Design’ to</u></p>

	<p>The intro says the SDP will cover phasing, but there seems to be no mention of it elsewhere. Change the intro?</p>	<p>design out opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour.”</p> <p>Recommended change – amend fourth bullet point in paragraph 1.2 to read: “</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure delivery”
	<p><u>Other facilities</u></p> <p>Has the capacity for schools and health centres within the standard distances and by public transport been assessed? We do not want another estate where the residents can't get into "their" school because they are at the edge of the catchment and it's full, or where they can't, in practice, get to their GP unless they have a car.</p>	<p>The secondary school and two primary schools within the main part of the SLA will be accessible on a bus route from the internal road within the development. For Church Farm we are liaising with the Setting and Schools Organisation team to identify school provision. This will be as local as possible to the development site and will reflect the 2012-2013 Setting and School Organisation Framework which states that changes to school or the creation of new schools should not result in unreasonably long journeys, increased transport costs or negatively impact on children due to unsuitable walking or cycling routes.</p> <p>In terms of health provision we are continuing our discussions with NHS England and the CCG over the provision of primary care to serve the SLA. Accessibility of services is a factor that we are discussing with them.</p>
	<p><u>Edge treatments</u></p> <p>The eastern boundary treatment of Church Farm seems daft to me. One of the pleasures of living right on the edge of a city or village is traditionally the back gardens with views over the surrounding countryside. Surely it would be better to have the houses facing inwards, as is normal with villages and edge of city developments, but with a couple of cul-de-sac ends that can be used to connect through if we do develop later? it's also much more intrusive to the countryside to have the houses facing that way.</p>	<p>Along part of the eastern boundary the site abuts Phoebe Lane, which is a public right of way and therefore it would be good practice to overlook this route. Further south the key objective is to retain the existing hedgerow and avoid a line of close boarded fences providing the interface with the open countryside. It may be possible to achieve this objective with houses backing onto the boundary, subject to appropriate design measures.</p> <p>Recommended change – Replace second paragraph under heading ‘Church Farm’ with following text:</p> <p>“The eastern boundary of the site is marked by a mature hedgerow, which should be retained. For part of its length, Phoebe Lane, which is a public right of way, runs along the outside of the site boundary. The development will be open to views from Phoebe Lane and from</p>

		<p>other public vantage points to the east.</p> <p>Where development adjoins the public right of way, development should front the boundary to provide surveillance of the public right of way and to retain the existing hedge within the public realm. Elsewhere development can back onto this boundary provided the hedge is retained within an appropriately sized garden. For security, a weldmesh fence should be located on the eastern side of the hedge.”</p>
	<p><u>Internal Roads</u></p> <p>I thought we were trying to avoid un surveilled redways along grid roads, so why are we putting redways north-south along the two new stretches of grid road leading nowhere and with no facilities along them, rather than down the middle of the estates (eg along the green space or through the houses to the shops) where they would get much more frequent usage? OK one is an existing right of way, but why the other? Redways need to lead somewhere people want to go to, from houses!</p>	<p>The Development Framework provides for a redway along the main spine road through the land south of the A421, connecting houses to the main facilities. The redways along the grid roads will help to connect the network into adjoining grid squares. The redway along the A421 will provide a fast route for cyclists who want to travel greater distances at increased speeds with less interruptions from crossing streets.</p>
	<p>The confusion between secondary streets and residential streets, and the failure to include a diagram or photo of a minor residential street gives the idea that minor streets will be level surface, whereas such streets are only acceptable in very limited circumstances. Can we retitle the top photo "Secondary street in Milton Keynes" and find a photo of a minor non-level street instead of the level surface street one? (Since i think we said cul-de-sacs the photo might not be acceptable anyway.)</p>	<p><u>Recommended changes – table 3.3 ‘residential street’</u></p> <p>(i) change heading to “residential/tertiary street”; (ii) amend second sentence under ‘design criteria’ to read: “In appropriate locations, can be designed as level surface streets (see New Residential Design Guide SPD).” Delete figures 3.9 & 3.10 and accompanying photo. Include cross-section and photo of “residential/tertiary street”. Change title of figure 3.8 to: “illustrative secondary street cross section” and of accompanying photo to; “typical secondary street in Milton Keynes”</p>
Parish Councils		
Woburn Sands Town Council	<p>Woburn Sands Town Council is very concerned about several aspects of this revised development framework which seems to have done little to take into consideration the comments this council has previously made on the earlier consultations.</p>	

	<p>1. <u>The Core Strategy</u></p> <p>1.i The original Core Strategy retained the par 3 9 hole golf course, pitch and putt and golf range between SR 2 and SR3 along with the club house which serves the 18 hole golf course on the opposite side of the road. Following further consultations the land between SR2 and SR3 was included in the SLA on the understanding that the facilities on this land would be relocated nearby but the club house, if not moved, would remain in situ. It now appears that all mention of replacement facilities has been lost from the Development Framework apart from the suggestion that the existing 18 hole course could be played as a 9 hole course. However, this is not nearly the same thing as a par 3 9 hole course with driving range and pitch and putt course. These are of vital importance in getting young people and newcomers to golf started on this sport which in turn can be played well into old age. The only other such facility in Milton Keynes is on the west of the city and the potential loss of these starter facilities surely flies in the face of any strategy to develop wide participation in sport, an aim of both Milton Keynes and of the Government.</p> <p>The facilities lost through development must be replaced in this locality.</p> <p>1.ii As a result of the Inspector’s examination of the Core Strategy in July 2012, the area north of Wavendon was added to SLA. Whilst Woburn Sands Town Council was extremely concerned about the impact of this upon our community, we came to the overall conclusion that in order not to</p>	<p>The text in the Development Framework at page 36 was negotiated between MKC, the landowners and Sport England before the Core Strategy Examination:</p> <p>The DF states that prior to the physical redevelopment of the 9 hole course land, the landowners will bring forward proposals for enhancement of the golf facilities to the south of Lower End Road to contribute to the aims and objectives of Milton Keynes Council's up to date planning policies, sports and leisure policies and national planning policy, subject to the proposals being commercially viable and also having regard to the other financial commitments that may be required from the landowner under the MK Tariff arrangements, Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy, if appropriate...</p> <p>The proposals will be informed by an up to date assessment of the supply and demand for golf facilities, at the time of physical redevelopment of the land. This will be based on identified, justified and required sport/leisure facilities for golf set out in an up to date Sport and Leisure Strategy authored by MKC within six months of the physical redevelopment or a golf assessment provided by the developers and agreed with MKC.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>delay further the adoption of the Core Strategy, by now long overdue, we would accept this at the same time listing what may be necessary to minimise the impact in our community.</p> <p>Our requests have largely been ignored in the Development Framework.</p> <p>2. <u>The Landscape Setting.</u> It is very important to maintain the rural aspect of the approach to the rural south east sector of Milton Keynes in which Woburn Sands is a small old town serving a number of villages in Milton Keynes and Central Beds. We are therefore pleased to see that mature hedges along the Newport Road, A 5130, are to be maintained and enhanced and it is essential that this feature remains in the Framework. Milton Keynes from its inception has always stated its aim to preserve the character and identity of existing settlements in the rural areas of Milton Keynes and this SLA is right on the northern edge of such an area. The character of the rural area must be protected.</p> <p>3. <u>Highways, Redways Footpaths and Public Transport.</u> 3.i This is the section which most alarms the residents of our community and which unfortunately remains very unclear and appears ill thought through. On P41 it states that a secondary access point onto the Newport Road will be provided from the land south of the A421. It goes on to state that measures may need to be introduced to ensure this does not become a rat run between the A421 and Newport Road (and vice versa) such as by limiting usage of a short section. Yet in the section following about the land to the north of Wavendon it states that internal access roads would allow for access from the eastern to western side of the site. These two statements need absolute clarification as they can</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The wording of the Development Framework on page 41 under Land north of Wavendon needs to be amended to clarify its meaning. The intention is that the Land north of Wavendon will be served from two separate access roads – one to Newport Road and one to H9 Groveway. This will not be a through road for cars in order to prevent the route becoming a rat run. Consideration could, though, be given to the creation of a bus route linking the two accesses. <u>Recommended change – Delete the second half of the second paragraph under ‘Land north of Wavendon’ on page 41 (from “although internal residential...”) .</u></p> <p>The impact of the SLA on traffic in the existing area will be considered in detail in transport assessments accompanying planning applications. The National</p>
--	--	---

	<p>appear contradictory and it is not possible to see how both can be achieved along with full access to the A421 for all the residents of the main development area.</p> <p>3.ii <u>The crossing of the A5130, Newport Road, by the internal east-west secondary street is the single greatest concern for residents in this rural sector of Milton Keynes</u> and since the nature of this crossing point is not indicated the concerns are heightened. The A5130 is already subjected to long queues at the approach to the Kingston roundabout as is accepted by the traffic assessment undertaken by Brian Mathews. Whilst improvements to the Kingston roundabout should alleviate this situation, the queues will simply be transferred to the new junction to the south, thus doing nothing to ease access for residents of this community and nothing to ease the movement of emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>Planning Policy Framework states that Transport Assessments will need to consider whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and whether improvements can be made within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</p> <p>In that context, Officers have considered traffic modelling information in looking at the issues raised. An important factor in considering how traffic will be affected by the development of the SLA is the impact that the planned improvements to the Kingston roundabout will have. The Kingston junction improvements have been designed to accommodate existing and future forecast traffic from the SLA access to both the A421 (Fen Junction) and A5130. The provision of the two access points feeding into Kingston allows for the delivery of a more even distribution of traffic and it is this which ensures that the junction delivers significant reduction in traffic congestion. The design and its development was assessed by the Department for Transport and was awarded funding based on its performance in removing a significant ‘pinch point’ on the network.</p> <p>The development of the design did consider an option without the access on the A5130, however the performance of Kingston in this scenario was reduced and does not offer the same level of benefits as the preferred option. Whilst the introduction of the secondary access on to the A5130 will, upon the completion of the SLA development, increase the average queue length on the Newport Road in the morning peak, the numbers of vehicles affected is significantly lower (and therefore the cumulative effect is less) than on the A421 at the same time.</p> <p><u>Recommended change:</u> add text to the Framework (end of first para under “Highway Access: Land to the south of A421” on page 41) to state that: “The secondary access road to the land south of the A421 onto the A5130, Newport Road should not be opened to</p>
--	---	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A roundabout is out of the question since it will give priority to traffic from the right which means north bound traffic on the A5130 has to give way to all traffic emerging from the eastern main section of the SLA, whilst traffic southbound will have to give way to traffic crossing from the western end to the eastern side of the development • The junction will make it easy for residents from the 	<p>vehicular traffic until, at the earliest, the upgrade of the Kingston roundabout is complete and the dualling of the A421 to the Milton Keynes Council boundary and preferably to Junction 13 of the M1 is in place. The phasing of the opening of the secondary access should be linked to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the reduced performance of the new Kingston Junction, as a result of increased pressure from the A421 from the east ; • Completion of the dualling of the A421 to the MKC boundary and preferably all the way to Junction 13 of the M1. However this latter section of dualling does not yet have funding and whilst, we are optimistic that it will come forward as it is a regional priority within SEMLEP, it would not be appropriate to restrict development on the basis of the delivery of infrastructure that is currently outside of our direct control and in a neighbouring authority's area. • The latest position regarding the East West Rail service, the electrification of the line (planned for 2019) and the level crossing option selected to be taken forward at Woburn Sands. <p>Given the above phasing requirements and anticipated build out rates it might be that the secondary access may not be required before 2021. In the meantime the local community will benefit from the improved Kingston roundabout.</p> <p>When proposals for new junctions on the A5130 serving the SLA come forward they will be subject to consultation with local residents.</p> <p>With regard to access to the land to the north of Wavendon this will need to be considered in detail (bus routes, junction on A5130, access to The Stables etc as part of the detailed transport assessment accompanying planning applications."</p> <p>With regard to access to the land to the north of Wavendon this will need to be</p>
--	---	--

	<p>main part of the SLA to turn south onto the A5130 during the morning peak in particular and take an alternative route via Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise to J13 on the M1. This rat running which already exists cannot be allowed to increase via this junction as the roads through Woburn Sands cannot cope. We note the Brian Mathews study accepts this rat running is a possibility and suggests traffic calming measures to deter it from happening. Such measures will affect residents of Woburn Sands every day of the year slowing yet further the journey between the town and Kingston roundabout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic from the development to the south of the A421 will be discouraged from exiting onto the A421 since with priority to the right, waiting for a gap in the traffic moving westwards on the A421 will be a lengthy process. Therefore, this will further encourage an exit onto the Newport Road if the opportunity is there, adding to the volume of traffic and thus impeding flows from the direction of Woburn Sands. • The potential queues at the new junction will also possibly lead 	<p>considered in detail (bus routes, junction on A5130, access to The Stables etc) as part of the detailed transport assessment accompanying planning applications. The planning applications will be subject to formal consultation.”</p> <p>The nature of the junction of the proposed new access roads to Newport Road is not yet decided. Further work on this will emerge in the transport assessments that will need to accompany future planning applications. Consultation will take place on planning proposals relating to the junction as and access roads.</p> <p>Traffic flows south of the access would be the same irrespective of whether an access was provided or not. An access into the development land to the east of Newport Rd would only affect the routing of traffic (ie it would mean that traffic from the SLA wanting to head south on Newport Road would not have to pass through Kingston roundabout first). Considering the rat running issue, travel time analysis shows that the Kingston to M1 via Woburn Sands/Aspley Guise would take up to 66% longer than Kingston to M1 via the A421.</p> <p>We will be starting discussions with Central Beds Council and Aspley Guise Parish Council (and other parish/town councils in the immediate area) to discuss the potential for traffic calming measures to address the situation.</p> <p>The junction on the A421 will be designed to cater for the forecast flow to and from the SLA . The design standard is to cater for the busiest forecast hour (typically am and pm peaks) and develop the design to accommodate this level of traffic</p> <p>We will work with the parish councils locally to identify ways of reducing the</p>
--	---	--

	<p>to rat running via Walton Road which is even more unsuited to increased traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northbound queuing could be somewhat alleviated by widening the A5130 along with a staggered junction thus allowing through northbound traffic junction to progress unhindered by traffic making a right turn into the new estate. • However, the only satisfactory solution to this whole significant problem is to remove the possibility of road access onto the Newport Road completely and replace it with a footbridge and cycle crossing bridge to serve the connection of residents on both sides of the Newport Road and to link with the internal road network. • The section of the Revised Draft under Redways, Footpaths and Bridleways on P42 mentions a crossing for these users but does not specify it should be via a bridge (or underpass). Thus such a measure would encourage walking and cycling between all parts of the SLA instead of car use which again strengthens the Government policy in 	<p>temptation for motorists to rat run through roads such as Walton Road.</p> <p>The detailed road and junction layout will be designed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Traffic modelling has shown that without a secondary access onto Newport Road, the Fen Roundabout junction on the A421 would not operate effectively once the full SLA development was built out.</p> <p>See above for new text to be added the SLA DF re the phasing of the secondary access onto the A5130 Newport Road.</p> <p>Further discussions will be had with Gallagher Estates about a possible underpass under the Newport Road to link the two sides of the SLA at this point. Underpasses are included in the designs for Kingston roundabout which enable grade separated crossing of the Newport road</p> <p>We cannot be sure what type of pedestrian/cycle crossing might be installed until we have received proposals of what form any junction into the development might take. This is not likely to happen until we receive planning applications. At that time we can make representations to the applicant to ensure that any pedestrian/cycle facility is fit for purpose and safe.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>this respect, and meets MKC's own criteria to decrease car usage. A bridge or underpass is essential as even if the road access onto Newport Road remains, it will be necessary to separate pedestrians and cyclists from this junction.</p> <p>3.iii. Public Transport. Fig 3.5 shows existing and proposed movement through this area. However, the route of the number 300 through to Woburn Sands from the Kingston roundabout appears to be missing in the stretch immediately south of the Kingston roundabout.</p> <p>Further bus stops on each side of Newport Road need to be added in the vicinity of the secondary east west route, which will hopefully be a foot/cycle bridge. This will increase the viability of the no.300 route through to Woburn Sands.</p> <p>Quite what the purpose of the number 2 is is mystifying. The whole of the new development is within closer reach of existing routes on the A5130 and the A421 than many parts of Woburn Sands are to their nearest bus route. If a route needs to be provided to the eastern section of the development, take the number proposed number 1 into it ending at the suggested dead end adjacent to the Newport Road. The number 2 as shown will add yet further problems with the planned right hand turn onto the Newport Road.</p> <p>3.iv. Dualling of the A421. Several references are made about completing the dualling of the A421 and money appears to be available to do this in the Milton Keynes section. However, it seems that money is only available for</p>	<p>Recommended change: Add the 300 bus route to Figure 3.5</p> <p>The exact location for new bus stops will be identified through transport assessments accompanying the planning applications</p> <p>The bus services are for different purposes and would not be desirable to have a single service. The first bus would serve the residential area south of the A421 and the second to serve the proposed Park and Ride site/Eagle Farm North.</p> <p>Whilst it is correct that we only have funding in place to deliver the dualling of the A421 as far as the borough boundary, there is funding for design work for the final leg of the dualling down to Junction 13 on conjunction with Central Beds Council and the completion of this section of road</p>
--	---	--

	<p>design work to be done in the Bedfordshire section leading to J13. Without the completion of this full dualling through to J13, none of this development should be allowed to commence. If it is begun, the effect of rat running referred to several times above through Woburn Sands and neighbouring villages will be totally horrific.</p> <p>In summary on this section, Woburn Sands Town Council urges</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the removal of the new road crossing of the Newport Road and its replacement with a cycle/pedestrian bridge (necessary in its own right). b. the removal of the unnecessary number 2 bus route, c. the essential completion of dualling of the A421 through to J13 before the development is begun. <p>4. <u>The Size and Site of the Secondary School</u></p> <p>4.i A 6 form entry school is included in the Development Framework to serve the development. However, this must be amended to include Woburn Sands and Wavendon for whom this will be the closest secondary school and it must be of a size to accommodate this. The population of Woburn Sands is set to increase by more than 50% with the completion of the Parklands development and this will consist primarily of families for whom the new school here will be essential. At present the secondary age pupils from Woburn Sands go in many directions: to Walton High or Oakgrove at 11, or to Leighton Buzzard and Ampthill at 13, leading to a serious loss of social cohesion in this significant teenage group to the detriment of a community spirit. A new secondary school within the SLA could do a great deal to solve this problem, and the Parklands development has contributed large sums of money for the development of secondary</p>	<p>is a regional infrastructure priority. The expectation is that the dualling all the way to J13 will be complete before the SLA development is fully built out</p> <p>A 6 FoE secondary school plus sixth form is the size of school required to meet the needs directly arising from the SLA itself.</p> <p>The s106 regulations only enable the Council to obtain land of a size which is reasonable to support a school of a size directly related to the impact of the development itself (6FE plus sixth form). The law does not provide for more than this, and the land owner has been clear that the site provided for the secondary school should not be affected in any way by any existing conditions or issues for which they are not responsible. The size of the site is therefore fixed, and this will constrain the possible size of the school. The size of the school is a local decision, however, and a larger school can certainly be considered nearer to the time if there is sufficient demand, the design allows it and the council has sufficient capital to support the increase in costs.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>education in Milton Keynes. Now is the time to ensure that Woburn Sands pupils get the benefit of this input.</p> <p>The inclusion of this area to the school's catchment will also enhance its intake.</p> <p>4.ii With this catchment in mind, it would be desirable to move the site of the secondary school, and the primary school to share its campus further west to the side of Newport Road. This serves 2 purposes:</p> <p>a) with the new footbridge it will make a primary school more accessible and closer to the land north of Wavendon but still serve the western section of the main part of the development</p> <p>b) it will enable pupils from Wavendon and Woburn Sands to access it more easily by foot or cycle (with the new pedestrian/cycle bridge) or indeed via the number 300 with new bus stops as mentioned in 3.iii above. Parents who persist in using cars to transport secondary age pupils will have to go via the Kingston Roundabout and A421 (assuming 3.11 above is auctioned), a considerable deterrent.</p> <p>Thus moving the site to somewhere adjacent to the Newport Road strengthens Milton Keynes school transport policy very considerably with the vast majority of pupils attending doing so by foot cycle or public transport</p> <p>4.iii A secondary school of sufficient size and accessible to the community of Woburn Sands and around will enable the adult</p>	<p>The site for the secondary school as shown on the DF locates the school in a relatively central location given its main purpose is to serve the SLA. The DF provides guidance and it is therefore possible for an alternative site for the school to be put forward in a subsequent planning application, should the catchment change.</p> <p>Whilst the idea of shared use of secondary school facilities seems like an ideal solution to space saving, in reality however this has not been successful elsewhere in Milton Keynes – see comments from the council's Leisure Services team below. For example – Oakgrove School and Leisure Centre share a site and playing fields. Although there has been agreement for shared use, there has been no access to the playing fields to the public. Where community use has been agreed there is no means of enforcement should this not be forthcoming and remains entirely in control of the management of the school.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>population to make use of and support the sporting and leisure facilities of the school, an area of recreation and leisure which is at present underresourced in Woburn Sands.</p> <p>4.iv The changed location will also put a greater distance and therefore distinction between this school and that being built at Brooklands less than 1 mile to the north.</p> <p>5. Conclusion. To date in many consultations, the objections and concerns of Woburn Sands and surrounding villages have not been addressed satisfactorily. We are confident that all the items above will be supported by responses from this rural area, both in residents' letters and by the Parish Councils concerned. We look forward to the amendments requested being implemented.</p>	<p>This is not a factor in the location of the secondary school.</p>
<p>Aspley Guise Parish Council</p>	<p>The Parish Council is particularly concerned about the impact of the resulting increase in traffic both on Aspley Guise and on neighbouring towns and villages in Milton Keynes and Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>Aspley Guise already suffers from significant levels of traffic through the village "rat-running" to avoid delays on the A421. This situation will only get worse with the continued development of the areas within Milton Keynes where development is already planned including the former Nampak site, the Eastern Expansion Areas of Brooklands and Broughton, Magna Park and other sites within the Milton Keynes urban area.</p> <p>The main route used by this traffic through the village borders very narrow footpaths (much less safe than those found throughout Milton Keynes) used by schoolchildren to get to the three</p>	<p>Traffic modelling shows that by 2026 with all of the SLA development in place and with the upgrades to the Kingston roundabout and the dualling of the A421 to J13 of the M1 complete, traffic levels in Aspley Guise will show an increase of 3% in the am and pm peak. That level of traffic increase will reflect the general background increase in car movements in the local area as much as the impact of the new development of the SLA.</p> <p>A travel time analysis based on when the development is completed (2026) for the journey from Kingston roundabout to the M1 Junction 13 shows that the route via Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise takes 50% longer than the route via the A421. This in itself will discourage motorists from viewing the Woburn Sands/ Aspley Guise route as an attractive alternative.</p> <p>As a result of the work done recently on the South East Rural Roads traffic study, the Council will work with colleagues in Central Beds Council and the affected parish and town councils in the area to</p>

