

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Overall summary	4
3	General comments	9
4	Question 1	19
5	Question 2	28
6	Question 3	32
7	Question 4	46
8	Question 5	55
9	Question 6	63
10	Question 7	70
11	Question 8	78
12	Question 9	88
13	Question 10	108
14	Question 11	117
15	Question 12	120
16	Question 13	127
17	Question 14	130
18	Question 15	134
19	Question 16	140
20	Question 17	143
21	Question 18	145
22	Question 19	148
23	Question 20	156

1 . Introduction

1 Introduction

1.1 This document reports on the comments received in response to the Strategic Development Directions Consultation Document (SDD Consultation Document) that was published for consultation in January 2016.

What is Plan:MK?

1.2 Plan:MK will be the new Local Plan for Milton Keynes Borough. When adopted, Plan:MK will replace the existing Core Strategy (adopted in July 2013) and the remaining saved policies in the Milton Keynes Local Plan (adopted December 2005). It will set out a development strategy for Milton Keynes up to 2031, with a range of detailed policies to guide development over this period.

1.3 The Strategic Development Directions Consultation January 2016

1.4 The SDD Consultation document presented ideas for how and where the longer term growth of the Milton Keynes area could occur. These ideas principally came out of a series of workshops that took place in Spring 2015 and in response to consultation on a range of Topic Papers in 2014. The workshops were attended by stakeholders from many different backgrounds and areas of interest and expertise. The intention of the workshops was to understand those stakeholders' priorities and ambitions for Milton Keynes, and then to talk through spatial options for where development could take place in the future to help deliver those priorities. Participants were asked to 'think big' and to draw their ideas on maps. Consensus on certain themes, priorities and ambitions was generated during this process.

1.5 The four possible directions for growth that were presented within the SDD Consultation Document reflect the results of the workshop discussions about how and where Milton Keynes could grow in the future. These directions were:

- Direction of Growth 1: West, South-west and/or South-east
- Direction of Growth 2: Expansion East of the M1
- Direction of Growth 3: New satellite settlement(s) in the rural area
- Direction of Growth 4: Intensification and redevelopment of the urban area of Milton Keynes city.

1.6 Feedback was sought on a vision for Milton Keynes, what the challenges for Milton Keynes are likely to be, and whether and how growth should be accommodated via the four Directions of Growth. This was done via 20 questions. In response, around 5,800 comments were made by 1,250 respondents to the consultation.

Consultation period

1.7 Consultation ran for a twelve-week period between Wednesday 13th January and Wednesday 6th April 2016. The Development Plans team led a series of events to raise awareness of the consultation and for people to ask questions. A full Consultation Statement will be produced at a later date. This will detail all of the methods used in the consultation.

Comments Received

1.8 As noted, around 5,800 responses were received from more around 1,250 respondents. Respondents are categorised as follows:

- Members of the Public
- Town and parish Councils
- Milton Keynes Council Ward Councillors
- Neighbouring and other Local Authorities
- Milton Keynes Council Departments
- Development industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents)
- National and Statutory Organisations
- Local organisations and interest groups

1.9 The responses were varied in length and detail. Some people responded directly to the questions posed in the Strategic Development Directions consultation and phrased their comments accordingly, whereas others made more comprehensive responses, and attached evidence or details of a site they are promoting through the planning process.

1.10 All the comments received are available to view via the online consultation portal, at <http://miltonkeynes-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/planmk>. This document however summarises the key points that were raised, in a more accessible format. Inevitably, due to the number of responses, the level of detail of those responses and the wide range of issues that they cover, this report is still quite long. Summaries have been presented by question posed, as well as General comments section which summarises comments that were made which not solely relate to a specific question.

1.11 Generally, the organisation or stakeholder who made the comments has not been disclosed within this report, since in many cases, the comment was made by several respondents but with a slightly different wording or emphasis. The detail of 'who said what' is available to view on the online portal, with the full comments received included.

How the comments will be used

1.12 As we progress with the preparation of Plan:MK, the full responses to the SDD Consultation Document will help us to develop the detail of the policy areas that the plan will cover. Please note, we will refer to the full content of what respondents said, not just the summarised key points, so the finer detail of the responses will not be lost.

1.13 The issues and views of stakeholders raised through the consultation, further technical information studies and reports that form the technical evidence base for Plan:MK and national planning policy and guidance will help us decide on policy directions moving forward.

1.14 This report does not provide a response to any of the comments or views presented by respondents, or debate what policy approach will be taken forward in the light of the comments received.

2 . Overall summary

2 Overall summary

Question 1

2.1 The majority of respondents indicated that the bullet points were a useful starting point, but were too generalised and needed further detail. Many also noted there was a need to add a bullet point to preserve the unique character of MK, with its mix of city, market town and rural villages

Question 2

2.2 The majority of respondents indicated that there was a need to expand each aim with explanatory text for clarity.

Question 3

2.3 The majority of respondents agreed with many of the points, but said that other points could be included.

Question 4

2.4 The main responses included;

- Improved health facilities/expand current hospital/new hospital
- Schools
- New centre for the arts: music, art, theatre, concert venues, galleries
- Improved, frequent public transport links using trams, light rail, monorail and driverless vehicles
- New campus university
- Plan:MK needs to fit in and coordinate with the complete range of initiatives for Milton Keynes Borough including 2050 Futures, City of Culture applications competing with cities such as London, Birmingham and Manchester.

Question 5

2.5 Members of the public were split between agreeing and disagreeing with the continued outward expansion of MK urban area.

2.6 A large number of respondents stated there should be no development in South East/Woburn Sands or close to M1 due to impact on landscape/transport/heritage impact/education/health infrastructure/sprawl.

Question 6

2.7 The majority of respondents considered that areas around J13 and the East-West rail link provide a good opportunity for industrial and logistic use, as well as the areas around the Brickhills, Stoke Hammond and Newton Longville as they would provide the opportunity to continue the MK tradition of a residential master plan maintaining a rural feel

2.8 The notable number of respondents considered that Bow Brickhill/Brickhill woods area is unsuitable for new development as it would cause traffic congestion, harm village character, detract visually, potentially flood, have broadband issues, put pressure on already limited facilities, harm green assets and be too remote and isolated.

Question 7

2.9 The majority of responses stated NO they did not think a 'final extent' for development needs should be defined at this stage and is appropriate. Reasons include its too premature to decide on a final extent of growth as the plan will be reviewed every five years and use existing land with permissions.

2.10 A smaller number of responses stated YES I think a 'final extent' for development needs to be defined at this stage and is not appropriate. Reasons include for peace of mind, to protect important environmental assets and prevent urban sprawl.

Question 8

2.11 The majority of responses stated that the green buffer was the best way of protecting the character and integrity of the existing settlements that lie within the areas of new development identified in Direction of Growth 1.

2.12 A smaller number of responses indicated that Plan:MK should cater for all options depending on the character of the existing settlement. Bletchley, particularly, should welcome significant redevelopment and integration with Central Milton Keynes, whilst current satellite villages should be preserved in a way which best suits the current character be it either a green buffer or a sensitive urban plan of integration in to the urban area so as to maintain a green and open character enjoyed by the likes of Willen.

Question 9

2.13 The majority of responses agreed with the scale of the development proposed for east of M1 in Direction of Growth 2, although they said that new infrastructure funding will be needed.

2.14 The main reasons for agreeing included;

- The east of the M1 was assessed by Planning Inspector Keith Holland who said that the land to the East of Milton Keynes is suitable for long term development as I consider this land is much less sensitive in landscape terms than the Whaddon Valley.
- The M1 should not be seen as a long term barrier to development as it is not unusual to have motorways running through cities. And with extra junctions would also provide seamless connections to H3, H5/6 (J14), H8 and J13.
- There is potential of Cranfield Technology Park and airfield and Marston Moretaine for employment and recreation.

Question 10

2.15 The majority of responses indicated a preference for no development beyond M1.

2.16 A smaller number of responses indicated that there should be a final extent defined and that Direction 2 should not proceed.

2 . Overall summary

Question 11

2.17 Overall, a clear majority of members of the public, parish/town councils and local groups supported the use of green buffers to separate existing villages from any new satellite settlements. The second largest preference was for existing villages to be sensitively incorporated into new urban areas. Industry bodies were more evenly split, with a small majority favouring a case-by-case approach. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 12

2.18 Overall, a clear majority of respondents across all categories did not support the creation of new satellite settlements, for the reasons set out in the summaries below. Of those who did support the concept of new settlements, the majority favoured a single larger settlement over a number of smaller settlements. A notable number of members of the public, parish/town councils and industry bodies supported expansion of the existing rural settlements, in particular Newport Pagnell and Olney, instead of establishing new settlements. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 13

2.19 The majority of respondents to this question reiterated their objection to new satellite settlements and suggested alternative approaches instead. However, of members of the public who expressed a preference on location, the majority expressed support for the area north of Milton Keynes between the West Coast Main Line and the M1. The second largest preference amongst members of the public was for the area around Olney. The numbers of respondents express support or objections for certain locations were broadly similar. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 14

2.20 The majority of respondents to this question reiterated their objection to new satellite settlements and suggested alternative approaches instead. However, of members of the public, parish/town councils and industry bodies who expressed a preference, the majority expressed support for limits to be defined. Amongst the other respondent groups, no clear preference on the use of limits was evident. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 15

2.21 The clear majority of members of the public, parish/town councils and local groups supported intensification and redevelopment of the existing urban area for a number of reasons. However, the vast majority of those who offered this support did so provided that the character and identity of Milton Keynes was protected, principally by avoiding development on grid road corridors and open space, and by not developing to high densities.

2.22 Notwithstanding this, a large group of respondents considered that higher densities should be sought within the urban area, including building on 'surplus' open space and through taller buildings. Of those who objected to this approach did so on the grounds of the impact it would have on the character and identity of Milton Keynes and upon existing residents. A notable number of respondents considered that this direction of growth should

be combined with direction of growth 1. The majority of industry bodies considered that this option by itself would not meet housing needs, and should instead be part and parcel of a strategy which included expansion of the urban via one or more of the other directions of growth in the SDD consultation document, or by other means (e.g. expansion of existing rural settlements). A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 16

2.23 Overall, there was support for all four approaches being used to meet housing needs from within the urban area. There was particular support for the completion and redevelopment of CMK to provide a greater amount of housing alongside office development in CMK to aid the vibrancy and identity of the city centre.

2.24 There was a lesser, but strong theme of not supporting intensification and higher densities across the urban area in particular through the use of open green spaces, amenity land and the grid road corridors due to concerns about the impact on the character of the New Town. A number of respondents also raised concerns about the loss of employment land to housing and that this may cause problems in the future, in terms of achieving sustainable communities and economic growth. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 17

2.25 The area west of the central railway station was suggested by the most respondents. For other areas suggested, the number of respondents suggesting these was relatively low (1-3 respondents) and broadly even.

Question 18

2.26 Whilst the SDD included intensification of the urban area as a possible option, around 10% of respondents suggested much higher density and higher rise development should be pursued in CMK compared to that presented in the SDD document. A notable number of respondents also suggested the towns and villages in the rural area should accommodate modest growth. Two industry respondents promoted land for a large expansion of Milton Keynes to the north around Haversham. For other suggestions, the number of respondents suggesting these was relatively low (1-4 respondents) and broadly even.

Question 19

2.27 The majority of comments made covered a range of issues and therefore no strongly recurring themes were evident; however, the following could be discerned:

- Direction of growth 1 would be consistent with and benefit from the East-West rail and recent infrastructure improvements linked to other developments, although concerns about rail crossings were evident.
- Direction of growth 2 could provide a significant number of homes, but faced challenges in terms of new crossings over the M1/improved or new junctions.
- Direction of growth 3 would require significant infrastructure investment, and it was not certain whether this could be achieved.

2 . Overall summary

- Direction of growth 4 would reduce the impact on the countryside, help reinvigorate the urban area and provide housing to meet short to medium term needs, although it could not meet all needs and risked losing the character and identity of Milton Keynes.
- All directions of growth would require infrastructure investment to support growth and avoid making existing deficits/problems worse.

2.28 A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

Question 20

2.29 The clear majority of members of the public favoured direction four with direction one (and the south and south-east areas in particular) the second most preferred. A clear majority consider direction three the least preferred. A large number of members of the public preferred a combination of two or more directions, with the clear majority being for a combination of directions 1 and 4. The order of preference is more mixed amongst the various organisations and bodies who responded to this question.

3 General comments

Public comments:

- Consultation was flawed as the workshops were poorly advertised and so did not have a representative attendance
- It should be easier to select options/choices through Yes, No, Maybe choices and optional comment section, rather than a comment section for every choice.
- The intent of these workshops was highly unclear
- The consultation was unrepresentative of the people of MK, attended by organisations with vested interests in the expansion of MK
- This consultation is supposed to be driven by consultee input, however it is almost impossible without a projection of how much the population is forecast to grow year by year.
- A doubling of the size of Milton Keynes is totally contrary to current central Government plans to re-balance population and economy between the North and South. The south east of England is already the most densely populated territory in Europe, with the exception of Malta, and our infrastructure is struggling to cope even with the current population demands.
- How will the responses to this consultation be analysed or what weight will be given to responses?
- I cannot see that the Council has made a case for housing need either, only estimated the number of likely new houses needed by 2031
- There is a lack of questioning of whether it is really in the best interests of residents to promote expansion of the MK population by more than 50%.
- How did the 4 Options proposed come out of "vision workshops" , when these did not fairly represent all the areas that are being considered for development?
- Should have included amount of planning permissions granted in consultation
- Regional Planning Guidance for the South East (RPG9) is part of the Evidence Base for any longer term vision for MK. The Oxford to Cambridge Arc initiative, which involved MK Council, is another overlooked aspect of the evidence base.
- If we do not plan for growth it will come at us in an unplanned way.
- 'Figure 2: Development constraints' is not fit for purpose. It is a miscellany of pieces of information, many of which are not constraints in any statutory sense. The map appears to be cluttered with the arbitrary choices of the map maker, and it does not help the discourse.
- The long term vision, which involves the adjacent parts of Aylesbury Vale and Central Bedfordshire, should be commissioned by and implemented by a New Town Development Corporation established for the purpose.

Town and Parish Council comments:

- Avoiding coalescence of the new town with traditional villages is a long established principle dating back to the South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy and should be respected.
- The review of the 2011-2016 Core Strategy is overdue. We are deeply concerned over the risk this represents in terms of a possible challenge from developers and the planning vacuum that could develop which might well lead to unchallengeable and piecemeal developments across Milton Keynes, but on the east and west flanks of the city in particular. The process followed to date, comprising of a series of workshops and the publication of a range of topic papers, has already been the subject of

3 . General comments

challenge and the outcome of the current consultations (the production of a Preferred Option(s) document for further consultation) could easily result in more such challenges placing the entire Plan:MK process under even more threat. We accept that Milton Keynes Council is constantly undermined by frequent changes in government planning directives. In addition, it is clear that the building industry simply cannot support and deliver the target levels of 1750 dwellings per year as set out in the 2013 Core Strategy. Thus the Core Strategy and local Neighbourhood Plans are now considered to be trumped by the overriding need and planning assumptions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The local housing market risks being controlled and manipulated by developers and their agents continually drip feeding land into the system whilst maintaining valuable housing land banks to stimulate company share values and company asset worth. We urge Milton Keynes Council to meet with its neighbouring authorities and with Central Government to hasten the process of developing and delivering a joint plan for Aylesbury Vale, Central Bedfordshire and Milton Keynes against which realistic housing targets, directions for growth and joint governance arrangements can be established. Whilst a duty to co-operate appears plausible at one level in reality only through the establishment of a tri-authority controlled delivery agency can Milton Keynes and its surrounds return to its previous controlled, affordable and sustainable level of growth. Whilst we do not have a view on the ultimate size of Milton Keynes it wishes to highlight the principles of sustainable development necessary to maintain the relative prosperity of the area, namely; an economic role ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure; a social role supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; an environmental role contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy. We maintain that no final decisions on the preferred option for growth should be agreed until that Commission reports and its recommendations are properly debated and considered. We submit that a figure of 1350 should be set as the annual target moving forward in the adopted Plan:MK (and as a revised figure in the short term as an amendment to the Core Strategy), in light of past housing delivery performance.

- If new housing built in Central Bedfordshire in the parishes close to MKB (all of which could easily be accommodated within MKB's own area) the effects will be felt across all of Central Bedfordshire. It would mean that areas such as Leighton Linlade, Marston Moretaine and Cranfield which have already seen significant new housing in recent years will have to take even more growth to compensate. 3. The NPPF does not give MKC any authority to determine levels or directions of growth outside the MKB border but requires MKC to work with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the requirements of the Duty to Cooperate. The changes to the final South East Plan made by order of the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in July 2008 made clear that new housing delivered within Central Bedfordshire would not reduce the number of new homes needed to be built within MKB, while there was more than sufficient land capable of being developed within MKB to meet its need. This principle has been confirmed by the NPPF which in paragraph 182 only requires planning authorities to provide for the unmet requirements from neighbouring

3 . General comments

authorities The current Strategic Development Directions Consultation gives the mistaken impression that the residents of MK can decide whether their housing need up to 2031 and longer term growth, will be delivered wholly within MKB or partly in MKB and partly in neighbouring areas. The consultation is the result of a flawed process based on a series of Vision Workshops that many were unaware of or did not understand the purpose of. The Options presented in the consultation do not even objectively reflect the results of those Workshops nor are any of them taken individually viewed as viable ways of delivering the new housing that MK needs. The consultation requires respondents to speculate on the level of new housing that MKB will need beyond the time period covered by Plan:MK and what sites will be available within MKB to meet that need. It is not evidenced based as required by the NPPF. Before proceeding further with Plan:MK, MKC should refresh its out-of-date SHLAA which we firmly believe will confirm that all of the need for new housing arising in MKB can be accommodated within the Borough and that there should therefore be no unmet need which MKC would need to look to its neighbouring authorities to accommodate.

- There is a widely held view amongst a number of local communities within MKB that the Vision Workshop process was flawed and should not be used as a basis for the preparation of Plan:MK. These failings were discussed at length at the MKC Executive Scrutiny Committee meeting that considered whether to proceed with the current consultation and were reflected in the decision sheet for that meeting.
- Neighbourhood Plans should be available to put in place for local Parish / Town Councils on the understanding that third party funding from Milton Keynes Council would be provided. This would provide future plans for estates in Milton Keynes and give the residents opportunities to put forward valid concerns or ideas. Milton Keynes Council should follow the I before E practice to ensure that infrastructure in put in place to ensure the smooth running of new developments. We have a number of infrastructure concerns relating to traffic and transport, public services such as schools, doctors, dentists, drainage, roads and parking. Milton Keynes Local Heritage should be preserved and there should not be anything developed in the way of houses, offices, public service buildings in close proximity of the local heritage areas to ensure that the local history is kept intact. It is important to avoid cross principal boundary developments. A University with Campus facilities should be considered as there will be an increase in families and young adults looking to move to Milton Keynes who may want to opportunity and access to further their education. Social care and outreach during growth should be monitored and funding should be available to create social cohesion between younger families buying in new developments and also older residents who still reside in MK.
- The consultation document makes much of respecting the original concepts maximising the image and identity~ and distinctive character of the city and this we support. The original concepts having been denied in the recent past are perhaps now being recognised as the very things that make the city unique and worth preserving. These elements should be more deliberately detailed and these should lead the future expansion plans. The costs of such features then have to be fitted into the planning gain raised by the developers levy and other highways and environmental grants as may be available from central government. We believe the following characteristics are all key in making the city the success story it undoubtedly is: the openness of the city; the wildlife corridors; the landscaping; the grid road system; the cycleways.
- That the second stage was poorly communicated and attendance at the Vision Workshop was not as representative of Milton Keynes as it could have been.

3 . General comments

- There is no sensible nor sustainable rationale in protecting the substantial area both east of the M1 and indeed north of the urban area, even taking into account the areas constrained by the River Ouse and its tributaries, by seeking to impose the M1 as a barrier to expansion.
- Parish councils outside MKB have been given less opportunity to participate in the Plan:MK process than parishes from within MKB. While some instances were unavoidable, some could have been avoided, such as allowing less time for parishes from outside MKB to speak at MKC meetings, if MKC had exercised its discretion to do so.
- The invitation to the Visioning Workshops did not make the purpose of the workshops clear and many parishes therefore did not appreciate the significance of the workshops and did not attend. As a result, Central Bedfordshire parishes were completely under represented at the workshops. We don't believe that other interest groups from Central Beds were invited either, and so the interests of Central Bedfordshire as a whole were under represented at the visioning workshops. The Parish Council therefore considers the outputs of the workshops to be flawed. The Parish Council considers it premature to hold a formal consultation on the outputs of a visioning exercise without technical evidence to support the options. It seems quite wrong that the future direction of travel for the growth of MK will be based on evidence as flimsy as a few visioning workshops. It suggests the technical evidence will now be sought to retrofit the preferred option.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- I would like to see a statement referring to the importance of good health and wellbeing and the positive impact planning can have on this early on in the document and within the plan clear reference to the different positive impacts good planning can have on health and with reference to specific best practice that links to the current Milton Keynes Health and Wellbeing Strategy such as Planning for Healthy Weight Environments and Age Friendly Cities. Specifically this would include clear reference to Access to green spaces, opportunities for minimising energy and water use and securing carbon emission reductions. Promotion of Community Cohesion. Promoting active travel and locating developments where access to day-to-day needs for employment, shopping, education, recreation, and other services is available by public transport, walking and cycling thus reducing the need to travel, particularly by private car. Promoting access to healthy foods consideration of cumulative impact for food and drink outlets. Transport Impacts: Walking and Cycling Accessibility; Pedestrian and Cycle Network; Cycle Parking; Public Transport Accessibility

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- It is imperative that both Councils work together through the Duty to Cooperate to ensure that any areas proposed for growth within the MK HMA are agreed by both Councils.
- Given that the SHMA is now three years old the housing requirement may have changed. It is important to understand early on in the plan making process the implications of any increase in housing need for MK, which could have significant implications for the scale of growth planned for through Plan:MK. We would therefore recommend that MKC update the SHMA as a matter of urgency. CBC are concerned about a lack of explanation in either the Topic Paper, SHMA 2013 or Plan:MK as to why an additional 100 dwellings per annum above the figure in the SHMA is considered

3 . General comments

appropriate. If the OAN (1,650) can be delivered within the MK area, it is considered that this is the appropriate housing target for the Plan. It is not clear in Plan:MK or the background Housing Growth Topic Paper whether the target of 1,750 dwellings means that MKC are unable to meet their OAN within their administrative areas and therefore have an unmet need which needs to be accommodated elsewhere. Two of the options proposed in Plan:MK provide housing growth in the neighbouring LPAs area, including Central Bedfordshire. This in itself would indicate that MK consider they are unable to meet their housing need within their own boundary. However there is no evidence, including an assessment of all the growth options within MK boundary, to support or justify the location of growth in the neighbouring authorities. This is clearly a matter that requires further explanation and justification.

- Milton Keynes should be planning to accommodate all its housing needs on its own land, as is referred to in the NPPF, before considering adjacent Local Authority areas. MK Borough has a large rural area, which combined with redevelopment in the urban area can accommodate all the growth projected over the Plan Period I can see no evidence provided by MK to support any of the four options presented from the visioning workshops to support growth in those area Central Beds Council is our Planning Authority, and it will decide where new housing growth will be placed in the CBC area In short, there is no evidence provided that would justify any provision of housing in CBC to satisfy MKBCs future housing needs.
- With regard to highways and transport issues identified within Plan:MK, CBC considers the main issues to include: providing a fit for purpose solution to delivering high quality, efficient and accessible movement in the future and what the challenges are; how the location and planning of new development areas can reduce the need to travel, especially by less sustainable modes; what opportunities exist in the planning of new communities to influence a change in people's travel behaviour. The Transport and Travel Topic Paper identifies there to be a relative decline in cycle commuting with car use being the dominate method to travel to work in Milton Keynes. The focus of transport measures for the new developments should therefore be to reduce car usage and improve public transport and cycling and walking. 33. Cycling and walking infrastructure should be at the heart of any transport proposals for future growth in MK. The investment in cycling and walking infrastructure should include contributions towards the key access routes into MK including NCN Route 51 and Public Rights of Way and Long Distance Routes. An expansion of the red routes into the key Central Bedfordshire locations such as Cranfield, Aspley Guise and Ridgmont Station should be considered. There needs to be continued and long lasting investment in bus infrastructure and supporting new routes to new developments. The new growth areas in MK should also make contributions to bus infrastructure in Central Bedfordshire to include those routes to from key locations such as Cranfield University, Ridgmont Station and Woburn. Any development in Milton Keynes should provide significant contributions towards the improvement of rail infrastructure, including the improvement of sustainable links to stations and improvement of transport interchanges. 36. Major developments in Milton Keynes will benefit from East-West rail improvements and should therefore contribute to them. Ridgmont Station, located along the new EWR link, will be a main station along this route and this will provide a vital transport interchange for the wider area. This station is located in Central Bedfordshire and thus investment in Central Bedfordshire's rail infrastructure will be required if there is additional new growth in the south east of MK and along the EWR corridor. All the stations along the Bedford to Bletchley line should be upgraded to allow for more local trips between the potential new growth areas and Bletchley & MK Central. The location of the ERW link within a strategic corridor and its implications

3 . General comments

needs to be looked at a more strategic level. Road Infrastructure 39. However, it is clear that there will still be a reliance on the car for a significant number of journeys in and out of MK. Travel to work surveys commissioned by CBC highlight that a significant number of Central Bedfordshire residents travel to MK for work, recreation, shopping and other services. This car use will put pressure on the highway network and there will have to be significant mitigation measures to increase capacity. The local roads into Central Bedfordshire and through its communities are coming under increasing pressure as a result of the existing growth in MK to the East and South. There will need to be a comprehensive package of traffic measures put forward to direct traffic away or mitigate the impact of increased traffic as a result of new growth areas in MK given the connectivity between MK and Central Bedfordshire.