	<p>local schools within the village and other pedestrians. The village also suffers from many HGV's ignoring the weight restriction on such vehicles.</p> <p>The rural area traffic study (which we greatly appreciate being included in) recently completed has demonstrated that even with the beneficial impact of the dualling of the A421 along the whole route from M1 J13 to the Kingston roundabout and the planned improvements to that roundabout, there would still be an increase in traffic through the village as a result of the proposed development.</p> <p>Accordingly the Parish Council firmly believes that development of the Strategic Land Allocation should be conditional on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Funding being secured for the dualling of the A421 along the whole route from M1 J13 to the Kingston roundabout 2. A scheme of traffic calming measures and improvements for pedestrians for Aspley Guise being agreed between local residents, Central Beds Council, Milton Keynes Council and the developers and funding secured to implement the scheme 3. A full evaluation being completed of potential queues at all existing and proposed junctions from the centre of Woburn Sands to the Kingston roundabout and appropriate measures being planned and implemented to avoid excessive queues <p>We are also concerned about the effect on both existing traffic and that that would be generated from</p>	<p>identify measures that can be implemented to mitigate the impact of increasing traffic levels.</p> <p>Whilst it is correct that we only have funding in place to deliver the dualling of the A421 as far as the borough boundary, there is funding for design work for the final leg of the dualling down to Junction 13 in conjunction with Central Beds Council and the completion of this section of road is a regional infrastructure priority. The expectation is that the dualling all the way to J13 will be complete before the SLA development is fully built out</p> <p>Noted and we will be contacting you to start discussions on this.</p> <p>This would be scoped within a future planning application (within the transport assessment. section) Agreement will be then sought between the two councils, the local community as to the appropriate measures required to address the identified issue.</p> <p>The issues of the East-West rail and electrification project are acknowledged but at present there is little information or</p>
--	--	--

	<p>the Strategic Land Allocation from the plans for the development of the East West Rail link and for the electrification of the line from Southampton to Sheffield. This could potentially see a number of local railway stations and crossings, including Aspley Guise, Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill, permanently closed or with significantly increased times when the barriers are down.</p> <p>The development of the Strategic Land Allocation cannot be allowed to proceed until the impact of the plans for East West Rail are fully understood and plans to mitigate the serious impacts on traffic through the area are developed and funding secured to implement them.</p>	<p>certainty from Network Rail as to the likely solution to the issues regarding the future treatment of the level crossings. How the existing level crossing are dealt with, especially the Woburn Sands crossing, will have a knock-on effect on traffic levels and flows across this area. The situation needs to be acknowledged in the DF and text should be added to note that developers will need to have regard to the most up to date information and position regarding East-West Rail when preparing future planning applications and Transport Assessments.</p> <p>We are assured by the East-West rail team at Network Rail that the closure of the Newport Road at the Woburn Sands level crossing is not an option.</p> <p>Recommended change: Add a new heading on page 41 in the Public Transport section after Church Farm:</p> <p><u>“East-West Rail</u> Network Rail has established a Task Force which is considering what will need to be done to the existing level crossings along the route of East-West Rail ahead of the delivery of the rail proposal. The outcome of this work is not yet known and is not therefore available to inform this Development Framework, however, developers will need to have regard to and respond to the most up to date information when preparing planning applications and transport assessments for the development of the SLA.” .</p>
Wavendon Parish Council	<p><u>New light controlled crossroads on Newport Road:</u> Wavendon Parish Council opposes the construction of access points east and west into the SLA (Glebe Farm) and land north of Wavendon village. Traffic modelling has clearly demonstrated that the access points are unnecessary and would add to congestion on an inappropriate rural trunk route. Access should be directly into the city grid road system via the Fen Street roundabout and the eastern access roundabout (to be constructed) and via an access from the Towergate access onto Groveway</p>	<p>Traffic modelling has shown that without a secondary access onto Newport Road, the Fen Roundabout junction on the A421 would not operate effectively once the full SLA development was built out.</p> <p>See the recommended change to the phasing of the secondary access:</p> <p>Recommended change: add text to the Framework (end of first para under “Highway Access: Land to the south of A421” on page 41) to state that: “The secondary access road to the land south of the A421 onto the A5130, Newport Road should not be opened to vehicular traffic until, at the earliest, the upgrade of the Kingston roundabout is complete and the dualling of the A421 to</p>

		<p>the Milton Keynes Council boundary and preferably to Junction 13 of the M1 is in place. The phasing of the opening of the secondary access should be linked to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the reduced performance of the new Kingston Junction, as a result of increased pressure from the A421 from the east ; • Completion of the dualling of the A421 to the MKC boundary and preferably all the way to Junction 13 of the M1. However this latter section of dualling does not yet have funding and whilst, we are optimistic that it will come forward as it is a regional priority within SEMLEP, it would not be appropriate to restrict development on the basis of the delivery of infrastructure that is currently outside of our direct control and in a neighbouring authority's area. • The latest position regarding the East West Rail service, the electrification of the line (planned for 2019) and the level crossing option selected to be taken forward at Woburn Sands. <p>Given the above phasing requirements and anticipated build out rates it might be that the secondary access may not be required before 2021. In the meantime the local community will benefit from the improved Kingston roundabout.</p> <p>When proposals for new junctions on the A5130 serving the SLA come forward they will be subject to consultation with local residents.</p> <p>With regard to access to the land to the north of Wavendon this will need to be considered in detail (bus routes, junction on A5130, access to The Stables etc as part of the detailed transport assessment accompanying planning applications.”</p>
	<p><u>Rat running:</u> Constructing connecting access points on A5130 Newport Road and H9 will encourage rat running to avoid the Kingston roundabout. Attempts to</p>	<p>The starting point is that there should be no through road for cars between the new accesses to the land north of Wavendon from Newport Road and H9, Groveway. However, in order to facilitate public</p>

	counter that by blocking through access would work against public transport movements	<p>transport measures such as bus gates or similar could be installed to enable bus only access through the site.</p> <p>As noted above in response to comments from Woburn Sands Town Council, there is a need to clarify the wording in respect of the links between the two accesses serving the land north of Wavendon –</p> <p>Recommended change – Delete the second half of the second paragraph under ‘Land north of Wavendon’ on page 41 (from “<i>although internal residential...</i>”).</p>
	<p><u>Stockwell Lane:</u> Stockwell Lane access should remain and be improved to two way traffic to the access to the Stables to provide access to the land north of Wavendon area for new residents. Beyond the Stables access the land should revert to single track traffic (one way only) for traffic leaving Wavendon village (i.e. northbound only).</p>	<p>In order to use Stockwell Lane to provide access to the new SLA development to the north of Wavendon as well as The Stables, the existing Stockwell Lane junction and Stockwell Lane itself would have to be improved to improve capacity, maintain road safety and to provide for pedestrian cycle crossing facilities. The character of Stockwell Lane would be lost as a result. An alternative access from Newport Road into the land to the south would give the opportunity to close the sub-standard Stockwell Lane junction and to preserve the character of Stockwell Lane by converting it into a walking/cycle route. This could also have road safety benefits in comparison to the existing arrangement.</p> <p>With the closure of the existing sub-standard Stockwell Lane junction, the new access would in essence be a replacement junction rather than a new one.</p>
	<p><u>Lower End Road:</u> Under no circumstances should any access be permitted from the new SLA development onto Lower End Road (apart from existing access arrangements). A substantial green buffer of planting should be inserted between the Lower End Road and the SLA development.</p>	<p>The Development Framework (page 41) seeks no further accesses onto Lower End Road. There are, however, existing accesses (eg to the golf club house; Sibley Haulage) and these may continue to be used for the foreseeable future. Page 35 of the Framework seeks the retention of and, where necessary, strengthening of the existing hedgerows along Lower End Road. Houses should be set back from the road and hedgeline.</p>
	<p><u>Footpath access:</u> Red way access should be included via an underpass at the Kingston Roundabout and underpasses Fen Street and new eastern end roundabout.</p>	<p>Underpasses are part of the scheme for the upgrading of the Kingston roundabout to integrate with the redway network in Milton Keynes.</p>
	<p><u>Land north of Wavendon:</u> It should</p>	<p>The inspector commented on the “existing</p>

	<p>be clearly shown that land north of Wavendon enjoys a 200 metre green planted buffer (as the Planning Inspector has confirmed was her intention when amending that element of the Core Strategy) and will not include any opportunities for development north of Wavendon St Mary's Church.</p>	<p>green setting for Wavendon that forms the basis of (the) buffer".</p> <p>Recommended change: Clarify the text and Figures 3.4 and 3.13 to show that the land north of St Mary's Church is private, unallocated land.</p>
	<p><u>Community and Leisure Facilities:</u> Before agreeing to the number, type and size of sports facilities research should be undertaken into likely need and demand for various sports options. Access to education sports facilities should be made available to Indoor sports and community facilities should be included in the development proposals including offices for local community and democratic administration purposes.</p>	<p>Playing field allocation is as per the required planning standards and in general is allocated for football and cricket as this is where there is demand. The actual usage of the fields however will be as the local and strategic requirement at the time of handover, and the pitches can be used for other sports as required. The Pavilion space allocation is for a multi purpose community and sport facility based on a draft brief that includes office space, meeting room space, community hall, sports hall and changing facilities but will be developed as per the demand at design consultation stage.</p>
	<p><u>Densities and layout</u> Wavendon Parish Council is concerned that the overall densities proposed for the sites will not allow for housing, infrastructure sufficient green planting without there being unacceptably high density levels in many parts of the SLA. Densities close to Lower End Road should be no more than 10 -15 per hectare.</p>	<p>The Lower End Road frontage area is part of the Wavendon/rural Edge character typology – average density in this area will be lower than the surrounding area at 15-30 dwellings per hectare. The development should follow an informal layout with soft landscaping and tree planting to soften to create and compliment the green setting.</p>
	<p><u>Walton Road,</u> Wavendon village is a quiet country lane not designed for the levels of traffic now being experienced. Given the likely increases in rat running traffic a traffic calming scheme aimed at persuading traffic not to use this route to avoid the Kingston Roundabout should be included in highways modelling outcomes.</p>	<p>We will work with the parish councils locally to identify ways of reducing the temptation for motorists to rat run through roads such as Walton Road.</p>
	<p><u>Church Farm:</u> There should be no access, other than emergency access, into the Church Farm development from Walton Road.</p>	<p>Noted – this accords with the Development Framework</p>
	<p><u>School(s):</u> Wavendon Parish Council supports the siting of the new secondary school and primary schools on the Glebe Farm and Eagle Farm SLA sites.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<u>Footpaths (Church Farm):</u> Wavendon Parish Council supports the layout of footpaths across Church Farm that adds access options into Wavendon village via Phoebe Lane and provides safe alternatives for pedestrians and cyclists that avoids the narrow double bend on Walton Road and encourages access to St Marys Primary School.	Noted
	<u>Places for burial and worship:</u> The new development should include sites for places of worship and burial	The Local Investment Plan identifies funding for a burial ground on the Eastern Flank which would serve this area.
	<u>Historic Context</u> Wavendon is an ancient settlement named in the Domesday book as Waundene. The Parish Council is keen to ensure that history is reflected in the new extended community through street and area naming etc and that a full archaeological survey is completed prior to any development being commenced.	This is not a matter for the Development Framework. In terms of archaeological investigation, this will be sought at the earliest possible time in the development process.
	<u>Broadband:</u> Access to Superfast broadband should be a basic planning condition for all new developments.	This is a requirement of principle 8 in Core Strategy Policy CS5.
	<u>Water:</u> Anglian Water is currently struggling to provide adequate water pressure levels into Wavendon village. Planning officers should be convinced that this challenge and been met and overcome by this utility provider before any planning permissions are agreed.	We have not had any objections from Anglian Water to the development either through the SLA DF or the Core Strategy. We are, though continuing discussions with them with regard to low pressure in the Wavendon area and to ensure that water and sewerage provision can accommodate the SLA.
	<u>East West Rail and Central Spine Electrification:</u> Wavendon Parish Council is very concerned that no consideration has been given in the traffic modelling of the likely impacts of the upgrade of the Bedford to Bletchley rail link, and the Woburn Sands crossing in particular and would suggest that no permissions be agreed until the full implications of these proposals are understood	The issues of the East-West rail and electrification project are acknowledged but at present there is little information or certainty from Network Rail as to the likely solution to the issues regarding the future treatment of the level crossings. How the existing level crossing are dealt with, especially the Woburn Sands crossing, will have a knock-on effect on traffic levels and flows across this area. The situation needs to be acknowledged in the DF and text should be added to note that developers will need to have regard to the most up to date information and position regarding East-West Rail when preparing future planning applications and Transport Assessments.

		<p>Recommended change: Add a new heading on page 41 in the Public Transport section after Church Farm:</p> <p>“East-West Rail Network Rail has established a Task Force which is considering what will need to be done to the existing level crossings along the route of East-West Rail ahead of the delivery of the rail proposal. The outcome of this work is not yet know and is not therefore available to inform this Development Framework, however, developers will need to have regard to and respond to the most up to date information when preparing planning applications and transport assessments for the development of the SLA.”</p>
	<p><u>Design:</u> Wavendon Parish Council is concerned by recent experiences in the eastern expansion areas where the city streets design has clearly been shown to be a planning and design mistake. Road widths should take adequate consideration of the needs of utility and emergency vehicles, shared space and back court parking developments should be avoided, and parking standards need to be reviewed with tandem parking designs not permitted.</p>	<p>The Residential Design Guide provides advice on parking, and street types. New development within the SLA will need to take account of the guidance in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Recommended change – Include new para in section 1.5 under heading New Residential Design Guide SPD to read: “The Council adopted the New Residential Development Design Guide as a Supplementary Planning Document in April 2012. The Design Guide provides guidance on the structuring elements of a large development (e.g. the movement network, parking), as well as more detailed guidance at the scale of the street and individual dwelling. The development Framework should be read alongside the Design Guide, and new housing development within the SLA should take account of the guidance in the Design Guide.”</p>
	<p><u>The Stables Theatre</u> and education centre is a valued asset for Milton Keynes. The SLA masterplan must contain access proposals that enhance the potential of the Stables, are compliant with emergency vehicle access and take full account of traffic movements such as artist support vehicles and bar dray supplies. No planning permissions should be considered that do not enhance access arrangements and which should include public transport access to</p>	<p>It is important that the development of the SLA does not prevent the continuing operation of The Stables music venue. At present, access utilises Stockwell Lane. Traffic travelling to/from the east, north and west of the venue utilises Stockwell Lane and the substandard junction on Newport Road. Traffic travelling to/from the south would pass through the residential area of Wavendon and along Walton Road. The existing highway infrastructure is not suitable for providing convenient access and egress from the venue.</p>

	and from the Stables.	The new Newport Road access would connect through to the Stables providing convenient access and egress and removing the need for venue traffic to pass through Wavendon.
	<u>Neighbourhood Plan:</u> Wavendon PC would welcome an early discussion with MKC regarding use of CIL monies and a protocol; for joint working during the period of development.	We will arrange a meeting with the parish council to discuss work on the Neighbourhood Plan. At present it is envisaged that the majority of the SLA development will be brought forward under the MK Tariff and not under a CIL.
	<u>Golf course:</u> Wavendon Golf Course consist of a driving range, club house, 9 hole and 18 hole course, all of which provides (affordable) access to golfing facilities in Milton Keynes. Wavendon Parish Council is concerned that no provision appears to have been made for a replacement 9 hole course, driving range nor club house either on the site or elsewhere in MK and is keen to ensure such provision is made a requirement of approvals for the master plan.	<p>The text in the Development Framework at page 36 was negotiated between MKC, the landowners and Sport England before the Core Strategy Examination:</p> <p>The DF states that prior to the physical redevelopment of the 9 hole course land, the landowners will bring forward proposals for enhancement of the golf facilities to the south of Lower End Road to contribute to the aims and objectives of Milton Keynes Council's up to date planning policies, sports and leisure policies and national planning policy, subject to the proposals being commercially viable and also having regard to the other financial commitments that may be required from the landowner under the MK Tariff arrangements, Section 106 Agreements and Community Infrastructure Levy, if appropriate...</p> <p>The proposals will be informed by an up to date assessment of the supply and demand for golf facilities, at the time of physical redevelopment of the land. This will be based on identified, justified and required sport/leisure facilities for golf set out in an up to date Sport and Leisure Strategy authored by MKC within six months of the physical redevelopment or a golf assessment provided by the developers and agreed with MKC.</p>
	<u>Hedgerows and landscaping:</u> Wavendon Parish Council is concerned that many other former rural locations have been swallowed up and disappear as MK growth has engulfed their locations and thus insist that policies be attached to the master plan that maintain the unique rural	An extensive landscape buffer is included in the Development Framework to protect the setting and character of Wavendon, in line with the recommendations of the Core Strategy Inspector.

	<p>character of Wavendon and its immediate surrounds in terms of buffering, retention of hedgerows and other protections that help retain the character and feel of the area.</p>	
	<p><u>Links between the SLA and land north of Wavendon</u> : The primary link must only be via the grid road system (Grovelway, Kingston Roundabout and Fen Street roundabout.</p> <p>There would appear to contradictory sentences in the consultation document some of which purport to recommend measures to avoid rat running across the A5130 and others (including public transport recommendations etc.) which would encourage rat running.</p> <p>Wavendon Parish Council is convinced that the proposed new A5130 cross roads would be disruptive and has no basis in evidence (given Brian Matthews presentations and the fact that issues such as the bursty nature of Stables traffic, traffic held in Woburn sands by the rail crossing and the possible implications of the East West rail link have all not been assessed to date)</p> <p>However a safe pedestrian and cycle link in the form of an underpass between the two locations would form a sustainable, environmentally friendly and practical solution to ensuring the school and community links between the two communities would be enhanced.</p> <p>Wavendon Parish Council has received a large number of representations regarding this issue and is supportive of residents' concerns and comments with regards to this particular issue.</p>	<p>With regard to access to the land to the north of Wavendon this will need to be considered in detail (bus routes, junction on A5130, access to The Stables etc as part of the detailed transport assessment from planning applications.</p> <p>See wording of recommended change above with regards to the phasing of the secondary access onto the Newport Road from the land south of the A421.</p> <p>The wording of the Development Framework on page 41 under Land north of Wavendon needs to be amended to clarify its meaning. The current intention is that the Land north of Wavendon will be served from two separate access roads – one to Newport Road and one to H9 Grovelway. This will not be a through road for cars in order to prevent the route becoming a rat run. Consideration could, though, be given to the creation of a bus route linking the two accesses.</p> <p><u>Recommended change – Delete the second half of the second paragraph under 'Land north of Wavendon' on page 41 (from "although internal residential...")</u> .</p>
	<p>The dualling of the whole of the A421 to J13 should be a planning condition not placed on the</p>	<p>Planning conditions can only be placed on a planning permission.</p>

	developer(s) but placed upon central government before the master plan can be enacted	
	Wavendon Parish Council is keen to ensure that provision is built into the school for children from both Wavendon and Woburn Sands. An early indication should be provided as to the likely impacts upon the future of St Mary's CoE Primary School which result from this development?	St Mary's School may benefit from the existing development as it offers an alternative to the larger, purpose built school for those parents seeking a small village school for their children.
	<p>Wavendon Parish Council remains unconvinced that simply providing pitches for soccer and cricket fully meets the requirements of new communities and would like to see a more imaginative approach involving research into the provision of facilities some minority sports and the provision of a sports hall catering for a community gym, indoor bowls, badminton etc</p> <p>It would further suggest that the secondary school be the site of a swimming pool for education use during term time and community use in the evenings, weekends and holidays.</p>	<p>Playing field allocation is as per the required planning standards and in general in allocated for football and cricket as this is where there is demand. The actual usage of the fields however will be as the local and strategic requirement at the time of handover, and the pitches can be used for other sports as required. The Pavilion space allocation is for a multi purpose community and sport facility based on a draft brief that includes office space, meeting room space, community hall, sports hall and changing facilities but will be developed as per the demand at design consultation stage.</p> <p>Community Facilities within schools is difficult and would require rigid community use agreements that can be enforced. There is no current land allocation for a swimming pool.</p>
Hulcote and Salford Parish Council	<p>Thank you for discussing these plans in person with our Parish Council chairman Alf Murphy and Councillor Robert Harrison. The Hulcote and Salford Parish Council (the PC) respectfully asks you to note its concern that the proposed development of 192 hectares of land in the south eastern flank of Milton Keynes to provide approximately 2,900 homes and business premises is not supported by convincing plans for, a viable road system, and for sufficient, easily accessible supporting facilities.</p> <p>Car transport will be required by the majority of new home owners for travel to schools and even for local shopping. The Kingston centre, where the large majority will shop regularly is already</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Public transport, especially the 300 service will provide access to Kingston for shopping and then on to CMK and elsewhere for residents of the SLA.</p> <p>The business case and modelling undertaken to support the funding bid to Government for the upgrade of the Kingston roundabout shows a significant reduction in delay time (from 4.1mins to 0.7mins in the morning peak) for traffic</p>