- Given the scale of rural hinterland within the Milton Keynes Borough boundary, it is considered that Milton Keynes should be able to absorb its growth needs within its own area, and South Northamptonshire Council is therefore opposed to any such unmet need being provided for within South Northamptonshire District. Part of the proposed Strategic Greenspace designation in Plan:MK, includes land within South Northamptonshire. A direct question is, therefore, whether Milton Keynes Council would wish South Northamptonshire Council to consider including this greenspace designation in its Part 2 Local Plan? South Northamptonshire Council is concerned that it has to date received no direct approach from Milton Keynes Council, in respect of the Duty to Co-operate. South Northamptonshire Council looks forward to being consulted further, at the next stages of the Local Plan process.
- It is unclear in your consultation whether any of the options beyond your administrative boundaries are necessary to meet your objectively assessed needs and we would like clarification in this issue. In relation to the options you have identified we would hope that MKBC: Seeks to make the maximum use of opportunities to intensify and redevelop land and sites within urban areas, and demonstrates that housing needs cannot be met within administrative area before going beyond district boundary. If it is necessary to look beyond your district boundary, ensures that there is no double counting in terms of whose needs are being met by identifying growth in neighbouring authority.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- It is important to draw the Council's attention to the policy changes emerging at a national level which should be taken into account in the preparation of the Plan, considering the impacts on the deliverability of affordable housing. The Government's recent consultation on proposed changes to national policy explicitly indicates that the affordable housing definition may be amended to incorporate innovative rent to buy housing.
- Future planning should enable the city to take its place amongst the UK's top cities: an internationally admired, vibrant, prestigious city. Planning should optimise the proven social, economic and place-making value of culture: its contribution to branding MK as a creative place, augmenting its profile through international collaborations and programming which draws visitors from overseas, attracting inward investment, enhancing education by cultivating imagination and confidence. The city should be courageous: play to its unique strengths, encourage vibrancy, facilitate risk, be daring about the unknown/unfamiliar. Milton Keynes current cultural provision is insufficient for the planned future population of 325,000 by 2037. A city without culture is not somewhere people choose to be. Specifically, the city needs: a central civic outdoor space; a robust and diverse independent indie sector; a city centre concert hall. The city's masterplan and early infrastructure are a significant heritage asset, uniquely

3 . General comments

distinctive to Milton Keynes, and warrant consideration for World Heritage Site listing. Milton Keynes planners should review the current cultural delivery model by assessing cultural impact as part of the policy and planning process, ensuring it is incorporated not bolted on. Creating an independent, charitable Cultural Trust (akin to Milton Keynes Parks Trust and Milton Keynes Community Foundation) which would use the interest from assets to deliver cultural investment. Seek opportunities to create larger scale, city-wide cultural impact, financing cultural delivery through income-generating asset transfer, land allocation and planning gains; optimizing national infrastructure initiatives such as the East West Rail scheme, East West and M1 road upgrades, and Milton Keynes' relationship with surrounding towns and cities and their strategic investment. Provide space for entrepreneurial, small scale, creative businesses in the city centre, rather than squeezing them to the margins where their contribution to the city's distinctiveness is limited and their viability risked. Enable cultural career development: the current relatively low level of cultural momentum makes Milton Keynes an unattractive base for creatives, offering little likelihood of commissions, serendipitous interaction and its consequent creative opportunism, draining talent incubated here to look elsewhere for work.

- Although Plan:MK is supposed to address significant questions regarding the future strategic and growth plans for Milton Keynes it does not seem to answer many key issues of concern for the local citizenry and many civic bodies.
- The document is complex and confusing to read.
- Need a research paper reviewing all the various previous planning documents over the last 10-15 years to show what has been achieved/delivered and what was still outstanding or even underway, and why some projects have not followed an adopted masterplan
- There is a deficient understanding of the original design principles and plans for Milton Keynes. Reference to the original masterplan and its 6 goals for Milton Keynes and how the masterplan and goals have been modernised, adapted and/or improved would go a long way in helping to create a better understanding of where the Plan:MK is going.
- Need real outside-the-box thinking (innovation, creativity and the vision, conviction and political will to make it happen). Plan:MK is the opportunity to do this. With the 50th anniversary coming up in 2017 Milton Keynes has an opportunity to put itself centre stage as a regional, national and even international place of importance and significance.
- The directional inputs (visions) of the experts on the 'Vision Commission' and those of the citizens of Milton Keynes should have informed or even set the guiding principles for Plan:MK.
- Arbitrary allocation of numbers for housing development needed (1750) should be well researched and needs solid justification for it to be believable.
- The 4 growth scenarios proposed by Milton Keynes Council as part of Plan:MK is an oversimplification of what is possible and completely not innovative or exploratory/'risky' enough to push the boundaries to achieve something amazing, e.g. like crossing the M1 and including areas up to Cranfield and even Cranfield itself into Milton Keynes.
- Instead of a residential university, create a niche institution similar to MIT around the racing-motor-aeronautics engineering and design industry - to include Red Bull Racing, Honda Racing, Aston Martin, VW/Audi, etc. - especially with Silverstone close by. The Transport Catapult and the local experiments with personal transport pods and electric vehicle can only benefit.

3 . General comments

- There is a case to be made for no further development in Milton Keynes (or the surrounding areas attached to MK) and this needs to be taken seriously. no other New Town has been asked to grow outside of its designated area in the same way Milton Keynes is currently forced to consider or do. The existing infrastructure has not been adequately maintained and are falling to bits in many places and adding more strain and demand will not be good.
- MK should be classified a world heritage site of a unique urban development model possibly similar in importance to Brasilia.
- The capture of land value (as in the past) for the benefit of the City and its development should be a prime consideration as a mechanism to fund growth at the local level.
- Growth needs to further consider those design and urban development concepts that worked well and those that did not, and plan the failures/bad developments out and build in and improve on those that worked.
- MKC planning officers or a new urban development type body, similar to the Milton Keynes Development Corporation, should be established to be the solid base and consistent feature in the delivery of Plan:MK.
- Plan:MK or a least one of its strategies aims should plan for optimizing national infrastructure initiatives such as the East-West Rail scheme, national plans for East-West and M1 road upgrades, and how Milton Keynes can position itself within the regional plans for growth, economic and transport developments and how to attract SEMLEP and national strategic investments.
- Highways England consider that at this stage development located within strategic development directions not outlined within MKC's report should not be ruled out, prior to any assessment of its viability and impact on the transport network, however any specific alternatives are not proposed by us. It is noted that for all four development growth scenarios a number of major changes are indicated for the strategic road network, including the provision of one or two new junctions on the M1. Further details of these proposals are not included within the Strategic Development Directions document and it is recommended that a more detailed assessment of the impact of the potential development on the strategic road network and the infrastructure that may be required to support the development is undertaken as the Local Plan process goes forward. It is recommended that early consultation is held with Highways England so that MKC have an understanding of the all aspects Highways England will consider and of the evidence base that would be required to support a new additional interchange with the M1. Highways England would require to be satisfied all options to accommodate development traffic impact at existing junctions are exhausted. We have no proposals for changes within our current Investment Programme, The Department of Transport published document Road Investment Strategy: for the 2015/2016 to 2019/2020 Road Period (RIS1). We recognise the potential for a considerable increase in motor traffic as a result of all development options and that any selection is likely to impact on the SRN junctions and routes in the nearby area. Without more detailed assessments, or an indication of the potential proposals, it is not possible for us to fully understand the impact on the SRN. When further assessment has been completed we would welcome the opportunity to review the findings. As part of Highways England's review of the SDD an attempt has been made to determine an order of preference for the four development directions. Whilst this is only indicative at this stage due to a lack of evidence of the impact of the development at this stage, the order is shown below:

- i. Direction of growth 4: Intensification and Redevelopment in the Urban Area

3 . General comments

- ii. Direction of growth 1: Development to the West, South-West and/or South-East of the City.
 - iii. Direction of growth 2: Development East of the M1 Motorway.
 - iv. Direction of growth 3: One or more Satellite Settlements in the Rural Area.
- Intu Milton Keynes Limited (intu) are concerned that Plan:MK does not reference or recognise the role of the City Centre, nor its main attraction shopping, in its current guise or as a driver for growth. This is in direct contrast to the current vision within the Core Strategy. The only reference to shopping is located within the other long term opportunities[□] which simply states that there should be the creation of an urban buzz in CMK. This does not recognise the importance of shopping and the role it plays as a major visitor attraction. The Plan needs to ensure that the shopping offer within CMK remains a key attraction alongside the introduction of additional complementary uses. This should be explicit within the vision and opportunities and thereafter included within policy. We consider that without due attention, the City Centre will fall behind both in its attractiveness and in its ranking as a key local, regional and national retail destination.

What industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents...) said:

- Our client owns land off Eastfield Drive, to the east of Hanslope, which he wishes to promote for development. The site has the potential to deliver around 26 new homes to meet the ongoing housing need of Milton Keynes
- The housing need figures presented in the consultation fail to properly consider the relationship between future housing need and the likely increase in jobs (and therefore requirement for workers) set out in the same document, and the more recent Employment Land Review. The conclusions of the SHMA (at paragraph 6.38) set out that to support the delivery of the EEFM job growth 2,160 new homes will need to be planned for. Therefore, on the Council's own evidence, over the suggested plan period from 2016 to 2031, an increase of 6,150 homes over and above the 8,750 homes the Council considers it should be planning for, to meet local need. In addition, this makes no allowance for any further flexibility and contingency in land supply. Given the undersupply in recent years, the 20% buffer requirement will apply and the future development strategy will need to ensure that it enables strong delivery rates in the short term. We would suggest these factors demonstrate Plan:MK should be planning to deliver at least 2,350 new homes per year and possibly more, to ensure future housing need is met. Overall, this is some 9,000 more houses over the proposed plan period than the Council currently base the consultation paper on. This gives a total additional land supply to be found of 17,750 homes.
- Milton Keynes continues to rely upon a range of generally small-scale and fragmented employment allocations. This residual portfolio of sites does not match the economic importance or ambition of Milton Keynes, in particular the absence of sites to accommodate strategic employment development and inward investment. Plan:MK should release some existing employment allocations that are unlikely to come forward for other uses (including housing) and put in place a range of new employment allocations to support a 21st Century economy. There is a clear and pressing need for an expanded and higher quality portfolio of employment land in Milton Keynes to better align with the economic potential of the city and its ambitions at the heart of the highly productive SEMLEP area. Specifically there is a requirement to meet the growth needs of the higher-value sectors to ensure this investment can be supported within Milton Keynes and the wider SEMLEP area. This can only be realised through a more strategic approach to new employment land provision that not only allows

3 . General comments

Milton Keynes to meet its current and future business needs, and maintain its position amongst other cities also competing for investment. This includes, but is not limited to, immediate requirements arising from the logistics sector for high quality next-generation warehousing space. Experience shows that planning for large-scale strategic employment developments is one of the most effective means through which to make best use of existing infrastructure and to secure investment in new infrastructure.

4 Question 1

Workshop outputs for a longer term Vision

4.1 Do you agree that these bullet points are a useful starting point to be used alongside other inputs (including the outcomes of the MK Futures 2050 Commission) for a Vision for Plan: MK and Milton Keynes in the longer term? 207 responses were received.

4.2 The majority of respondents indicated that the bullet points were a useful starting point, but were too generalised and needed further detail. Many also noted there was a need to add a bullet point to preserve the unique character of MK, with its mix of city, market town and rural villages

4.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

Yes the bullet points are a useful starting point;

- Quick and easy to refer to main points
- It is difficult to argue with laudable, top-level aims

No the bullet points are not a useful starting point;

- No, the vision needs to respond to the drivers of growth
- The Workshop process was flawed and cannot provide a robust evidence base to take Plan:MK forward.
- Too vague, unspecific, need more definition, the bullet points are meaningless without the details of how it will be implemented
- External assessment of how previous plans have been formulated, what they have achieved and some guidance as to how things could be improved in the future.
- First we should review the current commitments and requirements for the existing local community. Second we should properly establish where we are now; have we achieved the original vision for MK? Third review the requirements on us from Government and sensibly establish what can be achieved over the next 30 - 45 years.
- A more focussed and distinctive Vision will hopefully be developed by the MK 2050 Futures Commission

Summaries of main public comments on the bullet points;

- The bullet points are too generalised and could be the vision for any urban area in the UK, more detail required
- Respect / retain the original concept of MK/City in the Forest eg green space, dualled grid roads extended into new development, the red ways, transport links, no high rise buildings
- It is highly questionable whether Milton Keynes Council and its partners have sufficient resources/finance to deliver on some of the more ambitious aspirations.
- There is no technical evidence provided to support any of the options for growth.
- Quality of life and opportunity and choice for all is removed if the rural areas of Milton Keynes are developed into the likes of Broughton.

4 . Question 1

- Take regard of infrastructure needs
- The bullet points are only going to be worthy of consideration if all the infrastructure partners are persuaded to resource the current growth before considering future growth.
- The bullets presume continued growth; what if we stayed as we are?
- The bullet points need to be more-brief and clearly expressed
- Disagree with page 15. There must be some restriction in Development, otherwise what is the point of a plan?
- I do not believe rural communities have International aspirations.
- No mention of rural communities, farmland, woodland & waterways.
- I do think that there is a tendency to concentrate on the urban centre of Milton Keynes, perhaps at the expense of the rural areas.

Summaries of suggested amendments and additions to bullet points;

- Add preserving the unique character of MK with its mix of city, market town and rural villages
- New bullet: In Milton Keynes, protection of rural communities and associated countryside will be paramount. In Milton Keynes development plans will avoid promulgation of Urban Sprawl. In Milton Keynes full attention will be paid to Neighbourhood Plans, and that Bow Brickhill Policy BBNP3 Design and Environment (concerning criteria for new development in the vicinity) will be honoured
- Preceding the list of bullet points it reads "In the longer term, Milton Keynes could become a place: My attention is drawn to the words could become have these bullet points not actually been achieved?"
- Bullet point 5 implies that growth and change will benefit citizens of the surrounding area. Some citizens might benefit but I find the implied assumption that all will benefit to be offensive.
- Bullet point: "That provides quality of life through opportunity and choice for all (a place for everyone)" should be changed to "provides high quality of life for all, rich in opportunities and freedoms..."
- Bullet point: "That has succeeded in achieving easy movement and access for all." Should be changed to "That has succeeded in achieving easy movement and abundant access for all the goal of being able to take transit whenever and wherever you need it increases your freedom and leads to the logic of the frequent-network-grid."
- Bullet point: "Where infrastructure needs have been met through the smart use of resources and technology" should be changed to "Where infrastructure needs have been met, with smart use of resources and technology."
- Include reference to conserving/protecting MKs special Landscape character or unique architecture and planning form.
- They contain no sense of the look and feel of the city
- I am not sure that MK's cultural range and diversity comes through in these bullet points.
- Need more specific statements each dealing with a specific theme, i.e. quality of life/health; economy; infrastructure/technology; sustainability/energy/environment; housing
- Bullet points need to be more controversial
- They are too complicated and all-encompassing. A really good vision should have a single message, something that can be used to build a strong narrative around.

4 . Question 1

- Two particularly important bullet points is the notion of a place for everyone - recognising that people need a range of different areas and landscapes in which to live. Also important is that any development should benefit the citizens of MK and the surrounding area
- Opportunity for innovative & distinctive architecture & to attract high tech/scientific companies to establish themselves in Milton Keynes.
- Some phrases need exploring in more detail, what is meant by grown and developed in a sustainable way?
- "infrastructure needs" cannot be met only by "smart resources/technology" but can be supported by "smart use". Additional resources are essential.
- The bullet points need to reflect global changes e.g. meeting the issue of food production not meeting demand
- Can MK grow in a sustainable way if there is a move away from its pursuit of low density development and car dependency? Will the Plan:MK objective of reducing CO2 emissions result in a rejection of the Core Strategy? Is not Milton Keynes expected to contribute to the 80% CO2 emission levels by 2050 as set out in the 2008 Climate Change Act?
- The transport corridors should be utilised, especially H5 / H6 and V6 / V7, using trams, driverless pods, etc to provide rapid, cheap mass transit on a grade-separated basis.
- Greater emphasis to build on areas where MK has succeeded eg green credentials, recreational space, environmental issues.
- Rephrase bullet point to: That provides high quality of life for all, rich in opportunities and freedoms or similar
- Consider the opposite to the bullet point aspirations - eg for the first bullet point, MK as a place: That has grown and developed in [an un-] sustainable way that [fails to respect] its original concepts is unlikely to win any votes and so on down the list. For responses to this question to be usefully informative, specific options for critical evaluation by respondents are needed, e.g., MK as a place in which x , y or z dwellings would have been developed by 2030, in areas a , b , c and/or d (with summarised infrastructure support) and with conservation, or green belt areas e , f , g and/or h safeguarded to prevent unregulated urban sprawl contrary to the spirit of the original MKDC concept.
- First bullet point should be amended to: That has grown and developed in a sustainable way that respects its original concepts & historic settlements whilst embracing innovation and change.
- Disagree with the first bullet point - That has grown and developed in a sustainable way that respects its original concepts whilst embracing innovation and change. Too much development in the centre is not in line with the original MK concept to distribute housing, industry, business and shopping evenly throughout MK.
- The caveat in Q1 ("to be used alongside other inputs") suggests that at some later date the ideals contained in the bullet points will be sacrificed to some currently unspecified "other inputs".
- The bullet points fail to take into account the views of MK residents, protection of rural communities and countryside will be paramount, that completion of existing approved developments will precede any green-field allocation for further development, that in MK a culture of respect for residents and their views will be enshrined in policy, avoid promulgation of Urban Sprawl and protect/maintain/respect existing buildings, street patterns and local context.
- Trim down the bullet points to the following; 1. Innovate, and think green, but don't forget what has worked so well in the past, 2. The quality of a city is the happiness

4 . Question 1

of its people, 3. Green transport must be at the centre of our thinking, 4. Attract top employees and top employers by making MK desirable, 5. Look after the needs of the young and the old; they bind us all to each other

Summarised suggestions for new bullet points;

- Education
- Preserving and minimising impact on the natural environment
- The benefits of the natural environment to the quality of life within MK
- Forward thinking and continually striving to be the best fit for citizens
- Sustainable Development
- Healthcare
- Preserving the unique character of MK with its mix of city, market towns, rural villages and Hamlets
- Social housing
- Include references to:
 1. excellent transport connectivity east and west, as well as north and south, within the UK.
 2. excellent digital connectivity
 3. hosts more nationally significant cultural and arts activities and offerings
 4. high levels of educational attainment
 5. high performance indicators for health and happiness
 6. distinctive character and appearance
 7. admired internationally.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

Yes, the bullet points are a useful starting point:

- Yes, however by trying to merge the need for a current local plan and a much longer term vision is confusing and ought to have been avoided.
- The bullet points are a useful starting point for the vision for Plan:MK. Sight should not be lost of these during the process and key elements such as equality of life, movement and access for all must be considered throughout the consultations
- Broadly yes, however, we feel that planning out to 2050 is a meaningless exercise. Past experience shows that that this is guesswork at best and that priorities will change in the intervening years. For instance, Milton Keynes was already planned to be a town of 400,000 today had previous visions been realised. We suggest that the 2050 vision is dropped in favour of a more deliverable 15 year plan.
- The outputs of the Vision Workshops provide a suitable basis for the preparation of Plan:MK

No, the bullet points are not a useful starting point:

- Not particularly, because we cannot see in these - what the drivers are for growth and the vision needs to respond to the drivers of growth.
- Without a credible evidence-based forecast of any details in the final Plan:MK stemming from the vision would be meaningless and speculative.

Summarised comments on the bullet points;

- The bullet points are too generalised and would apply to almost every Borough in the country.
- Page 12 refers to longer term opportunities. The development of a logistics hub at J13 of the M1 would be in Central Bedfordshire. Improved links with Cranfield University which could be a location for a new hospital is in our parish in Central Bedfordshire. As a PC we are surprised that MKC is formally consulting on ideas for development that are firmly in a neighbouring authority without giving a clear indication that these ideas have been discussed with the neighbouring authority first. If MK is minded to take these ideas forward, we would expect to be fully consulted on any proposals that affect Central Bedfordshire and for Cranfield University in particular.
- Concerns over the use of the term "forward thinking 'can do' place" stated in bullet 7. If Strategic Development Direction 2 East of the M1 motorway, was chosen as a preferred option, then unless the land owner co-operated, development in this direction would be unlikely to happen, thereby placing Plan:MK in danger of being un-implementable. Officers admitted that the land owners had not yet been contacted, but they would be approached and the land 'properly evaluated' if this Direction of Growth resulted. If land to the East of the M1 has 'yet to be evaluated', are MKC genuinely seeking the most sustainable solution as per current NPPF guidance, and if so what discussions are MKC or the 2050 Commission having with Government that would enable MKC to 'acquire and develop' the land across the motorway?
- We agree that the bullet points are a good starting point but the emphasis for us is on the following points: The retention of the concept of grid squares occupied by a population that is balanced in both socio-economic and cultural terms. The inclusion of public green space managed by the Parks Trust The dispersal of employment; retail and housing areas to even out the traffic flow The provision of a major teaching hospital and a university for the modern age based on the OU concept of distance learning. Quality of design and build of all built areas. Mass transit system.
- Point 1 The Council agrees with this to a point. The Council would suggest that MK should continue to grow in a sustainable way that respects the original concepts. Point 2 The Council agreed with this statement. Point 3 The Council would wish MK maintains easy movement throughout Milton Keynes through the retention of the grid roads and redways. However, the Council welcomes innovative ways to improve the use of public transport. Point 4 The Council wholeheartedly supports this statement. The Council considers that the building of a university would help to develop Milton Keynes as an internationally recognised innovative city. Point 5 The Council agrees with this statement but would caution that any future growth and change should respect Milton Keynes original concepts. Point 6 WCC is keen that fast broadband / fibre-optics should be in place and considered as much as a priority as utilities. Point 7 WCC agrees with this statement Point 8 WCC agrees that Milton Keynes welcomes diversity and would wish to see a thriving and fully integrated community throughout the whole of Milton Keynes.
- Q1 Workshop outputs for a longer term Vision (bullet points)
 - i,• That has grown and developed in a sustainable way that respects its original concepts whilst embracing innovation and change.
 - i,• That provides quality of life through opportunity and choice for all (a place for everyone). That has succeeded in achieving easy movement and access for all.
 - i,• That is recognised internationally as a prosperous and competitive economy benefiting from a wide ranging skill base.
 - i,• That has taken advantage of growth and change to benefit the citizens of Milton Keynes and the surrounding area.
 - i,• Where infrastructure needs have been met through the smart use of resources and technology.
 - i,• With an international profile and reputation as an attractive and

4 . Question 1

forward thinking, can do place. i. With a variety of people belonging to diverse communities across the urban and rural area. In addition there should be ambitions that create civic pride e.g. "that takes pride in all aspects of its appearance" or "that is seen to set benchmarks for the standard and cleanliness of its infrastructure that other cities can aspire to" Milton Keynes should be a champion for excellence in everything that is done here. That would truly be a way to put the city on the map. This could be linked to the high quality/high tech industry that exists here.

Other comments:

- The time is right for formalised, joint working with Milton Keynes neighbours to achieve an outcome beneficial to all three current authorities (Central Bedfordshire, Aylesbury and Milton Keynes).
- There is the ongoing issue of transport and mobility and the plans for the East / West Rail link, including an electrified spine from Southampton to Sheffield and the reconnection of a Bedford to Cambridge extension linking Milton Keynes as the centre of an east west arc. Also a dual carriageway expressway linking Oxford and Cambridge (via Milton Keynes). Key planned infrastructure such as East-West Rail and Expressway would potentially incorporate the A421 from Junction 13 on the M1 through to beyond MK in the west but could also be seen as an opportunity to open up land east of the M1, offering new crossing points or a new junction 13A. It could also carry the potential risk of cutting through the heart of current communities and impacting heavily on the rural hinterland of Milton Keynes and its neighbours.
- Concern in our submission to the Topic Paper consultation that MKC had appeared to have pre-determined the areas for growth before the start of the process. This was evidenced by the map included on page 24 of the Topic Paper Issues Consultation The Way Forward Preparing a Vision and Development Strategy for Plan:MK which identified the locations for growth included in Options 1 and 2 of the current consultation. This map gave the clear impression that there was no land available for development within the MK urban area or in the rural area of MKB to the north of the urban area and east of the M1. This impression was reinforced by the maps in the Open Space Topic Paper which showed most of the land to the north of the urban area and east of the M1 retained for green infrastructure.
- The Options in the current Consultation are stated to reflect the outcome of the Vision Workshops. Only one group of the 28 attending identified the area of Aspley Guise included for development in Option 1 as an area for future growth. This Option is not, therefore, representative of the outcome of the workshops and is a further indication that MKC has predetermined its favoured directions of growth.
- The wording of the consultation document has been understood by some to suggest that the area under the control of MKB will be expanded with the MKB boundary changed to bring all of the areas selected for growth within the control of MKC. We understand from MKC officers that this was not the intention but we believe that it is important that MKC makes its intentions clearer as the Plan:MK process progresses.
- Concerned as to how the MK Futures 2050 will operate, and how/when their recommendations will feed into the emerging Plan:MK process. Plan:MK should not be progressed too far without this important element having been fed into the process, and the results analysed. The main concern is that inappropriate 'short term' decisions (ie those taken for the next 10-15 years) are very likely to prejudice the much more important financial, infrastructure and sustainable longer-term decisions determining where best to grow the 'City' over the next 50 years, and possibly beyond.

What Ward Councillors said:

- The bullet points are a good starting point for the vision of MK in the future.
- Noticeable difference between the vision and the principles of spatial planning in the original MKDC Plan, and both need to be covered in a future plan: the vision of MK as a place, which will cover spatial and non-spatial aspects, and the spatial principles on which it is planned.
- I believe the bullet points on the list are all true, but collectively they do not give us sufficient guidance on what kind of place we want MK to be. Many of them would apply to anywhere in the UK, whether urban rural new or old. It seems to me that the list boils down to just a single clear differentiator: We want MK to be internationally renowned for being forward thinking, attractive, and prosperous by implication, outstandingly successful as a place/city and in economic, sport and cultural terms.
- I think we probably need at least a couple of other key, aspirational, distinctive goals. The rate of growth and/or potential size of the MK conurbation (perhaps by reference to other UK cities) is the most obvious elephant in the room that needs to be discussed. I would suggest the role of MK as a sub-regional or regional destination for leisure, culture and retail also needs mentioning.
- Further clarify the final bullet point about people belonging to diverse communities across the urban and rural area. If this bullet point relates entirely to different types of settlement (conurbation, rural towns, rural villages, urban embedded villages, etc), I think I support it but would ask for it to be reworded for clarity. On the other hand, if the term communities² is used in the multicultural, ethnicity sense, I believe we should aspire to creating MK as one big community that everyone feels they belong to, whatever other communities or culture, ethnicity, lifestyle or interests people feel they also belong to.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- We would say yes but that the following should be added: ~Housing that will meet the needs and aspirations of the existing population and of future residents by the provision of an appropriate range of sizes, values, styles, tenures and densities. We also have a question mark about whether Plan:MK can deliver opportunity and choice for all and a prosperous and competitive economy

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- The bullet points considered a useful starting point to develop a vision for Plan:MK. There needs to be a reference to environmental aspects (existing landscape and green infrastructure). There also needs to be a specified timeframe for this vision and whether it refers to Plan:MK or the longer term vision related to MK Futures 2050.