	<p>reaching the limits of its parking facilities and accessibility especially at weekends. Other basic shopping facilities identified in the framework planning document are totally inadequate in the context of servicing even a small part of 2,900 new households.</p> <p>The Kingston roundabout which will bear the brunt of the road transport feeder access to the SLA developments is close to its traffic movement limits, as an uncontrolled roundabout, for long periods on weekdays.</p> <p>Reassurances given by you that this will be resolved by redesigning the roundabout and introducing traffic light control do not add up, when the increased volume of car and lorry traffic associated with all the business and residential development now in place, is combined with the impact on traffic of the SLA plans.</p> <p>The primary feeder roads to the SLA developments, the A421 and the A 5130 Newport Road are already very congested for long periods on weekdays. The PC is not convinced that adequate traffic movement research and related movement solutions are in place to alleviate the obvious misery the SLA developments will cause to existing road users and the new SLA homeowners trying to access and leave the development area for work, schools and basic shopping.</p> <p>The villages of Hulcote and Salford are already struggling with the ever increasing volume of cars and HGVs using the Salford Road “rat run” to the A421 / M1 Junction 13 trunk feeders to Milton Keynes. The PC sees the SLA plans as adding dramatically to village through traffic problems for decades to come.</p> <p>In this context the PC is very concerned that the Lower End Road feeder to the SLA development does not become a further “rat run” for traffic desperately trying to exit the</p>	<p>using the roundabout on completion of the upgrade.</p> <p>The existing queues on the Newport Road are not disputed, however, as explained above, the proposed upgrade of the Kingston roundabout and the planned dualling of the A421 is expected to deliver additional capacity to the road network to both accommodate the new traffic from the SLA and the existing traffic flows.</p> <p>As a result of the work done recently on the South East Rural Roads traffic study, the Council will work with colleagues in Central Beds Council and the affected parish and town councils in the area to identify measures that can be implemented to mitigate the impact of increasing traffic levels.</p> <p>A traffic management plan will need to accompany and be agreed as part of the planning applications for the SLA. HGV movements associated with the development of the area could be controlled through the Construction Management Plan the approval of which by MKC will be required through planning conditions on a planning consent.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Newport Road at Wavendon to get to the Salford Road and the M1/A421. This route, if not flow restricted, will bring an unbearable throughput of road traffic to Salford and Hulcote. The PC respectively suggests that it is imperative that the current HGV limitation for the Newport Road is maintained throughout the SLA development phase and permanently afterwards to at least legally inhibit HGV access by this route through Salford to the M1 / A421.</p> <p>The PC respectfully recommends that the existing “Road Hierarchy” and access to current and planned “Facilities” is seriously re-examined and oppose this SLA development framework plan in its present form.</p>	
Neighbouring Local Authorities		
<p>Central Bedfordshire Council</p>	<p>A421 The increase in the level of housing proposed will influence the justification for the dualling of the A421 between the Milton Keynes boundary and the M1 at junction 13. However, at the moment there is no funding in place to complete the section of the A421 in Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>CBC supports the aspiration for the dualling of the A421 between the Milton Keynes boundary and the junction 13 of the M1 but this is likely to be in longer term. There is a £1m funding allocation to be available from April 2015 from the Local Transport Board for the preparation work on this scheme. The current understanding is that the Milton Keynes Council will underwrite the delivery of the scheme, likely to be completed in 2019.</p> <p>Local Road Network Given that the completed dualling of the A421 in our estimation is not likely to take place before 2019, the Council want to be assured</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Discussions with Central Beds Council and the affected town and parish councils will be commenced to discuss measures to tackle the issues affecting the local road network.</p> <p><u>Recommended change:</u> Add more text to the Development framework, page 41 on the impact on the local road network and the possibility of using Tariff/S106 monies</p>

	<p>that the development will not have a negative impact upon the local road network in CBC particularly in the Aspley Guise area, and to this end we would seek reassurances from MK that this would not be the case. Further information from the detailed transport modelling should therefore be provided to identify the impact ahead of the dualling of the A421 as measures may be required to mitigate any impact particularly in the short term as the development commences.</p> <p>More specific reference should therefore be made in the Development Framework particularly on page 41 which discusses transport infrastructure and paragraph 4.2 in relation to S106 allocations to addressing any traffic impact on surrounding villages if shown by the TIA.</p> <p>In addition Aspley Guise station may increase in popularity and mitigating measures may be required to accommodate these both at the station itself and on access roads to the station. We would also like this be referenced in the document.</p>	<p>to addressing any traffic impact on surrounding villages if shown by the TIA to require mitigation.</p>
MKC Officers		
<p>Mark Haynes, Snr Landscape Architect</p>	<p>The approach to woodland retention as described on page 36 (Existing Woodland) needs more emphasis on retention. It should state that woodland must be retained, unless the reasons for removal can be fully justified. Planting new trees to offset the loss a good woodland area should not be encouraged. Any proposed woodland loss must be supported with a full ecological & tree survey, along with a description regarding impact on the landscape character</p>	<p>Recommended change: Revise the DF, page 36, Existing Woodlands to state:</p> <p>“Existing woodlands should be retained and incorporated as part of the public open space network unless the reasons for the removal of woodland can be fully justified. Any proposed woodland loss must be supported with a full ecological & tree survey, along with a description regarding impact on the landscape character”</p>
<p>Jill Dewick, Leisure & Community Facilities</p>	<p>Strategic Land Allocation Development Framework Consultation Response from Leisure &</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	<p>Community Facilities regarding proposals for leisure and community facilities and playing fields</p> <p>During workshops and meetings regarding the SLA, the Leisure & Community team have been consistent in their approach to the requirements of the playing fields, and the multi use sports/community facility provision to ensure that important lessons learned from earlier new developments are observed and issues are eliminated from the start, and that the new provision is a viable option in its future management.</p> <p>Using lessons learned from previous facility and playing field developments the recommendation was for provision to be allocated in one larger area, central to the SLA proposal. The facility would be multi use incorporating changing rooms for the playing fields and a community hall for various community groups including pre-school provision and that the location of this building on this site should be accessible from the street and the pitches. We are pleased to see that the development framework has taken these comments and feedback and translated this into a large usable space for the new community.</p> <p>A recent example of where a smaller site has made sporting provision difficult is Broughton. Due to the location and size of the playing fields, there are planning conditions restricting the use of the pitches allowing only one game at a time. This restriction does not help with satisfactory development of sports at the site.</p> <p>Smaller sites do not allow flexibility of space. This is especially difficult if the site has dual pitch use with cricket. To allow progression for community teams, the site needs</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>to be able to increase or decrease its pitch sizes depending on current demand, or in the case of a team making a facility its “home” ground, to allow for pitch sizes to increase as the team grows up. It is not ideal or always possible to have to move teams elsewhere.</p> <p>Examples of sites that work well with a larger playing field, multi pitch site with multi purpose facilities are Tattenhoe and Medbourne. On these sites, there is sufficient space for a variety of pitch sizes and a number of teams, space for sufficient parking and the facility is still in a residential area but sufficiently far away from neighbouring homes but located centrally for community access. We are pleased to see that the development framework does not recommend dual use of space with schools. Although this seems like an ideal solution to space saving. In reality however this has not been successful elsewhere in Milton Keynes. For example – Oakgrove School and Leisure Centre share a site and playing fields. Although there has been agreement for shared use, there has been no access to the playing fields to the public. In general, schools are reluctant to share their playing fields with public use, primarily because the cost of maintaining playing fields is high and increased use means increased wear and tear. Where community use has been agreed there is no means of enforcement should this not be forthcoming and remains entirely in control of the management of the school.</p> <p>Our comments on the future development of the golf course site remain as the agreement reflected in the development framework.</p> <p>Our comments on the provision for the Church Farm site remain as those proposed in the development framework.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
--	--	--------------

John Russell, Housing	<p>P.11 – Planning Guidance – please clarify if the Tariff applies to the SLA sites? – if so, then relevant document is the Affordable Housing SPG July 2004 – if current policy applies (as none of the sites has Outline to my knowledge) then relevant document is the Affordable Housing SPD Mar 2013 as per Policy CS10?</p> <p>I read P.46, Housing as meaning that the SPD 2013 will apply for the moment but P.58 seems to indicate that the Tariff will apply to certain SRA's.</p>	<p>All of the new outline planning consents for the development of the SLA will need to observe the new Affordable Housing SPD (March 2013).</p> <p>Recommended change: page 11 replace the second bullet “Affordable Housing SPD 2007” with “Affordable Housing SPD 2013”</p> <p>It is correct that the Tariff currently applies to some of the land in the SLA, but MKC is negotiating with the other landowners to seek their agreement to their signing up to a Tariff style Section 106 agreement.</p>
Statutory Consultees		
Highways Agency	<p>Summary of comments: The addition of the land to the north of Wavendon to the SLA could potentially present an opportunity to attain a good level of integration between the SLA and the existing areas of Milton Keynes. This especially relates to the provision of sustainable transport links which could help to minimise car traffic generation on the wider road network.</p> <p>Query whether the council has assessed the additional 400 homes and associated potential additional trips as part of the Milton Keynes Model. The area of land allocated for employment development has also increased by 12.8 hectares on that presented in the 2012 version of the Development Framework. Have the additional jobs and potential additional trips been taken account of if the modelling work?</p> <p>The phasing principles on page 57 are considered appropriate, especially the need to establish public transport links at an early stage. The Agency also welcomes the addition of a further principle that an appropriate balance should be achieved between the delivery of new homes and new jobs so that development is as self-contained as possible.</p>	<p>Noted – as the Core Strategy Inspector notes in her report, (para 56) “the enlarged site would offer potential for more sustainable travel patterns”</p> <p>2,900 homes have been modelled reflecting the increased size of the allocation</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p>

	<p>The Agency queried previously whether consideration had been given to the potential quantum of the SLA development that could be implemented prior to the completion of the dualling scheme. Notes that the Framework now refers to the Pinch Point funding approval for the dulling of the A421 and the upgrade of the Kingston roundabout with the council intending to take those schemes to delivery in 2014. On that basis it is likely that these schemes will be in place before the first occupation of the SLA development.</p> <p>Park & Ride: The Framework reaffirms the Council's preference for a park and ride site within the SLA. The Agency is, in principle, supportive of measures and schemes which aim to reduce congestion and encourage people to use more sustainable modes of transport. The Agency considers that it may be the case that the number of car trips will not reduce as a result of Park and Ride but could potentially increase on sections of the Agency's Strategic Road Network, in this case, the M1. As a result it is recommended that a Transport Assessment is produced for the Park and Ride site which includes trip transfer and trip rate calculations in addition to details of bus frequencies, parking and fare arrangements and consideration of the impact on M1 Junction 13.</p> <p>Lorry park: The Framework still supports the proposal for a lorry park. The Agency notes that there is a Truck Stop recognised by the Highways Agency adjacent to M1 Junction 13. Whilst the Agency is not opposed to the proposal for a lorry park in the SLA it is recommended that any planning application should be accompanied by a TA.</p> <p>Transport Assessment accompanying planning</p>	<p>Although not a requirement in Core Strategy Policy CS5, the Council still has an aim to seek land for a Park and Ride site in this part of the city. The HA's comments with regard to the need for a Transport Assessment to accompany any proposal for a Park and Ride site is noted.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This advice will be drawn to the attention</p>
--	--	--

	<p>applications: It is likely that the development of the SLA will come forward through several planning applications each accompanied by a TA. In preparing a TA consideration should be given to the development that is permitted at the time of submission of the planning application including any development adjacent to the SLA. Consideration should also be given to the cumulative impacts of all SLA development.</p> <p>Assessment of the Agency's road network will be required if the traffic generation exceeds 30 two-way vehicles on any link. With regards to junction capacity assessments that may be required, appropriate traffic modelling software should be used. If the 30 two-way vehicle threshold is exceeded reference should be made to DMRB TD22/06 '<i>Layout of Grade Separated Junctions</i>'.</p> <p>Minimising trips and sustainable travel: the proposed land use composition of the SLA offers potential to achieve internalisation of vehicle trips within the site and the local area. The Framework sets a suitably positive tone in setting principles which aim to ensure that the SLA is sufficiently well-integrated with the existing urban area. The emphasis on sustainable transport links is welcomed.</p> <p>Bus services will help to promote the urban extension as an integral part of the urban area as opposed to a segregated suburb more suited to those who desire convenient access to the M1, A5 or A421 trunk roads. High quality bus links to CMK, railway stations, the hospital other major employment area and the coachway should be considered.</p>	<p>of the developers of the SLA.</p> <p>Noted - this advice will be drawn to the attention of the developers of the SLA.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>A bus service serving the main part of the SLA east of the A5130 is referred to on page 41 of the DF. Consideration is also being given to creating a bus route through the land north of Wavendon from the A5130 to the H9, Groveway. Recommended change: Reference should be made to this in the revised DF</p>
English Heritage	HH supports a comprehensive masterplanning approach for the SLA development and therefore welcomes the principles of the Development Framework.	Noted

	<p>Although records show no designated heritage assets on the original allocated land they do show two listed buildings on the land to the north of Wavendon and two more immediately south of this land. Any development of the SLA should conserve the significance of these buildings by retaining those on the allocated land and respecting the setting of all four.</p> <p>Policy CS5 and paras 2.9 and 2.12 should be amended to incorporate these requirements although we recognise that Figure 2.12 indicated no redevelopment of the listed buildings or the areas of open space around them.</p>	<p>As English Heritage remarks, the listed buildings referred to are located within the area shown as green buffer or 'privately owned/ unallocated land' as such there are no development proposals that directly impact on these listed buildings.</p> <p>Recommended change: it is recommended that the first bullet point of para 2.9 of the DF be amended to say: <i>"There are two listed buildings within the SLA, in the land to the north of Wavendon, which should be retained. There are also a number of listed buildings which are located close to the strategic land allocation, particularly along Lower End Lane and in Wavendon village. Any development of the SLA should conserve the significance of these listed buildings by respecting their setting."</i></p>
Landowners/ Developers and Interested parties		
<p>Woburn Sands & District Society</p>	<p>The Society is very concerned over certain aspects of the revised Developmental Framework for the Strategic Land Allocation. The Society is disappointed that the revisions appear to have taken rather limited notice of the comments on the Framework that the Society submitted last October.</p> <p>1. The Society is delighted that work has begun on the Kingston roundabout to take the steadily increasing levels of traffic there, and it welcomes the success of Milton Keynes Council in acquiring resources to improve the A421 from that roundabout to the Central Bedfordshire boundary.</p> <p>However, it is appalled that Central Bedfordshire appears to show little or no sense of urgency over the dualling of the A421 from its boundary to Exit 13 of the M1.</p> <p>As the Society stated last October, the work on the Kingston roundabout and</p>	<p>Whilst it is correct that we only have funding in place to deliver the dualling of the A421 as far as the borough boundary, there is funding for design work for the final leg of the dualling down to Junction 13 in conjunction with Central Beds Council and the completion of this section of road is a regional infrastructure priority. The expectation is that the dualling all the way to J13 will be complete before the SLA development is fully built out</p>

	<p>the dualling of <i>all</i> of the A421 between that roundabout and Exit 13 of the M1 should be completed before any dwellings on the SLA site are occupied and ideally before construction traffic requires access to the site. The stretch of the A421 described is already congested and dangerous, and the addition of any more traffic, particularly construction traffic (not only heavy lorries but also the cars of persons working on the site), would only make the situation worse.</p> <p>2. As stated last October, the Society welcomes the proposal to retain the attractive, rural aspect of Lower End Road, by not allowing access to it from the SLA site (except for emergency access) and, where necessary, by improving the mature hedges along that road. The Society also welcomes the retention of the mature hedges along the A5130 Newport Road. Every attempt should be made to retain the rural character of the south east corner of Milton Keynes, including Woburn Sands, Wavendon and the adjacent villages.</p> <p>3. Last October the Society expressed concern over the proposal to build a new access point for the SLA site (onto and off the site) on the A5130 Newport Road, even though it was then said that computer modelling of traffic flows had indicated that this junction</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Traffic modelling has shown that without a secondary access onto Newport Road, the Fen Roundabout junction on the A421 would not operate effectively once the full SLA development was built out.</p> <p>See recommended change to page 41 of the SLA DF above relating to the phasing of the secondary access road onto the</p>
--	--	---

	<p>would have no adverse impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The Society is now convinced that any access between the A5130 and the SLA would have a disastrous effect on the traffic flow on the A5130 between Woburn Sands and the Kingston roundabout. As a result of the Inspector’s comments on the submitted draft Core Strategy last year, the SLA has now been extended to include land to the north of Wavendon. Computer modelling in the recent SE Rural Area Traffic Study by MKC now predicts a significant increase in the traffic on the A5130 as a result of the development of the SLA, at both the am and the pm peaks. This increase will occur even if/when the A421 is dualled right up to the M1.</p> <p>Unfortunately this modelling does not appear to have taken account of Network Rail’s plans to upgrade the railway line between Bedford and Bletchley. These plans include</p> <p>(i) the electrification of the line (indeed the line between Sheffield and Southampton),</p> <p>(ii) significantly more rail (passenger and freight) traffic on the line,</p> <p>(iii) the making of the station at Woburn Sands into a traffic hub and</p> <p>(iv) the closure of the level crossing gates in Woburn Sands more frequently and/or for longer periods of time. The details of this scheme are not</p>	<p>Newport Road.</p> <p>Issues of the East-West rail and electrification project are acknowledged but at present there is little information or certainty from Network Rail as to the likely solution to the issues regarding the future treatment of the level crossings. How the existing level crossing are dealt with, especially the Woburn Sands crossing, will have a knock-on effect on traffic levels and flows across this area. The situation needs to be acknowledged in the DF and text should be added to note that developers will need to have regard to the most up to date information and position regarding East-West Rail when preparing future planning applications and Transport Assessments.</p> <p><u>Recommended change:</u> Add a new heading on page 41 in the Public Transport section after Church Farm:</p> <p><u>“East-West Rail</u> Network Rail has established a Task Force which is considering what will need to be done to the existing level crossings along the route of East-West Rail ahead of the</p>
--	---	--

	<p>yet clear, but surely the flow of traffic heading north on the A5130 from Woburn Sands will be disrupted and the length of the queues at Kingston and at any proposed roundabouts before then will be increased.</p> <p>4. The Society believes that access between the original SLA to the east of the A5130 and the extension(s) to the north of Wavendon should be via an underpass under the A5130, ideally just for pedestrians and cyclists. (A footbridge over the A5130 would probably not fit in well with the rural character of the area – see paragraph 2 above – and would probably be less attractive to pedestrians and cyclists who instead might be tempted to try and cut directly across the A5130.)</p> <p>This underpass and the absence of any road access to the SLA site from the A5130 would (i) encourage pupils at the schools who live in the western extension of the SLA or who live farther afield in Woburn Sands or Wavendon to cycle or walk to and from their schools and (ii) discourage parents from using their cars to take their children to and from school, thus generating more traffic within and around the SLA, in particular on the A5130 (see Policy CS 10; Policy CS 11, paragraphs 3, 4 and 5; Policy CS 12, paragraphs 1 and 2; Policies D1(i), T1, T2(ii) and T3 of the Local Plan)</p>	<p>delivery of the rail proposal. The outcome of this work is not yet know and is not therefore available to inform this Development Framework, however, developers will need to have regard to and respond to the most up to date information when preparing planning applications and transport assessments for the development of the SLA.” .</p> <p>Further discussions will be had with Gallagher Estates about a possible underpass under the Newport Road to link the two sides of the SLA at this point.</p>
<p>Jane Hamilton Director, Bedford to Milton Keynes Waterway Trust</p>	<p>The Trust’s remit is to achieve a new canal link between Bedford and Milton Keynes and in this respect we wish to ensure that the waterway is fully deliverable.</p> <p>The Trust has a very strong interest in the SLA in so far as the route for the proposed Bedford to Milton</p>	<p>Good progress towards ensuring a deliverable route through the Eagle Farm North part of the SLA has been made with the assistance of Gallagher Estates</p> <p>It is recommended that the following text replace the wording in the fourth para under ‘The proposed Bedford to MK Canal</p>

	<p>Keynes Waterway runs through the area. To ensure the route for the waterway is both safeguarded and capable of being implemented we ask that the wording on page 42 of the document which refers to the canal link is amended as follows in the fourth paragraph:</p> <p>“ The route shown is indicative only. To ensure the waterway is deliverable future planning outline planning applications will need to make provision for the required infrastructure to support the waterway between Broughton Brook and the Borough Boundary at Eagle Farm including a crossing of the A421. Before detailed layouts are approved a specific and deliverable waterway route should be demonstrated within each development scheme.”</p>	<p>Link” on page 42</p> <p>Recommended change: “The route shown is indicative and while, subject to detailed design, is understood to be deliverable. Future planning applications will need to safeguard the route and allow for the construction, and the provision of the required infrastructure to support the waterway, between Broughton Brook and the Borough Boundary at Eagle Farm. Before implementable consents for development are given it should be confirmed that the route remains protected and deliverable.”</p>
<p>Savills for the SE MK Consortium</p>	<p>The Consortium has in principle been supportive of the SLA DF as long as it does not compromise and indeed should facilitate future extensions of the urban area. This issue was debated at length at the Core Strategy examination.</p> <p>The Consortium is disappointed that the Framework has been prepared in isolation and without any analysis of future directions of growth for Milton Keynes. As such the Consortium considers that the Framework is not ‘future-proofed’ as required by policy and therefore requires amendment.</p> <p><u>The Requirement for Future Proofing</u></p> <p>At the Core Strategy examination the extent and form of the SLA was discussed. One of the Inspector’s questions was whether future proofing had been appropriately considered. Para 42 of the Inspector’s report states that “it would be sufficient to future-proof the SLA, to ensure that sustainable options for further expansion are not prejudiced and this is addressed by the modifications recommended below”.</p>	<p>The Framework has been prepared to supplement Core Strategy Policy CS5 which allocated the SLA for development. To analyse future directions of growth in the Development Framework would pre-empt the review of the Core Strategy that will take place through the preparation of Plan Mk in accordance with Core Strategy Policy AD1.</p>

	<p>Core Strategy Policies CS5 and CS12 have been amended to reflect the Inspector’s recommendations and in order to comply with the policies of the Core Strategy, the DF needs to make adequate provision (particularly in terms of infrastructure) to facilitate future extensions. This can be achieved either by provision of that infrastructure or by adequate safeguarding of routes alongside a mechanism for transfer of the relevant land.</p> <p>The Consortium is concerned that the requirement for future proofing has not adequately been met in the DF. Nor has there been any wider masterplanning exercise to understand how future growth might take place and as a result there is no context for testing the future proofing credentials of the proposals.</p> <p>The use of Transport Reserves as the mean of future proofing the SLA is wholly inadequate. There is no mechanism for how the Transport Reserves are to be made available in the future. Without such a mechanism there can be no reliance that the reserves and therefore future infrastructure can be delivered.</p> <p>The Transport Reserves themselves are inadequate – the design and capacity of the Grid Road Extensions has not been tested against future expansion scenarios; there has been no assessment of Lower End Road as a possible extension to the Grid Road Network. Nor is there a grid road reserve shown to the eastern boundary of the SLA.</p> <p>Dualling of the A421 should be shown on the Framework Plan as it is an important infrastructure improvement.</p>	<p>The Development Framework makes provision for the future extension of the grid road network to the east and south of the SLA including Church Farm, should Plan MK or a subsequent review of the plan identify further growth in that direction.</p> <p>The land identified as a Transport Reserves could be managed by the Parks Trust as paddocks or informal open space in the short term or until such time as the land is required for a future roads extension. This would be on the understanding that the land will be available for transport infrastructure when required. This approach has been adopted previously elsewhere at the edges of the city to future proof the expansion of the grid road network.</p> <p><u>Recommended change: Add dualling of A421 to the Indicative Framework Plan.</u></p>
Terence	Accept that the broad scale and	Noted