What national/statutory organisation said:

- Include reference to maintaining, enhancing and creating wildlife-rich green spaces in the Vision, and as a bullet point within Other Long Term Opportunities.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Yes, these points provide a reasonable starting point for consideration
- The bullet points are very generic and could broadly apply to any major town or city

4 . Question 1

- Growth should be achieved by proportionate re-use of previously developed land alongside additional greenfield opportunities.
- Needs reference to climate, environmental impact and human health
- The vision for Milton Keynes should be ambitious and bold in its targets to meet short and long terms growth requirements of Milton Keynes
- Amend the bullet points and future vision to state the Councils commitment to providing affordable housing
- Include the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development
- Needs reference to the environment/biodiversity
- Needs reference to neighbouring authorities
- Why was not the Topic Paper Consultation and Report not used to formulate this list?
- Further refinement and greater explanation is needed
- No, the bullet points are too vague and need to be more specific.
- Needs reference to protecting neighbouring rural communities and open countryside from congested urban sprawl.
- Needs reference to what will receive full protection against future development, e.g. the linear park system and the surrounding green space which provides an important wildlife corridor; the areas likely to become flooded with the increased pressures associated with climate change.
- Needs reference to preserving the unique character of MK with its mix of city, market town and rural villages
- This consultation is meaningless without a projection of how population will grow.
- The incorporation of a longer term vision (Futures 2050 Commission) will be important to ensure that this plan contributes to the ongoing success of the town and its hinterland.
- The bullet points are MK urban area centric and fail to adequately address the wider scope of the Plan which relates to the Borough as a whole), the Plan should set out clear priorities for the rest of the administrative area of the Borough, beyond the MK urban area.
- The need to ensure an appropriate strategy to guide the principles of sustainable growth across the Borough, including at the rural settlements, should be identified and reflected in the bullet points.
- Needs reference to Milton Keynes as a whole does not only represent the urban area but also encompasses an expansive rural hinterland containing a range of sustainable service centres and settlements.
- MK Futures 2050 should be completed before the MK:Plan
- Do we need such a massive expansion when MK is already in the throes of building the east and west expansion areas and there is still land in the urban area itself which has been set aside for development?
- Will stretching MK well beyond its original boundaries as a self-sustaining new town of 250,000 people negatively impact on MK?
- No. This exercise will result only in those who have vested interests promoting them. You should first explain what things/places you think should be protected in a new Plan and only then propose a solution to your self-created problem of where any development would be most beneficial/least damaging.
- The bullet points should refer to planning positively and pro-actively. Milton Keynes can become a standout urban area that does not rest at the minimum level of development and expansion, but embraces it and uses it to become a world-class city that is exciting, whilst enticing as well as businesses to it.

4 . Question 1

- Reference to Milton Keynes, and especially Central Milton Keynes role as a regional destination for leisure and retail, and future policies should recognise and promote this.
- We support the statement that Milton Keynes could become a place that has taken advantage of growth and change to benefit the citizens of Milton Keynes and the surrounding area.
- MK should continue to grow in a sustainable way that respects the original concepts.
- We support that MK:Plan maintains easy movement throughout Milton Keynes through the retention of the grid roads and redways, and also welcomes innovative ways to improve the use of public transport.
- Encourage the building of a university would help to develop Milton Keynes as an internationally recognised innovative city.
- Milton Keynes welcomes diversity and would wish to see a thriving and fully integrated community throughout the whole of Milton Keynes.
- Fast broadband / fibre-optics should be in place and considered as much as a priority as utilities.
- There should not be an assumption that Milton Keynes should grow in size indefinitely, there should be a limit.
- As has been acknowledged by MKC the Vision Workshop process was flawed and cannot provide a robust evidence base to take Plan:MK forward.
- The plan must meet and achieve the full, objectively assessed housing needs for the area over the plan period.
- Milton Keynes should, in addition to being recognised internationally, also be promoted nationally and regionally as a key centre for economic growth. There should be recognition of Milton Keynes' and especially Central Milton Keynes' role as a regional destination for leisure and retail and future policies should recognise and promote this.

5 . Question 2

5 Question 2

Form of Vision for Plan:MK

5.1 When we come to write the Vision for Plan:MK do you think it would work best as a short, bullet point list or would there be value in expanding each aim with some explanatory text to provide more detail about what it covers? 183 responses were received.

5.2 The majority of respondents indicated that there was a need to expand each aim with explanatory text for clarity.

5.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- Expand each aim with explanatory text for clarity
- Short, bullet point list
- Bullets/vision should mean something not just buzz words
- Include reference to the environment/wildlife
- Dependent on infrastructure partners being persuaded to resource the current growth before considering future growth.
- Need to define terminology, eg sustainability
- Replace each bullet point with one word e.g Sustainable, then in a paragraph explain how and what will be done.
- They should be specific about what they cover
- Perhaps there is a need to have 2 documents, the first in the form of a synopsis comprising bullet points and the second as a longer, comprehensive and explanatory document, justifying need, proposals and decisions.
- There should be one Vision, not several bullet points. The supporting document can then expand on specific elements of the Vision.
- Additional emphasis on the need for a residential university could be made.
- Bullet points are too vague, and assumes unlimited growth is not just possible but desirable: MK could become a place that has grown and developed in a sustainable way. What is the capacity of the city's infrastructure? What is the maximum housing capacity of the MK unitary area? What is the capacity of the city's infrastructure? What is the maximum housing capacity of the MK unitary area? is there both a genuine need and the genuine capacity to build home on the scale MK:Plan proposes?
- Bullet point summary and detailed appendix including explanation of how Neighbourhood Plans have been adhered to.
- The Vision should certainly reduce the number of options and then flesh out those that remain with further detail of how each one could be realised with emphasis on infrastructure.
- Needs to consider current infrastructure, e.g. schools at full capacity
- Include specific objectives, with deadlines for completion.
- There is no sense in the vision that conservation plays a part.
- The council should, in collaboration with its citizens, develop and publish an attractive, viable and succinct vision statement similar to the six goals in the 1970 Plan for Milton Keynes. It should analyse and understand the local economy and demographics. And

it should provide the political leadership to work with the adjacent local planning authorities.

- The vision should be truly representative of the aspirations of the residents of MKB and that it respects the rights of residents from neighbouring authority areas.
- The form of Vision for Plan: MK must recognise the importance of local development plans, Neighbourhood Plans respecting the integrity of those plans as reflections of community values and goals.
- Links to sites of sources not just citation in footnotes on pages. Relevant pictures, charts, maps. It is a plan, not a sales brochure, but still has to inspire.
- It would work best in a picture/diagram/flow chart/box format, to give a more visual idea for those who do not do so well at wordy lists and text. This vision has to appeal to everyone not only those who are competent at reading documents.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- Bullet points need further expansion
- Short bullet points are not sufficient, there must be absolute clarity at what the vision means
- Some expansion on each aim is desirable, particularly with respect to how and when infrastructure improvements will be delivered and at what cost since these are key to the viability of any plan. Also housing numbers that are envisaged for each area are key to assessing the merits of any option. To date even a broad brush estimate of these factors is missing which draws into question whether this consultation is premature
- We believe that the format of the Vision statement is less important than it being truly representative of the aspirations of the residents of MKB and that it respects the rights of residents from neighbouring authority areas.
- Whatever form the Vision for Plan:MK takes we would hope that it would embody a respect for the rights of those living in surrounding areas, including the right for them to prepare their own Local Plan for their area.
- Why the vision for Milton Keynes needs to be substantially rewritten. The vision is clear to the people and businesses living in, doing business in and considering moving to Milton Keynes. For example, a key element is its location and ease of access to many other parts of the UK. Its radical and effective (private car based) transport system that has succeeded in achieving easy movement and access for most and which is based on a unique and effective grid system which continues to give the city a unique competitive advantage over its competitors. Independent economic studies repeatedly show that MK is the best placed of all locations in the country to prosper and grow. Milton Keynes enjoys higher than average levels of employment and business start-ups, and is among the fastest growing places in terms of population. There are strategic and often visionary policies set out in the 2005 Plan for MK and the 2013 Core Strategy that remain relevant.

What Ward Councillors said:

- We need more than one bullet point to define what is going to make MK special and different (currently we only really have one topic, the internationally renowned topic), and we need a separate list of qualities/values that are generic. If we word them well, the small number of key aspirational differentiators should be clear enough, in bullet point form, that they do not need elaboration. The generic qualities/values, that are not at all distinctive to MK (equality of opportunity, easy movement of people

5 . Question 2

and goods, smart use of technology and non-renewable resources), may work better as bullet points, or narrative, or a mixture.

- We believe that a succinct bullet point list would be the best presentation. For the vision, some explanatory text might be appropriate. For the spatial principles, the expansion will come in the policies.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Some expansion of the Vision is important in order for people to understand what the Vision means.
- The Vision for Plan:MK should be clear and not open to misinterpretation and should also clearly identify the timescales which the plan would cover. Although the vision statement will be visionary it should still ensure that it will be achievable and deliverable. CBC considers that the vision should include aspects about the landscape and green infrastructure to ensure that the vision includes all aspects of a sustainable community. Following the vision, we recommend that Plan:MK expand the bullet points listed on Page 11 as these are currently brief and will require further explanation on how these will be translated into Plan:MK and policies and allocations in this plan.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- We believe there would be value in explaining the green city principle upon which Milton Keynes was founded and that this be followed through into Plan:MK. A short list of general bullet points may fail to encapsulate this principle in full and how the special character of Milton Keynes is defined as much by its parks and green spaces network as by anything else.
- For MKs longer term vision - BCC would encourage MKC to continue to consider the implications of MKs strategic role as a rapidly growing urban centre and its sub-regional position in relation to other development locations; particularly in relation to improving cross boundary connectivity with neighbouring authorities such as BCC. MKs growth has a key role to play in providing a gateway for new and improved infrastructure provision from a sub-regional perspective. BCC look forward to working collaboratively with MKC to ensure that strategic infrastructure needs and other issues of joint interest are properly planned in order to support the delivery of additional housing developments.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Expand each bullet point aim with explanatory text for clarity
- Include the challenges of climate change
- Include the Sustainability Appraisal objectives to ensure the plan links back to the SA
- It must actively and clearly show respect to the rights of residents from neighbouring areas in Central Bedfordshire.
- Milton Keynes should concentrate on developing a strategy based on realistic plans with a specific direction rather than developing an aspirational vision.

- Include detail as to how all parts of the Development Plan, including the Business Neighbourhood Plan fit together.
- We suggest that in the interest of clarity the Vision Statement should be as concise as possible (no more than a few sentences), supported as necessary by explanatory text - in effect a blend of the above two suggestions.
- The shorter the better. If necessary, expand with an appendix to explain further
- There would be value in disaggregating each aspect of the vision to cover the urban and rural areas separately.
- The explanatory text should set out the clear strategic priorities for the MK urban area and the rural parts of the Borough, including the overarching approach to providing for development at the towns (including Olney) as an integral part of the spatial strategy. This will ensure that the policies to be included in the Plan positively for the infrastructure required in the area.
- Milton Keynes must not be allowed to grow in response to pressure for development, it needs to resist such pressure and remain in full control of our community
- We need a spatial plan, the design of which can be tested simply for its ability to satisfy whatever bullet puts you choose to assemble. For example, a spatial plan should exploit existing and new transport corridors, and avoid strategic constraints such as flood risk. It should connect places, widen choice, provide attractive opportunities for inward investment and self-generated growth, and opportunities for a healthy and fulfilling life.
- A vision set out as bullet points, even with explanatory text, has to be compatible across all the points
- We would urge MK Council to lead the way in exercising its Duty to Co-operate and - while Plan:MK is focused on the Borough without further delay be transparent and proactive in promoting and sustaining a longer term wider area discussion jointly with the neighbouring authorities.
- Vision for MK should reinstate a development corporation approach, be bold and visionary in decision making and embrace being the regional economic driver. Retain grid, city of trees vision as defining features.
- We suggest that an additional bullet point should be added to read: Engaging positively with the work being undertaken by the DfT on an Oxford to Cambridge Expressway to ensure that economic and infrastructure benefits for MK which may arise from this proposal are fully explored and maximised.

6 Question 3

Other opportunities

6.1 What are your thoughts on this list of workshop outputs? Do you think there are any that should be considered further through Plan:MK? 182 responses were received.

6.2 The majority of respondents agreed with many of the points, but said that other points could be included.

6.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What member of the public said:

- I agree with many of the points, but other points could be included
- I am happy with /have no objections with the workshop list
- MK must strive to develop and refresh itself to create a buzz and atmosphere as a city for people and serving people whether they live, work or simply just visit. Creating an inviting atmosphere, pedestrian friendly with ability to move not just between other cities, business centres and retail/leisure activities but also for city-dwellers to move between MK-based leisure and retail centres and of equal importance, the urban and rural environments. Currently MK is tired, none of the areas of interest link together particularly well station, the Hub, INTU, Theatre District. Stadium MK has leisure and retail attractions and Kingston Centre has a range of shops and restaurants but none are linked particularly well. The centre is not as thriving as one would expect given all the investment in the area since many leave (commute out) come the evening rather than living locally and have easy access to key areas. Having a better designed station with a rapid transit system connecting all points of the compass would incentivise people to venture into MK perhaps as the pass through MK rather than just heading home to the outskirts.
- An integrated transport system in CMK and beyond, using the grid roads or considering alternative methods of transport, including light rail, tram or an overhead system
- How can we make current transport hubs work better, including connection to the M1, east West connection by road and rail, greater capacity and ease of use of Central Milton Keynes railway station and/or Bletchley, assisting the needs of different transportation users, i.e. local traffic/the commuter/freight? Intercity commuter residential infrastructure needs to be more focused on the transport hubs. The CMK business hub needs to be much denser to aid communication and collaboration and create a business buzz. Service industry, leisure and retail need to be integrated.
- Re-establish/respect the original Mk concepts, high standards were set for planning and development, reinforcing the heritage, landmarks and buildings, green city, wide open spaces, low density in award winning houses and the distinctive character of the city.
- A tram system would be good, and also connecting up waterways.
- Improve the infrastructure and transport system, and to maintain and maximise the heritage of the area.
- Some of the bullet points may have a place in a Local Plan(such as the integrated transport system or better transport links, development of a logistics hub, Lifetime

Homes. However, others are out of scope either geographically, such as Cranfield which is in Bedfordshire, or are not planning matters.

- Does not cater for the aspirations of the rural and village Communities
- More emphasis on promoting integrated biodiversity-supporting infrastructure, with parks, wildlife conservation areas and balancing lakes connected by green corridors.
- Milton Keynes as a leading 'green' city with much greater emphasis on lower carbon footprint
- Encouraging more independent retailers, restaurants and other businesses, with outlets for creative uses, in CMK and other locations.
- The creation of an urban buzz in CMK, with a 24/7 and 365 days a year economy, with day- and night-time transport, and a CMK that isn't just about the shopping centre.
- The creation of a 24/7 city does not seem compatible with the original principles of a Garden City.
- Enhanced cultural diversity with arts, sports and environmental facilities in areas across MK.
- I disagree with - Create another 'Home World' type exhibition, showcasing the innovation that MK has been known for. Help to grow the reputation of Milton Keynes through the sorts of things that help make a city an exciting place to be. This could include, for example, a campus university, an Olympic-sized swimming pool, a theme park or a festival site.
- Exhibitions, festivals and the like should be developed as commercial enterprises and not funded by the public
- I agree there should be another Home World exhibition
- Agree that MK needs to become more visible on national stage
- Higher standards for development
- Plan:MK has no place to be commenting on development at Junction 13 of the M1 which is within Central Bedfordshire. Similarly with any development of Cranfield University. Both these issues are the responsibility of a Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire created by CBC.
- There is a lack of questioning of whether it is really in the best interests of residents to promote an expansion of the MK population by more than 50%. We see no benefits. There is scope to make current transport hubs work better, including connection to the M1, East West connections by road and rail, Intercity commuter residential infrastructure needs to be focused on the transport hubs. The CMK business hub needs to be much denser to aid communication and collaboration and create a business buzz.
- They need to be realistic ideas
- The list fails to be aspirational and unlikely to be delivered
- I do not believe that the objectives themselves are correct as they seek to solve issues that are not those that the town/city currently faces.
- No mention of OU how does this fit in.
- I agree with enhanced cultural diversity (bullet 8)
- I agree with making MK an exciting place (final bullet)
- Include a bullet point relating to developing communities with leaders and vision that grow and help themselves
- We need to grow education and health facilities in line with housing/population growth
- Any list should stress the importance of a strong and vibrant rural economy and the importance of the rural areas in the success of a wider MK. Rural employment, diversification and a range of housing type and tenure is vital and should be included.

6 . Question 3

- Some of the outputs would clearly be unrealisable regarding the ideas for a campus university, an Olympic-sized swimming pool, theme park, festival site etc, Milton Keynes currently does not have sufficient hospitality resources. Milton Keynes has potential to become a major international conference centre, given appropriate and sufficient choices of accommodation.
- It could be useful to list them into categories thereby making it easier to identify and prioritise land-uses that are most preferred by the public overall. Consideration needs to be given to the sustainable growth of these villages in suitable and sustainable locations. This needs to be considered further through the Plan:MK.
- I agree with the outputs which would support the expansion of CMK and development of transport systems and links
- I would rather see expansion of villages in the rural area, effectively each village taking their share of development to some degree. Expansion of 10- 15% of each village in the borough would yield a large increase in housing, not overload any one area and keep existing rural centres intact and balanced. Many local facilities currently threatened by lack of trade such as village shops and post offices would be safeguarded by this approach.
- The absence of a long term strategy for the growth of Milton Keynes has limited the value of this exercise.
- Prioritise provision of high-quality affordable homes for all, and alternative supplementary transport links, in parallel with any necessary extension of MKs distinctive and indispensable system of grid roads for motor vehicles.
- The key issue is an integrated transport system embracing all aspects of MK life and beyond. Without this there is little point in developing ad hoc opportunistic ideas. A University Campus we already have but greater support is needed to ensure the success of UCMK.
- Further consultation and workshops are necessary Bullet point 4 should be the first item and should be expanded to include: and protecting the identity of MKs rural communities and towns and outstanding rural highlights and their surrounding areas.
- Develop an international school/private school/grammar school in CMK
- Plan MK should acknowledge other planning contexts and consider how they may be mutually supportive.
- My vision for MK would include it having a centre for residential further education (possibly in a specialised area in which MK has excelled).
- The city also has a great opportunity to put itself at the forefront of transport innovation.
- MK needs excellent education and health provisions with a fully inclusive environment where people of all cultural and physical contexts can make a home, de-prioritise the Football Academy, health and elder care services improved. The new ad for MK should show that we are the most culturally and disability aware Town in the UK, with a focus on how people can work here rather than in London. Rejuvenation of estates such as Coffee Hall and Netherfield.
- Lifetime Homes and other new build standards should not be introduced where they will make schemes unviable or housing unaffordable. Focus should be on SME housebuilders, lots of small plots should be provided and larger developers forced to provide serviced plots to small builders and self-builders. Homes for affordable rent should be avoided in favour of homes for affordable purchase where possible.
- The list of points raised at the workshops are interesting in maximising the image of Milton Keynes, particularly the upgrading and improvement of older buildings, however constraints on transport and infrastructure within the local area are already evident

given current capacities so this would have to be addressed before further additional development.

- The Vision proposals do not seem to have considered the pressure on existing Hospital and NHS services
- Support healthy living with its attractive open spaces and world class sporting facilities
- Expansion within current boundaries of MK needs more thought before the countryside between MK and surrounding Villages is destroyed
- Infrastructure before expansion
- Adequate provision of community facilities
- There is no scope for trams
- The point about easy access and movement for all is not achievable in some rural areas without major road improvements, which will then spoil the rural aspect of these areas. Ease of access within the existing urban environment should be considered a priority before cutting swathes through rural areas.
- Improved links with Cranfield University, which could develop to become an undergraduate university and could even be a location for a new hospital to serve both Milton Keynes and Bedford.
- Cranfield University is independent of MK and would not be influenced by its aims.
- No mention of redways
- More thought given to the largely rural portion of the borough north east of the M1. I believe a separate vision and opportunities list should be written with emphasis on the long term rural settlements and protection of open space in the borough north east of the M1.
- The key issues are innovative design of both integrated transport and sustainable homes, also need to be included in development of commercial spaces.
- The plan should be more people centric, a lifestyle not a place
- More encouragement of sustainable transport
- The list of bullet points are laudable; this list is only going to be worthy of consideration if all the infrastructure partners are persuaded to resource the current growth before considering future growth.
- Any integrated transport system will depend on the road system, and we should ensure that traffic bypasses Milton Keynes where possible rather than being directed through it.
- Explain what is meant by an urban buzz, why is this promoted?
- Cranfield University is a world leading postgraduate university. A change of focus to accommodate undergraduate students may damage this status.
- I agree with the provision of arts, sports and environmental (NB this term needs clarification) facilities but not sure why cultural diversity should be the prominent part of this.
- Urban buzz is fine so long as you remember that people live here now. No more racing cars or outdoor amplified music events.
- Complete the dualling of CMK grid roads
- Introduce more independent outlets, pubs and restaurants.
- A theme park would take up considerable space which is at a premium in the Milton Keynes area. It is not clear why this should be a priority for the future of Milton Keynes.
- The section on quality of life should be more explicit regarding the value of green spaces, which were an important part of the original vision for Milton Keynes.

6 . Question 3

- A transport system which does not depend on the car needs careful consideration to ensure that the areas around the access points do not become carparks and congestion points.
- Make Milton Keynes the city of the bike, enhancing safety by extending cycle paths/lanes to the roads to rural villages would encourage many to cycle to the city centre. Making better links with key destinations, including linking CMK with the hospital, the Stadium and Bletchley train station.
- The shopping centre has seen the closure of most independent retailers in recent years largely I believe due to high rents. Does the plan have a view as to how to attract these back/into the city centre?
- What research has been done/could be done to establish the need for further university education in the area? Would it not be better to target excellent centres for teaching much needed skills?
- Include representation of worship places or the inclusive design features of the Equality Act 2010. Any new developments should accommodate all protected characteristics.
- There is also nothing mentioned regarding education for 2 to 18 year olds.
- There does not appear to be representation or consultation with NHS, Local Education or Universities, Transport (Network Rail and Highways) to identify what can be done to fulfill these ideas.
- There seems little appreciation of where funding for these items would come from.
- There is no mention of how we would identify land for retail development and support independent shop keepers to set up business in MK.
- Junction 13 cannot cope with the additional traffic from a logistics hub. A better option would be to build a new junction 13A with HGV only access to take the traffic away from the junction. A link could be made to the roundabout recently constructed on the A421 which could additionally take HGV traffic from the Brooklands industrial sites thus freeing capacity at Junction 13. A bridge could be built over the M1 to the east to provide access to the southbound carriageway and open up the area there.
- MK should encourage high building standards
- The Code for Sustainable Homes level 6 could be a suitable goal for housing. MK could lead the way in development of cheaper sustainable technologies, and it could encourage clustering of businesses in the area if the city was a showcase for sustainable housing technologies.
- Cranfield University is in Bedfordshire. Whilst it is a world class institution it needs cooperation with Central Bedfordshire Council if there is any intention of physical links to it.
- Needs to include transport improvements for rural areas
- A through journey ticket would be very useful so that you don't have to purchase 1 ticket to go into the centre and another ticket to get to your final destination
- insist all new houses have south facing roofs so that solar panels can be installed to best effect
- Workshops should be set up in the villages outside the designated MK boundary to ascertain impact on local communities.
- Transport is already an issue with current developments in Broughton causing Traffic problems in Central Bedfordshire. Large queues from Cranfield to Salford which is now a Rat Run. Further development into Central Beds and around Moulsoe can only make this worse. I do not believe the Workshop outputs reflected any ideas from Central Beds, and are therefore flawed.
- Need to be relative to the subject header

- The list of points raised at the workshops are interesting in maximising the image of Milton Keynes, particularly the upgrading and improvement of older buildings, however constraints on transport and infrastructure within the local area are already evident given current capacities so this would have to be addressed before further additional development.
- I have not attended any workshops. Gauging opinion of the local population through workshops should be a good way of finding out how to move forward.
- What is an integrated transport system?
- How will your Council encourage independent retailers, when it does not control retail letting policies at the city centre?
- Reducing the pressure on MK's infrastructure should be given high priority.
- Why was expansion into South Northants towards Towcester not considered as an option?
- New motorway junction between Junction 14 and the South Northampton junctions
- Milton Keynes as a leading 'green' city with much greater emphasis on lower carbon footprint, increased cycling and pedestrianisation, renewable energy sources (solar and wind), and anaerobic digestors should be included
- In the new local plan for Milton Keynes one of the strategic development objectives needs to be to continue to establish tree screens between busy roads and new developments. Designing the town to protect residents from traffic pollution must be a strategic priority.
- The options put forward by the workshops (the 4 Directions) all presume adherence to the government requirements for the very significant growth of Milton Keynes in the national interest. They do not include options for the "do nothing", "do minimum" or "natural growth" choices. Answers to these questions could be of interest.
- The list is typical of a blue sky process that is encouraged to think beyond what is practical or feasible, outside of the constraints of funding, market forces or market evidence. There appeared to be no exploration of what had worked well in the past as well as what had not been successful, to inform the future. While MK Council tried to encourage wide participation from the public, the participants appeared to be representatives of organisations with specific agendas, with a strong contribution from those interested in development perse. Hopefully this consultation will bring wider general public views to the table. There seemed to be an absence of vision for a educational offer based around the necessary practical trades and apprenticeships, whether for student nurses or plumbers where MK could become recognised for growing its own workforce. Also there was an absence of vision for the conservation and management of the wide rural landscape and the recognised areas of natural significance within this landscape.
- East/West railway should be planned from the start to fully integrate into the system
- The construction of the railway line from Oxford to Milton Keynes with the new station at Winslow will open up North Bucks & will encourage productive joint planning with Aylesbury Vale Council. The dualling of the A421 from junction 13 across to the A43 will also enhance east west links further encourage businesses to settle in Milton Keynes. Better links to Oxford & Cambridge would have the potential, to establish IT/scientific/high tech/research businesses to Milton Keynes. Redevelop the Theatre District & the old Food Centre. Improve parking facilities at Milton Keynes station, a major commuting hub a new multistorey car park needed & redevelopment of the old bus station
- Encourage minor sports, eg badminton, ice hockey, gymnastics

6 . Question 3

- Generally, a town with over 300,000 inhabitants needs more junctions with the M1 than J14 (which is totally overloaded) and J13 which is well outside the borough. All four "Directions" include a "Possible new M1 motorway junction where the A421 between Kingston Roundabout and J13 at the county boundary. The H3 should also have a junction with the M1.
- Review the existing infrastructure, their significance and value then decide on either demolishing them or redeveloping them.
- need for more (and more affordable) station parking, particularly if MK seeks to attract commuters to live in the city.
- Connect up waterways
- The entire Workshop concept seems to me to be flawed, undemocratic and prey to vested interests. The intent of these workshops was highly unclear, poorly promoted and entirely unrepresentative. I do not understand why some options were considered and others were not.
- I agree with Maximising the image and identity of Milton Keynes, reinforcing the heritage, landmarks and buildings, and the distinctive character of the city
- I agree with a CMK that isn't just about the shopping centre
- I think a logistics hub at J13 of the M1 is a good idea, although it might make more sense to improve the transport links to the major hub warehouses already established.
- Making better links with key destinations which could include linking up CMK with the hospital, the Stadium and Bletchley train station reflecting its future role as an interchange with the East-West Rail Line.
- Improved links with Cranfield University, which could develop to 5 become an undergraduate university and could even be a location for a new hospital to serve both Milton Keynes and Bedford.
- Excellent plan to link strategic and important facilities within the city.
- I would add to the list the regeneration of Bletchley. It has the canal and an increasingly popular romanticism as the birthplace of modern computing ...not enough is made of this reputation. With a new transport hub, the reputation of Bletchley could help to stimulate a technology industry in a similar vein to Tech City in London. This would align with your bullet about enhancing the existing heritage of MK, which should include a celebration of the cutting-edge architecture at the centre of MK.
- Essential to any efforts to make MK special; Setting high standards for new development, for example Lifetime Homes, meeting the highest sustainability and efficiency requirements, and enabling older buildings to be upgraded and improved too.
- Bullet point 1 needs to be further considered
- Bullet point 2 needs to be further considered
- Merge the first two bullet points so that an integrated transport system that establishes Bletchley as a second hub
- Bring together the bullets relating to independent retailers and enhancing cultural diversity In relation to growing the educational credentials, I would not support attempts to develop an Undergraduate University. I would encourage more vocational learning opportunities.
- Increase the capacity of schools
- Address the loss of tree and hedge tranches, and access issues from V and H roads to Oxley park and grange Farm.
- I am not sure about urban buzz, but it would be good to have a CMK that isnt just about the shopping centre.

- The new Core Strategy and Local Plan must be guided by a longer term Vision that is highly ambitious and truly aspirational. It must take account of population projections, national need for more houses, Government's continuing commitment to garden cities, the Government's recent commitment to the Oxford / Cambridge knowledge arc, emerging Government policy on devolution, parallel European developments, Milton Keynes' track record in delivering and sustaining growth, prosperity, infrastructure and quality of life over 50 years. Such a Vision would release significant opportunities for national infrastructure, for example mass transit along the east / west axis, a ring road based on the A413, A43, A428 and A421, a new university, enhanced broadband and smart city integration, opportunities for businesses, professional bodies and sporting organisations to re-locate, a major park
- Only one highlighted workshop output can be questioned, and that is the point that refers to Lifetime Homes. It is now inappropriate to continue to refer to the Lifetime Homes Standard, following the introduction of the national optional access standards. Though Milton Keynes needs to be a place of setting particular standards, it should not limit and restrict the type of dwelling built within the Borough, as this will lead to unviable development schemes that cannot be delivered, thus leading to a shortfall in housing numbers delivery and a below 5 year housing land supply.
- How can we make current transport hubs work better? Intercity commuter residential infrastructure needs to be focused on the transport hubs. The CMK business hub needs to be much denser to aid communication and collaboration and create a business buzz. Service industry, leisure and retail need to be integrated.

What Town and parish Councils said:

- How can we make current transport hubs work better, including connection to the M1, east West connection by road and rail, greater capacity and ease of use of Central Milton Keynes railway station and/or Bletchley, assisting the needs of different transportation users, i.e. local traffic/the commuter/freight? Intercity commuter residential infrastructure needs to be more focused on the transport hubs. The CMK business hub needs to be much denser to aid communication and collaboration and create a business buzz. Service industry, leisure and retail need to be integrated.
- How can we make current transport hubs work better, including connection to the M1, east West connection by road and rail, greater capacity and ease of use of Central Milton Keynes railway station and/or Bletchley, assisting the needs of different transportation users, i.e. local traffic/the commuter/freight? Intercity commuter residential infrastructure needs to be more focused on the transport hubs. The CMK business hub needs to be much denser to aid communication and collaboration and create a business buzz. Service industry, leisure and retail need to be integrated.
- We were surprised by the lack of publicity given to the workshops, particularly in the light of their critical role in this consultation process. This was most unsatisfactory. The Longer Term Vision and Opportunities seems to be an entirely urban-centric list with no consideration at all for the rural parts of the borough which throughout the document are considered more as a resource over which the urban borough can expand. Plan:MK needs to recognise that Milton Keynes has two distinct communities, urban and rural, which have a degree on interdependency but which have separate and different characters and needs. We believe that the next step in the process should include a specific engagement with the rural communities in order to better understand their needs, concerns and wishes.
- Some of the bullet points may have a place in a Local Plan (such as the integrated transport system or better transport links, development of a logistics hub, Lifetime

6 . Question 3

Homes. However, others are out of scope either geographically, such as Cranfield which is in Bedfordshire, or are not planning matters.

- Plan:MK is not the appropriate process for the consideration of a logistics hub at Junction 13 of the M1 which lies within Central Bedfordshire. Any developments at Junction 13 should be considered as part of the preparation of the new Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire the preparation of which CBC has recently begun. Any development of Cranfield University is also a matter for the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan, not Plan:MK.
- As has been acknowledged by MKC the Vision Workshop process was flawed and cannot provide a robust evidence base to take Plan:MK forward.
- Q3/Q4 Other opportunities (than Vision workshop list) / The next 'big things' for Milton Keynes Milton Keynes does need to maximise its image and brand. It still is a modern city but much of its infrastructure is neglected and run down creating a negative image for the city. This should be reversed as visible neglect in public spaces leads to graffiti, poor behaviour and crime. This means investment in a thorough maintenance program. The main infrastructure of Milton Keynes was conceived and designed around the motor vehicle. The ever-increasing population of Milton Keynes will create a growing requirement to move those people into and around the city . Building more roads to increase capacity is unsustainable, increase air pollution and will use space that should be used for housing, industry and recreation. Transport capacity should be increased with a modern and properly integrated public transport system including light rail or trams. These should be linked to the main rail stations and park and ride facilities at the main motorway junctions and other main entry roads, plus the football stadium, hospital and main retail centres. It does need to create attractions other than retail that will draw visitors to the city. Ideas like national sports facilities, specialist museums e.g. Aston Martin, F1 or railway which could be based around Wolverton A campus University is an excellent way of attracting people to the city and creating employment opportunities at many levels. Perhaps the University could initially focus on courses related to industries that already exist in the city such as retail, high end vehicle technologies, logistics, railway engineering.
- Additionally, MK must strive to develop and refresh itself to create a buzz and atmosphere as a city for people and serving people whether they live, work or simply just visit. Creating an inviting atmosphere, pedestrian friendly with ability to move not just between other cities, business centres and retail/leisure activities but also for city-dwellers to move between MK-based leisure and retail centres and of equal importance, the urban and rural environments.
- WCC is generally in favour of all the outputs listed. WCC firmly believes that MK should retain and extend, where appropriate, an integrated transport system in CMK and beyond by using the grid roads and alternative methods of transport, including light rail, tram or an overhead system if feasible. MK is in need of a 21st Century public transport system in line with its 21st Century need. WCC would wish to further promote MK as a place of innovation and setting high standards for new development and energy efficiency by providing homes of the future.
- Mostly excellent but should include affordable housing plans
- We would add the following: Provision of diverse educational facilities (university/technical college/apprenticeships). Increase the space allocated for employment Ensure the digital infrastructure is in place up front.
- Of the Other Opportunities it is essential that current and future transport systems are considered in identifying areas for future development. Education, health and social service provision should also feature.

- For the reasons set out in our General Comments we do not believe that the outputs of the Vision Workshops provide a suitable basis for the preparation of Plan:MK. The potential development of a logistics hub at Junction 13 of the M1 is a matter for the Central Beds Local Plan being prepared by CBC, not Plan:MK. Similarly, development at Cranfield University is also a matter to be covered by the new CBC Local Plan not Plan:MK.
- The workshop outputs are questionable as the presentation of these events to relevant stakeholders was in itself questionable. The workshops should be re-run or their findings reviewed thoroughly with stakeholders (including Parish Councils, NHS, Police, Fire & Rescue, Highways Agency etc.)

What Ward Councillors said:

- I think the greatest benefits of this list of opportunities are to raise the level of aspiration and to provoke further discussion. For this purpose, it doesn't matter whether the items on the list are plausible, deliverable, or worthwhile. However I would strongly object to this list being treated as an agreed working list for future projects, because there is too much that is missing and no feasibility, business case or prioritisation for many of the items listed.
- Any of the list would enhance Milton Keynes. We would add: - More integration between public transport from residential properties and the needs of the workforce in CMK to assist with the modal change we need if CMK is not to grind to a complete halt. - More provision for the homeless and a design of cheap affordable accommodation that fits well with the MK ethos. - A full university - A concert hall to show off and complement the huge music sector we have here

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- We welcome the reference to setting a high standard for new developments, particularly Lifetime Homes but would suggest that the caveat needs to be made that standards have to be affordable/viable We welcome the reference to enabling older buildings to be upgraded and improved.

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- In relation to the logistics hub at Junction 13 of the M1 it is noted that there is already an existing business park in this area including a number of significant warehouses. Further information is required in relation to the scale and mix of uses that would be envisaged at such a hub and how it would complement existing and planned logistics developments within the SEMLEP area, including Northampton.
- The list of opportunities raised at the workshops reflects a range of opportunities for Milton Keynes. Two of those listed include areas within Central Bedfordshire; the development of a logistics hub at Junction 13 of the M1 and improved links with Cranfield University. Junction 13 of the M1 is located in Central Bedfordshire and therefore any proposals for this junction would need to be made through the CBC Local Plan process. M1 J13 will need further interventions and potential remodelling if significant growth in the area puts further pressure on this strategic junction. This long term opportunity has implications for overall development opportunities at this junction, the East West Rail Link and the station improvements for Ridgmont Station. The appropriate place for considering this is through the CBC plan process. Cranfield University is also located in Central Bedfordshire and CBC would welcome an explanation about this proposed opportunity for improved links between the University

6 . Question 3

and MK. CBC are working with Cranfield University to prepare a Masterplan that will provide an overarching development strategy for Cranfield campus and provide a framework for physical change and development opportunities for the campus over the next 20 years. Any further aspirations that MKC have for Cranfield University should be dealt with as part of the new Local Plan for CBC and discussed with the University in relation to the emerging Masterplan and areas of growth identified in this area.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- An Olympic size pool should only be considered if it can be justified through a robust study working with Sport England and ASA due to the running costs and impact on swimming pools not just in MK but in adjoining LAs. Ditto any other major sports facility.
- Consideration should be given to whether it is appropriate to identify a specific water efficiency standard as part of the New Local Plan having regard to relevant evidence as set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance.
- Again this list fails to include specific mention of the high quality green environment Milton Keynes has and which needs to be continued as the city develops in future. In our view, Milton Keynes must continue to be planned, developed and seen as a green city based around a strong, well-functioning and sustainably managed network of green infrastructure that adds significant environmental, social and cultural value to the city, helping to make it an attractive and sustainable place to live and work.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Plan:Mk should have more emphasis on the Core Shopping Area as a location that can contribute to economic growth for Milton Keynes thus reinforcing its regional status as a retail and leisure destination. Moreover, and in order to achieve this, more emphasis should be placed on attracting national operators and providing the requisite mechanisms for the Core Shopping Area to grow in line with the retail hierarchy, set out in the NPPF. Plan:MK must recognise the contribution leisure and especially retail development has on job creation in Milton Keynes and the wider region. Although we support the image and identity of Milton Keynes and its distinctive character, this should not lead to prescriptive policies that stifle development and economic growth. CMK and especially the Core Shopping Area must be allowed to evolve and adapt to changing retail and commercial cycles if it is to retain its regional status.
- As has been acknowledged by MKC the Vision Workshop process was flawed and cannot be used to base any decisions on. Plan:MK has no place to be commenting on development at Junction 13 of the M1 which is within Central Bedfordshire. Similarly with any development of Cranfield University. Both these issues are the responsibility of a Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire created by CBC.
- As has been acknowledged by MKC the Vision Workshop process was flawed and cannot be used to base any decisions on. Plan:MK has no place to be commenting on development at Junction 13 of the M1 which is within Central Bedfordshire. Similarly with any development of Cranfield University. Both these issues are the responsibility of a Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire created by CBC.
- The SMV note that not all of the Other opportunities have a direct spatial planning dimension e.g. Home World type exhibition and others can be achieved within the existing policy frameworks e.g. reinforcing the heritage landmarks and buildings and high standards for development.

- Sustainable transport is key to all of this. Public transport needs to be made more attractive (in speed, frequency, availability, comfort and cost) and private road transport made less attractive (e.g. bus priority, workplace and other parking charges). A tram network linking the major passenger destinations would be highly desirable and would be more attractive than a bus network. Places to be served would include the Hospital, Shopping Centre, MK Central and Bletchley Railway Stations, the Stadium, Park & Ride sites and other major traffic generators. Independent retailers should be encouraged. Shopping is currently dominated by the large chains. A decent market too, please! MK doesn't have to be big in everything. It doesn't have to have its own campus university just because other towns and cities do.
- There is general support for list of opportunities. The improvement of links with Cranfield University is particularly welcomed.
- We support improving links between key destinations such as CMK, hospital, Stadium:MK and the future East-West Rail Line. This connectivity will be important to the continued success of Milton Keynes and help achieve the sustainability aspirations. Improved links with Cranfield University should also be encouraged. This should be facilitated through growth of Milton Keynes to the East of the M1 and use of S106/CIL to improve highway and potentially mass transit public transport connections to the campus. Milton Keynes should continue to be ambitious in its growth aspirations and seek to continue to attract business, events and landmarks which will grow the reputation of the town.
- Whilst the list of workshop outputs is a useful starting point for the plan, as set out above, a fundamental requirement for the plan to be found sound is to ensure that it both identifies and then meets full, objectively assessed housing needs. Without achieving this objective, the plan will fail. The workshop outputs do not identify this fundamental requirement as a key issue to be addressed in the plan and this is, at present, a failing which needs to be addressed in future versions of the plan. This is important given that a number of the other workshop outputs could be read as to be restricting necessary development growth, and it is important that the plan achieves a variety of objectives, but that for example maximising the image and identity of Milton Keynes and reinforcing its heritage should not be at the expense of delivering necessary housing growth.
- NPWG is generally in favour of all the outputs listed. NPWG firmly believes that MK should retain and extend, where appropriate, an integrated transport system in CMK and beyond by using the grid roads and alternative methods of transport, including light rail, tram or an overhead system if feasible. NPWG would wish to further promote MK as a place of innovation and setting high standards for new development and energy efficiency by providing homes of the future.
- Issues relating to transport, not just within the City's existing built up area but beyond, should definitely be considered as part of Plan:MK. As recognised in Section 4 in respect of Direction of Growth 1, there are opportunities for linking development to new sustainable transport, particularly the East West Rail Line to the west of Milton Keynes. New development could facilitate the provision of additional station(s) in appropriate locations; one such being to the north of Newton Longville. This could form part of a transport interchange including a Park and Ride facility with direct links to the Bletchley southern bypass, thereby providing significant opportunities for modal shift.
- They read as a broad wish-list rather than potentially deliverable policies. An integrated transport system is to be encouraged, but the barriers to creating an entirely new network such as tram or light rail should not be underestimated - substantial technical assessment / analysis would be required very soon.

6 . Question 3

- Full advantage should be taken of existing transport infrastructure, and more specifically, Plan:MK should prioritise development that would assist with the implementation and success of the East-West Rail Line, in addition to any planned improvements to the A421 corridor to Buckingham.
- Improved links to Cranfield University could have a significant impact on employment forecasts, and create a knock-on effect on overall housing requirements, suggesting the need to reconsider overall planned targets.
- Development to the east of the M1 is problematic in various respects.
- Focuses entirely on the urban area and failed to provide the well-connected MK, with main infrastructure already at peak usage.
- Any more devastation of the environment devalues the original plan for the New City.
- Market forces alone will not deliver the quality of life and calibre of infrastructure that is vital if MK is to continue to succeed. Plan MK must come up with the principles, spatial plans, and policies that will prevent MK (both urban and rural) losing its unique appeal and being turned into a characterless, congested and unattractive urban sprawl.
- Broadly the action points appear appropriate although should be added to. Once again they are generally very urban focussed and fail to acknowledge the value of rural diversification past the immediate opportunities offered in and around Cranfield. Both the NPPF and PPG provide a far greater presumption towards sustainable levels of development, bolstering of rural populations and the creation of diverse commercial uses in the rural area, a presumption that does not appear to be fully reflected through either the vision or list of opportunities.
- A tram system would be good, and also connecting up waterways. The workshop outputs should include preserving the unique character of MK with its mix of city, market town and rural villages.
- Outputs from the workshops do not appear to include full recognition of how continuing growth will impact on the areas outside the MK boundaries (irrespective of how these may be redefined in future). The outlying highways infrastructure is already under pressure and the impact of extra traffic associated with growth, especially through neighbouring villages and by-roads, appears not to have been fully considered.
- Light rail and tram systems have been identified through the Vision Workshops as potential public transport innovations. However, such solutions should be tested for long-term viability and appraised against other public transport options, for example by creating priority bus routes and implementing a park & ride strategy. The key objective is the attainment of substantially higher levels of public transport usage. The Consortium welcomes the identification of junction 13 of the M1 as a potential development location; a logistics hub is referred to.
- Protect rural communities and towns
- Include the protection of green space and biodiversity
- Managing flood risk and water use
- Concerned about the possibility of improving links between the MK Stadium and Bletchley as retail and leisure development in Bletchley has already increased significantly in recent years and should links be improved, there is the potential that the town will expand further, drawing people away from CMK.
- Lifetime Homes has been superseded by the new technical housing standards, it needs to evidence the local need for these, and test the viability of their introduction through the viability testing of the new Plan.
- The third bullet point should be re-phrased to refer to the prospects for logistics hubs at both J13 and J14 of the M1.

6 . Question 3

- These bullet points are all supported as long term opportunities, but we suggest that an additional bullet point regarding the Cambridge Expressway to ensure that economic and infrastructure benefits for MK are fully maximised. The next iteration of Plan:MK should focus on what needs to be safeguarded or put in place to support these ideas.
- Plan:MK should seek to maximise the economic potential of Milton Keynes by facilitating and attracting business investment and job creation.
- Broad wish list rather than potentially deliverable policies. Clearly an integrated transport system is to be encouraged, but the barriers to creating an entirely new network such as tram or light rail should not be underestimated, and the evidence base to date has not considered this area in any detail. Support better links with key destinations and prioritise development that would assist with the implementation and success of the East-West Rail Line and improvements to the A421. Improved links with Cranfield University could have a significant impact on employment forecasts and on overall housing requirements.

7 . Question 4

7 Question 4

The next 'big things' for Milton Keynes

7.1 What sorts of facilities or opportunities do you think Milton Keynes should try to develop in the future? 197 responses were received.

7.2 The main responses included;

- Improved health facilities/expand current hospital/new hospital
- Schools
- New centre for the arts: music, art, theatre, concert venues, galleries
- Improved, frequent public transport links using trams, light rail, monorail and driverless vehicles
- New campus university
- Plan:MK needs to fit in and coordinate with the complete range of initiatives for Milton Keynes Borough including 2050 Futures, City of Culture applications, competing with cities such as London, Birmingham and Manchester.

7.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said?

Business

- CMK business hub needs to be much denser
- Service industry, leisure and retail need to be integrated
- Conference centre
- Attracting business to MK
- Commercial centre for local businesses and entrepreneurs
- Locate business and commercial development in CMK.
- Science park for Environmental technologies
- Bring high quality firms/businesses into the city
- New home world exhibition
- Develop SME businesses
- Build on distribution centre of the country
- An area designated for small, independent, creative retail outlets

Culture

- Provide space for local artists/craft persons in CMK
- Multi-purpose space with flexible facilities
- Observatory and space technology development centre
- Festival site
- National centre for sports, arts, culture, commerce
- Nightlife district
- CMK promoted as premier cultural centre
- No festival site
- No theme park

7.4 Infrastructure

- Infrastructure improvements
- It should plan for future growth and match this with improved infrastructure and facilities. Infrastructure should run ahead of the growth, not the other way round.
- Intercity commuter residential infrastructure focused on transport hubs
- Improved roads/motorways
- Need East/West transport
- Prioritise/link up canals and waterways
- Solve the existing infrastructure problems before planning for new development
- Develop more redways extended into new areas
- Maintain the redways
- Improved parking
- Free/cheap parking for public transport commuters
- Better links with key destinations in the south of the city
- Development of a logistics hub from Junction 13 of the M1
- New types of transport
- Cycle hire/Cycle network/cycling incentives
- Monorail system into the city from the train station linked to the park and ride
- Expand grid systems in the outskirts of MK
- CMK is ideally suited for development between Campbell Park and CMK railway station
- Do not let the grid system grind to a halt
- Need a faster route from east to west across the city
- Provide for the car properly. No more "streets for people" and Non-provision of domestic parking spaces or narrow estate roads that buses cannot get down.
- Dualling of A421 & Bletchley bypass
- Sustainable transport - Electric vehicle infrastructure
- Development to the south west that links with new rail connection to Oxford, and linking to the East with Cambridge
- Park and ride from junction 13 & 14
- Keep the grid system and no more building city streets
- Single carriageway off ramp and on ramp J13a junction off/onto only the Northbound section of the motorway just East of the new Fen roundabout on the A421 (and connecting to this roundabout, which is within direct line of sight of the M1) would significantly unload the A421 between the Eastern edge of MK and J13
- Junction close to Westcroft, hospital/city centre, Kingston then M1 motorway
- We need a rapid transport system to get us to the main points ie: Westcroft, Kingston, City Centre, Main Railway station, Hospital, Bletchley, Stony Stratford and Newport Pagnell.
- Virgin run a reassemble services to Airports plus National Express coaches but could be better advertised and run to times of flights
- Linking the coach station near M1 J14 with CMK and the CMK railway station; linking the railway station to the stadium area; and linking the stadium area to Bletchley.
- Improved rail links to London
- Improved transport links to the railway station
- Airport
- Building roads is unsustainable
- New sky train system
- New development inline with grid roads, cycle and footpath

7 . Question 4

- Dual carriageway to north or south of MK
- More car sharing to relieve congestion
- More park and ride car parks to relieve congestion

Accommodation

- Accommodation needs of the population are changing with a particular emphasis on the build to rent sector providing high quality corporate rental accommodation available for all sectors of the community.
- New hotel accommodation
- More affordable housing
- No more housing development as it causes congestion
- Any major housing development should have accessible schools, hospitals, parking, supermarket, etc first.
- No more high-rise eye sores like The Hub
- Locate residential close to employment opportunities
- Create starter homes for low income/single people
- Use modular homes
- Vertical and rooftop gardens to provide green space
- More shared ownership
- Some peripheral housing development in rural areas for higher value housing

Retail

- Encourage more independent shops, cafes and restaurants
- Develop Station Square with top quality shops and restaurants
- No more restaurant chains
- Provide opportunity for quality independent traders in eg Bletchley Town Centre
- More shopping facilities/hubs
- Introduce a sustainable food market

Design

- Keep to the original MK concept/plan eg city of trees
- Encouraging modern, cutting edge architecture
- Demanding high standards of architectural and landscape design and planning

Healthcare

- Localised/central provision of healthcare accommodation for elderly
- Second hospital / Teaching hospital

Education

- Specialist further education/training facilities
- Develop OU

Emergency services

- Increased fire and police cover for the whole area, not just centralised

Environment

- Preserve open spaces/environmental assets
- Environmental centre (flora and fauna)
- More open spaces/linear parks
- New urban park for relaxation and wildlife
- Create a large rural green space surrounding and including the Ouse Valley Area

Leisure

- Rowing centre
- MK cricket club
- More outdoor leisure facilities eg Large area of woodland
- Further development of leisure facilities at Willen lake
- Better/more sport facilities
- State of the art training ground for MK Dons
- Outdoor swimming facility/ Olympic class swimming pool centre
- Indoor badminton courts/stadium
- Athletics Sports Stadium
- Multi-purpose leisure centre for concerts and sporting events
- Create sporting opportunities in each of the estates

Community

- Local meeting places, run by the neighbourhoods and offering a wide variety of services

IT

- Develop enhanced broadband and smart city integration from the outset of development.

General comments

- Local shops, centers and schools must be provided for newly developed areas

Other

- There is no point suggesting unobtainable goals
- Preserve unique character of rural areas
- Potential facilities are only going to be worthy of consideration if all the infrastructure partners are persuaded to resource the current growth before considering future growth.
- Suggest 2 new corporations: A roads trust and a transport trust funded by endowments of land
- Make CMK more urbanised.
- Do not increase densities in MK
- Set the Strategic Direction for 40-50 years in the future.
- Only one development option will provide any sort of 'Big vision and that is Development to the East of the M1.
- Develop available land within the Town limits before developing in villages
- Over the next 50 years MK should be a City of 600,000 people with all the facilities of a 21st century city

7 . Question 4

- I think this lies within the remit of the MK 2050 Futures Commission and that canvassing residents' views and suggestions should be a part of that consultation, and not this one.
- Protect existing communities identities, infrastructure, green space, grid system. Further expansion will risk all these positive aspects of MK.
- Redevelop deprived areas
- To be a world-leading green city.
- To develop an attractive public transport system.
- Develop links with Cranfield University and motorsport companies to make Milton Keynes an engineering technology
- Aim for city status
- The Vision should be highly ambitious and truly aspirational, taking account of: population projections, the national need for more houses, the Government's recent commitment to the Oxford / Cambridge knowledge arc, emerging Government policy on devolution, parallel European developments and Milton Keynes' track record in delivering and sustaining growth, prosperity, infrastructure and quality of life over 50 years.
- Expand: to the north by creating a garden city in the rural part of the Borough incorporating the Ouzel Valley as a second Linear Park and embracing the existing settlements as sensitively as those that formed the basis of the original Milton Keynes New Town along an east west axis following the line of the A421 from Buckingham to Bedford to the south east along the A5 to Leighton Buzzard, and along the A413 from Buckingham to Aylesbury in the south west. Such a Vision would release significant opportunities for national infrastructure.
- opportunities for businesses, professional bodies and sporting organisations to re-locate to virgin sites if constrained elsewhere a major park to the west of MK
- Keep the 70s plan
- MK should develop and build on its existing foundations rather than trying to reinvent itself. It should resist diluting its essential offer and not compromise on its planning, architectural, green and blue strategy which has given it its unique character.
- It should further champion its green and blue spaces and resist intruding into the rural landscape so that it does not become yet another city spreading out to its boundaries by building on all available land in an effort to become larger but in the process create a sprawling patchwork of large communities interspersed by small, lonely green belts until the boundary is reached and the rural character can then re-establish itself.
- Only develop within MK boundary
- Maximise MK image and brand

What Town and Parish Councils said:

Transport

- Intercity commuter residential infrastructure focused on the transport hubs
- Enhanced public transport to work/leisure
- Improve the M1 motorway
- Mass transit system
- Transport capacity should be increased with a modern and properly integrated public transport system including light rail or trams. These should be linked to the main rail

stations and park and ride facilities at the main motorway junctions and other main entry roads, plus the football stadium, hospital and main retail centres.