<p>O'Rourke for O&H Properties</p>	<p>scope of the SLA has been set through the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Core Strategy Policy CSAD1 requires the council to undertake an early review of the Core Strategy with the express aim that a replacement plan will be in place by 2015. This review could bring forward the need for further housing beyond the current boundaries of the SLA and therefore it is essential that the SLADF retains a flexible approach towards the adjacent land.</p> <p>We welcome the acknowledged potential to extend H10 (Bletcham Way) through the Church Farm site, but consider that given the strategic importance of this route to future development to the east, further emphasis should be placed on facilitating its construction before 2026.</p> <p>We are also concerned that the Church Farm site appears to rely on the safeguarded open space area that will be lost when this route is complete. We believe that the indicative framework plan (figure 3.13) should ensure that the SLA vision is compatible with further development beyond the current boundaries.</p> <p>Section 3.4 of the SLADF suggests that the eastern boundary of Church Farm 'should be strengthened with planting'. Whilst we agree that the boundary treatment should reflect the short-term transition from built form to open fields, regard should also be had to the future development potential of this land and desirability of creating new linkages. Any planting should therefore be designed in such a way that it would not prejudice or inhibit future development.</p> <p>We note that despite being outside of the SLADF area, a number of the</p>	<p>At this stage it is not appropriate to pre-empt the outcome of the review of the Core Strategy in Plan MK with regard to future scale and direction of growth. The SLA includes transport reserves for the extension of the grid road network to the south and east should that be required in the future.</p> <p>The scale of development currently planned for Church Farm does not support the delivery of a full grid road at this time and decisions are yet to be taken as to the future scale and direction of growth in this area. The grid road corridor is, however protected and future proofed.</p> <p>The Transport Reserves for the possible future extension of the grid road in Church Farm are not intended to provide that development's open space needs. The Transport Reserve land could however be used for informal open space until such a time as it is required for development.</p> <p>The provision of landscaping along this boundary would not act as an impediment to future development should that be proposed.</p> <p>Whilst the identification of the hedgerows on Figure 2.5 is useful to provide some context for Church Farm we agree that Figure 2.14 could be amended to only show those hedges on the SLA that should be retained as part of the development.</p> <p>Recommended change: Amend Figure 2.14 to remove reference to hedgerows outside of the SLA development site.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>diagrams indicate constraints on our client’s land. Figures 2.5 and 3.3 identify existing hedges; whilst figure 2.14 also suggests that they will be retained. We consider that these references are inappropriate, as this land is not within SLADF and the retention or otherwise of these hedges is outside of the local authority’s control</p>	
<p>JB Planning for The Fairfield Partnership</p>	<p>Deliverability Paragraph 1.5 page 8 – Planning Policy Background and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). We refer the Council to paragraph 173 of the NPPF and which should be mentioned in the text on page 8.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1 page 57 – Deliverability: <i>“Milton Keynes Council advise that all SLA landowners and parties should act in good faith and work co-operatively with each other with the aim of facilitating development on all sites within the SLA at an early stage. This involves engaging with each other to agree mutually acceptable connection arrangements and delivering connections to site boundaries within the SLA.”</i></p> <p>We support this advice, but question whether or not it will happen in practice, given the commercial considerations and aspirations of the various landowners. Indeed, the Homes and Communities Agency have already stated in a preliminary conversation with me (August) that they would require ransom for vehicular access via their Towergate site.</p> <p>Without co-operation and agreement, the Strategic Land Allocation (or parts of it) will not be delivered.</p> <p>As you are aware, supplementary planning documents are capable of being a material consideration in planning decisions but are not part of the development plan and are</p>	<p>Recommended change: add reference to the need for plans to be deliverable to the bulleted list at para 1.5 on page 8</p> <p>MKC is in discussions with the HCA about the access to the Fairfield Partnership land from H9, Groveway. The HCA has provided the following response: <i>“HCA is committed to facilitating the delivery of housing and economic growth in MK in accordance with existing and emerging local policy. HCA recognises the potential requirement shown in the draft SLA Development Framework (SPD) for provision of vehicular access to the SLA development area via adjacent HCA land that sits outside of the SLA. Whilst HCA is not party to the SLA we are ready and willing to structure an agreement with the relevant landowners/developers and the local authority to ensure the delivery of appropriate access to facilitate both the SLA and the remaining adjacent HCA land.”</i></p> <p>Signatories to the MK Tariff have an obligation to allow and not prevent access</p>

	<p>guidance only. Annex 2 of the NPPF refers.</p> <p>Access We refer to the section headed Highway Access and headed 'Land North of Wavendon' (page 41 of the SPD) and Figure 3.4 – Green Buffer on page 38 and which shows a proposal for two secondary streets to The Fairfield Partnership land. One connects to H9 Groveway and the other connects to the A5130 Newport Road across Stockwell Lane and to include a possible new access to The Stables Theatre. In so doing Stockwell Lane would be downgraded to cycle and pedestrian access only.</p> <p>We understand the rationale for such an access arrangement and it has been described to us as a longstanding desire of the Council to minimise access from the A5130 and for Stockwell Lane to be watershed. Whilst this is laudable, we do not believe that direct access to the A1530 cannot be supported.</p> <p>MKC highways officer has commented as follows: <i>"It has long been our thinking that we do not wish to see any additional junctions onto A5130 other than those already indicated from SLA1 east of this road and the one serving the Wavendon Triangle land at a point more or less opposite that from the east side.</i></p> <p><i>We wish Stockwell Lane to act as a watershed in traffic terms with all traffic south and east of it accessing to A5130 and that north of it (so the bulk of this being Fairfield Partnership land) accessing to Groveway (H9) only. Stockwell Lane will then be retained as a pedestrian/cycling facility much as we have done with some of the other historic minor lanes in MK.</i></p> <p><i>We are coming under heavy pressure from the local Parish and</i></p>	<p>to land. MKC will continue to work with the landowners to ensure that this requirement is delivered on. The Council is continuing to hold discussions to ensure that access to all development land will be available free from ransom charges .</p> <p>The view of MKC remains that the land to the north of Wavendon can be served most</p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>Town Councils to remove the accesses that are shown on the Development Framework document. That said as the highway authority and for the reason mentioned we would not want to see additional junctions onto A5130.”</i></p> <p>The proposed secondary streets providing access to The Fairfield Partnership land rely on third party land and the co-operation of adjoining owners to ensure access. It is stated that the secondary streets should be provided in a timely manner and made available without impediment to access The Fairfield Partnership land. This is considered to overcome any ransoming by adjacent landowners over any land essential to deliver housing within the SLA, but in our view is not a legally binding mechanism that would fulfil that intention.</p> <p>In our view, it is therefore essential that the SPD also includes an option to directly access the A5130 from The Fairfield Partnership land that would be supported by the Council to protect an essential part of the allocation from not being brought forward, should the proposed secondary streets be unavailable.</p> <p>We have therefore shown a proposed vehicular access directly to the A5130 in Appendix 2 roughly in the position of Stockwell Lane that could be incorporated as a single point of access and request that the SPD is amended. Our client’s highway advisers, Cannon Consulting consider that such a solution (which has been discussed in principle with the Council in the past), could be delivered so as to link with proposed traffic signals at the Kingston Roundabout to the north and be at such a distance as to not disrupt the traffic flows on the A5130 to the detriment of either Kingston Roundabout or the proposed secondary access into</p>	<p>effectively by two accesses – one onto H9 Groveway and one onto Newport Road which replaces the existing Stockwell Lane junction.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>the SLA to the south. We are progressing with the detail of the access design and look forward to discussing this with the Council shortly.</p> <p>We trust this work will be viewed objectively by the Council in the manner it is intended so as to achieve the aim and objective of the SPD. Our initial modelling based on the 2026 future year forecast traffic flows modelled for Kingston Roundabout including all SLA development suggests that there is no capacity constraint with such an access in place and will therefore not constrain the operation of the A5130 to the south, or approach to the Kingston Roundabout to the north. We will arrange a meeting with Council Officers to discuss this further. If provided as a traffic signal controlled priority junction, such an access would be inherently safe and in keeping with proposals north and south. If located so as to replace Stockwell Lane it would comply with the aim of the council to see Stockwell Lane as the watershed.</p> <p>Endorsing the principle of direct access is essential so as to provide independent access to an important element of the SLA. Without such an access provision delivery of this part of the SLA is questionable in our opinion. Provision of the means of such an access by the Council would allow effective negotiation with the parties controlling access to the east and west (H9). MKC should be party to such discussions in confirming access can be made available, at which time the need for access directly to the A5130 could be reappraised.</p> <p>Until such time as evidence exists that other means of access into The Fairfield Partnership land is confirmed, we would need to continue to object to the SLA in its present form without direct access</p>	<p>As above - Signatories to the MK Tariff have an obligation to allow and not prevent access to land. MKC will continue to work with the landowners to ensure that this requirement is delivered on. The council is continuing to hold discussions to ensure that access to all development land will be available free from ransom charges.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>to the A5130.</p> <p>Density Page 46 of the draft SPD advises that for the allocated land to the North of Wavendon, the overall net density should be 25 dph. We further refer to Figure 3.12 - character typologies, whereby to the north and east of the A5130, this land has been designated as having the possibility of a density of 35 to 45 dph and classified as General Residential.</p> <p>In our view, having assessed The Fairfield Partnership land in the context of its surroundings, it seemed to us that there is scope for potentially higher density residential development within the northern part of the allocated site. This would accord with the suggested density for General Residential development on the eastern side of Newport Road. A higher density is appropriate, given the site's context; the lower level within the topography compared with the village of Wavendon; the new Vauxhall motor car showroom presently under construction; the proposed Kingston Roundabout improvements; designated employment land at Towergate and as mentioned, the designated land on the eastern side of Newport Road proposed to be built at the higher density.</p> <p>We have suggested a minor alteration to Figure 3.12 Character Typologies attached as Appendix 3.</p> <p>Noise and Air Quality With reference to page 52 under the heading 'Noise and Air Quality', we point out that PPG24 (Planning and Noise) was cancelled in March 2012 with the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There may be other more up to date guidance on these issues and which might be added to the SPD for reference.</p>	<p>'General residential' has an indicative average density of 30-35 dph. There is a case for allowing this higher density close to Kingston roundabout, mirroring the approach taken on the opposite side of Newport Road.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Recommended change – delete text in section under heading 'Noise and Air Quality' (page 52) from "PPG24 (Planning and Noise)..." to "...residential development will not be acceptable within this area."</p>
--	--	---

<p>David Lock Associates for the Burford Group and Merton College</p>	<p>I write on behalf of my clients, the Burford Group and Merton College in response to the draft Development Framework.</p> <p>1. Additional wording is required that makes clear that the indicative Development Framework is not the final or only way in which the site could be developed. Other constraints and opportunities may arise which could inform alternative land use arrangements. It is important from the public's perspective that the Council's Development Framework is not viewed as being a final or absolute layout.</p> <p>2. The new hatching on "privately owned unallocated land" north of Wavendon village includes the Stables, pub car park, church land and gardens on Walton Road but not the Summer Camp land (Wavendon Foundation) (see page 53). The latter falls in the same group and should be annotated as such.</p> <p>3. There is new reference to archaeological "field investigations" prior to submission of an application (page 31). The starting point to determine archaeological value must be a desk based assessment. This will determine whether field investigation is justified and needed. The text should be amended to reflect this. An operational golf course cannot allow intrusive investigations which could result in untold damage to the course and which might lead to the immediate closure of the business. The Council must accept that if there is a proven need for trenching that the timing of this must be agreed with the operator.</p> <p>4. We support the reference to an "interim access to Lower Road" to ensure delivery is not delayed</p>	<p>Recommended change: add a new paragraph to the end of section 1.2 to state "The Development Framework provides guidance and further detail to the development principles set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Alternative solutions and land use arrangements could come forward as part of the planning application process and should explain the reasons for any significant differences in approach"</p> <p>The summer camp (Wavendon Foundation) land performs an important landscape buffer role and MKC consider that it should remain as currently shown on Figures 3.4 and 3.13</p> <p>As the text on page 31 states, "Developers are recommended to contact the Council's Archaeological Officer at as early a stage as possible to discuss individual circumstances" – the implications of any archaeological investigations on the continuing operation of the golf course would clearly fall under such 'individual circumstances' and an acceptable solution can be agreed following discussions.</p> <p>Noted</p>
---	--	---

	<p>(page 31 and 41).</p> <p>5. Under "Existing Golf Course" on page 36, the Council state that <i>"the clubhouse will be retained within any new development, unless alternative provision can be made adjacent to the 18 hole course..."</i>. The existing clubhouse may be retained within the new development, however the wording regarding alternative provision is unacceptable. The draft SPD currently places an obligation on land outside of the SLA which it is not empowered to do and is inappropriate. It is not in the gift of the SPD to make this allocation.</p> <p>Locating a replacement club house on the 18 hole course would be subject of a separate planning application which the Council would have to consider. Should the Council not support a clubhouse south of Lower End Road, alternative provision would not be possible. This might result in an oversized club house being forced to be retained which would be uneconomical to run without the 9 hole and driving range.</p> <p>It is proposed that the wording is revised to state: "The clubhouse may be retained within any new development. If the clubhouse is subject of redevelopment, proposals for alternative provision would be considered."</p> <p>6. The location of the community centre on the golf course land needs further consideration. The Local Centre and schools will form the central hub for community development in the SLA and is considered a better location to facilitate easy access for the greater number of people. The Local Centre is likely to be best served by bus routes and see the convergence of pedestrian and redway routes. The proposed location connected to the playing fields would appear to be driven by</p>	<p><u>Recommended change</u> – "A clubhouse serving the remaining golf course facility should be retained. In the short term the club house is likely to remain in situ within the SLA land, but if the clubhouse is subject to redevelopment then proposals for alternative provision must be considered."</p> <p>We refer to comments included above on page 26 from the Council's Leisure and Community Facilities Team: Using lessons learned from previous facility and playing field developments the Team are seeking for provision of playing fields to be allocated in one larger area, central to the SLA proposal. The facility would be multi use incorporating changing rooms for the playing fields and a community hall for various community groups including pre-school provision and that the location of this building on this site should be accessible from the street and the pitches.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>the desire for changing rooms. Changing rooms can be provided separate from a community centre (page 47).</p> <p>7. Reference to a Community Energy Network should be removed (page 51). The Local Plan Inspector struck out the Core Strategy policy on this matter and it is therefore inappropriate for the Council to include words related to this in a document which is supplementary to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>8. Reference is made to a 6 form entry secondary school with 6th form. This remains unsubstantiated and not agreed. A further discussion on education provision is required. A meeting of the Project Board is needed to resolve this matter.</p>	<p>A recent example of where a smaller site has made sporting provision difficult is Broughton. Due to the location and size of the playing fields, there are planning conditions restricting the use of the pitches allowing only one game at a time. This restriction does not help with satisfactory development of sports at the site.</p> <p>Smaller sites do not allow flexibility of space. This is especially difficult if the site has dual pitch use with cricket. To allow progression for community teams, the site needs to be able to increase or decrease its pitch sizes depending on current demand, or in the case of a team making a facility its “home” ground, to allow for pitch sizes to increase as the team grows up. It is not ideal or always possible to have to move teams elsewhere.</p> <p>Examples of sites that work well with a larger playing field, multi pitch site with multi purpose facilities are Tattenhoe and Medbourne. On these sites, there is sufficient space for a variety of pitch sizes and a number of teams, space for sufficient parking and the facility is still in a residential area but sufficiently far away from neighbouring homes but located centrally for community access.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Policy CS5 includes the principle (7) that the use of community energy networks should be considered in line with Policy CS14. The wording of the final paragraph under Community Energy Network on page 51 of the Development Framework reflect that in Policy CS14 and it is considered appropriate to include information about the potential benefits of Networks.</p> <p>The Council’s Setting and School Organisation Framework (SSOF) 2012/13, Section D5 demonstrates that detailed research has been carried out to determine the likely additional pupil yield from new housing. From an analysis of 12 greenfield sites, the conclusion has been reached that, on average, 5.8 pupils per year group are generated by every 100 houses built. This</p>
--	--	---

	<p>9. There remains doubling up of open space provision, resulting in an over provision. For example, the waterway and existing woodland are shown as additional to the open space required under the Council's own open space standards. There is no justified reason for additional open space provision beyond the Council's own standards. This brings unneeded pressure on the SLA land area with housing densities are subsequently higher than they need to be. It is requested that the open space calculation takes into account the existing woodland and canal.</p> <p>10. The provisions of the SPD (particularly section 4 concerning delivery) should make specific reference to the possible need for Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) and make an express statement that the Council will intervene and make CPOs, if it becomes necessary to do so in order to facilitate future development of land to the south of the A421. This is important in those</p>	<p>rate of 5.8% can be applied to future years' planned housing, to give a projection of the likely number of additional places required. The application of this pupil yield to the development of 2,900 homes in the SLA results in 168 pupils per year group. In Section E4 of the SSOF the Council notes that a secondary school would be expected to have a minimum expected intake of 150 pupils per year group. 168 pupils at 30 pupils per form would generate a need for 5.6 forms, hence the requirement for a 6 FE school.</p> <p>The Council's public open space standards relate to the amount of space required as a consequence of new residential development. The need to retain the existing woodlands on the Eagle Farm North site or to provide land for the waterway is not generated by new residential development. The existing woodlands on Eagle Farm North are not identified as areas of public open space. They are existing features that should be retained for their biodiversity/arboricultural value (Fox Covert is covered by a group TPO). They are located adjacent to a proposed employment area and therefore would have limited value as public open space. The existing woodland in the area of land south of the A421 incorporates a neighbourhood play area and is included in the open space calculations for the development.</p> <p>The need to provide land for the waterway is a specific policy requirement of the Core Strategy policy CS5. It is not public open space and the majority of the land required to accommodate it lies within an employment area.</p> <p>The Council retains the ability to use CPO as a last resort in order to remove any obstacles to a cohesive and comprehensive development. However, we do not believe that this should have a specific reference in the Development Framework.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>circumstances where all attempts at connection arrangements with other SLA landowners have failed and a developer cannot otherwise deliver access to its development site.</p> <p>11. The SPD should make it clear that CIL for land to the south of the A421 will be nil or nominal on account of the MK Tariff Framework Agreement. This is the basis for present negotiations on the Framework Agreement.</p> <p>We trust there will be a further meeting of the Project Board or Steering Group to consider the outstanding issues and agree final changes before the document goes to Cabinet?</p>	<p>Developer contributions from the SLA will be sought either under a MK Tariff style Section 106 or under CIL if a schedule is adopted in time.</p> <p>Yes – a meeting has been arranged and has taken place</p>
<p>Terence O'Rourke on behalf of The Stables Music Venue</p>	<p>We refer to your email of the 31st July 2013 and our subsequent meetings and discussions. As you are aware we submitted on behalf of The Stables Music Venue detailed representations to the previous draft document by email on the 29th July 2013. In relation to the consultation on the Revised Draft Development Framework our further comments on behalf of The Stables Music Venue (Wavendon Allmusic Plan Limited) are as follows:</p> <p>Access Issues Page 31 – Access and Movement and Page 41 – Highway Access It is recognised in the draft document that access to The Stables Music Venue will need to be considered in order to ensure that the development of the SLA has full regard for the current and future activities at The Stables Music Venue. In this regard we attach a proposed solution to this issue (Masterplan A) which provide for a separate access into The Stables in conjunction with the residential development proposed as part of the SLA and the emerging Gallagher scheme.</p> <p>The key benefits of this solution</p>	<p>The access road shown on the Development Framework will be designed to accommodate the needs of The Stables and the future provision of a bus route through the land to the north of Wavendon with a bus gate arrangement to allow buses to take a through route from Newport Road to H9 Groveway via The Stables.</p> <p>We are aware of The Stables Music Venue's concern that new residents will be inconvenienced by traffic attending the venue. Information about the nature and flow of traffic to and from The Stables will be useful to understand the severity of any impact on residents – we understand that this information will be supplied alongside a current planning application for the venue and we will use that in further</p>

	<p>are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A dedicated access to The Stables Music Venue would be achieved which would minimise potential "nuisance" to the proposed residential development. • The dedicated access off Newport Road (A5130) would reduce potential traffic congestion and would provide scope for a tidal flow system if appropriate at "non-peak" hours. • There would be the potential to create one new junction (roundabout) on the A5130 Newport Road to serve both The Stables Music Venue and the new development areas to the east. • No access is required into Wavendon Village. • The current role and constraints of Stockwell Lane would no longer form a potential obstacle to future development as proposed. • There would be scope to provide a "bus gate" link across the public park to serve the new residential area and The Stables Music Venue. • The access to the residential developments would be from H9 and thus there would be no conflict with the activities at The Stables Music Venue or Wavendon Village. • There would be scope in the future to provide access to potential additional residential development or other uses if this is progressed in the Towergate area via Ortensia Drive. 	<p>discussions with the landowners and The Stables</p>
--	--	--

	<p>In addition we attach a Masterplan B that sets out the opportunity to include an access route through the Hewlett Packard land in the event that this site is subsequently redeveloped.</p> <p>In due course The Stables Music Venue will provide the Council and their traffic consultants with detailed traffic data for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Customers • Trade deliveries • Artists and venue hire vehicles • Emergency services <p>Educational Requirements Page 48 – The Stables Music Venue Education Opportunities As noted in the Revised Draft Development Framework it is recognised that the continuation of the education facilities at The Stables Music Venue, notably the annual summer camp for school children, will need to be achieved as part of the development of Wavendon North. In this respect we attach a drawing illustrating the proposed new education facility in the form of an integrated extension to the proposed Courtyard development. Combined with this proposal is the enhanced and reinforced "green" parking area which has the alternative use as a campsite marquee base should this be required in the future.</p> <p>The Stables Music Venue request that the full cost of the access roads and the education facility be fully funded by the developers of the SLA.</p> <p>As previously noted we consider that great care should be given by the Council to the form and content of any planning application relating to the Development Framework area. If this cannot be</p>	<p>Masterplan B is tied up with Hewlett Packard’s plans for the redevelopment of their land, the majority of which lies outside of the SLA and, along with the land at Towergate, is allocated in the Milton Keynes Local Plan for employment purposes. Any future development if this land, especially involving a change of use away from employment should ideally be progressed through the PlanMK review process.</p> <p>MKC is keen to encourage and support the proposed expansion of educational facilities and opportunities at The Stables Music Venue.</p> <p>The cost of the access roads and the replacement educational facilities will need to be considered separately from the Development Framework and funding streams looked at in the context of the overall community and infrastructure requirements of the development. It is, however, important to bear in mind that the proposed new education facility would replace the seasonal and limited use of the Wavendon Foundation field facility with a permanent facility with the potential for use 365 days a year. On that basis it would not be appropriate for the full cost of the new educational facility to be met by the SLA developers.</p> <p>Any planning application will be expected to have due regard to existing land uses surrounding the application site.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>achieved as one streamlined process then proposals will need to recognise and respect the proposals of adjoining landowners in a coordinated and constructive manner.</p> <p>We trust that these representations will be considered carefully by the Council and we would be pleased to discuss our submission in more detail and to provide any additional information that might be of assistance.</p> <p>As you are aware we have tried on several occasions recently to speak with Gallagher's and their consultants in order to progress these matters but this has not proved to be possible to date. We will continue to seek to discuss these issues with them over the coming weeks.</p> <p>We look forward to receiving your response to these representations and in the interim please do not hesitate to contact us if you would like to discuss any aspect of this matter.</p>	
<p>Bidwells for Connolly Homes</p>	<p>Our comments on the revised draft plan are set out below. MKC should acknowledge that the previous detailed comments provided by Connolly Homes to the July 2012 draft have not been considered or included within this revised draft, hence it is necessary to repeat some of them as part of this consultation. Whilst the consultation statement that accompanies the current consultation stage does report the previous views of Connolly Homes, it does not include any response or commentary by MKC to the points raised.</p> <p>Section 1.5 Planning Policy Background The text 'The Development Framework will only be adopted once the Core Strategy has been adopted' either requires updating following the adoption of the CS,</p>	<p><u>Recommended change</u> – delete sentence which states “The Development Framework will only be adopted once the Core Strategy has been adopted.</p> <p>The text is ambiguous – the watercourse</p>

	<p>or deleting.</p> <p>Section 2.6 Habitat and Vegetation There is no existing linear park within the Church Farm site. This text reference is incorrect and should be deleted. We raised this in our representations to the July 2012 draft and it has not been considered. The text could be replaced as follows: <i>"There is an existing linear park, which follows a watercourse through Browns Wood and Old Farm Park. This could be extended into the Church farm Site"</i></p> <p>Figure 2.6 Public Transport We welcome the updates to the drawing to reflect the current bus service provision.</p> <p>Figure 2.10 Facilities We commented at the previous draft consultation stage in July 2012 and restate that this plan details the proximity of local services and amenities within the area with the 5, 10 and 20 minute walking isochromes plotted. We consider this should be extended to include the 2km isochrome to reflect the 'walkable neighbourhood' definition within Manual for Streets.</p> <p>Figure 2.14 Opportunities and Constraints We welcome the Flood Zone updates to provide greater clarity. However our previous representations to the July 2012 draft have not been considered. We restate that the hedgerows within and surrounding the Church Farm site require detailed assessment to establish those that should be retained and those which could be removed/replaced as part of an overall landscape and ecology strategy for the site. The</p>	<p>continues into the Church Farm site, not the linear park. Recommended change – replace fourth bullet point with: "There is an existing linear park, which follows a watercourse through Browns Wood and Old Farm Park. The watercourse continues through the Church Farm site and could be incorporated in an extended linear park."</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Manual for Streets states that "Walkable neighbourhoods are typically characterised by having a range of facilities within 10 minutes' (up to about 800 m) walking distance of residential areas which residents may access comfortably on foot." Whilst it states that journeys up to 2km offer the greatest potential to replace short car trips, it isn't put forward as a definition of walkable neighbourhoods. The policy aim should be to achieve walkable neighbourhoods based on the 10 minutes journeys.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Developer supports the principle of maintaining the boundary hedgerows and specimen trees but the document should be flexible on those within the site confines. These features will need to be individually assessed to establish where road access may need to be taken through the site.</p> <p>The annotation and key should be extended to define important hedgerows along the site boundaries which are to be retained and separately, those which there is a desire to retain if possible, subject to the detailed masterplanning process.</p> <p>3.4 Landscape and Open Space Strategy Under the subsection 'Edge Treatment' and specifically for 'Church Farm', the statement that 'the hedge should remain within public ownership' is unclear. Either it is already within public ownership and outside the developers landownership, or it is not. This sentence should be deleted and replaced with <i>"Where this occurs, the hedge should not be conveyed to the individual property and should be managed and maintained as strategic landscaping"</i>.</p> <p>3.5 Movement strategy Under the subsection 'Redways', it states "Within the Church Farm Site, a redway will be provided along the grid road extension of the H10 connecting to Pheobe Lane to the East". The concept of the H10 extension is not agreed and this statement conflicts with the earlier sections. This should be deleted to change to <i>"Any land to be safeguarded for a potential future H10 grid road extension, should also allow for a future redway extension connecting to Phoebe Lane to the East"</i>.</p>	<p>It is accepted that it may not be possible to retain every hedgerow in its entirety. Where retention of hedgerows is referred to in the document, it is accompanied by the caveat "where possible." Many of the hedgerows within the site (e.g. Phoebe Lane) are as important as those on the boundaries.</p> <p>Recommended changes– page 31 under heading 'habitat and vegetation' amend second bullet point to read: "Existing hedgerows should be retained where possible. To ensure their long term maintenance they should be incorporated within the public realm where practicable."</p> <p>Amend figure 2.14 key to read "hedge to be retained, where possible"</p> <p>Amend paragraph page 35 after heading 'landscape' third sentence to read: "In order to create developable land parcels and provide road access, it may not always be possible to retain every hedgerow in its entirety."</p> <p>Recommended change – Delete final sentence of first paragraph after Church Farm heading on page 35 and replace with: "Where this occurs, the hedge should not be conveyed to the individual property and should be managed and maintained as strategic landscaping".</p> <p>Recommended change: to Page 42 'Redways' – last sentence of first para. To: "Any land to be safeguarded for a potential future H10 grid road extension, should also allow for a future redway extension connecting to Phoebe Lane to the East".</p>
--	---	---

	<p>3.6 Land Uses</p> <p>The land uses are defined within the Character Typologies at Table 3.4. Whilst we agree with the broad assumption that Church Farm site will be predominantly family housing with some executive housing at lower densities to the northern of the primary access road, the central spine road may require some higher density development to meet any identified housing needs for the area. This can be considered through the detailed masterplanning process. We request that Figure 3.12 and Table 3.4 be reclassified as '<i>Indicative Character Typologies</i>' to complement the '<i>Indicative Land Use Budget</i>' section 3.10 and Table 3.5.</p> <p>Under subsection Housing, with reference to the Indicative Land use budget, assumptions about the net density are based on stated developable areas which may differ at the application stage when the detailed site specific assessments are made. Flexibility is key to ensure delivery of the Core Strategy Housing targets.</p> <p>Under subsection Primary Schools, we object to the change made between the 2012 draft and the current draft for Church Farm. The position regarding primary schools has not changed between the two drafts. Church Farm is not required to provide a primary school on-site and the original text confirming this and the need for the developer to make appropriate financial contributions should be reinstated. This updated wording provides uncertainty.</p> <p>5.5 Programme and Milestones</p> <p>This section still does not reflect the fact that Church farm site can be delivered as an early standalone phase as the existing social and community infrastructure has capacity for additional development subject to improvements through the tariff</p>	<p><u>Recommended change</u> – Amend table 3.4 and figure 3.12 to read '<i>Indicative Character Typologies</i>'</p> <p>The current wording on the Framework on page 48 'Primary Schools' accurately reflects the current position of the Setting and School Organisation Team.</p> <p><u>Recommended change:</u> introduce separate trajectories for the main core part of the SLA and for Church Farm.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>framework. The developer envisages delivery of housing before 2017 as a result. A separate trajectory should be included to show Church Farm site as an early phase with first housing completions expected in early 2015. No commentary has been provided to explain the amended timetable.</p> <p>Appendix A: Community Engagement & Consultation Statement</p> <p>The basic chart included within Appendix A of the Development Framework is not sufficient in our view. It does not fully represent the issues raised during the July 2012 consultation. The separate Consultation Statement dated July 2013 summarises the detailed matters raised by interested parties but contains no assessment. A proper response is required to all matters raised, several of which have had to be raised again for this current consultation stage where updates have not been included.</p> <p>Appendix D: Indicative Land Use Budget – Church Farm</p> <p>Greater clarity is provided which is supported. However the Neighbourhood Play Area requirement is not justified by the scale of development and the stated amount contradicts the minimum size requirements set out in Table 3.1 open Space Standards and the relevant Planning Obligations SPG and Adopted Local plan Policy L3/Appendix L3. This should properly be reflected as a Local Play Area of 0.35ha for Church Farm.</p> <p>We seek confirmation that the above comments will be properly considered and reported upon, particularly if they do not lead to any updates to the document prior to adoption.</p>	<p>Recommended change: Appendix A to be replaced by the schedule of responses which will be an annex to the Cabinet report on 5 November.</p> <p>The Council’s Leisure Recreation and Sports Facilities SPG states that housing developments of 200+ dwellings will normally require a Neighbourhood Play Area.</p> <p>The Council’s open space standards require that 0.35ha/1000 population is provided for Local Play Areas and 0.6ha/1000 population for Neighbourhood Play Areas. These standards generate sufficient land requirement provision for a single Neighbourhood Play Area. No Local Play Areas would be required within Church Farm site, in addition to the Neighbourhood Play Area.</p> <p>Recommended changes – Page 39 second para under heading ‘play areas’, include sentence: “Within the Church Farm site, there will not be a need to provide any Local Play Areas in addition to the Neighbourhood Play Area.”</p> <p>Also, amend appendix C page 72 para under heading ‘Local Play Areas’ final sentence to read: “The remaining 0.5ha would be provided on-site within the land north of Wavendon, and as part of the Church Farm site Neighbourhood Play Area.”</p>
--	---	--

<p>Collins & Coward for Hewlett Packard plc</p>	<p>We write on behalf of Hewlett Packard Ltd who own land and property at Wavendon Gate Business Park, Milton Keynes. HP has three parcels of land as shown on the attached plan (CC/001) of which one lies within the Strategic Land Allocation (“SLA”) and two adjoining. All three parcels are in the process of being promoted for residential development as they are surplus to business needs. Our client’s representations are set out below:</p> <p>1. Whilst the site boundary of the SLA is defined it is important that the relationship to the land outwith the SLA is fully assessed and integrated with the SLA proposals. In respect of HP’s land this has not been undertaken or fully assessed. At present the western edge of the SLA is promoted under the Development Framework as a hard urban edge with no connectivity to the west. This is neither desirable in planning terms nor sensible in practical terms as access to the west could lead to the early release of housing land to meet housing needs;</p> <p>2. All of HP’s land within and outwith the SLA is accessible to public transport within 400m of a bus stop (figure 2.6) making it suitable for development;</p> <p>3. Figure 2.10 does not correctly identify the full extent of HP’s implemented office (Class B1) planning permission. All of HP’s land as shown on CC/001 save for the northern parcel has the benefit of implemented class B1 use. We confirm HP’s land falls within 600m of a primary school and 1500m of a secondary school. It is also within 800m of a local centre making HP’s land readily suitable for residential development;</p> <p>4. At Figure 3 some of HP’s northern parcel within the SLA is proposed for residential development the remainder is</p>	<p>Proposals by landowners outside of the agreed SLA boundary need to come forward as part of the work on the Site Allocations Plan or PlanMK especially where a change of allocated use is being sought. Nothing in the SLA prohibits future development outside of the SLA boundary. The Development Framework plan at Figure 3.13 shows residential development up to the western boundary of the land to the north of Wavendon. The Framework deliberately does not plan down at the more detailed level of internal connections and estate roads, and so it is possible that future connectivity to the west could be included in developers’ detailed plans.</p> <p><u>Recommended change:</u> Add in the Western piece of land to the purple employment shading on Figure 2.10</p> <p>The landscape buffer shown in the Development Framework reflects the extent of the buffer as shown in the Adopted Core Strategy Appendix E, Policies</p>
---	---	--

	<p>proposed for open space. This does not accord with the Inspector’s Report at paragraph 51. This states in respect of “Wavendon Business Park” the following:</p> <p><i>“The existing landscape form and trees belts around Wavendon Business Park and the Stables and the openness of the area immediately to the north of Wavendon’s settlement boundary together provide an attractive green setting for the village. This can be retained and opportunities to extend and enhance the green setting can be taken while integrating the lower-lying land further north into the developed area of the SLA...”</i></p> <p>5. This draws a distinction between the tree belt boundary of the business park and the open space north of Wavendon. The Inspector is seeking to reinforce and extend the tree boundary at HP’s northern parcel and not create open space. HP’s northern parcel is not part of Wavendon Village. Therefore the proposal for a large area of open space does not accord with the Inspector’s Report. HP would wish to see the Development Framework plans modified to reflect the proposals in CC/002 and CC/003;</p> <p>6. Figure 3 shows allotments at the western extreme of HP’s northern parcel which reflects the hard edge the Development Framework sees to establish which in HP’s view is an incorrect approach. The allotments should be deleted from this location;</p> <p>7. Figure 3.4 does not reflect the best and most appropriate approach to development in this section of the SLA. It does not reflect HP’s proposed access to the west to join with Ortensia Drive which would release land immediately for residential development. This may offer an opportunity for the Stables to</p>	<p>Map Amendment.</p> <p>In our view it is the correct approach.</p> <p>As stated above, proposals by landowners outside of the agreed SLA boundary need to come forward as part of the work on the Site Allocations Plan or PlanMK especially where a change of allocated use is being sought. Nothing in the SLA prohibits future development outside of the SLA boundary. We are aware of the interest from The Stables Music Venue in a potential new access from Ortensia Drive and this would</p>
--	--	---

	<p>realise an early and better access to its facilities (CC/002). Access would go through the area shown for allotments. This would link with HP's intension to seek a change from implemented Class B1 business use to residential use on the land outwith the SLA as shown on Plan CC/004.</p> <p>Conclusion HP proposes that the development framework be modified to reflect previous discussions with MK Council and as reflected in plans CC/002 and CC/003.</p>	<p>ideally be considered through the plan-led process or through a planning application were that to be submitted.</p>
<p>Barton Willmore for Gallagher Estates</p>	<p>In general, Gallagher estates are pleased that the emerging outline planning application proposals for land at Glebe Farm and Eagle Farm South, forming the majority of the land south of the A421, broadly accord with the current draft Framework. This reflects the close working relationship and consultation which has been undertaken in preparing the applications.</p> <p>Gallagher Estates has welcomed the opportunity provided by the Council for continuous and active involvement in the preparation of this Framework. We are generally supportive of the draft document in its current form, subject to the following issues which we comment upon below.</p> <p>Gallagher Estates has welcomed the opportunity provided by the Council for continuous and active involvement in the preparation of this Framework. We are generally supportive of the draft document in its current form, subject to the following issues which we comment upon below.</p> <p>Gallagher Estates supports the amendments which have been made to the Framework in response to the adopted Core Strategy (July 2013). In particular, we are pleased that the draft recognises:</p> <p>I. The increase in the amount of</p>	

	<p>housing to be delivered within the SLA, as reflected in the adopted Core Strategy;</p> <p>II. The inclusion of the land west of Newport Road and east of Stockwell Lane;</p> <p>iii. The inclusion of areas of woodland located immediately adjacent to Eagle farm North; and</p> <p>iv. The removal of any requirement for the development of the SLA to fund the dualling of the A421.</p> <p>We do however wish to raise the following concerns and objections which remain and to which Gallagher Estates seek amendments to the Framework prior to its adoption. Our representations are set out below in response to the relevant sections of the draft Framework.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>In our view, the Framework’s Introduction should include a short statement confirming that the Development Framework provides guidance and an indicative framework masterplan. This should guide more detailed development proposals in the form of outline planning applications. It should be clear that planning applications should be in general accordance with the content of the Framework but alternative approaches could be made where justified.</p> <p>In particular, the Development Framework Plan (fig 3.13) should not be taken as a fixed masterplan but a framework to guide applications. Critically, planning applications should not be refused solely on the grounds that they do not strictly adhere to the Development Framework Plan.</p> <p>Park and Ride</p> <p>The Concept Plan (fig 3.1) identifies the provision of a Park and Ride and lorry Park within Eagle Farm North. The Concept Plan includes</p>	<p><u>Recommended change:</u> add a new paragraph to the end of section 1.2 to state</p> <p>“The Development Framework provides guidance and further detail to the development principles set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Alternative solutions and land use arrangements could come forward as part of the planning application process and should explain the reasons for any significant differences in approach”</p> <p><u>Recommended changes:</u> amend the Park and Ride notation on Figure 3.13 to say</p> <p>“Possible site for Park and Ride”</p> <p>Page 41 “Park & Ride”: Add new text at</p>
--	---	--

	<p>a footnote stating: “Although Policy Cs5 has been revised following the Core Strategy Examination to remove the requirement fro provision of a lorry park and a park and ride site, the Council still wishes to encourage the provision of these uses.”</p> <p>The footnote correctly identifies that this infrastructure was deleted from Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy as it was demonstrated that the requirements are not justified. It is therefore surprising that the Council maintain that this should be formally identified within the Framework SPD.</p> <p>Such an approach conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that SPDs should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens of development. Furthermore, the draft National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) website published by DCLG advises that SPDs cannot be used to introduce new policies or revise existing ones.</p> <p>A technical note has been prepared by Gallagher Estates’ highways consultant and is submitted with these representations. In summary, this demonstrates that any requirement for land to be reserved for a Park and Ride is not justified by robust evidence – the proposed site at Eagle farm North is not considered suitable or feasible fro Park and Ride use.</p> <p>In conclusion, any requirement or encouragement for the provision of Park and Ride within the SLA is unsound and should be deleted from the document.</p> <p>Lorry Park</p> <p>As with the above objection regarding to provision of park and ride, there is no requirement with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy for</p>	<p>the start of the second paragraph to say “The SLA is the last piece of developable land on the eastern edge of the city and so it remains...”</p>
--	--	---

	<p>a Lorry Park to be provided as part of the SLA development. This is recognised within the footnote to relevant plans within the Framework (as stated above) and set out on page 46 of the draft document.</p> <p>The Council's Lorry Management Strategy adopted in 2008 is out of date. The Core Strategy Inspector did not endorse this document and the proposed allocation of a site within the SLA. The Core Strategy is of course the adopted development plan and, having regard to the NPPF and the draft NPPG, this infrastructure is not justified and its inclusion within the Framework is unsound.</p> <p>To address our objection the Council should remove any proposed requirement or encouragement for the provision of a Lorry Park within the SLA.</p> <p>Grid Roads</p> <p>The Framework includes an illustrative cross-section for the proposed Grid Road corridors to be provided as part of the SLA (fig 3.6). This is supplemented by table 3.3 'Street Hierarchy', which provides inter alia design criteria. As with our previously submitted representations, Gallagher Estates question the specific requirement for a "green reserve" of more than 30 metres in width to be provided each side of the carriageway in order to allow for an additional carriageway in the future. This approach would not in our view make best and most efficient use of land. The Council's objectives for providing Grid Roads within the SLA can be achieved with corridors of approximately 45 metres in width.</p> <p>Outline planning applications for land at Glebe farm and Eagle Farm South are to be submitted in due course. The proposal will include the reduced width corridors to</p>	<p>The grid road width shown in Fig 3.6 of the Development Framework future proofs the grid road corridor for possible future expansion. The wide grid road reservations follow guidance in the Milton Keynes Planning Manual and are intended to accommodate services, landscaping (including noise attenuation mounds to mitigate noise levels for dwellings and other sensitive uses) and other forms of transport if required. The green reserve allows for both a second carriageway in the future but also ensures that any housing built in the current SLA development is sufficiently set back from a future dualed grid road that residential amenity is not adversely affected by such future traffic noise.</p> <p>Should a phasing plan be agreed by all interested parties then this allowance for an interim access could be withdrawn. MKC will continue to work with the core landowners to encourage the production and agreement of this phasing plan.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>allow for the future provision of Grid Roads. The application will explain this design and the technical work undertaken to justify this approach.</p> <p>We therefore raise concerns with the fig 3.6 and the text within table 3.3 and seek a more flexible approach to be adopted by the Council.</p> <p>Highway Access</p> <p>The Framework states at page 41 that the use of interim access arrangements to Lower End Road will be considered if required to ensure development is not delayed. We find this surprising given the Council’s clearly stated intention to restrict new accesses with Lower End Road. The delivery and phasing of the SLA is addressed elsewhere within the Framework and there should be other mechanisms such as an agreed phasing plan provided within the Framework. This approach would avoid the need for such interim measures to be considered.</p> <p>School Provision</p> <p>Gallagher Estates confirm that the application proposals for land at Glebe Farm and eagle farm South will include land for 2 new primary schools and a secondary school. This accords with the requirements of the Framework. However, the draft document (page 48) includes site size requirements which is in excess of the level of provision which is necessary and directly related to the development of the SLA.</p> <p><u>Primary Schools</u></p> <p>With regard to primary provision, the Framework states that a minimum of 2.6 hectares should be provided per two forms of entry primary school. This in fact is the</p>	<p>Recommended change: There is an error on page 48 of the Framework. The site size requirements for both the secondary and the two primary schools are correct but the last sentence of the first paragraph under ‘Primary Schools’ should refer to three form of entry primary schools and not two form of entry.</p> <p>The sizes agreed with School Organisation colleagues are: 7.83ha for 6 FE secondary school plus sixth form and 2.63ha per 3 FE primary schools, 2 primary schools are required hence the allowance of 5.2ha in the Land Use Budget in Appendix D of the Framework.</p> <p>In terms of the requirement for a 6 FE secondary school, see response to David Lock Associates above on pages 46 & 47. .</p>
--	--	---

	<p>site size for a three forms of entry primary school and would therefore result in the provision of six forms of entry for primary (in addition to the off-site provision to meet needs generated by Church Farm).</p> <p>In our view, 2 forms of entry primary school sites (each 2.1 ha in size) is sufficient to meet the future requirements of the SLA development south of the A421. This should be reflected through amendments to the Framework prior to adoption.</p> <p><u>Secondary School</u></p> <p>Gallagher Estates object to the requirement for the six forms of entry secondary school including 6th form. This is not needed to meet needs generated by the development of the SLA and would be provided to help meet wider needs. Whilst this enhanced provision could be agreed following negotiation, this should not be the Council's starting point within the Framework. We would welcome an opportunity to review this issue in more detail prior to adoption of the Framework.</p> <p>Land north of Wavendon</p> <p>Gallagher Estates support the identification of land north of Wavendon as part of the SLA. This includes a Green Buffer which will provide separation between new development and the village, protecting its character and identity. This buffer has been reflected in the more detailed proposals which have been prepared for development at Glebe Farm and which were subject of public consultation in July 2013.</p> <p>Open Space Strategy</p> <p>Gallagher Estates object to the proposed provision of formal sports pitches within the SLA. The</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Lessons from earlier developments are that a large playing field allocation is more successful than smaller individual sites. The indicated allocation in this draft development framework has been</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Framework identifies a single group of pitches within the land south of the A421, on land entirely outside of the control of Gallagher Estates. The delivery of this part of the SLA is likely to be as part of a late phase of the development. We are therefore concerned that individual application proposals would not meet the Council's requirements and that such earlier phases of development would not be served by this provision.</p> <p>To address these issues, Gallagher Estates propose to provide formal sports pitches are part of Glebe Farm and Eagle Farm South. A third grouping of pitches is envisaged to be delivered as part of the development of the site controlled by third parties. We are mindful that the Council is seeking to reduce its obligations with regards to maintaining sports pitches, however, this does not in our view outweigh the concerns outlined above.</p> <p>Against this background, we object to the proposed approach and seek amendments to the documents to reflect the approach advocated by our client.</p> <p>Character</p> <p>We generally support the guidance contained in section 3.7, including fig 3.12 'Character Typologies'. This reflects the approach envisaged by Gallagher Estates which would respond to the surrounding environment, with the development changing from more dense development along the northern A421 edge to lower density development along the southern edge and west of Newport Road.</p> <p>Delivery</p> <p>Gallagher Estates seeks the deletion of the 3rd paragraph in section 4.1 of the Framework. This wording should be replaced by the inclusion of a phasing plan within</p>	<p>developed to ensure greater flexibility of use and overall viability (it will include a multi-use community and sports building). It is recognised that this approach carries a risk of delivery as the land ownership is split and could be developed at different times. The recommendation, however, would still be to pursue the development of the large site as the best option for the future of sport.</p> <p>Character - Noted.</p> <p>Should a phasing plan be agreed by all interested parties then this allowance for an interim access could be withdrawn. MKC will continue to work with the core landowners to encourage the agreement of this phasing plan.</p> <p>Recommended change: add text to page</p>
--	---	---