- Building roads is unsustainable

Business

- CMK business hub needs to be much denser to aid communication and collaboration and create a business buzz
- Development of CMK between Campbell park and CMK railway station
- More employment space
- Logistics hub at junction 13
- further employment and commercial development at and around Brogborough and Junction 13
- Maximise the use of the Bowl
- Maximise MK brand and image

Health care

- New/larger hospital

Education

- New education facilities
- Campus university
- improved links with Cranfield University and Technology Park

Design

- Statement architecture should be encouraged to define an anchor CMK

Retail

- Service industry, leisure and retail need to be integrated

Leisure/Recreation

- Expand Liddlington water-based recreational facilities
- Sports training facilities, eg swimming pool
- Olympic sized swimming pool
- Theme park or Festival site
- national sports facilities, specialist museums

Environment

- Protect strategic green spaces, parkland and trees, maybe scope for a horticultural centre of excellence where an enlarged and relocated Parks Trust could expand into new premises thereby continuing its excellent work and upholding the original MK 'green' legacy. There are excellent opportunities and potential for this use around the old brickwork workings, thereby growing Marston Vale Nature Reserves.

Accommodation

- Emphasis on the build to rent sector for all sectors of the community

7 . Question 4

General comments

- This should come from the MK 2050 Futures Commission and for this consultation
- to put options to residents as well as invite ideas
- Plan:MK needs to fit in and coordinate with the complete range of initiatives for MK Borough including 2050 Futures, City of Culture applications, competing with cities such as London, Birmingham and Manchester
- Develop existing Cranfield airfield either as improved freight location or extended short-haul airport
- Put in place the required infrastructure to support development

What Ward Councillors said:

- Double total medical provision for MK
- Internationally significant green energy, green industries business innovation & incubation centre including sustainable urban agriculture
- Need more schools
- Need a University
- Need a private school for 11-18s
- Green belt designation within rural parts of the borough and similar protected status for green areas within the city
- Olympic class swimming pool & diving complex
- Bedford-MK Waterway park
- Conference/exhibition centre (Walking distance of MK or Bletchley rail station)
- Corporate head offices
- New home world exhibition
- Freight depot to serve MK region
- Multi storey car parks in CMK to hold another 5000 cars

What Milton Keynes Council departments:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- CBC consider there to be an opportunity missing to enhance the green infrastructure network particularly along the route of the proposed Bedford and Milton Keynes Waterway. This should lie at the centre of a strategic green space and linear park extension.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- Develop/expand the green network
- Developing/upgrading Willen Lake south as a major leisure and recreational destination.
- Developing Campbell Park as a world-class city centre park with high quality environment and visitor/event facilities.
- Enhancing the range of recreational facilities at Furzton Lake.
- Enhancing and extending the Ouse Valley Linear Park as a strategic biodiversity, heritage countryside access resource of regional significance.

- Enhancing and extending the Ouzel Valley Linear Park. Conserving Great Linford Manor Park as a key heritage asset
- A clear vision for its green and blue infrastructure network that makes a positive contribution to biodiversity whilst enhancing the quality of life for residents.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Build existing planning consents and infrastructure first
- Zero carbon homes
- Encourage use of renewable and low carbon energy
- MK continues to provide a range of housing in multiple locations to support the growth of businesses and any other opportunities Milton Keynes pursues.
- Facilities and opportunities conceived and developed within your own geographical boundaries
- Sustainable transport is key. Public transport needs to be made more attractive (in speed, frequency, availability, comfort and cost) and private road transport made less attractive (e.g. bus priority, workplace and other parking charges)
- A tram network linking the major passenger destinations would be highly desirable and would be more attractive than a bus network. Places to be served would include the Hospital, Shopping Centre, MK Central and Bletchley Railway Stations, the Stadium, Park & Ride sites and other major traffic generators
- Independent retailers should be encouraged
- It doesn't have to have its own campus university just because other towns and cities do
- No, not a theme park
- Develop a University with an Undergraduate programme, complete with campus and halls of residence
- Sports training facilities
- Put in infrastructure to support development such as hospitals, schools, GP surgeries, open space, retail to alleviate pressure on city centre facilities
- New concert hall/Music performance facility
- Develop a tram system and link up waterways Milton Keynes should seek to preserve the unique character of its rural areas
- Culture outdoor space
- Space in CMK for civic business activity
- Independent shopping, retailing, eating, culture and leisure city centre concert hall
- Optimizing national infrastructure initiatives such as the East West Rail scheme, East West and M1 road upgrades
- Providing space for creative entrepreneurial businesses in the city centre
- Develop a clear vision at an early stage. New development may of course provide for additional infrastructure and funding to enable Milton Keynes to fulfil its objectives for expansion
- International school
- Discovery centre
- Wildlife sanctuaries
- Expansion and enhancement of the Linear Parks is vital Conservation area status for CMK/Campbell Park
- MK must protect its environment, both built and natural
- Expansion of the linear parks, redways and bridle paths should be an essential element of future plans

7 . Question 4

- Incorporate the rigid system into new development
- New development incorporate green space and trees
- Public transport improvements including interchange facilities such as P&R.
- This is an over aspirational question and should instead focus on where development should be located rather than the facilities it should create
- Develop a better cultural hub with local independent bars and restaurants.
- Plan for future employment needs and maintain its status and reputation as a world leading Smart City

8 Question 5

Continued outward expansion of Milton Keynes urban area (Direction of Growth 1)

8.1 Do you think that continuing the outward expansion of the Milton Keynes urban area in this direction is the best way to accommodate new development in the longer term? 922 responses were received (including those to Figure 3).

8.2 Members of the public were split between agreeing and disagreeing with the continued outward expansion of MK urban area.

8.3 A large number of respondents stated there should be no development in South East/Woburn Sands or close to M1 due to impact on landscape/transport/heritage impact/education/health infrastructure/sprawl.

8.4 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

Reasons for Yes

- Integrated development/good transport links/neighbour authorities develop adjacent land/natural progression
- Yes to development at SW/Bletchley, joint authority working could improve road infrastructure
- Would benefit from EWR
- There is re-development in the town already
- directions 1&2 should be considered together though
- Regeneration of Bletchley is a positive step
- takes some pressure off MK station
- Extending the existing urban area provides the opportunities for regeneration of areas
- Provides potential demand for the East/West Rail route
- But all builds must be in keeping with current design and layout of the areas
- But protect wildlife around Bow Brickhill woods
- Natural extension and would enable Milton Keynes to remain as one city, rather than being divided by the M1.
- Yes, although further transport is needed to ease congestion
- If either of option 1 or 2 are taken forward then it must be conditional on any sites outside of the MKC area being transferred into the MKC area
- Infrastructure needs to be there first, not after
- Apart from the impact on the Shenley Ridge this is an attractive option. It is close to the existing city infrastructure and the new transport links. It avoids the high capital investments of some of the other options.
- Development in this area is the best way to accommodate development in the long and the short term as there are already considerable traffic problems to the south of the city.

8 . Question 5

- Developing the existing urban area of Bletchley and regenerating the town could provide considerable benefit in terms of employment.
- Yes - combination of directions of growth 4 and 1

Reasons for No/objecting to this option;

- Environmental impact is unsuitable, see inspector comments
- Create extra pressure on infrastructure, e.g. schools, GPs, village character, transport, local services
- Flooding will be an issue
- No expansion of MK into rural communities
- No, should develop along east/west corridor
- No should be in the east
- Not in isolation, should be borough wide
- Development too far away and isolated from MK
- No, instead intensify CMK, redevelop brownfield sites do not develop on greenfield sites
- it will not achieve the targets for growth as it will be too expensive
- Outward expansion disregards the original and successful concept for Milton Keynes
- Milton Keynes should develop within its own boundary and not sprawl into other territory.
- No need for Plan:MK and no need for further development
- Whaddon Valley must be off limits to expansion for MK
- Too challenging due to railway crossings, and limited extent of development caused by steep hillside
- The A421 is already a busy route through MK and development in this area would make this worse.
- Development in north of the city between the railway line and M1 much better location for transport
- No, MK needs to stay as a individual area and not become so large that it uses its uniqueness
- MK showed it is unable to keep up with expansive development in line with original character of MK
- development should not be west side of MK
- Significant further development south of the East-West railway line would pose severe transport problems
- The distinction between Milton Keynes and existing villages will be eroded
- Develop within administrative boundaries before beyond administrative boundaries
- No expansion in north due to impacts visually/not well connected/transport congestion
- No western expansion towards Whaddon

General comments:

- This whole consultation is meaningless without a projection of how the population will grow. Whether and where houses are built in practice depends on how many of them are actually necessary to meet population demand.
- Outward expansion of MK should focus on those areas where it is most appropriate and acts as a viable and sustainable urban extension to the existing area of MK.
- Could potentially provide improved transport infrastructure

- Direction 1 could be an option BUT for SMALL scale development that does not require new roads big infrastructure.
- Development in southern MK very difficult due to transport/landscape/flood constraints and expensive
- Already development underway in south and west
- The main development goal should be to rescue MK from its present damaging and unsustainable trajectory through adopting appropriate planning policies such as reducing MKs CO2 transport emissions and building in a more dense way.
- Further development beyond direction 1 needs to be carefully considered
- No development outside MK boundary, use undeveloped land in MK
- Needs infrastructure improvements to work
- I like the idea of Bletchley regeneration and the extension of the linear parks but I think further expansion south across the railway line should be avoided.
- Base new development design on Broughton development standards
- Potential benefits to these villages from infrastructure improvements are tenuous
- Regenerate Bletchley, Fenny Stratford and upgrade Bletchley Train Station
- Strategic Development Direction 4 Intensification and Redevelopment in the Urban Area plan as the most appropriate plan for the future.
- New growth already appears to be ongoing to the south and west following the improvements to the A421. It would be useful to know how much expansion is currently being planned in these directions.
- Provided neighbouring counties contribute to the development of infrastructure within Milton Keynes to support the numbers of people.
- The expansion should be across the boundary rather than just a focus on the south of the city. The north, west and east also have excellent transportation links and plenty of underdeveloped space for new housing.
- put the housing into the north and east rural area and make sure that their infrastructure levels are correct
- A southern Bletchley bypass is urgently needed before any extra development.
- Development to the west including a grid road could work providing it is low rise, well landscaped and park buffers are created to protect existing villages.
- Expansion to the SW and SE might be acceptable, expansion to the west is not.
- We think that Direction of Growth 2 is better than Direction of Growth 1, but that 1 is better than both 3 and 4.
- Direction 2 is the most unsustainable.
- Support option 4
- There should be a balance between building on and developing brown field sites and further development out in the rural areas of MK

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- No, Growth in this location will cause transport issues, impact on landscape against inspectors findings, loss of strategic gap between Winslow and MK
- Yes suitable to grow in SW/SE, several transport links existing character of MK
- Should not determine housing/development in Central Bedfordshire
- Yes suitable to grow in SW/SE, several transport links
- No inappropriate, will cause coalescence between villages.
- The case for further development within the villages of The Brickhills, Wavendon and Woburn Sands is fundamentally flawed and formally request that Milton Keynes considers whether the requirement for further expansion over and above the current

8 . Question 5

- number of outline permissions is actually required and further that if so deemed, should consider areas less environmentally challenged than our villages.
- End up utilising MK facilities and put pressure on that
- Complete the SHMA
- MK has sufficient land to meet housing need in MK
- No funded infrastructure
- As discussions are already taking place with Aylesbury Vale, this would appear to be an obvious direction. Development to the south and west also has a number of benefits mainly because Aylesbury Vale Council also wishes to develop there on adjacent land. The benefits of scale from the two authorities working together in terms of road infrastructure (e.g. link dualling the A421) would be significant though, again, protection must be offered to existing villages by a green belt. Another benefit of developing on this route will be proximity to the new East-West railway between Oxford and Cambridge.
- It is important that the large-scale new development is a coherent expansion of the city and not a set of piecemeal add-ons. The East West rail link between Oxford and Bedford, due in 2020, offers an artery around which other transport links could be created. The opportunity to create a linear park as the central feature of such a development should be taken.
- Not necessarily the best way, but likely to be a feasible if not inevitable option.
- No, this is the second best option and need investment/infrastructure.
- No. New housing could continue to be delivered sustainably within MKB up to its south east order without the need for further development across the border in Aspley Guise. This is not the case for development in the area of Aspley Guise north of the Bedford to Bletchley railway line which could only be delivered sustainably as part of a wider development including land in Woburn Sands and Wavendon. As noted above we do not support further development in either of these areas at least until after the period covered by Plan:MK when there has been an opportunity to assess the impact of the growth already planned.
- No, option 3 is most practical as this will result in loss of identity of Woburn Sands.
- The original grid system for roads, which enables such rapid movement throughout the city has been ignored in the recent Broughton development.
- Whichever Development Direction is eventually adopted please enshrine in your Planning Guides that all future developments shall include substantial tree planted areas which formed part of the original planning guidelines

What Ward Councillors said:

- Housing target of 1750 homes per year as Borough housing need is incorrect
- Expanding the City south, southwest and southeast is feasible
- The extra 770 homes will increase the size of the city and meet neighbouring authority unmet need
- This is one of the directions that should be considered. Whether it is the best cannot be assessed at present because the technical feasibility work has not been done. Need to take into account feasibility of EWR/Bletchley bypass plans.

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- MK cannot require housing built in Central Bedfordshire, and MK need to demonstrate insufficient land in MK to meet housing need

- In our view the construction of a by-pass or improved rail links will not automatically bring about the regeneration of Bletchley (although we acknowledged that the by-pass & improved rail links are important in themselves). Also, similar sentiments about development assisting the regeneration of Bletchley were expressed historically with the construction of the MK1 development. It is noted also that most of the development would take place within the administrative districts of Aylesbury Vale and Central Beds, leading potentially to a situation whereby the benefits accrue to councils other than MK (such as increased council tax/business rates) but the demand for services falls on Milton Keynes. We therefore have reservations about this option.
- This site was discounted for development for a number of reasons and any development here could only proceed with the co-operation of CBC. The scale of housing growth envisaged for the Aspley Guise area is not clear as no figures are provided at this stage. However, we have concerns about any development in this area due to the impact on the character and setting of existing villages, the adverse landscape impact, the risk of coalescence with the existing settlements and increased traffic congestion on rural roads. We also have some concerns regarding landscape which is not discussed or highlighted in this option.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- More prominence with specific reference to include Ongoing protection of the route of the Waterway Park Support for development
- The location of housing growth in this area would allow residents access to the employment opportunities in Oxford and, at a later date, Cambridge. Growth in this area should be considered alongside capacity and station amenity improvements for the stations at Bletchley and Milton Keynes.
- It is suggested that outward expansion of Milton Keynes could be continued subject to reaching agreement with neighbouring local authorities and communities. At this stage no indication is given of the scale of additional development to the west, south-west and south east of the City. Further technical work would be required to establish whether there is available capacity within the foul sewerage and water supply networks to accommodate further development in the potential urban extensions or whether improvements would be required to accommodate further development. Similarly further consideration would need to be given to the impact of additional development as outlined in this option on both water resources and water recycling centre(s) (formerly sewage treatment works).
- Support the inclusion on Figure 3 of an extensive the network of green infrastructure, which appears to support the principle of strategically planning a green network and using this as a key structuring element to the city.
- This area incorporates a number of sensitive areas in particular are a key feature of the SW and SE edges of the proposed expansion area. This direction would need to include a disproportionately higher quantity of green space to prevent direct and indirect encroachment on those wildlife sites.
- BCC are generally supportive of Direction of Growth 1 given the challenges of future growth within Buckinghamshire, particularly within Aylesbury Vale. BCC recognise the impact of significant planning applications that have come forward along the border of MK into Aylesbury Vale to the strategic growth relating to Direction of Growth 1 and request that consideration is given to the mitigation of impacts on existing communities in this area as well as to potential opportunities to lever

8 . Question 5

additional benefits for local communities, such as improving connectivity between Buckinghamshire and MK.

- Development Directions 1, 2, and 3 will have negative impacts on communities affected; traffic congestion, increases in commuting time, air pollution, increases in demand for under resourced healthcare provision, and loss of rural amenities. All these adverse effects of expansion outside the Milton Keynes urban area is unnecessary when compared to the obvious benefits of Strategic Development Direction 4.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Yes, consider direction 1 as an appropriate Direction of Growth
- No, develop consented land, identify constraints
- No, development should be accommodated in MKB
- We support the growth of Milton Keynes towards the south west.
- No - Impacts on landscape, access issues, pollution, health at capacity, lack of infrastructure
- No - most destructive option, landscape impacts lose village identity, traffic congestion, no solution regarding Network rail.
- No, expansion of MK will cause car dependent sprawl
- No - Health and schools at capacity, Network Rail has no solution to the railway crossing at Woburn Sands, impact on character/environment
- No - no growth in Woburn Sands/Aspley Guise. Prioritise intensification.
- Concern - impact on landscape as a whole which is cohesive and key to Bedfordshire's landscape character
- This option is one of a number of directions of growth that will be required to meet Milton Keynes HMA ongoing housing need.
- Consider SW,S and SE separately. Best development potential is around Newton Longville with East-West Rail. Protect Whaddon Chase. Some small potential around Bow brickhill area. No development east of Woburn Sands.
- No, too expensive to develop and infrastructure already under pressure
- We would support the first direction of growth which sees development located in the south of the city to take best advantage of the opportunities afforded by the East-West Rail project. As well as connecting Milton Keynes to services towards Oxford it is anticipated that a service would operate to London Marylebone station.
- Any expansion under Growth 1 should be no further than the A421, which should be duelled, and should concentrate around access to the East-West Rail Link. Any existing village within the Growth 1 expansion area should be protected by a Green Buffer Zone.
- Development to the south and west also has a number of benefits mainly because Aylesbury Vale Council also wishes to develop there on adjacent land.
- further consideration would be needed to junction improvements and the potential need for new link roads
- MK should be planned to grow at its south west boundary along the railway line and to the south east boundary for the same reason. The East/West rail upgrade now in design confirms this, and the Oxford to Cambridge Expressway will relieve the pressure on the A421
- Concentration of development to the south of Milton Keynes could place increased pressure on the A421 and main road connections to the south-east of Milton Keynes are limited to the A421 (towards Bedford) and the A5130 (towards Woburn), meaning

further consideration would be needed to junction improvements and the potential need for new link roads.

- Support the continued outward expansion of Milton Keynes, particularly to the south west as the best way to accommodate new development in the longer term.
- The growth of Milton Keynes should be focused in the most sustainable locations that promote inward investment in to the city centre and maximise the use of the existing infrastructure. Extensions to MK are likely continue but they should tie in to the existing urban fabric and promote the wider improvements to MK, with less of a focus given to inward looking isolated communities.
- Object to Direction of Growth 1, especially any attempt to cross the Shenley Ridge or head south west beyond the North Bucks Way. The 2004 Local Plan Inspector commented that he did not see the Whaddon Valley as a possible long term development area as to do so would disregard the qualities of the valley landscape and the merits of the Shenley Ridge as a logical and clear long terms boundary.
- The continued outward expansion of Milton Keynes as indicated in Direction of Growth 1 will be a natural progression of the expansion of the urban area over the last 10 to 15 years. The areas, particularly to the south east already benefit from good transport connections, infrastructure and a large employment site at Magna Park.
- This area of Milton Keynes - in particular the west and south west - is home to a number of legacy employment sites that have been proven over the years to not be suitable employment sites and have remained vacant since the inception of the original plan in 1970. It is considered that these sites would be a more suitable location for housing, particularly given the prevalence of housing development westward via the westward expansion area policy.

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents...) said:

- The ability for the current SLA areas to be required to deliver additional strategic road improvements in the wider area is now passing. However, the safeguarded grid corridor extensions safeguarded in the SLA Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) do still offer an opportunity to tie back new grid roads into the MK grid system provided they are not compromised by the detail of current built development proposals. Plan:MK offers an opportunity (maybe the last) to secure and safeguard the necessary infrastructure improvements for this part of Milton Keynes in a comprehensive way. The rationale for why SE MK should be strategic rather than piecemeal expansion relates to the ability to collectively redress the current problems of MK strategic infrastructure capacity and connections and help integrate with wider planned infrastructure upgrades (EWR and potentially the O2C expressway connection through MK). We advocate that any such requirement needs to be set out clearly and up front in primary local plan policy and not left to SPD to secure delivery. Specifically, we suggest that a strategic expansion framework allocation should be made at South East Milton Keynes Furthermore, because of the previous policy support afforded to this growth location and its ability to resolve existing widely publicised issues arising from poorly planned piecemeal delivery of growth in recent years in this part of MK, it is respectfully suggested that the South East extension of Milton Keynes between the urban area and the rail line in this location should be included in all of the options for growth, regardless of discussions about longer term growth directions beyond this point. . We are aware that, for South East Milton Keynes, the piecemeal approach to development in successive local plans, the recycling of previously developed land, and speculative planning applications is continuing to increase local uncertainty and stress in this part of MK. Plan:MK and the possibility of a longer range vision provides

8 . Question 5

an opportunity to settle the future of the south east corner of the Borough in a considered manner

- Regarding land South of Bletchley, we advocate that positive and early dialogue is established with Milton Keynes Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council to consider the role this land might play within wider growth and infrastructure aspirations.
- Regarding land to the east of Church Farm and south of Lower End Road, these could come forward independently (with either or both parcels north and south of the railway line) or as part of a wider strategic extension to Milton Keynes concluding this quadrant of Milton Keynes. Development of the land provides opportunities to resolve problems of strategic access in terms of both road and rail.

9 Question 6

Sensitivity of areas on the edge of Milton Keynes to new development (Direction of Growth 1)

9.1 Are some areas on the edge of Milton Keynes identified in this direction more sensitive to new development than others? If so, which? Are there some areas identified in this direction that you think are more suitable? 169 responses were received.

9.2 The majority of respondents considered that areas around J13 and the East-West rail link provide a good opportunity for industrial and logistic use, as well as the areas around the Brickhills, Stoke Hammond and Newton Longville as they would provide the opportunity to continue the MK tradition of a residential master plan maintaining a rural feel

9.3 The notable number of respondents considered that Bow Brickhill/Brickhill woods area is unsuitable for new development as it would cause traffic congestion, harm village character, detract visually, potentially flood, have broadband issues, put pressure on already limited facilities, harm green assets and be too remote and isolated.

9.4 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

Development is suitable on the edge of MK;

- Direction of Growth 1 redevelopment would be suitable if any development in rural areas must be carried out
- Areas on the edge of Milton Keynes
- Bletchley, as it would benefit from careful regeneration
- Around existing new road networks
- Area north of Woburn Sands as within Borough boundary/part of EWR and close to M1
- Newton Longville Provided that new railway station were provided on EWR & potential for park and ride
- Near to the city so easier access to main roads, motorways etc.
- North and east rural areas are not bordered or hemmed in by M1 motorway
- Triangle between MK, Aspley Guise, J13 of M1
- North of Fenny Stratford Southern bypass
- West is not bordered or hemmed in by M1 motorway
- Salden Chase development would support EWR and part fund SW Bletchley bypass
- Yes, opportunity for zonal development of different land uses
- Land south and east of Waterhall park would help regenerate the area
- Land south of and adjacent to Dobbies Garden Centre subject to constraints
- Development on land to the south of Caldecotte between the A5 and Brickhill Street would help support EWR with improved train station at Bow Brickhill and around transport hubs
- Land alongside M1 between Aspley Guise and Kingston
- Development south of MK would be supported by rail connections/transport links
- South of Stony Stratford

9 . Question 6

- Whaddon Chase/Calverton/Wealds
- Develop north
- Development in the south east would be supported by new stations on EWR/largely gently sloping and featureless and M1
- Grow in new areas but make it attractive and original in design
- The area around The Brickhills, Stoke Hammond and Newton Longville provide the opportunity to continue the MK tradition of a residential master plan maintaining a rural feel.

Development is not suitable on the edge of MK;

- All the mentioned areas are sensitive, look at Landscape Character Assessment/Flood Risk Management Strategy Rural areas are crucial to city's cultural balance/potential loss of cultural balance/rural areas offer benefits of health, recreation and leisure facilities
- Development at Newton Longville would result in loss of identity, encroachment and traffic congestion
- Development south of MK barrier would impact on sensitive landscape, cause traffic congestion, harm local character. The location is within a flood plain and Area of Attractive landscape and result in loss of farmland. The railway forms a physical barrier.
- Stoke Hammond development would cause encroachment, be within flood plain and be too isolated making this area too remote from Mk facilities
- Aspley Guise, due to sprawl, traffic and infrastructure issues
- Expansion to the south would lead to disproportionate urban sprawl/sensitive landscape/traffic
- Areas of natural beauty/greenbelt/existing woodland/wildlife corridors/Extensions to existing green/SSSI
- Shenley Ridge/Hazeley Wood development would be contrary to Planning Inspector findings, cause coalescence, traffic congestion and be outside the MK boundary
- Development at Nash would result in the loss of identity/ Landscape quality, ridge lines, coalescence with Newton Longville and traffic generation/dispersal remain the vital issues to be addressed
- Development in the south east would cause congestion, be within a flood plain and Area of Attractive Landscape, be constrained by railway line forming a physical barrier, result in the loss of farmland and existing infrastructure is not coping at present.
- Development at Whaddon Chase is not suitable as it would be outside the MK boundary and the area is sensitive
- Development in villages and surrounding land would result in loss of identity and should be protected. Small scale development may be appropriate.
- Development to the west would impact on open countryside and village character
- Development at Weald would impact on open countryside
- Greensand ridge as it is rural in nature
- Beachampton, need to protect with green belt/ Landscape quality, ridge lines, coalescence with Newton Longville and traffic generation/dispersal remain the vital issues to be addressed
- Calverton as it is a sensitive landscape location
- Developing beyond MK boundary is not suitable, should stay within the Borough
- Cross boundary development would cause traffic issues
- Eaton Leys is highly sensitive and prone to flooding

- Moulsoe needs to be protected
- Development in rural areas is unsuitable as it would cause sprawl, impact on character and harm green spaces
- Development at Whaddon Valley would cause a loss of identity, impact on open countryside and cause traffic congestion
- Salden Chase is not suitable as it is a sensitive landscape location
- Further development at Tattenhoe Park and Kingsmead would place a strain on western side of the city.
- Development west of Calverton and north of Wadden would have visual and environmental impacts
- Development on farmland would not be suitable
- Central Bedfordshire Local Plan and not Mk will identify and assess sites within Central Bedfordshire area for development. New development needs to avoid coalescence and respect the character of existing settlements.
- Development at Winslow would cause encroachment
- Woburn Sands development would cause traffic congestion, loss of character, detract visually, potentially flood, cause ecological impacts, impact on facilities and too challenging due to railway crossings, steep topography and being too isolated.
- Wavendon, Walton, Simpson and Broughton are already encroached upon by development.
- Ouse Valley should be protected due to wildlife corridors/biodiversity
- Development west of the city is too sensitive to new development and will not be able to absorb such growth
- Villages to the East of the M1 is unsuitable as there needs to be protection of the extensive green buffers

General comments

- A detailed landscape analysis should be undertaken for all of the development options and edge of settlement sites should be ranked in a sensitivity analysis.
- The landscape character and topography dictates the form of development in this area with a natural boundary described by the Brickhills, Whaddon Chase and the Weald. Strengthening the green corridor between these features is important to provide a development buffer between the city and the wider countryside.
- If development in this direction is agreed, care will need to be taken not to risk the environment around the historic and cultural sites in the locality, particularly Bletchley Park.
- Sort the immediate infrastructure problems first before building more
- The majority of developments at the edge of a settlement can be seen as sensitive, but with effective mitigation strategies in place, sensitivity issues should be easily negated.
- The Council would have to work with Aylesbury Vale to plan a cohesive expansion. At present there is little cooperation between the councils.
- Improvements to the grid roads including the A421 should be undertaken with caution. It should not worsen air quality, increase noise disruption, should improve the ability to have a frequent-network-grid public transport system and work towards a vision of zero fatal or life-affecting road traffic collisions.
- If Aylesbury Vale Council intend to build houses to the west of Milton Keynes, we should involve ourselves in this process so that integration with a frequent-network-grid public transport system is good, and that those areas - effectively outskirts of MK -

9 . Question 6

have sufficient schools, healthcare provision and local amenities. We should not create a situation where it is necessary to drive to MK for every little thing. Western expansion offers the opportunity to anchor the edge of a frequent-network-grid public transport system with a campus university. Unlike a (typical) business park, most students and academics would walk, cycle or use public transport.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

Suitable:

- Development to West, South is suitable due to several existing major transport links
- Areas on the edge of Milton Keynes
- J13 and the East/west rail as they provide a good link opportunity for industrial and logistic use
- CMK is suitable as it would provide high density mixed use development, transport links and Campbell Park
- Area around the Brickhills, Stoke Hammond and Newton Longville provide the opportunity to continue the MK tradition of a residential master plan maintaining a rural feel

Not suitable:

- Yes some areas are very sensitive. Aspley Guise and neighbouring Salford and Hulcote are very sensitive to new development
- Development to West, South West and south east of city would be unsuitable as all development in this direction is sensitive. Impact on existing road networks, make all further development unacceptable.
- None are suitable, all the mentioned areas are sensitive to traffic congestion and an A421 dual link road needed
- Whaddon chase valley (SW edge of MK: Whaddon village, Beachmapton, Nash and Shenley Ridge) are unsuitable due to Planning Inspector findings, high landscape quality, ridge lines, coalescence with Newton Longville, traffic generation and dispersal issues.
- Central Bedfordshire should decide suitability of sites within their area, not MK. The character and integrity of historic villages such as Aspley Guise should be retained and coalescence with neighbouring urban areas, including MK, avoided. Open space should be provided and coalescence between Aspley guise and the new town avoided.

General comments:

- Bletchley should be considered as well as junction improvements on the main highway routes. This option will create redevelopment opportunities for Bletchley and Fenny Stratford as well as new sites.
- New development should respect the character of the existing settlements including Aspley Guise, Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill, Aspley Heath, Wavendon, and Husborne Crawley
- Coalescence between these settlements and the new town is avoided.

What Ward Councillors said:

- We recognise that Woburn Sands has taken a large amount of development in recent years and this is still continuing. If further development is eventually planned, this should be left till late in the plan, to allow a period of consolidation.

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- CBC considers that the area around Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley as being sensitive to development. This is in terms of impact on the setting and character of the villages; coalescence and landscape implications and increased traffic generation.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- There are a number of environmental features in this area such as the corridor North Bucks Way and the Whaddon Chase woodlands that are sensitive features that could be vulnerable to development pressure unless they are set within and buffered by a wider network of green space. It would be important to plan this network to structure the layout of any urban expansion in this direction and to ensure that existing environmental assets were not left isolated and fragmented. The presence of these environmental assets could, if they are conserved within a wider green network, present an opportunity to create an attractive and rich green space network enabled by and serving the development, provided this was all properly planned and sufficient resources were allocated for long term management. This would need to be based on a thorough technical assessment of the existing features and their sensitivity.

What local organisations/interest groups said:Suitable

- Direction of Growth 1 redevelopment would be suitable if any development in rural areas must be carried out
- Bow Brickhill would be suitable if sensitively designed to minimise impact on woods/hill
- Woburn Sands is suitable as it has good facilities, public transport and is deliverable
- East of M1 is suitable due to existing infrastructure, city links and strategic road networks
- South west expansion is suitable due to existing infrastructure, potential minor impact on landscape, heritage and ecology and minor positive effect on flooding.
- Development in the south east would be suitable due to rail connections, sustainable transport, gentle topography, featureless area, m1 already giving urban feel and no significant constraints to development within area
- Development at Newton Longville is suitable provided that a new railway station were provided on EWR & park and ride
- Expansion in the south is suitable due to rail connections and sustainable transport
- Development at Shenley Ridge is suitable. Direction 2 describes Shenley Ridge as a significant landscape constraint, however in MKCs Landscape Character Assessment this falls within the Shenley Claylands which extends northwards from the site of the Snelshall Priory.
- Warehouse development would be suitable in the Triangle, east of Kingston, south of M1 and north of A421

Not suitable

9 . Question 6

- The places where people because of the through traffic routes in to CMK and other areas currently live are extremely sensitive
- Bow Brickhill is unsuitable
- Shenley Ridge is unsuitable as it is a significant feature on skyline. Development would impact on the rural character of Whaddon Chase, impact on views and there would be landscape constraints effecting new development
- Development would be unsuitable at Whaddon Chase/woodland as it is protected
- Careful design needed to assimilate development into the south west expansion area
- Woburn Sands is not suitable
- Expansion in the south is unsuitable as it would cause transport congestion, be constrained by the physical barrier of EWR line, result in loss of farmland and vital flood plain, and impact on the area of attractive landscape and visual amenity
- East of Woburn Sands is not suitable
- Central Bedfordshire should assess the suitability of sites in their area

General comments

- Any development should remain in line with the retail and settlement hierarchies set out in the New Local Plan.
- Need to address current infrastructure problems first before new development takes place.
- Plan MK needs to refer to the relevant Neighbourhood Plans for the area, eg Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill.
- Avoid coalescence of new town with traditional villages
- In our opinion the most sensitive area is to the west of Milton Keynes over the Shenley Ridge. Careful design would be required to properly assimilate the urban development into this area. Also land to the south will need to be managed sensitively where it meets the sensitive landscape of the Brickhills. Further to the south west and towards Newton Longville the land becomes flatter and less featureless. The same applies to the south east which is comprises in the main large tracts of arable land and significantly, the M1 already creates an urban feel to the area. In these areas we accept good design is paramount but any harm that may be caused will be significantly outweighed by the benefits that the development will bring.
- We understand that existing communities are sensitive to new development. We believe that Wavendon Properties proposals for a new Area of Expansion have the potential to be designed in a way which would minimise the impact on the local community, and provide some genuine benefits. The development could be separated from the existing community by a green buffer, in the style of a country park, which would also provide a new resource for local residents. The proposed development could also provide solutions to existing problems, such as replacing the level crossing on the A5130 junction with the east/west railway, and providing new and enhanced school and medical facilities. The final form of development would be created following substantial engagement with the local community, with the aim of improving local infrastructure and minimising any impact on existing residents.
- The areas situated to the West are sensitive in nature due to high levels of congestion and strain placed on the transport network that would require investment in to improve as well as landscape sensitivity. All of the areas in this direction area are subject to this sensitivity and therefore it is considered that large scale development should takes place to the east of Milton Keynes. It is clear that the transport infrastructure in place on the west of Milton Keynes is inferior to that of the east where the M1 is located. Given the Infrastructure before Expansion concept that is

important in Milton Keynes, it is considered that development to the east of Milton Keynes offers a sustainable basis for growth in this respect given there is a sound infrastructure base already in existence.

- The capacity issues identified with the A421 / H8 are, as identified, potentially capable of resolution through the creation of a southern by-pass to Bletchley; i,· Whilst the East-West rail route is a barrier, it is significantly less so than the M1 which the alternative "Direction of Growth 2" would be required to address. i,· Shenley Ridge: this is noted as a significant landscape constraint, however in MKCs Landscape Character Assessment this falls within the Shenley Claylands which extends northwards from the site of the Snelshall Priory. As such, this constrains only the north western expansion of Milton Keynes, around Upper Weald / Whitehouse Farm/ Shenley Hill Farm, and does not affect the potential for development at and around Shenley Park, as proposed by Crest Nicholson. i,· Landscape sensitivity around the Brickhills is acknowledged; but sizeable areas of less sensitive land are available.

10 Question 7

Final extent of outward expansion of Milton Keynes (Direction of Growth 1)

10.1 If Direction of Growth 1 were to proceed, should we define an eventual 'final extent' of development? If so, where should this be? 171 responses were received.

10.2 The majority of responses stated NO they did not think a 'final extent' for development needs should be defined at this stage and is appropriate. Reasons include its too premature to decide on a final extent of growth as the plan will be reviewed every five years and use existing land with permissions.

10.3 A smaller number of responses stated YES I think a 'final extent' for development needs to be defined at this stage and is not appropriate. Reasons include for peace of mind, to protect important environmental assets and prevent urban sprawl.

10.4 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

No, not suitable

- MK has already expanded as far south as it should. The east-west railway provides the logical boundary between urban and rural.
- As it is, with small infill growth.
- Final extent of development should be the MK borough boundary. There are plenty of opportunities for Milton Keynes to develop further within their own boundary and development should be contained within the MK boundary. MK Council should consider the development plans of the neighbouring councils.
- Committed developments should be completed first of all
- The current MKB boundary is the appropriate final extent for development. Within the MKB boundary you have more than enough unused space to accommodate all future housing and employment need.
- What guarantee would there be that any new definition of 'final extent' would be adhered to?
- No! We believe that the original concept of MK, as a city of about 250 000 inhabitants accommodated within an area of no more than 35 square miles, was the right one.
- it may not be possible to define limits into the future
- The boundary to urban development in the SE corner of Milton Keynes should be as it is now no further than Lower End Road east of the A5130 and no further than the additional land allocated by the Inspector in the existing Core Strategy including no development between Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands beyond the current allocation of Church Farm. To the W and SW, the urban development boundary should be the MK Unitary Authority Boundary.

Yes, suitable

- The final extent as identified in the map would seem reasonable.

Suggestions on what to use as a final extent

- Use WEA boundary to the West
- Use Greensand hills to the South
- Newton Longville
- south of Wadden and run along the natural escarpment / ridge to Calverton
- Somewhere before Buckingham
- From Hanslope in the north, Pottersbury, Wicken, Thornton, Little Horward, Swanbourne, Heath and Reach, Woburn, Ridgmont. (All to the West of the M1)
- define the western limit of expansion by the natural structures, elevation provided by Whaddon Chase & the weald
- Natural forms will be the final extent
- If this was the preferred option, development should be kept to MK boundary to enable the rural villages to keep their identity.
- Expansion should be limited by the capacity of the existing road grid to access CMK, CM station and so forth
- No further than the East West rail line

Development potential

- Extension into Whaddon Chase would be an unfortunate but probably necessary sacrifice, since the city is currently quite lopsided, so it would make a lot of sense to subsume Calverton, the Wealds and Whaddon entirely.
- Development in SE - Already has a better transport network than any other direction, but this is not sufficient reason to push more housing into this already pressured environment just because it reduces the need for transport infrastructure expenditure. Existing health infrastructure is below an acceptable level.
- Some capacity for development to west as proximity to EWR and work with AVDC
- Development potential to the north and south west. Fewer constraints in the south west.
- Development along A421 and South East to South West rail axis makes sense. South west of MK has lacked investment in the past and has become more run down, letting down image of MK Investment in this area could make it more vibrant and a better place to live with better quality housing and new/improved facilities
- Bowbrick Hill and Woburn Sands should be developed, also Newton Longville depending on the route of the by-pass
- Potential for development in south MK as current development is already ongoing in this region, and it is already developed into a leisure and retail hub. Existing cooperative understanding between MKC and AVDC in place, and infrastructure is also already in place or ability to extend present services
- Add some extra areas close to Bletchley
- If MK must expand south and west then it is best done by expanding north of the A421 with a dual carriageway

No development potential

- It would be inappropriate for MK to plan development in neighbouring authority areas, concentrate development within MK boundaries
- Development in rural areas in the north and east are not suitable and need infrastructure improvements.

10 . Question 7

- Opposed to development to the south of the city, unless substantial infrastructure put in place, e.g. A5
- Development potential to the south is limited. Should not expand further south than the east-west railway line. The Southern limit should be the Bow Brickhill / Woburn Sands Road as development encroaching on the wooded area would remove wildlife habitat, and also Horse Riding, Cycling, Walking and other leisure activities that take place in the Wooded area. Any development should not be at the expense of healthy outdoor leisure activities. No further south than the Bletchley - Bedford railway line between A5 and M1. Benefits - AVDC wish to develop there on adjacent land & proximity to EWR.
- No development at Bow Brickhill and Woburn as development is too challenging due to railway crossings, constrained by steep hillside.
- Development in the southern MK sector would be very difficult and expensive. Roads, sewage, water, gas, electricity and broadband have to cross the East West railway line and A5, which for good reason have always formed the logical boundary of the urban area. The upgrade of the East-West Railway calls for improved road crossings at Bow Brickhill, Woburn Sands and possibly in between. Investigations so far have already ruled out several proposals as unworkable. Increased traffic congestion and gridlock are guaranteed. Continuation of urban sprawl toward Aylesbury Vale, the Brickhills, and Woburn Sands is contrary to Milton Keynes Core Strategy Spatial Vision. Preservation of the rural environment is elemental to the vision for Milton Keynes and accordingly is at odds with Option 1. The land shown in Option 1, if developed, would remove Milton Keynes only opportunity to connect Milton Keynes Linear Park to the Greensand Ridge, with its potential to be one of the regions leading leisure environments.
- No further building development south of the railway line between Fenny Stratford and Aspley Guise
- The Landscape Characteristic Assessment carried out by Gillespies as part of the research for Plan: MK is at odds with Option 1. It says that the land between Milton Keynes and the Greensand Ridge "provides an important foreground to the densely wooded slopes of the ridge" and it advocates ensuring "that open views across the landscape character area to the Brickhill Greensand Ridge are retained."
- No further development to the east than M1 unless it's a few small satellite villages
- Do not develop to the west of MK as there are existing traffic congestion issues
- No development at Moulsoe which should be buffered from urban development
- The extent of development should be defined by neighbouring planning authorities in Aylesbury Vale and Central Bedfordshire, not MK.
- The whole of the Brickhill Woods area should not be threatened with any future development. This area should be enhanced for leisure and wildlife pursuits.

General comments

- The best way of protecting the character and integrity of existing settlements that lie close to existing areas of major development is by maintaining a green corridor around urban areas.
- A clear buffer should be retained between Milton Keynes and Buckingham, Aylesbury etc
- The boundaries should be obvious physical barriers - East-West railway line, the A5, south to the A4146, west of Newton Longville and the M1
- A421 the natural boundary to the south

- The planning process should set the agenda for the final size of MK, the final extent of development. Many citizens do not understand the need for unrestricted urban development. The community should decide what final population it wants, not have a figure forced upon it.
- The protected Brickhill Woods escarpment immediately to the south already forms such a boundary. Along the SW margin, the extensive green cross-hatched areas on Fig. 3, labelled potential strategic green space and linear park extensions, would also seem to provide natural exclusion boundaries besides the Shenley Ridge skyline feature referred to on p. 23 of the consultation document.
- MK could look to plan positively by working with Aylesbury Vale to extend the settlement further.
- On the western side of this proposed Growth Area the final extent of any development should be the existing boundary of the Borough of Milton Keynes.
- The boundary limit should be determined by the road / transport infrastructure and measured by the time taken to travel to Central Milton Keynes, say a maximum of 20 minutes.
- The M1 seems to be a natural barrier and there seems to be an opportunity from the area east of Wavendon to join up with Beds authority along the line of the A421 from Jn 13 towards Cranfield. This is where the technology and logistics parks are developing and recent road improvements have channelled traffic towards Jn13.
- Existing infrastructure needs sorting out before development, Schools/health at capacity
- Final extent of any development option should be determined by an agreed maximum population for MK but, in any case, not beyond the area designated on your map.
- Ensure villages are kept as villages
- The focus should be to minimise urban sprawl by the creative use of high-density development within Central Milton Keynes.
- Consultation proposals could severely adversely affect Husborne Crawley, Ridgmont, Brogborough and Cranfield
- The focus should be to minimise urban sprawl. Development should be limited .So long as MK does not expand by more than 50% there should be no overall problem
- If any planning for the future growth of Milton Keynes in the south is to have any credibility an embargo should immediately be put on any current requests for developments, in particular on designated green space, until the plans for Milton Keynes are finalised.
- The starting point should be to build in a level of strategic thinking that allow for adaptation and change over time
- If a campus university can be built to the west, expansion could extend several estates deep. A station on the east-west rail line might also be added. Otherwise expansion should be limited by the capacity of the existing road grid to access CMK, this can be increased by developing a frequent-network-grid of public transport. We should not consider the M1 a barrier to MK expansion - long term, such expansion seems inevitable. Thus, western expansion need not be extensive. Southern expansion may be more extensive to take advantage of the redeveloped centre of Bletchley, and access to the East-West and West Coast Main Line.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- The final extent of development is already defined by both the existing administrative boundary and existing build development. The existing boundaries should not be breached and nor should development within the Aylesbury Vale area close to the

10 . Question 7

Milton Keynes boundary be supported by Milton Keynes Council due to the lack of suitable provision for infrastructure. Should ultimately any such development be taken forward by other planning authorities then it should only be supported by Milton Keynes Council if there is full compliance with the principles in Milton Keynes Core Strategy policy CS6 Place-shaping Principles for Sustainable Urban Extensions in Adjacent Local Authorities.

- Yes. The east west rail corridor will present a significant cost challenge to any expansion further south. Adequate room for any reasonably foreseeable expansion exists north of this line and the additional cost of multiple crossings should be avoided.
- The focus should be to minimise urban sprawl by the creative use of high-density development within Central Milton Keynes.
- The A421 would be the natural boundary to the south.
- Depending on the final decision of East-West rail, and the Oxford-Cambridge Express-way (and/or dualling of the existing A421) then perhaps Salden Chase might provide the final extent of development in this direction, with perhaps some smaller pockets of suitable land, heading North-East towards the M1 motorway and within the line of any new and guaranteed road improvements.
- MKB boundary is the most appropriate final extent of development. As there is more than sufficient land available within MKB to meet all of the towns need for new housing well beyond the period covered by Plan:MK
- This direction of growth is inappropriate. Inappropriate to define boundaries as further detail needed.
- Development in the south west would be easier in that there are fewer constraints in the South.
- We should not go beyond anything what already has outline planning permission
- It is difficult to determine the answer to this question without knowing what space is required to achieve the population expansion anticipated over the plan period. Clearly the difficulties would be fewer to expand within the borough boundary rather than having to negotiate with neighbouring authorities. Since in the original development existing communities as diverse as Bletchley and Broughton have been incorporated the incorporation of a number of village settlements should be no more problematical.
- Yes, a final extent should be defined; where this should be depends on any development requirement, which is as yet undefined in terms of final population size.
- The focus should be to minimise urban sprawl by the creative use of high-density development within Central Milton Keynes.
- Direction of Growth 1 Development to the west, south west and/or south east of the city This could be easily linked to the first option as for the same reasons it is the next easiest to achieve requiring the least investment in grid roads and roads. Also with the implementation of the East West Rail link it ties in naturally with Option 2.
- We consider that the boundary to urban development in the SE corner of Milton Keynes should be as it is now no further than Lower End Road east of the A5130 and no further than the additional land allocated by the Inspector in the existing Core Strategy including no development between Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands beyond the current allocation of Church Farm. To the W and SW, the urban development boundary should be the MK Unitary Authority Boundary.

What Ward Councillors said:

- Yes. We need a Masterplan for the area numbers of houses, locations of local centres, schools, medical facilities, community sports centres, local play areas, neighbourhood

character areas, mix of dwelling types (tenures, densities, styles, value propositions), street hierarchies including grid-roads, primary public transport routes and stops, etc. We also need a rough implementation phasing plan and timetable, so that each road and neighbourhood moves from building site to finished residential area in a timely way. The only way to achieve this is by having a planned approach to the entire development site and development process and therefore, there must be a defined total area!

- Not enough information to comment

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- CBC would want to identify a final extent of development if it is a site which comes forward through the new CBC Plan to protect Aspley Guise from coalescence. t. However, prior to the allocation of this, or any other land in Central Bedfordshire, to accommodate any unmet housing need for MK, CBC need to see a robust explanation and justification as to why MKC cannot meet their own OAN within their administrative area to support or justify the location of growth in neighbouring authorities.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- The scale of housing growth currently being proposed together with other housing proposals in MK is likely to be sufficient to require a new secondary school and is unlikely to be met by the expansion of existing local schools. This would require a cross-authority solution.
- Plan:MK should consider the impact of new development site locations on generating opportunities for improved strategic infrastructure across the local authority borders and ensure adequate infrastructure capacity is provided to meet the needs of future development.
- Focus on large development sites rather than small pockets of development so that appropriate transport infrastructure can be secured. It would be difficult to secure infrastructure funding through smaller developments. Development should be focussed in areas with existing sustainable transport links.
- We expect the plans to be consistent with BCCs Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4).
- It will be essential that growth, in particular housing development, maintains strategic links with the adult social needs of both Buckinghamshire and MKs councils, so that resource demands for managing adult social care can be understood, managed and monitored.
- Encourage the provision and enhancement of green infrastructure networks between existing and new developments, within MKs border and Buckinghamshire's border.
- From a waste perspective the issue is more about general impact on tonnages in terms of treatment; with the Strategic Development Directions consultation, along with the Core Strategy and Site Allocations Plan reconfirming that between Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan and Plan:MK, there could potentially a significant amount of development taking place between the two authorities.
- With such a large development expansion we would recommend a strategic catchment based approach to flood risk management which incorporates all sources of flooding, focusing on surface water, groundwater and fluvial risk

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Yes there should be a final extent boundary

10 . Question 7

No

- Direction 1 is not realistic, desirable or feasible
- No final extent of development should be made. It is considered that this would be against sustainable development principles. The artificial restriction of growth has the effect of increasing pressure on existing areas and potential to drive up house prices due to the restricting factor on supply. It will be important to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place to ensure thriving communities in these locations but no restriction on the growth that can be achieved. Natural and environmental constraints should be the only constraints on growth in this location.
- Until more detail was available, NPWG believes that this direction of growth is inappropriate and thus, inappropriate to define the boundaries. Development in the South West would be easier in that there are fewer constraints than in the South.
- Since housing need has not been established yet and it is anticipated that further growth will occur in the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford corridor it would be inappropriate to define a final extent of development South West of Milton Keynes until these matters have been resolved.
- Any decisions now on the final extent of the area of growth would be premature. The Plan is likely to be reviewed every five years or so to adjust to or modify the development strategy allowing the long term vision to be achieved. Taking short term decisions now will not facilitate this.

General comments

- Growth in neighbouring authority areas should be planned for by those neighbouring authorities
- A final extent of development for the purposes of this plan should be identified in order to provide certainty for both communities and stakeholders delivering development. This does not mean that this would be an absolute restriction in circumstances where, for example, the Council were unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land, nor would this be a boundary which would be fixed in perpetuity, never to be breached. It would however be a boundary identified for the purposes of this plan period. The extent of the boundary would need to be determined once the quantum of development, to be delivered through the preferred option (Direction of Growth 4) had been exhausted and the residual development requirements were identified. This should be subject to landscape sensitivity testing and strategic transport assessment.
- Within the MKB boundary you have more than enough unused space to accommodate all future housing and employment need. Therefore the MKB boundary is the appropriate final extent for development.
- Development limits should be defined by hard boundaries such as an existing major or new road or by policy constraints such as protected sites or green space
- Whilst the allocations of land to be made in this document will obviously be finite, we would suggest not using terminology such as final extent, since all Development Plan Documents must be reviewed in the fullness of time and it would be wrong to suggest that there is an outer perimeter beyond which Milton Keynes could never extend. There may however be opportunities to provide key additional green infrastructure with development, which may provide clear defensible boundaries, and provide wider ecological, landscape or heritage related mitigation. There is potentially the opportunity for such on land controlled by Crest Nicholson South West of Milton Keynes.

- The final extent of outward expansion in Direction of growth 1 should be where it is now, and no further erosion of countryside.
- Expansion to the south east represents the most sustainable option, the one that is least affected by strategic constraints, is well integrated with proposed and committed new infrastructure and which is contained by long-term defensible barriers that would ensure a finite edge to expansion.
- An appropriate solution to this matter would be to define the extent of the area and detail in the Local Plan what 3 uses would be strategically envisaged for the area. An SPD could be produced following the adoption of the Local Plan to provide further detail as to how the site should be delivered. This will be much simpler to achieve if the area of development remains within the MK boundary. Should it stretch beyond the boundary, adjoining authorities will need to identify whether they can accommodate Milton Keynes unmet need. The Council should realistically await the findings of the evidence base to identify the development need, and enter discussions with the adjoining authorities before consulting on this issue.
- Each site in this location should be considered on its individual merits and if it is a sustainable location to accommodate growth. Although all new development should have continuity and connections in to the existing build form of MK.
- There is a real risk that without fast and decisive action through Plan:MK, some avenues of joint infrastructure funding (for example) will be lost in the next 12-24 months. Therefore, we suggest that as a minimum, a framework plan for the planned growth of South East Milton Keynes be embedded in the next round of Plan:MK consultation, so that there is something concrete and of material weight with which to lobby other agencies making decisions on strategic infrastructure investment in this area

11 Question 8

Treatment of existing settlements in Direction of Growth 1

11.1 Is a green buffer the best way of protecting the character and integrity of the existing settlements that lie within the areas of new development identified in Direction of Growth 1? Or would you prefer to see them integrated in a similar fashion to the villages in the existing urban area, for example Great Linford and Loughton? 172 responses were received.

11.2 The majority of responses stated that the green buffer was the best way of protecting the character and integrity of the existing settlements that lie within the areas of new development identified in Direction of Growth 1.