	<p>the Framework which inter alia should demonstrate that the phasing of the SLA will include the early delivery of supporting community infrastructure and facilities. We would like an opportunity to discuss this issue with the Council and to assist in the production of a phasing plan.</p> <p>Reflecting this phased approach, the 6th bullet point within section 4.1 should be reworded to require agreement and implementation of all necessary infrastructure needed to implement the development in a phased manner.</p> <p>Phasing/Next Steps</p> <p>Section 4.3 of the Framework refers to all landowners agreeing an equalisation mechanism. This is unlikely to be achievable in the short term and is potentially unrealistic given the number of interest who are now involved. Officers will be aware that the landowners are engaged and will continue to negotiate terms. Nonetheless, the Framework should instead confirm that equalisation requirements should be agreed with the Council. This will ensure that planning applications and the early delivery of development cannot be frustrated in the absence of such an agreement being reached with all SLA landowners.</p> <p>Whilst it is perhaps of assistance for the Framework to identify the sequence of key milestones for the implementation and delivery of the SLA development, the document should make clear that there is no restriction on planning applications being submitted and/or approved. In this respect, the Council will be aware of its duty to maintain a sufficient supply of land for housing – the timely delivery of the SALA will make an important contribution to this.</p> <p>We therefore seek amendment to</p>	<p>41 to stress the conditional nature of the interim access – “If required, and only to ensure that development in this area is not delayed, the Council will consider the use of interim access arrangements. <u>The Council, though, expects that the need for such arrangements will fall away once a phasing plan is agreed by all interested parties...</u>”</p> <p>The Council continues to offer to facilitate the commercial negotiations required between the parties at their earliest convenience.</p> <p>The Council continues to offer to facilitate the commercial negotiations required between the parties at their earliest convenience.</p> <p><u>Recommended change – amend para 5.5</u></p>
--	--	--

	<p>section 5.5 of the document, so that it is entitled “<u>Indicative Programme and Milestones.</u>”</p> <p>Finally, we confirm our support for the removal of the requirement for the preparation of Development Briefs. This responds to the changes made to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>heading to read: “Indicative Programme and Milestones.”</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	---	---

Summary of comments from other respondents, by issue raised and number of comments

214 written and email responses setting out objections to various aspects of the proposals were received from residents during the consultation period. Responses have come from residents in the surrounding area, notably Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. The main issues of concern were the proposed access roads into the SLA to the east and west of the A5130 Newport Road and the impact of additional junctions and traffic from the SLA on traffic queues and safety along that road. This issue has also been raised by the parish and town councils in the area and some of the responses set out above are therefore relevant.

Number of comments	Nature of comment	MKC officer response
Roads and transport		
184	<p>Total opposition to the council’s plan to build 2 new exit roads onto Newport Road from the SLA development of 2,900 homes.</p> <p>At peak times traffic on this stretch of Newport Road is frequently backed up over half a mile.</p> <p>This situation that can only get worse with the additional traffic that the new development of 2,900 homes will generate. This will create congestion on an enormous scale.</p> <p>Commuters would face lengthy delays as would Emergency Services due to queues along the Newport Road heading north to the Kingston roundabout and beyond. . People driving from the southerly towns and villages (Wavendon, Woburn Sands, Aspley Guise, Woburn, Eversholt and Bow Brickhill) towards Milton Keynes along the Newport Road - for normal daily reasons of going to work, to the hospital, library, and shops etc, will suffer the most dreadful of tailbacks.</p>	<p>The impact of the SLA on traffic in the existing area will be considered in detail in transport assessments accompanying planning applications. The National Planning Policy Framework states that Transport Assessments will need to consider whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and whether improvements can be made within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development.</p> <p>Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</p> <p>In that context, Officers have considered traffic modelling information in looking at the issues raised. An important factor in considering how traffic will be affected by the development of the SLA is the impact that the planned improvements to the Kingston roundabout will have. The Kingston junction improvements have been designed to accommodate existing and future forecast traffic from the SLA access to both the A421 (Fen Junction) and A5130. The provision of</p>

		<p>the two access points feeding into Kingston allows for the delivery of a more even distribution of traffic and it is this which ensures that the junction delivers significant reduction in traffic congestion. The design and its development was assessed by the Department for Transport and was awarded funding based on its performance in removing a significant 'pinch point' on the network.</p> <p>The development of the design did consider an option without the access on the A5130, however the performance of Kingston in this scenario was reduced and does not offer the same level of benefits as the preferred option. Whilst the introduction of the secondary access on to the A5130 will, upon the completion of the SLA development, increase the average queue length on the Newport Road in the morning peak, the numbers of vehicles affected is significantly lower (and therefore the cumulative effect is less) than on the A421 at the same time.</p> <p>In preparing the Development Framework account has been taken of information from the Milton Keynes Multi Modal Transport Model and a Transport Assessment submitted by Gallagher Estates in support of their planning application for Eagle Farm North. The traffic modelling information contributes to the planning process, it is not the sole determinant in the design of the SLA masterplan</p> <p>The Council has also carried out further work over May to August 2013 on a South East Rural Area Traffic Study. This study extends the current Milton Keynes transport model with more data from the rural south east villages and it also incorporates the upgrade of the Kingston roundabout which has Government Pinch Point funding and work on which is due to commence in July/August 2014.</p> <p>Traffic modelling has shown that without a secondary access onto Newport Road, the Fen Roundabout junction on the A421 would not operate</p>
--	--	---

		<p>effectively once the full SLA development was fully built out.</p> <p>Recommended change: add text to the Framework (end of first para under “Highway Access: Land to the south of A421” on page 41) to state that: “The secondary access road to the land south of the A421 onto the A5130, Newport Road should not be opened to vehicular traffic until, at the earliest, the upgrade of the Kingston roundabout is complete and the dualling of the A421 to the Milton Keynes Council boundary and preferably to Junction 13 of the M1 is in place. The phasing of the opening of the secondary access should be linked to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the reduced performance of the new Kingston Junction, as a result of increased pressure from the A421 from the east ; • Completion of the dualling of the A421 to the MKC boundary and preferably all the way to Junction 13 of the M1. However this latter section of dualling does not yet have funding and whilst, we are optimistic that it will come forward as it is a regional priority within SEMLEP, it would not be appropriate to restrict development on the basis of the delivery of infrastructure that is currently outside of our direct control and in a neighbouring authority’s area. • The latest position regarding the East West Rail service, the electrification of the line (planned for 2019) and the level crossing option selected to be taken forward at Woburn Sands. <p>Given the above phasing requirements and anticipated build out rates it might be that the secondary access may not be required before 2021. In the meantime the local community will benefit from the improved Kingston</p>
--	--	---

		<p>roundabout.</p> <p>When proposals for new junctions on the A5130 serving the SLA come forward they will be subject to consultation with local residents.</p> <p>With regard to access to the land to the north of Wavendon this will need to be considered in detail (bus routes, junction on A5130, access to The Stables etc as part of the detailed transport assessment accompanying planning applications.”</p>
120	<p>As a result of the tail backs on the A5130, Newport Road, drivers coming from the south will seek alternatives and will seek out rat running opportunities, especially along Walton Road in Wavendon. Rat running will also increase on other rural roads as drivers seek out other alternatives. No amount of 'speed bumps' would deter frustrated and delayed drivers.</p> <p>Increased traffic on Walton Road leads to risks to house foundations and drains plus pollution and hazards for pedestrians especially children on foot and on bike going to and from the village school but also walking to school buses on Newport Road.</p> <p>Traffic from Old Farm Park/ Wavendon Gate will increase further as a result of the Church Farm development.</p>	<p>MKC will be arranging to meet with the parish councils in the affected area and with Central Bedfordshire Council where relevant, to discuss issues around rat running and to identify possible mitigation to address these.</p>
52	<p>Kingston roundabout needs to be re-engineered before any new development takes place.</p> <p>Traffic lights on the Kingston roundabout will not help the situation.</p> <p>Has any provision been made for pedestrians or cyclists?</p> <p>The building of the car showroom would seem to have reduced the land and therefore limited the opportunities for improving the roundabout.</p>	<p>This is in hand. A scheme to upgrade the Kingston roundabout has ‘pinch point’ finding from the Government and work to upgrade the roundabout (including enlargement of the roundabout, widening of entrance lanes and the introduction of traffic signals) is due to begin in summer 2014.</p> <p>Modelling has been carried out to support the bid for funding that was made to and accepted by the Government. This demonstrates a clear improvement in the reduction of queuing times on the A5130 at peak times.</p>

		The car showroom development does not interfere with the land required for the roundabout upgrade.
54	Impact on road safety on Newport Road – the location of the access roads is on the worst stretch of this winding rural road.	The impact of the SLA on traffic in the existing area will be considered in detail in transport assessments accompanying planning applications. The Transport Assessments will need to consider whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and whether improvements can be made within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
33	Noise and exhaust fumes would damage the environment and affect the health of existing (and future) residents. Traffic noise and sounds associated with a built up urban area (sirens; speeding cars and motorcycles etc) would increase dramatically to the detriment of the amenity of the area.	<p>The area already has a level of background noise as a result of proximity to the A421 and the M1. The National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) states that planning policies and decisions should aim to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoid noise from giving rise to significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life as a result of new development; • mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development, including through the use of conditions; • recognise that development will often create some noise and existing businesses wanting to develop in continuance of their business should not have unreasonable restrictions put on them because of changes in nearby land uses since they were established <p>The views of Environmental Health officers will be sought on planning applications as part of assessing and then mitigating any significant adverse impacts.</p>
25	Neither the installation of a roundabout or traffic lights at the new junction of the two roads from the SLA with the Newport Road	The assessment work carried out in support of the bid for funding that was made to and accepted by the

	will relieve congestion for those coming from the South.	Government. This demonstrates a clear improvement in the reduction of queuing times on the A5130 at peak times
18	<p>Proposals are based on a flawed traffic survey – predictions are based on 2009 figures and don't include the Parklands development.</p> <p>The survey ignores the impact on Wavendon and Woburn Sands and only considers the impact on Kingston roundabout and the A421.</p> <p>The 'traffic modelling' does not take into account at all the variations of behaviour in drivers who get angry and frustrated through delays. The model is at best an oblique estimate and omits the real life effects of human behaviours.</p>	<p>The developers' transport assessments that will be submitted alongside planning applications use the Council's Multi Modal Model. The Multi Modal Model has been validated and accepted by the Department for Transport and the Highways Agency. In order to be validated, a comparison is made between what the model predicts for the situation "today" and what is measured independently "on the ground". For it to be acceptable, 85% of the traffic flows predicted in the Model need to be within 10% of observed flows and journey times need to be within 15% of those observed on the ground.</p> <p>Whilst the model has a base year of 2009, when used, the model is updated to add development since 2009 to the 2009 base. The Parklands Development is therefore accounted for in the base data. .</p>
10	The A421 must be dualled all the way to M1 J13 before the development starts	All of the new homes are unlikely to be completed before the A421 is dualled all the way to Junction 13 of the M1. The upgrade to the Kingston roundabout and the A421 dualling to the Milton Keynes Council boundary will, however be in place before many homes are completed on the site.
9	<p>Look at alternative road layouts eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close Newport Road at its junction with the Kingston roundabout and route all traffic through the SLA or • Build a flyover to take A421 traffic over the Kingston roundabout or • Develop in a linear fashion along the H9, retaining a much larger landscape buffer for Wavendon • Fully dual the A421 • Install traffic speed restrictions on surrounding roads • Create two or three accesses from the development onto the A421 • Provide a road from Newport road to H9 Groveway to relieve congestion at the Kingston 	<p>The upgrade to the Kingston roundabout will; increase the capacity of the roundabout and allow for traffic to flow through it much more efficiently.</p> <p>Adding more accesses from the SLA onto the A421 will not improve the capacity difficulties predicted for the Fen roundabout as all traffic will still have to pass through the Fen roundabout in order to reach the Kingston roundabout and then disperse into the grid road network.</p>

	roundabout.	
7	<p>Closure of Stockwell Lane will have implications for access to the Stables.</p> <p>It is unclear how traffic going in and out of The Stables would be managed.</p> <p>Traffic going to The Stables would have no option but to come through Wavendon village.</p> <p>Stockwell Lane is an ancient and well-loved lane in Wavendon.</p>	<p>Throughout the development of this area, it will be necessary to ensure that access to The Stables is maintained. The proposed replacement of the eastern section of Stockwell Lane with a new access road will provide a road and junction designed to cope better with both the existing levels of traffic using the Stables and the new development on the land to the north of Wavendon.</p>
6	<p>Walton Road, Newport Road and Lower End Road are part of the National Cycle Route 51 but it is very dangerous to cross Newport road by bike especially with young children.</p>	<p>The impact of the SLA on traffic in the existing area will be considered in detail in transport assessments accompanying planning applications. The Transport Assessments will need to consider whether safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people and whether improvements can be made within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</p>
4	<p>Close Walton Road to through traffic</p>	<p>This issue has been considered several times in the past and the issues are finely balanced on both sides. AS part of the discussions that the Council will be arranging with the parishes affected by the SLA around traffic calming and mitigation, this issues will be considered again. There may be alternatives to a full closure, such as, perhaps, making Walton Road single carriageway at the narrow section and using traffic lights to enforce an alternating one way flow. This could have the effect of deterring rat running as well as freeing up road space that could then be used to create a pedestrian footway.</p>
3	<p>New residents trying to get to Woburn Sand would cause problems trying to get into the village</p>	<p>The majority of traffic from the SLA is anticipated to head either north towards Milton Keynes or east along the A421.</p>
2	<p>Need a roundabout at the junction of Lower End Road with Newport Road.</p>	<p>This can be considered as part of the traffic management discussions that the Council will be initiating with the parish councils in the area, as explained above.</p>

2	Phoebe Lane is not suitable as an emergency access	For the Church Farm development it is suggested that emergency access would be taken either from Phoebe Lane or onto Walton Road. This would not be a permanent vehicular access. The most appropriate location for the emergency access will be determined through the planning application for the Church Farm development.
Village and landscape character		
49	Wavendon and Woburn Sands will lose their character of rural villages and the villages will become a rat run. Character of Wavendon village will be ruined.	Means of deterring rat running will be looked at as explained above. The importance of protecting Wavendon's identity and setting was recognised by the Core Strategy Inspector. She concluded that mitigation measures, particularly the landscape buffer would provide an appropriate long term defensible green buffer for the village.
9	The landscape buffer is not large enough. A 200metre buffer was agreed, but as shown development is too close to existing properties and Wavendon village.	At no point has 200 metres been defined as the depth of the buffer. The extent of the buffer shown in the Development Framework generally follows the green 'wavy' line on the Policies Map amendment at Appendix E of the Adopted Core Strategy.
9	Need to retain hedgerows along Lower End Road and Newport Road.	The Development Framework states within section 3.4 'Landscape and Open Space Strategy' that existing hedgerows along Lower End Road and Newport Road should be retained.
7	Design of development – don't design the area to look like Broughton – too high a density and lack of landscaping.	The proposed density of the SLA is lower than that of Broughton Gate.
East-West Rail		
30	The council has not considered the impact of the East-West rail proposals. Having the level crossing barrier down more of the time would cause further queues and congestion on the Newport Road and in Woburn Sands.	The council is aware of the East West Rail proposals, but as Network Rail has only recently established a task force to examine the impact of the East West Rail proposals on the level crossings including the one at Woburn Sands, it is not possible for the SLA DF to be prescriptive at this stage as to what the response should be. It is proposed to amend the text of the SLA DF as follows Recommended change: Add a new

		<p>heading on page 41 in the Public Transport section after Church Farm:</p> <p>“East-West Rail Network Rail has established a Task Force which is considering what will need to be done to the existing level crossings along the route of East-West Rail ahead of the delivery of the rail proposal. The outcome of this work is not yet known and is not therefore available to inform this Development Framework, however, developers will need to have regard to and respond to the most up to date information when preparing planning applications and transport assessments for the development of the SLA.” .</p>
Principle of development		
4	Questions over the validity of building so many houses on the SLA site. Is the local infrastructure is capable of sustaining such a huge development?	The Council has identified the infrastructure needs of the development and these are identified in the Local Infrastructure Plan. Funding for new infrastructure at least in part is available for the MK Tariff and developer contributions. For facilities that are provided by other organisations eg health services, the Council is actively engaged in discussions with those organisations to plan for these.
4	Objection in principles to the allocation of additional homes to the west of Newport road. Concerns about the scale of the proposed development.	The principle of the scale of development on the SLA has been confirmed in the Adopted Core Strategy which has been through several rounds of public consultation and an independent examination.
1	Have these plans been thought through properly in relation to the heavy business occupancy in the area?	An area of open space has been identified as a linear park running along the northern edge of the land to the south of the A421. This will act as a multi-purpose space including as a noise and visual buffer separating the new development from the employment activities to the north fo the A421.
Facilities and infrastructure		
11	Concern about the impact of the SLA on local amenities especially health, open space, sports provision and education	The SLA is being planned so that its residents will have access to a range of facilities on site – including two primary schools, a secondary school, playing fields, open space, community facilities

		and a local centre. Discussions are ongoing with the NHS around the provision of health care.
Church Farm specific		
1	<p>The developer has indicated his intention to construct a road which joins the H10 at the roundabout currently connecting to Britten Grave and Gregories Drive, and in doing so to also connect his access road to Byrd Crescent rather than the more expensive option of extending the H10 grid road from the aforementioned roundabout. The reason given for this is cost and Milton Keynes Council's unwillingness to contribute to the construction of a grid road extension.</p> <p>The connection of a new access road to Byrd Crescent appears to be totally inappropriate due to the nature of the existing road and I assume the Council will ensure that appropriate transport studies are undertaken and the current policies and advice from highway engineers will be adopted. The additional traffic which may be generated on Byrd Crescent, and thereby onto Britten Grove and Gregories Drive, is not appropriate to the size and nature of the existing roads.</p> <p>If the H10 grid road is extended it must be done in such a way that the existing access to Old Farm Park is maintained i.e. the current access to Britten Grove adjacent to Wavendon Gate School should be incorporated into any road improvement scheme rather than rely solely on access via the H10/V11 roundabout</p>	<p>Further consideration to the arrangements for the design and construction of the access road into the Church Farm site will come forward in the transport assessment that accompanies the planning application.</p> <p>The current recommended approach is for a relatively short term solution which would create a single carriageway residential road designed for 30mph maximum speeds from the H10 roundabout into the Church Farm development through the Transport Reserve. Under this option it is suggested that Byrd Crescent be closed to through vehicular traffic at the point at which it is crossed by the new access road into Church Farm from the H10. This will prevent traffic from the new development entering Byrd Crescent and will allow for a pedestrian crossing to be provided at grade across the H10 access road to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing from Old Farm Park into Wavendon Gate at this point.</p> <p>This option does not preclude, and does, in fact, protect the future development of a grid road extension should further development beyond Church Farm come forward. Transport reserves are identified within the Church Farm development.</p> <p>As proposals for the road access develop through the planning application process these will be shared with residents through the Church Farm Stakeholder Group.</p> <p><u>Recommended change:</u> It is recommended that a new paragraph be</p>

		<p>added to the section on access to Church Farm on p41 and a new figure be included to illustrate the proposed access road.</p> <p>New text to say: “it is proposed that Byrd Crescent be closed to through vehicular traffic at the point at which it is crossed by the new access road into Church Farm from the H10. This will prevent traffic from the new development entering Byrd Crescent and will allow for a pedestrian crossing to be provided over the H10 access road to improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists crossing from Old Farm Park into Wavendon Gate at this point. Byrd Crescent could always be re-opened to vehicular traffic should the full grid road, including the bridge over Byrd Crescent be constructed in the future. “</p>
<p>Dilip Nathwani, local resident</p>	<p>Firstly, I understand that you are progressing plans for the above on purely a ‘financial’ basis rather than ‘what is right’. It is also clear that tactically, you are looking to upset a few residents like me, than many around us.</p> <p>Hopefully, you will be able to correct or defend these as appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of the original MK grid plan which would have involved a bridge (to allow traffic to flow from Bletcham Way to the proposed Church Farm development), I understand that a decision has virtually been made to build a roundabout or a cross-road junction on the narrow Byrd Crescent. • I am naturally concerned that compromises are being agreed internally and with the builders without full DETAILED consultation of the available options. <p>As it directly affects us, I would have expected direct contact to explore the options as we live here every day and can give you proper input from the coal face than decide upon them remotely from the office.</p>	<p>The above solution for a single carriageway road link from Bletcham Way roundabout with Byrd Crescent closed as a through route for vehicular traffic at the point that the new access road crosses it has an initial estimated cost of approximately £1.3m. Allowing for a 20% contingency on this, the total cost could be in the region of £1.6m. These figures are subject to conformation.</p> <p>MKC would be looking for Connolly Homes to contribute approx £1-1.1m of this cost leaving a residual cost to MKC of approx £0.5m which would need to be picked up from the Tariff.</p> <p>In contrast, the cost of the H10 extension with the bridge crossing over the top of Byrd Crescent would vary dependant on whether we were looking to provide this as single or dual carriageway. As single carriageway the cost would be around £4.6m and again allowing a 20% contingency would give a budget of nearer £5.5m.</p> <p>The contribution we could expect from Connolly Homes would remain the same as the first option (ie £1 to 1.1 million) and therefore MKC would be looking at investing up to £4.5m of which £1.2-1.3m could be taken from the Tariff and the balance of which would have to be</p>