11.3 A smaller number of responses indicated that Plan:MK should cater for all options depending on the character of the existing settlement. Bletchley, particularly, should welcome significant redevelopment and integration with Central Milton Keynes, whilst current satellite villages should be preserved in a way which best suits the current character be it either a green buffer or a sensitive urban plan of integration in to the urban area so as to maintain a green and open character enjoyed by the likes of Willen.

11.4 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

Reasons for agreeing that the green buffer is the best way of protection:

- Buffers should be a mixture of existing working farms, woodland and maintained parks for use by all inhabitants and visitors.
- Adds to the character of the city
- So that MK is not visible from the Whaddon Valley
- Protect village character, life and sense of community
- to protect any current "countryside" village which might be subsumed into the city by future expansion.
- But this should not dramatically decrease the developable area of the land highlighted as this could lead to an inefficient use of the land. Also, restrictive design codes applied to development areas are unwarranted and lead to unviable developments, as well as causing delays in the planning system as negotiations are prolonged substantially
- To protect the character of places like Woburn Sands, Wavendon, Bow Brickhill etc
- Older settlements need to be protected not only for current residents but for future generations
- Provide an area for dog walking, leisure walking, bicycle riding, etc
- Maintaining a buffer is the only chance of preserving any of the character of these places, and unless it is sufficient, even that may see the decline of the rural community
- Whaddon, Nash, Newton Longville & Beachampton must be protected by a green belt.
- A green buffer is the best way of protecting the character and integrity of existing settlements and significant natural features such as the Greensand Ridge. The Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment 2015 supports this vital statement. Expansion

of the Milton Keynes urban area in the direction of Little Brickhill, Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands is ill-conceived. Hence, the best way of protecting the character of these villages is to leave them well alone and not develop in this direction at all.

- Integration of Great Linford and Loughton has created two sprawling settlements which have lost their original character.
- Also restrictions on height, massing, uses and development should be put in place to protect the rural settlements
- It is important to make sure that Milton Keynes doesn't become an urban sprawl, and any development surrounding Milton Keynes needs to be carefully planned in sustainable locations.

Prefer to see them integrated

- As it is a more consistent approach
- Integration is a good thing but it should not allow areas of natural interest to be destroyed.
- I would like to see them sympathetically integrated in the same way Great Linford is.
- But it needs to be sympathetic
- The integrated approach has proved successful in MK and the benefits demonstrated.

Other comments:

- Plan:MK should cater for all options depending on the character of the existing settlement. Bletchley, particularly, should welcome significant redevelopment and integration with Central Milton Keynes, whilst current satellite villages should be preserved in a way which best suits the current character be it either a green buffer or a sensitive urban plan of integration in to the urban area so as to maintain a green and open character enjoyed by the likes of Willen.
- A development of this scale will require significant amounts of green space as part of its design. We therefore consider it would be more appropriate to create that space when it is needed as part of the overall scheme and allow the successful integration of the existing settlements into the design rather than creating distinctly separate areas with green buffers. Great Linford and Loughton clearly show how the integration does work.
- There was Open Green Space included in the previous draft CBC Development Strategy so this should be provided. No coalescence between the existing historic settlements and the new town should be deemed acceptable. Central Bedfordshire will determine its growth plan, not Plan:MK.
- With regard to Direction of Growth 1 it has already been noted with the Landscape Characteristic Assessment carried out as research for Plan:MK that the land between Milton Keynes and the Greensand Ridge provides an important foreground to the densely wooded slopes of the ridge and advocates ensuring that open views across the landscape character area to the Brickhill Greensand Ridge are retained.
- This question assumes a most unacceptable precedent has been made.
- The creation of a frequent-network-grid of public transport that will serve these villages suggests the Loughton strategy is more likely to be effective.
- The development to the south of the city will not drive long term growth to enable Milton Keynes to become one of the great cities of the UK. Re-generation of the area may improve living standards in some areas and improve transportation links but the other growth direction strategies are more bold, provide greater opportunity for

11 . Question 8

- expansion, do not perturb existing settlements and allow Milton Keynes to follow an expansion of originality which has made the city special.
- Depending on how close a development is needed the villages should be treated on a case by case basis. Whaddon, Nash and Newton Longville should be better connected to the areas and not segregated but not turned into housing estates. Upper/Middle/Lower Weald and Calverton, being so small could be incorporated in an extended WEA, this may be painful for the residents but it would open a lot of land for development and give more character to the new estates.
 - I think it's fine to subsume villages in the manner in which Broughton or Milton Keynes villages have been subsumed and integrated as MK neighbourhoods.
 - This should depend upon the nature of the existing community. For most a green buffer that is extensive enough to create a true rural character around the community should be the preferred option.
 - Exclude development south of the railway line between Fenny Stratford and Aspley Guise, creating a green buffer.
 - I would suggest perhaps a mix of protection by green buffer of some existing settlements and integration into the urban area of others.
 - A combination of green buffer and grid roads which preserve the existing communities.
 - Let's keep it green but make sure that roads will allow a smooth flow into the city and the rest of MK.
 - Need to deal with the current infrastructure issues - transport, education
 - Expansion of the urban sprawl in the direction of Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill is completely unacceptable; hence clearly the best way of protecting the character of the villages in this area is to not develop in this direction at all. If, against the overwhelming body of residents' demands, any development is proposed to go ahead in this direction, existing villages SHALL be preserved via green-belt (retaining existing active farm land) in a buffer of a minimum of the size that permits continued economic viability, or 1km width (whichever is larger) i.e. the existing arable land is to be left to the purpose it is in use currently. Should this not be the case there will certainly be a legal challenge using the precedents already established for rural life.
 - The examples given are not comparable; they are not rural areas in the same way that the area in this option is. Rural settlements should be protected in order to maintain their character and the lifestyle of the existing residents who opted for a rural environment.
 - I don't think integrating high density housing into the environment would be possible.
 - The Racecourses estate in Far Bletchley has resisted all attempts by AVDC to develop the land just beyond the estate. If development is required in that direction then the existing field next to the Racecourses estate, from the disused railway line to the A421, should be retained as a green buffer.
 - I do not believe that some small or medium-sized green buffer would be sufficient to protect the existing rural settlements of Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill. Nor would I wish for them to be integrated into the existing urban area. I do not believe that any further development beyond that already decided for these communities is appropriate as it would have only a negative impact on them, particularly in respect of environment/landscape, health and education services; and they would lose their unique identities. Furthermore, I am not aware if there is a technical definition specifying the dimension of a green buffer, without this it could be interpreted in many ways. In the case of our local area and particularly the greensand ridge I would define the green buffer as the existing area of countryside.

- A continuance of the original planning structure for MK would maintain the look of the City.
- We would prefer to see the existing villages incorporated into MK, in a similar fashion to somewhere like Stony Stratford: retaining their unique character whilst benefiting from the close links to the city.
- The residents of any area affected by development should have the final say on anything that impacts the; this is the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plans scheme. It also depends on the definition of 'green buffer' - does this mean a line of trees or a substantial buffer zone? In the case of expansion south of the east-west railway line, the area that is proposed for development between Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands is the area that currently acts as a green buffer between any existing development and any expansion in this direction that does unfortunately proceed.
- Villages like Milton Keynes Village have been cleverly integrated in the past. A relatively small number of properties would be affected by the Southern and Westerly expansion. Continued discussion with locals will always produce the best solution.
- Treat the Bedford to Bletchly Railway line as the natural boundary of the MK urban area.
- If you must expand near to a village then there should be a large green barrier (of quality and use to Nature and not just monoculture fields) around it and efforts should be made to downgrade the village's existing roads - eg, road bumps, pedestrianisation, one way systems etc. - in an attempt to restore some of the lost rural character. A total bypass would be even better. The 'greenbelt' between Bow Brickhill and Milton Keynes is already as narrow as it can be without destroying Bow Brickhill. Please do not build any more houses in this area.
- To provide a green belt around all the villages would take up more land to build a nominal number of houses. The best use of the land would be to concentrate the housing together and have larger areas of green belt. Wildlife tend to keep away from developed areas and so a nominal green belt would not assist wildlife as they require a 'green belt' between development and their habitat.
- If you must expand, you must leave a significant green barrier. There is already only a relatively small strip of land between MK and Bow Brickhill. If this is reduced any further, Bow Brickhill will become part of MK.
- The best option to protect the character and integrity of existing settlements is to develop brownfield sites first.
- Please protect any affected village with a significantly large green buffer and a bypass if possible.
- The only reason that the south east direction has appeal is that it already has a better transport network than any other direction, but this is not sufficient reason to push more housing into this already pressured environment just because it reduces the need for transport infrastructure expenditure. squeezing more housing into this area when the existing health and other infrastructure is below an acceptable level is just creating a problem for the future. bite the bullet and put the housing into the north and east rural areas and make sure that their infrastructure levels are correct unlike the existing areas.
- 'Green buffers' will not address the underlying lack of infrastructure and huge up-front investment in facilities that would be required to achieve meaningful, cost effective development in the rural areas. It would be much better to focus investment in a single major development to the east of the M1, where the infrastructure and facilities are already developing or can be more easily integrated.

11 . Question 8

- A green buffer zone is the bare minimum, under no circumstances do I agree that these settlements should be 'integrated' which is just another way of saying swallowed up.
- Expanding into Aspley Guise triangle would remove the green buffer, and bring Aspley Guise closer to becoming a suburb of Milton Keynes
- Integration of Woburn Sands with the main MK urban area would clearly conflict with the vision statement of its adopted Neighbourhood Plan
- Apart from any green / wildlife corridors my preference is for sensitive development to protect the features of existing settlements.
- Unsure what a green buffer is in reality as the concept is continually under attack from developers
- No! We believe that the original concept of MK, as a city of about 250 000 inhabitants accommodated within an area of no more than 35 square miles, was the right one, and that Prescotts plan to double its size by 2026 was ill-conceived and should be abandoned.
- No to integration. No to green buffer as this will only work until developers find ways to get round the rules and before you know it integration happens by stealth. Leave the villages alone and build within existing MK boundaries.
- Great Linford and Loughton were part of a nationally designated new town. It is not morally right to equate their position to that of settlements in the expansion area. Such settlements are an asset to the Borough and should be protected by a green buffer.
- Absolutely not integrated. That is absolutely the true problem of MK- its uniformity and as a result MK suffers from a national reputation of being a characterless area. This is absolutely putting a limit on MKs growth: it unfashionable reputation. A large buffer zone would need to be include, which protects the rural nature of these areas.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

Yes, support green buffers

- The area of Open Green Space included in the previous draft CBC Development Strategy should be provided and coalescence between the existing historic settlements and the new town avoided. The nature of any development proposed in Central Bedfordshire is a matter for the Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire currently being prepared by CBC, not Plan:MK.
- The treatment of each existing settlement should be carefully considered on its own merit and after consultation with its residents.
- Prefer to see green buffers integrated in the existing urban area.
- Green buffer should be preserved as all villages in this direction are in Aylesbury Vale or Bedfordshire areas which would prove difficult to administer
- We do not see a green buffer as the answer but to incorporate along the lines of Great Linford where the old village , the green spaces and the new developments sit comfortably alongside each other.
- Existing settlements should be protected by a green buffer
- The nature of any development, including the provision and protection of green infrastructure, within Central Beds is a matter for CBC to determine through the preparation of its new Local Plan. It has been a long standing principle of development within Central Beds that the character and integrity of historic villages such as Aspley Guise should be retained and coalescence with neighbouring urban areas, including MK, avoided. We fully support this principle. The area of Open Green Space (attached)

included in the previous draft CBC Development Strategy should be provided and coalescence between Aspley Guise and the new town avoided. This area of Open Green Space was supported by AGPC in our own Green Infrastructure Plan

- Plan:MK should cater for all options depending on the character of the existing settlement. Bletchley, particularly, should welcome significant redevelopment and integration with Central Milton Keynes, whilst current satellite villages should be preserved in a way which best suits the current character be it either a green buffer or a sensitive urban plan of integration in to the urban area so as to maintain a green and open character enjoyed by the likes of Willen.
- Great Linford and Loughton were part of a nationally designated new town. It is unfair to equate their position to that of settlements in the expansion area. Such settlements are an asset to the Borough and should be protected by a green buffer.
- A protective green buffer is definitely the best solution, and this enhanced strategic green space should be given long-term protection under the control/guidance of Parks Trust, or a similar organisation given responsibility to maintain and protect it for the enjoyment of future generations. 'Integration of existing villages', similar to the original MK concept, is not supported as it does not appear to be the best way forward given that original green gaps (over the lifespan of the City to date) have in part been eroded, leading to unacceptable and undesirable coalescence -a regrettable result which sadly diminishes the separate identity, individuality and character of the village that should always be respected and maintained.
- The starting point is that no such development should take place for the reasons already stated. It seems fairly clear that former villages within the urban area of Milton Keynes have been subsumed and lost their identity. Therefore this is not a model which ought to be followed in the future. If despite the above, there is to be any such development then as well as complying with Core Strategy policy CS6 there should be large landscape buffers such as around rural settlements such as Castlethorpe, Hanslope and Emberton not simply a token green space which would do nothing to avoid coalescence.

What Ward Councillors said:

- The character of existing settlements should be respected and actively protected, not just out of respect for the amenity of the existing residents, but because those historic settlements will become much-loved features within the city. I would propose MK Village, Simpson, Great Linford, and Broughton village as good examples (in general) of how to retain and protect a historic village within a larger, new estate and within the conurbation as a whole. Key facets of this seem to be avoiding or minimising any through traffic (eg in MK Village, one of the three old roads was blocked off, and the other two roads are sufficiently indirect that through traffic will use a different route), but making it very easy to get into the old village area on foot or cycle. I would propose Woughton on the Green, Woughton Park, and Woolstone, as examples of a very different approach. In these areas, the overall gridsquare is relatively small, and the amount of newer development was sufficiently modest, and sufficiently similar in character, that the historic village has effectively grown to fill the entire small gridsquare while retaining its original feel and character.
- Existing settlements should be offered the choice of expanding to become the heart of the new community, eg Woburn Sands now, Wolverton being integrated in a way which effectively bypasses them eg Great Linford. Loughton or MK Village, being the centre of their area but having a green buffer around them, eg Haversham or Woburn Sands in the past The consultation document should discuss the pros and cons of each,

11 . Question 8

eg no way to expand a buffered settlement, so shortage of new housing for its children, and loss of business for bypassed settlements.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring authorities and other local authorities said:

- A green buffer to protect the character and integrity of the existing settlements in Central Bedfordshire, namely Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley would be damaging to the vale landscape. A rural country park, extending from the Canal Park, could be acceptable in maintaining the landscape character as well as the character of these existing villages

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- A development of this scale will require significant amounts of green space as part of its design. We therefore consider it would be more appropriate to create that space when it is needed as part of the overall scheme and allow the successful integration of the existing settlements into the design rather than creating distinctly separate areas with green buffers. Great Linford and Loughton clearly show how the integration does work.
- A green buffer would be the best way of protecting the character and integrity of the existing settlements.
- The identity of some of the more historic settlements within the proposed arch of growth, identified within Direction of Growth 1, should be protected by green buffers. The arc is at present no more than an area of search and it would appear to be possible to identify sufficient edge of settlement land to meet housing needs, without unwelcome coalesce of all settlements.
- Either approach could potentially be appropriate, but this would best be considered on a case-by-case basis. For instance, much of Whaddon is encompassed by a Conservation Area and a local landscape designation, which would suggest the need for a Green Buffer in the interest of maintaining local character and distinctiveness. Such a proposal is incorporated within Crest Nicholsons attached Vision document. Elsewhere there may be greater potential to integrate existing settlements into the urban area, for example Newton Longville which has lesser historic significance and already acts as a significant satellite to southern Milton Keynes.
- Given Milton Keynes history of integrating existing villages into the urban area, it is considered the best approach would be to continue this approach. This would ensure that Milton Keynes continued to grow in a consistent way retaining the original principles of the New City. A change in approach could create a disjointed settlement. The use of parks and public open spaces should be considered as a mechanism for integrating existing villages with the enlarged urban area whilst maintaining a level of separation.
- It is not considered that a green buffer would be the best way to maintain the character and integrity of existing settlements that lie within the areas of new development identified in Direction of Growth 1. Green buffers are not found anywhere

in the NPPF and so support cannot be drawn from National Policy. As a consequence they are not consistent with National Policy and cannot be found to be sound. This is precisely the approach taken by the Inspector in the Cherwell Plan, the Council promoted green buffers in the plan which the Inspector removed following the examination. Instead, it would be preferable to draft policies concerned with Direction of Growth 1 so as to be explicit that the character of existing settlements should be retained but that this need not to be by separation and instead could be achieved through landscaping and buffering; such an approach could be reinforced within Development Management policies elsewhere in the plan.

- With the possible exception of Newton Longville, existing villages and hamlets should be protected and generously buffered rather than integrated.
- Prefer to see green buffers integrated in the existing urban area.
- Whilst the integration model is considered to be preferable, it is recognised that this may be resisted by village communities. If this is the case, it is considered that the best way of protecting the character and integrity of existing settlements is through planned development which provides for the sensitive location of playing fields and other areas of public open space. Whilst such areas might be described as a green buffer, it would be inappropriate for these to be the subject of minimum specifications in respect of their size and / or the distance between new and existing developed areas, as to do so would prevent a flexible approach which has regard to individual site circumstances.
- For the current planning application on SWMK Consortium land a green buffer approach has been used. The landscaping strategy for the proposed development comprises additional woodland, trees and hedgerows at the site boundary, which will reduce the visual impact from neighbouring residential areas and surrounding villages including Newton Longville. In the case of further development to the south west of Milton Keynes the existing railway line (due to be reopened as part of the East West Rail project) would also provide a buffer to separate existing settlements from new development.
- A development of this scale will require significant amounts of green space as part of its design. We therefore consider it would be more appropriate to create that space when it is needed as part of the overall scheme and allow the successful integration of the existing settlements into the design rather than creating distinctly separate areas with green buffers. Great Linford and Loughton clearly show how the integration does work.
- Any form of green buffer, if so designated would need to be sustainably managed and to realise the other environmental opportunities such buffers could provide. This would require some direct intervention such as establishing the buffer as linear park. It should be recognised that the integrated villages within Milton Keynes benefit from and are extent buffered within the city by the linear park network.
- Plan:MK should cater for all options depending upon the character of the existing settlement. Bletchley, particularly, should welcome significant redevelopment and integration with Central Milton Keynes, whilst current satellite villages should be preserved in a way which best suits the current character be it either a green buffer or a sensitive urban plan of integration into the urban area so as to maintain a green and open character enjoyed by the likes of Willen.
- The possibility of defining the existing boundary of Woburn Sands has been lost with the building of the Nampak site which brought urban MK into Rural WS without any definition of the boundary. The effect on the character of WS has been truly awful, though understandably the hundreds of new residents seem to enjoy being part of an iconic Victorian small town. I am not familiar with the way the stated examples work

11 . Question 8

so cannot respond usefully. The only thing which is absolutely clear is that Option 1 is the most destructive direction to build in the Rural Area since none of the others contains the most unique countryside features, held in private hands, anywhere in the Borough. I am not qualified to comment on the other Options nor, I suggest, are any others qualified to comment on other options if they do not live in them.

- A green buffer seems essential but it is up to those communities to say how they wish their character and integrity to be protected.
- We believe that the proposed Area of Expansion could be delivered in a way which is sensitive to the existing settlements of Woburn Sands and Wavendon, with appropriate green separation which would also allow it to have a separate character. However, it would still be able to make a substantial contribution towards the improvement of local infrastructure and facilities, which would benefit these communities.
- Existing settlements should retain their own identity and be projected by green buffers.
- The green buffer zone distinguishing between MK and its surrounding villages is the only acceptable way to preserve the character integrity of existing settlements in this area. The Brickhills in particular have individuality quite distinct from other villages that now form part of the urban area. They were never designated as part of the expanding New Town of MK for good reason. Development in this direction should not be approved under any circumstances.
- As set out within the comments on question 6, it is appropriate within the context of growth to the south-west of Milton Keynes to maintain a green buffer to existing settlements. This rolls forward the previous approach which has been assessed and considered to be acceptable. It also accords with the key objective of the Salden Chase Masterplan and Delivery SPD, to maintain and protect the identity of Newton Longville and neighbouring communities.
- The provision of green buffers can be an effective way to help protect the character and integrity of existing settlements, as the Consortium propose in relation to Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. The extent and location of such buffers should be established as part of a comprehensive planning process for the area, rather than arbitrarily imposed in isolation. To predetermine the extent of green buffers would risk prejudicing the proper and effective master planning of area as part of the strategic direction or growth. The extent and nature of any buffer should be agreed and defined as part of comprehensive master planning and be informed by detailed technical reports, survey work and public consultation. Beyond responding to the specific questions in the consultation document, the Consortium considers that there are additional issues in relation to the Plan:MK process and programme. In a letter dated 30 October 2014, the Consortium identified the growing disparity between the programme for preparing Plan:MK contained in the adopted Core Strategy at Policy CSAD1 and the then recently published LDS. We are now beyond the 2015 deadline for adoption of Plan:MK prescribed in the Core Strategy and the programme is now behind that contained in the LDS. There is therefore an urgent need for progress to be made with Plan:MK, particularly in light of the Governments target for Local Plans to be in place by early 2017.
- We do not believe that some small or medium-sized green buffer would be sufficient to protect the existing rural settlements of Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill. Nor would we wish for them to be integrated into the existing urban area. We do not believe that any further development beyond that already decided for these communities is appropriate as it would have only a negative impact on them, particularly in respect of environment/landscape, health and education services; and

they would lose their unique identities. We also have major concerns in respect of the proposed increase in rail traffic through Woburn Sands and the resulting increase in the duration of the barrier closure, which will cause gridlock in the High Street there. The increase in traffic both on the major routes Newport Road and Bow Brickhill Road, the Kingston Roundabout, the A421 and Junction 13 and the increase in rat-running on minor roads through the villages in the surrounding area to access the A5 and M1 will have a negative effect, in terms of pollution, noise and congestion.

12 . Question 9

12 Question 9

Scale of development east of the M1 (Direction of Growth 2)

12.1 What do you think about the scale of the development suggested for east of the M1 in Direction of Growth 2? 671 responses were received.

12.2 The majority of responses agreed with the scale of the development proposed for east of M1 in Direction of Growth 2, although they said that new infrastructure funding will be needed.

12.3 The main reasons for agreeing included;

- The east of the M1 was assessed by Planning Inspector Keith Holland who said that the land to the East of Milton Keynes is suitable for long term development as I consider this land is much less sensitive in landscape terms than the Whaddon Valley.
- The M1 should not be seen as a long term barrier to development as it is not unusual to have motorways running through cities. And with extra junctions would also provide seamless connections to H3, H5/6 (J14), H8 and J13.
- There is potential of Cranfield Technology Park and airfield and Marston Moretaine for employment and recreation.

12.4 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

Agree with the scale of development suggested

- Potential infrastructure improvements form development
- Existing good road links to Newport Pagnells, the M1 and grid road system including connectivity with MKC.
- Provide links MK with Bedford and properly takes advantage of existing rail and motorway links. J 13 has already been redeveloped and the Bedford Road has already been rebuilt.
- But need good road connections and infrastructure
- The provision of a large amount of primary infrastructure up front' is billed as a risk; however, in many ways this may be a far more economical and sustainable option in the long term than adding a relentlessly incremental burden on to existing village facilities and services (DoG1 and DoG3) which are already even now over-capacity and struggling to cope.
- Provided that this proposal includes sufficient amenities to create an Eastern Community, then the scale is fine. If amenities, such as local shops, leisure activities, schools and healthcare are not included in this proposal, then it will need to be bigger. While the cross-boundary development could be seen as a drawback, it also may be an opportunity to share costs with Bedfordshire Council.
- It would take advantage of the city's location being a link between the midlands and the M1
- Could be extended even further than marked on the map in Figure 4
- It is the location indicated by the planning inspector Keith Holland to be the most suitable and sustainable location for future expansion due to is less sensitive landscape.

- The critical mass of residents and housing concentrated in one area would mean that the infrastructure could be developed from scratch, tailored to precisely suit the specific facilities and services needs of the new community, with roads built to cope with the traffic. Properly designed it would not put further strain on the road networks within Milton Keynes or small villages, and it would not have nearly as much impact on rural character and areas of beauty/greenbelt/parklands/sensitive environments as it would in DoG1 and DoG3.
- But need to extend existing grids roads over motorway making this a costly option
- Potential to link development with the east west rail connection
- Strong public transport links to the Centre are essential to prevent over-congestion on the existing grid road system.
- Concentrates development on a single area close to existing infrastructure
- This direction provides the best option to protect MK from any increases in the 1,750 dwellings per year requirement. There is already a university, technology park and airport that could form central features of sustainable development in this direction.
- Whilst there are clearly challenges with this option, MK should embrace the sustainable development that this option can provide.
- This is the only option to provide the sustainable scale of development likely to be required by MK over the next 15+ years.
- This proposal should be bolder and plan for a larger scale of growth to full advantage of the opportunities post 2050. Expanding at a low density would be a mistake and a lost opportunity.
- Development east of the M1, on both sides of J14 up to North Crawley but within the MK borders, is appropriate if combined with urban intensification to promote and support MK Centre. This was what was originally planned for MK, and it would still leave a substantial rural area, both east of the M1 and north of the existing urban area.
- Fine if Bedford agrees. Don't agree with the premise of Speed of development. The existing Urban area does not need infill development just to mark time while a larger development is created elsewhere.
- Best of a bad lot. This area has been largely destroyed by the eastern expansion anyway
- Develop Cranfield airport and north Crawley
- But protect greenspaces
- As the area is relatively under-developed new homes and infrastructure could be built to set-up a modern community that would rival the living and work space of any other part of the country.
- Least impact on MK's unique mix of urban and rural communities
- Most cost effective option
- Infrastructure spend will be less than for remote options
- Big advantage of being close to M1 artery
- The additional M1 cross routes will provide some relief to the existing crossing to the North.
- Appropriate scale to serve the needs of MK without impinging on too many villages
- This zone would be better shifted further east and made a new town in its own right, with a planned infrastructure of its own. SDD2 has more scope for development of lines of supply and communication involving road and rail giving improved access to the east coast ports.
- Would take the pressure of the south eastern corner of the city
- Would take advantage of the economic potential of Cranfield University and airport.