		<p>found from Highways funding.</p> <p>The difference in the amount that the Council would have to find is substantial and if we were to consider the fully dualled option the potential minimum cost would be in excess of £7m needing a Council contribution, outside of Tariff funding, of at least £4.5m with a strong likelihood that this figure would end up being more than £5m.</p>
	<p>This roundabout/cross-road junction idea is fraught with serious dangers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The risk for some 400 children living in the Old Farm Park/ Browns Wood who use Byrd Crescent routinely will move from 'Little' risk to 'Grave' risk. • The redway is bursting at peak times with families, bicycles, small scooters etc. and the roads are nearly impassable due to the number of cars awaiting children to finish school. • At night, despite drink/drive laws, drivers speed at night through the narrow Byrd Crescent and this will become worse with another feeder cross-road being built. • Why has an option of Byrd Crescent being made into a cul-de-sac not been considered? This would still only reduce the risk level from 'Grave' to High', but surely worth serious consideration. • The best option remains a proper H10 bridge extension. 	<p>See the recommended change to Byrd Crescent above.</p>
	<p>Irrespective of traffic lights at the cross road and any traffic calming measures, this will soon become an accident black spot and a case of manslaughter to come.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do hope all officers and elected members will consider the plans carefully, to clear the human conscience you must all have - a tragedy will come to haunt you through your lives. Just remember, you can never forget this - Would you want your child to be exposed to such a risk in Milton Keynes, a city designed for cars and bicycles? • Connolly tell me that the council have ruled out a bridge for financial reasons and therefore they are helpless. It seems that they can build the cost of a bridge into their business plan, if the 	<p>The design of the new access road and any new junction would need to be the subject of a safety audit.</p>

	<p>council asks for it. Effectively, they will need to recover the cost from the development, somehow, some time.</p>	
	<p>I am advised that the Highways team don't think a bridge is justified for some 300 homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It seems strange to me that such professionals would simply discard the obvious compelling extension of the H10 embedded in the original plans! Hence there seem to be other drivers here that I need to understand. • I recognise further land behind CFD is not part of the current plan, but surely it is incumbent on the council to make this road future proof. • I understand that Central Government has boosted spending money on roads to revive the economy and surely this would make a good case. • Have you approached our local MP Ian Stuart to help secure circa £4m required here for future proofing the infrastructure here. 	<p>The Council's preference would be for the full grid road, complete with bridge to be built now, but as explained above, the current size of Church Farm development does not require such a level of infrastructure provision and the funding gap is significant.</p>
	<p>In my opinion, the option being pursued is an easy one for you and the builders as it impacts on some of us. BUT that is not sharing the burden equally when there are further options open.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please advise whether multiple accesses have been considered – i.e. through Ravel close, Rossini Place, Phoebe Lane, Rackstraw Grove etc. • This would actually save the council wasting at least half of the £1m on making a new road off the H10. If finances are under pressure, then why not adopt this option. This is why I have formed the view that you would rather upset a few of us than most of us. • The suggestion here would spread the traffic equally around the estate and still leave the building of a bridge open when the new 2026+plan is established. 	<p>One of the Council's stated policy aims is to maintain and future proof the grid road network (Core Strategy Policy CS11, (6)) The proposed access from H10 would future proof the H10 grid road and a transport reserve is identified to allow for the future extension of the road to the east should that be required. The suggested alternative of multiple accesses through the existing cul de sacs would not allow for this principle to be achieved and would bring traffic out onto Britten Grove and smaller residential streets where the impact of additional vehicle movements would be much more significant.</p>
	<p>Current local Old Farm Park/Wavendon Gate Infrastructure Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please note that we have major issues with appointments at our local Doctor's Surgery and the Dental Clinic in Walnut Tree which was NHS initially, 	<p>We and the NHS/ Clinical Commissioning Group are aware of the issues at the Walnut Tree Surgery and we are continuing to seek a resolution to these issues with the service provider. This work is ongoing and does not stop once</p>

	<p>but immediately converted to Private, so paying lip service to the diversity/affordability agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What commitments are you able to make on these two fronts please? • Within the local area and the next decade to come, should a piece of land like CFD not be earmarked for elderly housing as we have a growing elderly population. 	<p>the Development Framework is finalised.</p>
	<p>Wider Observations in Milton Keynes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am proud of our city and an ambassador for businesses but I feel humiliated with all of the above especially when you see how the new heritage is being abandoned: • The Broughton development is an embarrassment to all residents of the city to see such tall dwellings and narrow roads. • The extensive amount of money being spent near the Oakgrove School development to build an underpass. • Bridge repair works on the H6 with 24 hour recovery services on tap as if this is the M6 Spaghetti junction. • All of this shows CFD and its entry road can be handled better and funding is potentially available. 	<p>The underpass at Oakgrove is a requirement of the S106 agreement for which there is developer funding. It was negotiated to be built upon completion of the 100th dwelling.</p>
	<p>Pedestrian Bridge(s) over the new road into CFD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand that a bridge is being considered over the proposed new road. • A bridge here would look monstrous to say the least and worse still, few will use it in preference to crossing over. In particular, parents will cross the road and lead the children to do the same. To ensure the bridge is used by everyone, would involve large unsightly barriers. • I am not aware whether another bridge will be built on the other side of the road. If yes, it would be even more unsightly and unlikely to be used. If not, children/parents, would use that side of the redway cross-road instead of the bridge side. • These deliberations confirm that a cul-de-sac option would be safer here. 	<p>As above the option of a single carriageway residential road designed for 30mph maximum speeds with Byrd Crescent closed to through vehicular traffic at the point at which it is crossed by the new access road, would allow for a pedestrian crossing to be provided at grade across the H10 access road The other option for a single carriageway grid road built would require a grade separated crossing which could be a footbridge.</p> <p>Discussions and costings for these alternative options are continuing between MKC and the developer and will be shared with residents through the Church Farm Stakeholder Group.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe you should do a local survey with a mock-up of what is envisaged to seek the view of parents and potentially, danger facing their children. 	
	<p>Coming back to CFD and the H10 – Financial Case:</p> <p>My local Councillor and your Officials tell me that the Leadership Board has considered that there are other priorities for some £5m spend involved here for the bridge over and above £2m coming from Connolly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I can't see the rationale for this. Only a few months ago, the SLA framework was looking at some 2,500 homes around Wavendon here. The latest consultation is looking at increasing this to 2,900, so the additional 400 more than offsets the revenue from CFD. With CFD having some 300 homes, you can surely divert funds from the larger estate for the H10 or agree to defer the CFD build until the new Strategic 2026+ plan is formulated as it will easily justify a proper H10 extension. I am led to believe that the current draft plan of entry road into CFD will cost £1m and at some stage in the future when a bridge is built, this would be discarded – so wasting a significant amount of money - £1m now. Please confirm that this is the rationale behind your planning? I would like to see a value analysis undertaken or shared with me please as I see it very simplistically as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With 10 year borrowing costs at 3% from the treasury for local authorities, the additional capital investment for the bridge of say £4m would cost £120,000 p/a. So, instead of spending £1m now on a compromise 'bodge-up', you could use that money to pay the interest for the next 8/10 years and then not have to worry about future disruption. You can therefore future proof the road infrastructure 	<p>The Council has recently approved the MK Local Investment Plan that sets out the framework used to inform investment decisions in critical, necessary and desirable infrastructure to help grow and develop the borough.</p> <p>The Tariff money is used to help fund infrastructure provision to support all areas of development that contribute to it. The infrastructure projects have to be prioritised as the Tariff will not cover 100% so additional funds have to be found to meet the infrastructure needs of growth in any event.</p> <p>The issue with the Church Farm development is that there are currently no plans for further development beyond the site to the east which may necessitate the future extension of the grid road corridor and the delivery of the 'full' grid road access from the H10. There are, however, many other infrastructure requirements that have to be delivered elsewhere in Milton Keynes in the short term and which assume a higher priority for the limited funds.</p>

	<p>now and the new build revenues post 2026 would be much higher, so it would be a 'win win' situation for the council.</p> <p>Please advise why such a commercial and sensible rationale has been ruled out?</p>	
	<p>For the avoidance of doubt, please note that this submission is in no way an acceptance by me of the CFD plans as these will be challenged separately.</p> <p>It is very sad that the CFD entry road being pursued is because it is less damaging in terms of dwellings effected and appease the wider community despite there being compelling logical alternatives.</p> <p>Logically, it makes common sense for both the CFD development and the bridge to be postponed until the 2026+ plan has been developed and agreed.</p> <p>The recent consultation for the adjoining area has already provided the council with a bonus opportunity of building 400 homes which were not contemplated a few months ago</p>	<p>The Church Farm development is identified for development in the current Core Strategy plan period up to 2026.</p>

Other comments		
Woburn Lions Football Club	<p>The football club is currently based at the Wavendon Recreation Ground but are very interested to be part fo any leisure development o nthe SLA that may help to deliver both the community and the Club proper and improved facilities.</p> <p>Keen that current pressure on pitches should not be worsened and should in fact be improved by the new development.</p>	Letter passed to colleagues in Sport and Leisure
Local resident	<p>Support for the plan to build two new roads onto Newport Road.</p> <p>People need somewhere to live and roads to drive on. The Campaign Against Newport Road Access identifies no factual reasons to oppose access. They fail to appreciate that at peak times there are traffic queues on nearly every main road in the south-east – simply a consequence of a high population. They provide no evidence to support their claim that journey times will be increased, even if they are, that's simply a consequence of growth.</p> <p>Traffic is unlikely to hamper Emergency</p>	Noted.

	<p>Services vehicles – they turn on their flashing lights and traffic lets them through.</p> <p>I travel from the south along Newport Road at peak times morning and evening and have no problems with the proposal nor with any extra houses in Wavendon and Woburn Sands.</p>	
--	---	--

Appendix B

Strategic Land Allocation Development Framework Internal Stakeholder Workshop 23 June 2011

Facilities Workshop

1. Group Members

MKC: Diane Webber; Marie Denny; Andrew Tusting; Jill Dewick; Eric Wright; Kevin Monkton

TV Police: David Alderson

Ambulance: Steven Cooper

Fire & Rescue:

MKCVO: Clare Walton

Apologies: Beryl Anderson, PCT

2. Issues Noted

General points:

- View expressed by all that it was difficult to plan for services given the disjointed nature of the sites. Planning of services would be made easier by the addition of the golf course 'gap' site to the allocation. This is acknowledged but the Core Strategy only allocates the four Strategic Reserve Areas for development – we have no current mandate to look beyond their respective boundaries. DW asked the group to consider two scenarios – 'Plan A' the allocation as per the Core Strategy as that would be the Council's position going forward to the Core Strategy Examination and then Plan B, the extended site, encompassing the golf course land.
- It was felt that the facilities needs of SR4 (Church Farm) would most likely be met from within the established residential area to the east (Old Farm Park, Wavendon Gate and beyond)
- SR1 most likely to come forward for non-residential development due to surrounding land-uses.

Specific requirements:

Education

- likely to need a 2 form entry primary to serve SR3; a further 2 form entry to serve SR2 together with some secondary capacity. There is also an issue in Woburn Sands which is not currently well served by secondary provision, many pupils having to go into the Bedfordshire school system. Whatever is planned needs to have future expansion built in and the community involved need to be aware that expansion is a possibility.
- NB recent meeting with C Beds has highlighted that planned housing development in Leighton Buzzard will mean that there will not be places from about 2015/16 for the approx 65 secondary aged children from Milton Keynes who are presently educated each year at Cedars School in Leighton Buzzard and these children will therefore need to be educated in secondary provision in the Woburn/Woburn Sands area.
- There will be a need for an additional 5 fe secondary capacity if development takes places on the 4 SRAs

- On SRA4 the preferred option is the expansion of an existing school on an adjacent site

Development on the 4 SRAs only		Development on the 4 SRAs and the golf course	
SRA1	No requirement for educational provision if this area is used solely for employment and industrial purposes	SRA1	No requirement for educational provision if this area is used solely for employment and industrial purposes
SRA2	5 fe secondary provision 2 fe primary provision	SRA2	7 fe secondary provision 3 fe primary school provision
SRA3	2fe primary school provision	SRA3	3 fe primary school provision
SRA4	Expansion by 1fe on an adjacent primary school to which contributions would be sought	SRA4	Expansion by 1 fe on an adjacent primary school provision for which contributions would be sought

Ambulance service

- need a stand-by point (2 car spaces and accommodation for the crew)

Fire service

- the SRAs will be served by Broughton and Newport Pagnell stations. Good access along the grid roads and the A421.

Police

- would be seeking a neighbourhood police facility (c 80m2) ideally located in a local centre

Community facilities

- would need a contribution from SR4 for enhancement of existing services; SR2 & SR3 would require their own facility including playing fields. With the sites as allocated in the Core Strategy a site for a local centre and shared facilities would be best located on the far eastern edge of SR2, though access for residents of SR3 would remain problematic.
- Need to heed the lessons from Brooklands where the playing fields were located within the flood plains and also the problems associated with playing fields placed in the middle of residential areas (Westcroft and Broughton) – preferred location of playing field areas is on the edges of any residential development and no round sites.
- Experience from the EEA has been the difficulties experienced by new communities when there is a delay in the delivery of new community facilities – this is something that needs to be borne in mind when phasing and programming the work. If there is to be a delay in providing the community centre then a community house is an absolute pre-requisite

PCT/ Health

- SR4 to be served from the existing facilities within Milton Keynes. SR2 and SR3 unlikely to generate a large enough population to support a separate health facility – may have to be served by the health centre at Brooklands. Woburn Sands to the south is in the Bedfordshire PCT area. Further work needed.
- NB a contribution will still be needed even if the solution is to include the population in existing health provision.

Clarification required

- Map attached showing size of each of the SRAs, including the golf course 'gap' site.
- Indicative housing numbers on a range of densities:

SR1 has not been included as we are assuming that this site will be primarily non-residential. Most major developments in Milton Keynes use between 40-67% of the site area for residential use. Assuming that SR1 will provide the majority of the non-residential development, then the proportion of the remaining SRAs used for housing will potentially be higher than normal – I have therefore notionally assumed 75% of the total site area to be used for residential.

Site	Potential no. of dwellings at indicative density		
	25 dph	30 dph	35 dph
SR2 Total site area = 56.4ha 75% of site area = 42.3ha	1057	1269	1480
SR3 Total site area = 20.3ha 75% of site area = 15.22ha	380	457	533
SR4 Total site area = 20ha 75% of site area = 15ha	375	450	525
Total	1812	2176	2538

Transport/ Infrastructure Workshop

1. Group members

MKC: David Blandamer, David Lawson, Andy Swannell
Chris Jarman, Paul Gibson, Darren Gray, Navin Sankersingh
Martin Davies, Lee Tufnell

2. Issues Noted

- Lack of support for J13A from Highways Agency
- Dualling of the A421
 - New roundabout to be provided to serve SR1 and SR3
 - A421 should be dualled on the southern side. There is provision to dual it on the northern side along the stretch between SR2 and SR3.
 - Developers of the SRAs should be required to implement the dualling up to the new roundabout prior to development.
- 500 space park and ride site to be provided on SR1. Would park and ride site be allowed within flood risk zone 2?
- Lower End Road
 - Vehicular access would change nature of road and should be resisted.
 - Access should be restricted to pedestrians, cyclists and if required, buses.
- Co-ordination of transport routes would be helped if the golf course site were included within the development area. Without golf course site, residents of SR3 would be required to walk/cycle along Lower End Road (no space for footpath/cycleway) or A421 (not attractive environment) to access SR2.
- East-west spine road (high street) to be provided through SR2. Provision should be made to enable spine road to be extended through golf course site from SR2 into SR3. Redway to be provided along spine road.
- Future proof opportunity for road connection to land south of SR4 (Bow Brickhill).
- Grid road extensions could be provided south from existing roundabout on A421 (through SR2) and proposed roundabout on A421 (through SR3); and east from H10 (through SR4)
- Public transport
 - No bus stops to be provided on A421.
 - Bus routes to loop in and out of SR2 & SR3.
 - Pedestrian links to be provided within SR4 to enable residents to access existing bus route through Old Farm Park
 - Define bus journey times to CMK. Park and Ride bus routes would go straight to CMK. Other routes would go to CMK via Kingston.
- Development to be zero carbon, so no need to provide gas to individual homes.
- Strategic energy study required to identify need for CHP. CHP could be provided for SR1-3, with other measures (e.g. PVs) for SR4.
- Minimum speeds should be specified for digital infrastructure. Developers should undertake network assessments and engage with utility companies.

Green and Blue Infrastructure Workshop

1. Group Members

MKC:	Mark Haynes, Chris Coppock, Bruce Stewart
Bedford IDB:	John Oldfield
EA:	Neville Benn
HCA:	Jennie Selley
B&MK Waterway:	John Best, Graham Mabbutt
MK Parks Trust:	Phil Bowsher

2. Issues Noted

- Protect strategic and integrated flood risk management areas/water-courses.
- Protect views of Brickhills from SR4.
- Protect views of Brickhills and northern views from SR2 and SR3.
- Retain hedges on/along SR4.
- Retain, extend and improve existing Rights of Ways.
- Provide entrance gateway and protect city views along A421 at SR1 and SR2.
- Provide landscape bund along M1 Motorway/SR1 for noise/aesthetic protection.
- Integrate existing redways (for walking and cycling) with proposed development.
- Retain Lower End Road edge as rural as possible:
 - Narrow landscape edge – not an extensive landscape edge.
 - Allotments/open space/playing fields.
 - Provide open space/playing fields through strings and beads concept.
- Protect alignment of Bedford/Milton Keynes Waterway and marina/basin across SR1.
- Due to complexity of SR1, undertake more detailed urban design:
 - Land use allocations.
 - New M1 Junction 13a and/or access across M1.
 - M1 Motorway bund.
 - Entrance gateway and city views along A421 at SR1 and SR2
 - Strategic and integrated flood risk management areas/water-course.
 - Impact of “woods.
 - Bedford/Milton Keynes Waterway and marina/basin.
- Existing villages (Wavendon/Woburn Sands) and hamlets (Lower End, Wavendon End, Wavendon Manor, Wavendon Lodge) not affected by proposed development.

3. Clarification required

- Ownership of “woods” adjacent to SR1 – incorporate into SRAs?
- Impact of proposed development on Secondary Aquifers – especially for SR4.
- Open space standards to determine on-site open space requirements.
- Future-proofing between SR2 and SR3 – include as part of SRAs?

Appendix C

Wavendon and Woburn Sands Consultation Questionnaire Results

Q1. Do you think that a new secondary school is needed for the wider area?

Yes	No
18	7

Q2. What do you think is the best location for a secondary school?

Land to east of Magna Park	2
OU area opposite Kents Hill Park	1
In the middle of its catchment area	1
To east of the golf course	2
Land by Wavendon Tower, so traffic does not use Newport Road	1
Close to the local centre (like at Walnut Tree)/close to A421 roundabout	2
Church Farm site, instead of houses	1
Brickhill/Bletchley Road	1
Eagle Farm area	1
Land to south of A421	2
Within the housing development	2

Q3. What do you think is the best location for a lorry park?

Magna Park/east of Magna Park	20
Next to motorway junction 13	3
Coach station/J14	3
Not needed	1
Furthest away from Lower End	1
Nowhere local	2

Q4. What do you think is the best location for a park and ride?

Already one at Coach station/no further need	13
Magna Park/east of Magna Park	6
Gateway to MK	1
Eastern end of A421/j13	6
Behind BP garage, A421	2
South of A421	1

Q5. Do you think the alignment of the MK/Bedford Waterway should be safeguarded?

Yes	No
24	1

Q6. Should housing be provided in the land to the east of Magna Park?

Yes	No
9	18

Q7. Where is the best location in the development to provide for employment land?

East of Magna Park/Magna Park area	18
Near A421	2
Near J14	1
B1 uses south of A421 (eastern end)	1
Eastern end of A421	1
No more	1

Comments:

Do not support further large footprint B8 use

How much employment land should be provided for in the development?

None	2
Little as possible	1
All employment, no houses	1

Q8. How should the noisy area adjacent to the A421 be treated?

Don't build alongside A421	2
Trees/landscaping	15
Earth mounds/fencing	13
Green buffer	2
Employment land/no housing/lorry park	4
Retain hedges	1
Nature reserve	1
Not a problem	1

Q9. Should vehicular access be allowed to/from the A1530/Newport Road?

Yes	No
3	24

Comments:

Only buses & cars, no HGVs (x1)

How should the highway frontage along the A1530/Newport Road be treated?

Low density buildings	1
Trees/landscaping	11
Screening/fencing/banking	5
More lighting/bus shelters	1
Redway/cycle path	1

Green buffer	2
Retain existing trees/shrubs	3
Natural habitat	1

Q10. Should vehicular access be allowed to/from Lower End Road?

Yes	No
4	25

Comments:

Only buses & cars, no HGVs (x1)

How should the highway frontage along Lower End Road be treated?

Low density buildings	2
Trees/landscaping	10
Retain existing trees/hedges	4
Screening/Fencing/banking	3
Better lighting	1
Redway/cycle path	1
Green buffer	4

Q11. Should vehicular access be allowed to/from Walton Road?

Yes	No
3	22

Comments:

Only buses & cars, no HGVs (x1)

Other comments

- Severe congestion in mornings at Wavendon and Kingston roundabout. Upgrading of Kingston roundabout should form part of the Framework.
- Walton Road has become a rat-run for traffic from Walnut Tree & Walton Park. Block road off to prevent access to and from Wavendon Gate.
- No more development.
- Phoebe Lane is important tranquil place that should be retained.
- Support future housing growth – nice to have affordable housing in Wavendon, to allow children to remain in village.
- Include smaller bungalow affordable housing, as well as family-type affordable housing.
- Public spaces should be built to allow disabled access.
- Sad to see golf course go. Should be relocated on other side of Lower End Road or within immediate local area.
- Newport Road should be 30mph past houses & garden centres.
- 40 mph on Newport Road should be extended to Kingston roundabout.
- Area has historical importance with grade 2 listed building & Victorian listed sewer system.
- Church Farm development will affect character of Wavendon village.
- Land adjoining railway should be used for a new station.

- Church Farm should not be built until other land has been developed in full.
- Wide landscaped zone should be provided between Wavendon Gate/Old Farm Park and Church Farm.
- Increased pedestrian use of culs-de-sac in Old Farm Park should be discouraged as routes to schools and shops.
- Access to and from Bletcham Way should be maintained to Britten Grove and Gregories Drive.
- Wavendon services (such as storm drains) will be strained.
- All existing planned and approved developments and brown field sites should be developed before new developments are allowed.
- Development is unnecessary, ignores wishes of existing villages, ignores rural nature of surrounding area, and not thought out with regard to additional traffic, pollution, surface water & sewage treatment.
- Junction of Lower End Road and Cross Road should be permanently closed.
- No more than 10-15 large deluxe properties allowed access off Lower End Road.
- Lower End Road needs speed humps to prevent people cutting through from Kingston to Bedford.
- Low density housing should occur next to Lower End Road to be in keeping with the rest of Wavendon.
- No development should be allowed to commence until A421 between Kingston roundabout and J13 is fully dualled.
- Concerned about impact of additional homes at Church Farm on local services (schools, doctors/dentists, shops).
- Extension of H10 would result in noise, light and air pollution, and loss of pleasant countryside.
- Development must provide a broad mix of housing combining flats, semi-detached as well as those with large gardens.
- Housing styles should be compatible with those in Wavendon and Woburn Sands, not Broughton Gate.
- Church Farm is big enough to command its own facilities.
- There will be major costs to extend the H10. Paddocks and tranquillity add to the aspiration of a green world.
- If Church Farm is to be developed, it makes sense to incorporate Wavendon Fields as well.
- As a last resort, Church Farm should be served off small roads adjoining the site (e.g. Phoebe Lane, Walton Road, Gable Thorne, etc.)
- Church Farm land should be used for office development, retirement bungalows. More housing should be on the land to south of A421.
- No access should be allowed onto Phoebe Lane. New development should have its own facilities, not use those in Wavendon.
- Development should demonstrate the transition from city to countryside, and be in keeping with the rural style of the area.
- There are numerous hedgerows which should be retained.
- Build schools alongside house building not at a later date.
- Keep Milton Keynes gateway as green and attractive as possible.
- Support redway access from Walton Road to Church Farm.
- Make Walton Road between Dennison Court and the Plough pedestrian/cyclist priority area with 5mph speed limit.
- Should be buffer between developments and Church Farm/the Barn/Stables Cottage.

Wavendon Parish Council

- Lower End Road should be 30 mph.
- No access to any development from Lower End Road.
- Site for lorry park should be reviewed, given existing one at Husborne Crawley nearby.
- Resist access being allowed onto Walton Road. Request consideration be given to closure of Walton Road to motor traffic.
- More investigation is required on the impact of developments on Newport Road. Consideration should be given to reducing speed limit to 30mph from Woburn Sands level crossing to Kingston roundabout.
- Resist access to secondary school from A1530 unless part of a new junction connecting directly into an improved Kingston roundabout.
- Further discussions required to establish timeframe of any new educational facilities and impact this will have on existing facilities.
- Plenty of green buffers must be built into the design brief.
- Developments must be in keeping with existing dwellings.
- Further discussions required to establish/maintain enough sporting facilities within the development.
- Discussions still need to take place with regard to S106 monies.
- Clarification required from Golf Course representatives to understand any long term plans for this land.
- Despite concerns regarding traffic access and rat running, parish council is anxious to ensure that the developments are designed to allow an integration of the old and new communities.

Woburn Sands Town Council

- Deplore loss of golf course. Should be relocated within immediate local area.
- Secondary school should be provided to serve not only the development but also Wavendon and Woburn Sands.
- No development should commence until A421 fully dualled to J13.
- Upgrading of Kingston roundabout should form part of the Framework.
- Access from/to A5130 is unacceptable. Congestion on this section of road is already high at peak times.

**Church Farm
Consultation Questionnaire Results**

Question 1 – Do you think that new community and social facilities are needed for the development?

Yes	No
117	

The types of facilities that it was considered are needed were:

- Doctor’s surgery
- Dentists
- Community hall
- Local shops
- New Kingston library
- Police

Question 2 – If so, what do you think is the best location for these community and social facilities?

In the new development	60
Walnut Tree local centre	7
In a central position	6
Walking distance of new development	4
Wavendon	4
Accessible for existing and new communities	3
Not near existing housing	3
Furthest from existing services	3
SR1-3	3

Question 3 – Do you think that a new primary school is needed for the development?

Yes	No
96	4

Question 4 – If so, what do you think is the best location for the primary school?

In the new development	51
Expand St Marys	8
Wavendon Gate	5
SR1-3	5
In a central position	3
Wavendon	3
Walking distance of new development	3
To the north	3

Question 5 – Do you think that new green infrastructure is needed for the development?

Yes	No
107	

- Number of people responded that we are proposing to build on their open space

Question 6 – If so, what do you think is the best location for this green infrastructure?

In the new development	51
Between existing and proposed development	13
Play areas incorporated into housing areas	11
Preservation of existing trees and hedgerows, natural green features	8
Surrounding the development	7
Same planning as existing Old Farm Park/Wavendon Gate/MK	7
Continuation of linear park through Browns Wood & Old Farm Park	6
Site should stay as it is	5
Linear parks and redways	4
Phoebe Lane needs to be kept as it stands	3
Sports pitch/village green/MUGA	3

Question 7 – How should highway access to/from H10/Bletcham Way be provided?

Should be single carriageway	21
No access from H10	12
Pedestrian bridge/underpass needed across extended H10	8
With sufficient speed control and traffic calming measures/30mph	5
H10 needs to be a dual carriageway	5
H10 should not be prime way in/out	3
H10 should be only vehicular egress point	3

Question 8 – How should the highway frontage along H10/Bletcham Way be treated?

Plenty of landscaping/ Tree lined	34
Plenty of green space/verges	19
Banked earth, planting, screening/acoustic barriers to keep noise to a minimum	19
Road should be lower than existing ground level	7
Redways/footpaths	6
Keep as it is	4
Speed limits	3

Question 9 – Should vehicular access to Church Farm be allowed to/from Walton Road?

Yes	No
28	62

- Currently no safe routes to the proposed development
- Emergency access only (x3)
- Build H10 through to Woburn Sands

- Additional access points should be considered
- Access should be from A5130 (x2)

Other comments

Existing facilities are already oversubscribed	25
Development is unnecessary	20
Development has been brought forward 10 years/delay development until 2026	13
Existing facilities/infrastructure need to be improved before development proceeds	9
Road access is a major issue – there would be only one entry/exit to the development	9
Increased traffic congestion	9
Increased traffic at roundabout between H10 and V11. Traffic calm approach to roundabout	8
Land should not be developed – it is a valued and much-used open space	8
Impact on flooding	7
Safety concerns for children walking to/from school	5
Developers should fund improvements to broadband in local area	5
Bigger hospital needed	5
Impact on wildlife/ecology	5
Houses should be of a similar density, type and size to that in adjoining developments	4
SR4 not part of an integrated development. SR1-3 could be developed standalone	3
Make Church Farm a proper grid square	3
Concerns over density, parking provision, road widths, space standards, overlooking	3

Walnut Tree Health Centre

- Health Centre is not adequately financially supported to take on further 1000+ patients
- Current building cannot accommodate further expansion
- Tariff per patient is lowest in Milton Keynes and without right level of funding will result in further squeeze on existing services for current patients

Walton Community Council

- Object to piecemeal nature of development.
- Council had expectation that land would not be developed until 2025/26.
- Unfeasible to run public transport through Church Farm site.
- Concerned about the strain on services, including doctors, dentist, community centre.
- Development may not be sufficient to require a new school but cumulative development may require that a new school is built to serve this part of Milton Keynes. No local school should be forced to expand to accommodate new development.
- Play areas and youth facilities must be provided; flood management of Caldecotte Brook may require balancing lakes; linear park extensions required to preserve hedgerows.

- Roundabout junction of H10/V11 is unbalanced in traffic flows. This leads to long waiting times.
- Attention must be paid to Byrd Crescent as this is a school walking and drop-off route.
- Effective noise and visual intrusion plan must be in place for H10 extension.
- Consideration needs to be given to emergency access from Church Farm.

APPENDIX D

SLA Development Framework Regulation 12 Consultation, July-October 2012 Summary of Representations

Formal consultation closed on 5 October

About 150 representations received

- Statutory Consultees, In-House MKC, Parish/Town Council's, Developers/Landowners (26)
- Church Farm specific (100)
- A421/General (25)

Related Secondary School Consultation (15)

Main Issues

- Generic
 - Context and need
 - Infrastructure
 - Sustainability
- SLA Specific (mostly in relation to Church Farm)
 - Education
 - Healthcare
 - Public amenities
 - Landscape, public open space, green infrastructure
 - Transport
 - Flood Risk
 - Infrastructure funding

“Statutory” Consultees

1. Highways Agency

- Is there a threshold which requires dualling of A421 as a result of development proposals?
- Support provision of a Park and Ride, but TA/modelling required.
- Support provision of a Lorry Park but TA/modelling required.
(Questions purpose of Lorry Park; existing Lorry Park in Central Beds.)
- Questions phasing of development to ensure balanced residential/employment development.
- Supports/accepts removal of requirement for a bridge over M1 and proposed M1 J13a.
- TA/Travel Plans required with all subsequent planning applications.
- Overall SLA DF TA required to model and understand cumulative impact of development.
- Supports proposals to minimise trips at source and for sustainable transport initiatives.

2. Walnut Tree Patient Participatory Group (relates to Church Farm especially)

- Practice building cannot accommodate more patients.
- No funding is available for expansion of the Practice.
- Implementation of any expansion will take a long time.
- No additional parking can be provided for expansion.
- The NHS provides low contributions to the Practice, counter to any expansion proposals.

3. Thames Valley Police

- Supports allocation of site for TVP facility.
- TVP requires funding; not part of MK Tariff arrangements.

4. English Heritage

- General support for proposals to protect historic environment.

5. Parks Trust

- Requires consideration of site specific conditions and functional requirements of design and layout of open space/landscape.
- Need to provide for integrated “natural” play areas, not nucleated play areas.
- Supports Parks Trust being responsible to maintain open space/landscape. (Design of open space/landscape in consultation with Parks Trust.)
- Supports green infrastructure development prior to housing development.
- Supports future-proofing of paddocks for future grid road extension.
- Need to link leisure routes with open space network.

6. Environment Agency

- Need to acknowledge northern part of SRA1 is in Flood Zone 2.
- Need to address surface water management.
- Need to show location of Secondary Aquifer.
- Provides advice on contaminated Land.

7. Canals and River Trust

- Partner and have an interest in Bedford/Milton Keynes Waterway.
- Supports new alignment of waterway route. (New alignment only supported if developers provide the waterway channel.)
- Waterway must cross A421 to SRA3 and proposed park, not to be aligned north of A421.

8. Bedford/Milton Keynes Waterway Trust

- Initially accepted new alignment, subject to conditions.
- Require condition that requires site assembly and dig-out of the waterway by developer.
- Propose an alternative alignment – west side of SRA1/east side of Magna Park.
- Proposed alignment ignores synergy between waterway and the places it passes through. (Waterway needs to cross A421 to SRA3 and proposed park, not north of A421.)

In-House MKC

1. Conservation and Archaeology Team

- Need to provide clearer requirement for protection of historic environment – hedgerows, listed buildings, archaeological sites.
- Integrate historic environment with landscape and open space strategy.

2. Councillor Bramall

- Similar to ReviseSR4 representations.

3. Councillor Barney

- Similar to ReviseSR4 representations

4. Children and Families/Education Team

- Support for provision of two Primary Schools and one Secondary School.
- Consideration needs to be given to early years and childcare provision.

5. Leisure/Landscape Team

- Emphasise need to integrate/enhance existing landscape features.
- Provide more detail on open space standards and open space provision.
- More detailed explanation of location/provision of neighbourhood/play areas.

Parish/Town Councils/civic societies

1. Woburn Sands and District Society

- Upgrade of Kingston Roundabout/dualling of A421 before any development proceeds.
- Supports landscape/hedgerow buffer along Lower End Road and A5130/Newport Road.
- Questions desirability/need for a link to/from A5130/Newport Road.
- Preferred Secondary School location integrated into SLA, not at Wavendon.

2. Woburn Sands Town Council

- Upgrade of Kingston Roundabout/dualling of A421 before any development proceeds.
- Questions desirability/need for a link to/from A5130/Newport Road.
- Requires landscape/hedgerow buffer along A5130/Newport Road.
- Supports Secondary School location integrated into SLA; not opposed to Wavendon option.

3. Aspley Guise Parish Council

- Supports deletion of requirement for a bridge over M1 and proposed M1 J13a.
- Upgrade of Kingston Roundabout/dualling of A421 before any development proceeds.

- Requires well designed landscape/hedgerow buffer along A5130/Newport Road.
- Preferred Secondary School location integrated into SLA, not at Wavendon.

4. Walton Community Council

- Similar to ReviseSR4 representations.

5. Wavendon Parish Council

- Preferred Secondary School location integrated into SLA, not at Wavendon.
- Upgrade of Kingston Roundabout/dualling of A421 before any development proceeds.
- Questions desirability/need for a link to/from A5130/Newport Road.
- Supports landscape/hedgerow buffer along Lower End Road and A5130/Newport Road.
- Opposed to high density development (35dph) on edge of the urban area.
- Requires clarity on the relocation of parts of the Wavendon Golf Course.
- Prefers the provision of open space in the “middle” of the development.

Developers/Landowners

1. David Lock Associates (Burford/Merton)

- Question continued inclusion of Church Farm in SLA DF; deal with separately
- Clarity on purpose and function of SLA DF required; await Inspectors Report
- Need to update context of Brooklands and Magna Park and extent of built up area
- Objects to inclusion of draft Landscape Character Assessment; not tested
- Questions extent of group TPO south of SLA
- Base OS material relating to road/street hierarchy is old and requires updating
- Revise and amend catchment distances for facilities (play areas/schools)
- Revise text to explain SLA DF also informs and guides planning applications
- Concept plan is adequate for SLA DF; final plan is too detailed/does not permit flexibility
(Also relates to character typologies)
- Playing fields too concentrated on two sites and not on other sites
- Movement strategy shows too much detail; does not permit other appropriate options
- Clarity required on dualling of A421 and its funding
- Concern that the site cannot deliver 2,500 homes; further clarification required
- Concern that mix and siting of community facilities are incorrect
- Green infrastructure/open space definition/standards in Land Use Budget require clarification as these could be over-provided; look at dual use options
- SLA DF phasing must allow for access to all parts at the earliest point to maximise competition, delivery and development opportunities
- Support location of Secondary School to west of Newport Road

2. Bidwells (Connolly Homes)

- Transport Assessment required to inform site access arrangements
- SLA DF policy guidance may change following Inspectors Report (Clarification required on process to follow if Inspector proposes changes to the SLA; this may require further consultation and delay the Core Strategy and SLA DF process)
- Delete reference to linear park on Church Farm; it does not exist
- Extend walking isochrones to 2km as defined in Manual for Streets
- Introduce flexibility regarding the retention of hedgerows; leave to planning application
- Support land use core concept and future proofing for Church Farm
- Support for Transport Assessment to inform access strategy/traffic impact of development
- Redefine character typologies (as indicative) to permit land use/layout flexibility
- Generally support Land Use Budget but flexibility required due to site-specific conditions
- Confirms intention to join MK Tariff or similar to deliver infrastructure
- Support location of Secondary School to west of Newport Road
- Objects to phasing proposals as Church Farm can deliver housing from 2015 onwards

3. David Lock Associates (Gazeley)

- Need to update factual position, planning context, importance and economic impact of Magna Park/ Glebe Land and their relationship to the SLA (Editorial changes)
- Ensure provision and funding of adequate infrastructure, especially dualling of A421
Introduce reference to require all SLA landowners signing up to MK Tariff
- Need to note unresolved issues relating to Glebe Land and completion of EEA City Street
- Potential change to SLA and SLA DF based on Inspectors Report

4. Peter Mavrogordato (Mr A Ripper)

- Support for lorry park, park and ride, neighbourhood play areas and road structure
- SLA should be extended to include the Ripper land (permitting access to Lower End Road)

5. Terence O'Rourke (O&H Properties)

- Preparation of SLA DF is premature given emerging status of Core Strategy; halt process
- Potential change to SLA and SLA DF based on Inspectors Report
- Opposes SLA allocation; supports previous allocation of SE SDA of 4,800 not 2,500 homes

Short term approach that limits the ability to provide infrastructure and community facilities and a missed opportunity to comprehensively develop plan south east Milton Keynes

- Supports future proofing for future development to allow an extension of H10/Bletcham Way; opposes a defensible edge/landscape buffer on east edge of Church Farm
- Objects to lack of consultation/involvement of adjacent landowners

6. David Lock Associates (Places for People)

- Main concern relates to the uncertainty of the provision of a new Secondary School in SLA
Representation focuses on social infrastructure delivery and “sufficient school provision”
- *Detailed comments to follow*

7. Barton Willmore (Gallagher Estates)

- Generally supportive of allocation of the SLA and the SLA DF proposals
Committed to delivery of SLA and are preparing planning applications for their landholdings
- Potential exists for changes to SLA and SLA DF based on Inspectors Report
- Supports Council acceptance of SLA capacity from a “maximum” to “about” 2,500 homes
- Proposes inclusion of land to the west of Newport Road into the SLA
- Proposes inclusion of woodland adjacent to Eagle Farm North/SRA1 into the SLA
- Opposes provision of all playing field provision in one site as this limits deliverability
- Opposes SLA policy and funding requirement for the dualling of A421
- Opposes SLA policy requirement for the inclusion of a Lorry Park in SLA DF
- Opposes SLA policy requirement to safeguard a route for the Waterway
- Opposes inclusion of Grid Road corridors 80m. in width; suggests City Streets
- Generally supports a mix of B1, B2 and B8 employment land; the main focus on B8 uses
- Opposes level of need for the provision of an additional Secondary School
Land to the west of Newport Road is proposed as a site for the Secondary School
- Opposes reference to Design Codes; no longer required as part of the planning process

8. Fox Land and Property (Bow Brickhill Consortium)

- SLA DF consultation is premature as it overlaps with Inspectors Report
- Core Strategy sustainability process of reasonable alternatives remain outstanding
- Questions the capacity of SLA to deliver 2,500 homes
- Questions multiple land ownership of SLA
- Proposes a more suitable and sustainable alternative site
- Questions adequacy of landscape and open space strategy

- Questions adequacy of movement framework
- Questions appropriateness of “isolated” Church Farm allocation
- Questions previous Core Strategy and SLA DF consultation events
- Questions inconsistency between Church Farm future proofing and defensible boundary
- Questions ability of SLA to deliver expected housing provision; ownership/phasing issues
- Questions ability to achieve proposed equalisation arrangements
- Questions development programme and milestones; its impact on 5-year housing supply
Development delayed due to Core Strategy delays leading to a consequential delay in adoption of SLA DF, planning applications, equalisation and developer contributions

Church Farm (Basic ReviseSR4 representations + individual representations)

1. Context

- Development is unnecessary
- Development is being brought forward
- Develop Brownfield sites first
- Why bring project forward if so many areas with planning permission not yet developed
- Initial allocation should never have been made; other land more suitable for development
- Damage to quality of life on Wavendon Gate/Old Farm Park
- Environmental impact of loss of natural areas for plants and wild animals (and local residents)
- Retain hedgerows and open countryside on edge of MK
- Bolt on development
- Development in an already developed area (never before in MK)
- One way in/one way out
- No infrastructure
- 8-year building site

2. Infrastructure

- No infrastructure – what about I before E

3. Character of Existing Settlements

- No safeguards to match proposed development with existing settlements
- Higher density than in OFP/WG; not respecting existing character (but do so for Wavendon)
- Village character of Wavendon is not being protected

4. Education

- No extra provision – existing schools full and not able to expand
- Insufficient school provision in MK – further pressure on Wavendon Gate/Walton High

5. Flood Risk

No flood risk provision for Church Farm

6. HealthCare

No extra provision – existing facilities cannot cope and not able to expand

7. Infrastructure Funding

Education, healthcare, amenities and transport not timetabled or funded

Hospital cannot cope with further growth

No guarantees that developer contributions will be spent in CF

No safeguards that OFP/WG will bear the brunt of planning failures

8. Public Amenities (shops/community centre/linear parks/+)

No public amenities are being provided

Loss of Wavendon Golf Course facilities (not being replaced)

9. Sustainability

Existing facilities in local area are not a sustainable option for CF (need to travel by car)

Development requires use of the car; not sustainable

Thought/work needs to be done to ensure development of CF does not put a burden on existing facilities and negative effect on existing residents

10. Transport

Transport solution not planned, timetabled or funded.

Extension of H10 is glossed over

Safety/security concerns of H10 extension; impact on adjacent residents and maintain pedestrian access along Byrd Crescent

Access (including public transport) is fundamental and needs detail in SLA DF

How do old/infirm residents get about – difficult site for emergency services?

Existing roads/intersections are busy; new development will make roads even busier

Rat running; negative impact on Wavendon

Severe traffic congestion in Wavendon/Kingston Roundabout/Woburn Sands; made worse

Existing traffic/parking problems at Wavendon Gate School; will get worse

No access to Phoebe Lane, Walton Road, Newport Road and Lower End Road

11. Studies Missing

Flood Risk Assessment

Transport Assessment

Biodiversity Report

Noise Impact Assessment

Arboriculture Statement

Statement of Community Involvement

Design Codes

12. General

Stakeholder Group exploited by developers

Too many unanswered questions – more detail required

Not preserving original development concepts and policies of MK – architecture/green space

No reassurances that original development concepts and policies will be preserved

Provide adequate road widths to accommodate redways/busses/pavement verges

Provide adequate off-road parking

Need to create an attractive gateway entrance to MK

{Additional detailed amendments to SLA DF not noted in this Summary of Representations.}

A421/General

1. James Farmer

- Due to recent East-West Rail announcements SRA4 requires additional infrastructure
- Railway underpass for bridle-way will now be required for access to south Milton Keynes

2. Stuart Turner

- Acknowledges location/configuration/area of SLA
- Acknowledges objective, role and key strands of SLA DF
- SLA DF requires strengthening/improvement to ensure effective sustainable development
- Clear definition of sustainable development is required and relevant overarching principles
(As a starting point use NPPF definition of sustainable development)
- The three land parcels do not represent a coherent and sustainable development concept
- Acknowledges important sustainability principles set out in SLA DF
- Social and economic structures to support sustainable development
- Improvement in structuring principles required – urban design statements
- Improvement in movement framework required – respond to highway structure
- Improvement in assessment and monitoring procedures required – gauge whether development delivers sustainable development (Breeam Communities)

3. Others (Individual representations)

- Main Issues
 - Context and need
 - Infrastructure and infrastructure funding
 - Sustainability
 - Public amenities

- Landscape, public open space, green infrastructure
- Transport

Urban Design & Landscape Architecture

Planning and Strategic Transport Group

Milton Keynes Council

Civic Offices

1 Saxon Gate East

Milton Keynes MK9 3EJ

T +44 (0) 1908 252708

F +44 (0) 1908 252329

E urban.design@Milton-keynes.gov.uk

www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/udla