12 . Question 9

Disagree with the scale of development suggested

- Negatively impact on rural living and existing towns, e.g. Salford and Cranfield - change character, existing roads can't cope and cost of new infrastructure would be extremely high
- Existing infrastructure won't cope, M1, J14, A509, A421, A428 already overloaded need infrastructure before housing
- Not financially viable - It requires huge infrastructure investment to cross the M1 and provide sufficient links back into MK where all the jobs, services and facilities would be to support this new development.
- Preservation of the rural environment is a key element of the vision for Milton Keynes
- Too much/too large/too big, unnecessary and create far too big an urban centre for this region
- Loss of quality farmland, wildlife habitat, and outdoor recreation opportunities (walking and cycling). This would have an irreversible effect on the environment, recreational space and wildlife
- Is not consistent with the Community Forest objectives and designation of the Forest of Marston Vale.
- Would increase traffic on Broughton Road
- Air and noise pollution from the M1 would be detrimental to the health of any future residents, as well as for existing residents living alongside the local road network..
- Central Bedfordshire should decide where growth goes in its area not MK
- Loss of heritage/character of villages. It is an established principle of the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy that the character of existing historic settlement should be protected and that coalescence between them and MK should be avoided.
- The M1 has been a barrier to any MK development in the past due to the cost it will take put in and supply the local infrastructure.
- The existing roads will not cope with higher volume of traffic from new developments
- It would result in a conurbation divided by the M1 motorway
- Would necessitate additional infrastructure investment to improve roads and alleviate existing congestion
- Unsustainable - It would take years to establish this 'divorced' settlement and place extensive strain on Newport Pagnell and surrounding infrastructure.
- The M1 currently forms a good eastward boundary for the urban area of MK and should be kept as such.
- This proposal would prejudice a likely future requirement to widen the M1
- Growing in this direction across the M1 would not result in a cohesive city.
- Development here would not be able to compete with CMK and will end up with limited shopping centres and attractions.
- Infrastructure would need to be in place first for development to be viable
- Undeliverable - It would require extensive co-operation with the adjacent LPA.
- This option would be too slow to come into effect to meet needs
- Impact on property values within the rural area would leave people in negative equity.
- Green buffer zones are a feeble attempt to mitigate the resulting damage a development of this scale would bring.
- Loss of green belt
- Inappropriate
- Level of primary infrastructure required would be vast

- Development straddling the M1 seems totally opposed to the original idea of the new town of Milton Keynes.
- Too isolated and would be an unsustainable location
- Effect noise/air quality
- could severely adversely affect the character of Husborne Crawley, Ridgmont, Brogborough and Cranfield and cause coalescence
- it would compromise the current development of the Forest of Marston Vale
- the topography of the area would make large scale development very visible and destroy natural landscape
- new expensive bridge crossings would be required plus a considerable amount of subsidiary road and other infrastructure
- MK can accommodate all development need within its own boundary.
- Cranfield already undergoing 3 new large developments and further expansion cause problems with traffic, parking and healthcare/schooling facilities.
- Would negatively redefine Centre MK
- New development cannot compete with the appeal of MK, end up with tertiary shopping centres and attractions
- Too difficult to achieve co-operation required between Bedfordshire Council and Milton Keynes Council
- The potential development of so many homes with associated infrastructure east of the M1 will put too much pressure on the resources of Central Beds and Bedford Borough.
- Development east of the M1 will lead to coalescence
- Will bring increased volume of traffic
- The problems encountered in the early days of MK would be replicated, i.e. attracting businesses and developing schools and medical facilities at the same pace as the development required.
- Satellite settlements would require upfront primary infrastructure
- Isolated/disconnected locations are unsustainable, people need to be able to work, live and relax near to where they work
- Impact on choice of where to live, rural living is attractive for families who need choice
- Housing developments in this area will result in dormitory developments resulting in mass transit movements in the morning and evening.
- Instead: Possible requirement for hybrid approach to development, delivering multiple smaller sites to secure a short term supply of development.
- This proposal seems to rely a great deal on new infrastructure being developed - four new roads/bridges across the motorway? That seems very unlikely to be achieved.
- By crossing the motorway, we will lose the rural nature of the villages of Salford, Hulcote and Cranfield.
- There is plenty of opportunity to add housing within Option 4.
- This development appears far too costly and the timeframe to deliver may not meet the needs of housing availability. This should be considered as a last resort prospect
- Extremely busy motorway junctions
- Careful consideration must be made as to not add pressure on the existing M1 junctions and that the A421 should be dual carriageway leading to Junction 13.

Other comments:

12 . Question 9

- Instead of this option, intensify development around town/city centre as it will provide good transport links, space to expand and concentrate development where facilities are located.
- There is no discussion of the demographic or economic issues, the planning framework required to deliver this growth or the quality/affordability of such proposals. Further work is needed to understand these options.
- This agree should not be sterilised by piecemeal development, and should be protected to meet the longer term development needs of MK
- MK should not build in Bedfordshire to avoid ruining countryside/village character, increasing traffic congestion and encroachment by neighbouring councils. No valid reason and where in the past it has been proven to be unsuitable. There is concern that still could lead to the coalescence of the smaller villages making them feel part of the MK and losing the rural life which people have left MK for.
- Any development in Olney must come with a high quality, dual bypass. Traffic congestion/non-existent public transport
- Development in smaller villages to ensure they remain viable communities but this should be limited to slow growth to prevent destruction of the community feel. e.g. no more than 20% population growth over a 10 year period. This would still allow them to make a significant contribution to housing demand and support the local shops/pubs/schools.
- There is no need to build a bypass around Olney as this would greatly scar the surrounding rural area. A better option would be to re-route HGV traffic away from the A509 through Olney. Olney bypass option shown over Strategic Green Space is not acceptable. Growth close to MK fits in with strategic growth of the Bedford to MK arc along the trunk road A421.
- The co-operation required between Bedfordshire Council and Milton Keynes Council may be difficult to achieve
- Motorway is a natural barrier to the development of MK
- The M1 motorway is a major barrier to any urban development east of the motorway, extending development to the East of M1 is too expensive
- There is potential for some development along a corridor adjacent to the M1; working with beds authority to link with the Cranfield Technology Park development. However, I would oppose developing beyond Newport Pagnell's
- Add to congestion/motorway access problems
- New development could cause flooding
- It will ruin village character
- Prefer this option to Direction 1
- Needs to be done sympathetically as in Linford and Loughton
- Area looks pretty limited, which means that urban character will tend to be more dense and high, thus restraining transportation capabilities
- Current planned development at Tickford Fields. The landscape beyond this is of small villages, farmed land and rural roads; to develop this area would be to destroy the English rural landscape and would be costly in terms of the necessary road network and infrastructure requirements - not to mention the cost to the rural way of life, natural environment and wildlife
- I don't think a green buffer would offer enough protection as the character of any rural village would be completely compromised, as are the 'villages' now swallowed up by the current Milton Keynes conurbation.
- This is advantageous to the extent that it considers future development requirements for Milton Keynes as well as the current plan.

- Development south of Newport Pagnell (south of the A422, west of the A509 and east of the M1) can probably be done without much impact on surrounding boroughs - though I'm not sure how much of this land is suitable for development. Development surrounding Moulsoe and south of North Crawley might be possible, but I think it is important that the Central Beds plans for the area around Cranfield and Salford be considered as well.
- Current infrastructure is inadequate, and new infrastructure will change the character of the area
- Protect existing villages by a large green buffer
- Whilst most village dwellers accept that small scale housing development is necessary, we do not accept the concept of, for example, satellite towns between Hanslope and Castlethorpe, or Hanslope and Newport. This would irrevocably ruin the rural area and have a huge impact on rural business and pursuits, as well as residents.
- I feel this area would be better developed for industrial and commercial use, and some of the older existing "in town" industrial sites (Tongwell, Blakelands, Kiln Farm etc) could then be utilised for housing.
- I think that people in Salford and Hulcote and towards Cranfield are extremely suspicious of Milton Keynes' intentions, after seeing the terrible over-development at Broughton, which seems overcrowded and feels difficult to navigate by road or on foot. It seems to fail to be a pleasant or sustainable place. Whilst I completely understand the attraction of expansion past Cranfield, and incorporating and extending the University there as part of the city, this would have to be very sensitive to the character and of existing small villages.
- Invest in places like Bolton, Liverpool and Manchester - they have empty houses but no jobs.
- Growth East: The M 1 forms a strong physical boundary with limited crossing points. If development spreads across the M1 then additional crossing points will be needed, and existing ones upgraded. Eastern and Southern expansion would justify a new junction 13A on the M1, to improve access to MK and Cranfield
- Infrastructure e.g. roads, schools, medical facilities, need to be built before buildings
- Does Milton Keynes require such large scale expansion?
- Issue with the feasibility and viability of transport links across the M1
- Also it is hard to see how large volumes of construction traffic could use current rural roadways in support of building projects, without massive disruption to all those currently living in rural locations
- This area would seem to be more suited to industrial and business development, being close to the M1 and the proposed East-West rail route.
- With new road access over the motorway then this would maybe an option for later in the development.
- This is an infill option and largely contributes to the housing need.
- Smaller scale development may be possible around existing motorway junctions particularly J14 east of the M1 and with the agreement of adjacent authorities, I would be prepared to consider small residential developments at J13 alongside the commercial estate. This is served by a railway that would give sustainable transport links East-West.
- Why were the participants in the workshops told to ignore the local authority boundaries so the expansion into Central Bedfordshire be considered, when a. Central Bedfordshire has its own housing needs to fulfil and b. Why the agreement of Central Bedfordshire Council was not sought before this option was either considered.
- Concerned about potential impact on forest between MK and Bedford

12 . Question 9

- Direction of Growth 2 should only be considered when 4+1 have been fully explored and implemented and are unable to yield the necessary numbers of houses
- New development is dependent on new transport infrastructure e.g. roads, motorway junctions and bridges being built
- MKC need to work with the MK2050 Commission and Central Government to finance a crossing over the M1 and other infrastructure improvement/investment

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- This area would benefit from easy access and linkages to the M1, Newport Pagnall and Cranfield (the University and the Airfield etc) and a lot of the industrial/employment opportunities to the East of Milton Keynes. Expansion in this area would provide benefits both ways between the industrial and organisational facilities in the area (as listed). Residents would benefit from employment and educational opportunities while companies and organisations had access to employees and students.
- This area has already benefitted from recent infrastructure improvements and there is a more complete plan in place for further developments, as such there is less likely to be a period of inadequate facilities and infrastructure than is anticipated with Growth Option 1.
- Has the greatest implication for Newport Pagnell as it will join the town with the city. Additional road linkages will be required across the M1 and improvements to Junction 14 otherwise the traffic impact will be huge. Marsh End Road should be dualled if this comes forward. Trigger points should be put in place for infrastructure delivery so it does not lag behind housing.
- The developments would remain within the MK Borough and therefore the benefits of additional Council Tax and S106 funding would remain in the MK area. It would also avoid the need for additional liaison and the risk of any overlap between MK and other neighbouring districts' growth plans etc.
- The M1 is not considered a barrier to any development in this area as MK has been seen so successfully span the railway line (Euston to North/North West) and the A5. There is also already a plan to increase the number of links over the Motorway.
- I can understand the problems that Milton Keynes is now facing having worked in the London Borough of Tower Hamlets from 1989 to 2004 and saw the vast changes in the demography there firstly through the London Docklands Development Board and then through the Council itself. The situation was different because land was a premium both for new residential development as well as commercial expansion, Canary Wharf now challenges the City of London as a financial centre. I will be following the Plan MK progress especially if expansion to the Bedfordshire side of the M1 corridor looks a possibility. Although there are very strong objections from Mulsoe Parish Council to any expansion in their direction, I do know that Milton Keynes has aspirations in regard to Cranfield University and the airfield, and indeed has support from the University Vice Chancellor.
- As far as land within the existing boundary of Milton Keynes borough, this seems to be the most appropriate location for development of a sufficient scale to meet most the housing needs of Milton Keynes whilst being close to the existing urban area. However it is essential that transport solutions are fully developed before any such proposals are taken forward. As a new junction on the M1 may not be permitted by Highways England other options would need to be explored. As greenfield development it would be far more likely there would sufficient funds from the development to

ensure the necessary infrastructure would be provided. In addition the time required to build out would be relatively short so more quickly meeting housing need.

- There should be no large scale development east of the M1. We have no faith that the necessary huge infrastructure improvements will be delivered on time or possibly at all, leading to significant problems. Additionally the cost of such improvements will be such that this option is unlikely to be viable. A small amount of redevelopment in Newport Pagnell may be desirable to make use of previously industrial areas (Aston Martin). Dualling of the A509 to Olney should be a priority, even at current traffic levels. Similarly, even at current population levels the North / Rural North part of the borough lacks facilities for recreation and sport and these would be desirable now regardless of any further development.
- Direction of growth 2 would concentrate development in too small an area which could lead to pressure around housing density. This approach is too unambitious and NPWG suggests that development could be more extensive, possibly doubling the development proposals and extending development up to Cranfield. It would be important that the appropriate infrastructure was in place to support such a development and that the area should be attached by bridges that are an extension of the existing grid system.
- WPC believes a great opportunity is being missed and this Parish Council really hopes that the MK2050 Commission will thoroughly investigate with Government the opportunity for proper sustainable development in this location that should and could be grasped, given the right funding and acquisition opportunities. In other words the scale being proposed (26,000 homes are suggested to the East of the motorway) would solve the current housing numbers problem, and provide the 'accepted' opportunity to provide future expansion ability over the much longer period of time that Milton Keynes can be expected to grow, i.e.50 years minimum. Interestingly the consultation document states on page 25 "there is potential that the scale of development in this location could even extend beyond that on the diagram if it was considered sustainable or desirable in the future."
- There are sufficient available sites for all of the need for new housing arising within the MKB part of the MKHMA to be delivered within MKB. It is unnecessary therefore for Plan:MK to consider development outside the MKB boundary east of the M1. Any development in this area should be planned as part of the preparation of a new Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire by CBC if CBC through its SHLAA process determines that development here is necessary and sustainable. The potential for development east of the M1 is limited by the traffic issues detailed above, the country lanes through Central Bedfordshire villages are inadequate to handle today's traffic levels let alone that which would arise from any further development east or south of Moulsoe. We believe, however there is scope for MK to grow east of the M1 in the area previously identified between Newport Pagnell and the M1 around Junction 14
- WCC believes that direction of growth 2 would concentrate development in too small an area which could lead to pressure around housing density. This approach is too unambitious and WCC suggests that development could be more extensive, possibly doubling the development proposals and extending development up to Cranfield. It would be important that the appropriate infrastructure was in place to support such a development and that the area should be attached by bridges that are an extension of the existing grid system.
- This is a better solution than Direction 1 as the infrastructure could be easily improved
- The PC does not support the development of Milton Keynes into neighbouring authority areas. It does not support the scale of development proposed for East of the M1 as suggested in option 2. It is far too large. It considers the vague indication of growth

12 . Question 9

shown on the map to be poorly considered as it takes no account of existing conditions and constraints. Page 25 states that a considerable number of ideas at the visioning workshops suggested growth MK eastwards across the motorway. The PC would like to remind MKC that parishes for this area of Central Bedfordshire were not at the vision workshops, and that our Ward Councillors were not invited. Therefore this area of Central Bedfordshire was not represented. It is easy enough to draw on a map without taking any count of landscape or transport constraints, and perhaps tempting to push the development into someone else's area. A very vague area of growth is proposed on the map, yet a very precise number of houses 26,000 is given that could be delivered. There is no evidence or rationale to support this number at all, nor any logic behind why it might be necessary to build a self-sufficient mirror image of MK to the East of the M1. The PC cannot support development on this scale east of the M1 because a large-scale urban settlement east of the M1 would lead to the coalescence of villages, completely change the character of Cranfield, Salford and Hulcote villages; harm the villages landscape setting, harm the rural landscape, and lead to congestion of rural roads. No account has been taken in this proposal of the topography, which rises from the M1 to the Cranfield Ridge meaning development in this area would be very prominent in the landscape. No clear suggestion is made as to how transport links over the motorway could adequately provide for the necessary connectivity with Milton Keynes. This is already an issue with much congestion at both the J13 and J14 crossing points. The roads leading up to and away from these roundabouts are already regularly grid-locked at peak times, and whenever there is an incident on the M1. The Parish Council could also not support urban development that affected Moulsoe and then towards Cranfield. Large-scale urban development in this area would harm the setting of Moulsoe, be harmful to the rural landscape, and have a knock-on impact on the rural road network which Cranfield residents rely on. Cranfield PC could support development towards Newport Pagnell along the A509, as this would be an extension of the urban area and within MKB. However, the road connectivity across the M1 would need to be substantially improved.

- The development identified in the Topic Papers was reasonable, but this proposal will impact adversely on Moulsoe and North Crawley and impact Central Bedfordshire. The scale of the impact on Moulsoe and North Crawley would be such as to destroy their character, and is not supported
- We consider option 2 as too modest. If the development is to go in this direction, it makes sense to go as far as Cranfield in order then to base the new university campus there alongside the existing post-graduate institution. If there is a need to build a major new hospital, then this is one of the areas which could find room for it. However, we recognise that it may be better to build on the existing links between MK and Buckingham. A development in this direction would have the benefit of the new A422 as well as the M1 corridors as the major transport arteries. The M1 would then become a useful main artery to the city as a whole in much the same way as the A5D. Expansion into the east improved would require additional motorway bridges and where they link into the existing grid roads, it would be necessary to widen some of these, particularly where they are still single carriageways.
- The scale of development proposed in the Consultation Document is purely speculative and is not based on any credible estimate or forecast of population size and hence housing demand. If this option is taken forward there should be detailed discussion with Central Bedfordshire Council to ensure congruence between their and Milton Keynes plans.
- The M1 motorway is a major barrier to any urban development east of the motorway. Rather than assisting MK's current transport and infrastructure problems, this will

exasperate the issues of connectivity with key railway links and access to the established MK centre. Mixed use development in this location is likely to prove unsuccessful due to its isolation and there will be a major challenge to creating a good quality of life and a sustainable mixed use community given this isolation. We are NOT in favour of this direction of growth for the following reasons: Infrastructure does not exist. Cost of infrastructure build. No viability assessment has been carried out with regard to this option. Some locations for settlement appear disconnected with existing road network, less than optimal. Possible requirement for hybrid approach to development, delivering multiple smaller sites to secure a short term supply of development. Satellite settlements would require a degree of upfront primary infrastructure needing a mechanism for forward funding to kick-start the investment programme. Getting across the M1 in terms of people movements and extending infrastructure. M1 is a massive barrier. Having a motorway running through the centre of MK is catastrophic from a town planning perspective and quality of life. Housing developments in this area result in "dormitory" developments resulting in mass transit movements in the morning and evening. People need to be able to work, live and relax near to where they work. Development under Plan:MK in this region addresses housing not employment. This is not appropriate. Loss of greenbelt and character of villages. People and families need choice; rural living is attractive for young families. Chaos of infrastructure build on rural roads. Better to focus on the development of MK Centre as a city with growth in industry, culture and shopping. The challenge of alignment between Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire authorities. New development cannot compete with the appeal of Milton Keynes, end up with tertiary shopping centres and attractions. Flood plains in the Ouse Valley. Transport links across M1, the cost of building bridges. Destruction of rural amenities and livelihoods. M1 J14 is already heavily overloaded. Moulsoe is a "Domesday" village - engulfing it with 26k houses doesn't sit well with MK intention to protect heritage. Infrastructure would need to be put in place before development as existing crossings and links would not cope with significant development. DfT stated no plans for new junction and whilst this may change - in the interim it will make MK a challenging and difficult place to get into for both residents and workers travelling from outside areas, and contrary to what MK trying to achieve. This mirror image across M1 doesn't sit well with the idea of making MK an urban vibrant city - M1 is a barrier and it will split the city. This option will take longer to achieve the hybrid approach, will result in an eclectic development which would undermine aim to achieve an identity for the city of MK. Currently, MK, as an area, offers both a city location for young people, which needs investment to make it more vibrant, and also beautiful villages to attract families which don't want to be part of a city environment and yet have its facilities nearby as this would disappear with the expansion and engulfing of these villages, even if protected by a buffer zone. Issues arising from flooding along river which is becoming a more regular event. Increased density of housing/ employment opportunities in this area would only exacerbate this issue. Traffic noise and pollution from M1 does not provide for a good quality of life. Residential accommodation should be kept away from the motorway.

- Expansion into Central Bedfordshire as outlined in both Options 1 & 2 would have a harmful effect on the rural area and character of Central Bedfordshire villages. Expansion would overload the existing road network and lead to coalescence of villages. Again no supporting evidence has been provided to support the expansion into Central Bedfordshire. In conclusion, the parish council feels strongly that Milton Keynes boroughs growth should be accommodated within its own boundary and should not overspill into Central Bedfordshire.

12 . Question 9

- We believe that all of MKBs need for new housing can be accommodated within MKB and therefore there is no need for any of the new housing need arising within the MK part of the MKSHMA to be provided within Central Beds. MKC should comply with the provisions of the NPPF (paragraph 159) and refresh its out of date and incomplete SHLAA to identify suitable areas within MKB where the need for new housing arising within MKB can be delivered. This may include sites east of the M1 within MKB such as land between Newport Pagnell and the M1 around Junction 14.
- MKB can accommodate all development need within its own boundary. Development outside the MKB boundary east of the M1 is unnecessary and inappropriate and is not feasible or preferred due to constraints on all types of infrastructure and the costs of addressing such constraints. If any development did take place it should only be counted as fulfilling CBCs housing needs. As previously stated, avoiding coalescence of the new town with traditional villages is a long established principle dating back to the South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy and should be respected. The existing settlements including Hulcote and Salford, Ridgmont, Brogborough and Cranfield are not part of MKB and coalescence between these settlements and the new town is unacceptable.
- There is no inherent reason why development of sufficient scale should not proceed east of the M1. However this would require agreement with Central Bedfordshire Council and (without scale) could also prove to be prohibitively costly in infrastructure terms. Linked with the planned (Cambridge Milton Keynes Oxford) road expressway and a potential new M1 Junction 13A, such a scheme could also benefit the economic development potential of Cranfield University and Cranfield Airport and open up a new logistics and employment zone north of the M1 at junction 14.
- Provides the advantage of proximity to the M1 and potential jobs growth at Cranfield. The grid road system should be extended and new linkages to the city created. Landscaping and public realm infrastructure should come before development, and the existing urban form and principles of MK should be continued.

What Ward Councillors said:

- I believe the diagram mis-represents and understates the massive barrier effect of the M1. Except in respect of existing bridges, the M1 is effectively an impenetrable barrier. Brooklands has been designed as an end game, with no provision for substantial volumes of new traffic heading for Broughton Grounds Lane or Salford Road, and no future-proofing in the form of sites for new bridges over the motorway. Junction 14 appears to be at maximum current capacity at busy periods, and the Willen Road from Tongwell Roundabout is only served by two single-carriageway grid roads, and only gives access to a relatively small potential site, between the M1, the A422, and the River Ouzel. This option therefore will lead to an effectively isolated neighbourhood, physically close to Brooklands but not accessible to or through Brooklands, and with the A509 across Junction 14 being the least worst route into the city. The site will also suffer massively from motorway noise, being on the receiving end of the traffic noise in most weather conditions. Any noise bund would need to be massively larger than the Brooklands Bund, to have a comparable effect.
- This option would directly harm the villages in my ward. The idea of a new large urban area, a mirror image of MK to the east of the M1, a substantial part of which would be in Central Bedfordshire is completely unjustified. There is no evidence given as to why this might be necessary, nor why development could not be accommodated within MKB. A notional figure of 26,000 houses is given, but no evidence is presented on how this figure has been arrived at. The extent of the urban area is only vaguely suggested. No account has been taken of the landscape, any existing constraints, or

current transport constraints. The M1 junctions at 13 and 14 are highly congested pinch points in traffic flow, both at peaks times and when there are incidents on the M1. It is unclear how the transport constraints presented by the M1 corridor could be overcome. If this option were to proceed there would be harm to the village settings, coalescence between settlements, harm to the rural landscape, and the rural road network would not be able to cope. This is a vaguely defined poorly presented option which should not be taken forward with the exception of expanding the urban area in a corridor to Newport Pagnell. This could be justified if crossing the M1 at J14 or further north could be improved, because it would mean urban development would be contiguous and contained MKB and within an area of less sensitive landscape value. I would not support the expansion of the urban area to Moulsoe or North Crawley even though they villages are within MKB because of the harmful effect this would have on those village settings, and harmful the effect on the rural road network, which would impact Central Bedfordshire villages, especially Cranfield.

- As with the south option, this is one of the directions that should be considered. Whether it is the best cannot be assessed at present because the technical feasibility work has not been done. In this case, connectivity over the M1 would be critical if the settlement was not to suffer the same sort of blight that affected Bletchley in the past. For the same reason, we also believe that, since the M1 is such a major natural barrier, it will be important that any initial settlement on the east of the M1 should be substantial and attractive in its own right in the initial plan period, with community facilities that make it attractive delivered early, and then may be expanded over a longer time period.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- Given that no work has been done on the details of the primary infrastructure that would be needed to make this option work, and the view of the Department of Transport, we therefore have reservations about this option.

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Plan:MK and Futures 2050 10. CBC understands that Plan:MK will be the new Local Plan for the Borough of Milton Keynes, covering a period of around 15 years from the date of adoption and will follow on from the adopted Core Strategy. The Core Strategy covers the period 2011 to 2026 and plans for the provision of 28,000 new homes. Plan:MK will therefore extend the plan period to 2031 and plan for 1,750 new dwellings per year (the same rate of growth as the adopted Core Strategy). 11. Plan:MK, pages 7 and 10, refers to a long term overall vision for Milton Keynes and alludes to the MK Futures 2050, which is running alongside Plan:MK. CBC considers that the Plan:MK document is not clear about how Plan:MK and Futures 2050 are linked. Plan:MK does not provide any information about housing numbers, or justification for the scale of growth that would be needed as part of the longer term vision. It isn't clear which of these documents will determine future numbers and directions for growth. 12. It appears that only Option 2 directly alludes to the longer term vision and how further housing growth will be facilitated stating that in the longer term development east of the motorway could deliver in the region of 26,000. There is no explanation of how this number has been arrived at or why other directions/ options in the document could not deliver the longer term vision. In addition to housing growth Plan:MK, page 12, identifies a number of other longer term opportunities some of which are located in Central Bedfordshire and states that these have particular merit. One of these is the development of a logistics hub at Junction 13 of the M1 located in CBC. We will

12 . Question 9

need to consider this location as part of our own Plan but we are too early in the production of our Plan to identify how much employment land is needed and where it could be located. However, If this location is seen as providing employment land for MK, the plan should state so and also that any proposed development would need to be identified through CBCs plan and not Plan:MK. However, there has been no discussion or agreement on this issue to date and there would be a number of transport issues to resolve. M1 J13 will need further interventions and potential remodelling if significant growth puts further pressure on this strategic (and already highly congested) junction and the identification of this long term opportunity has implications for overall development opportunities at M1 J13, the East West Rail (EWR) Link and the station improvements for Ridgmont Station, all of which need to be looked at holistically in CBCs Plan, in relation to the EWR link and opportunities arising from this. Another opportunity listed is to improve links with Cranfield University, also located in Central Bedfordshire. Plan:MK does not specify what it means by improved links and we would therefore welcome an explanation about this proposed opportunity. CBC are working with Cranfield University to prepare a Masterplan that will provide an overarching development strategy for Cranfield campus and provide a framework for physical change and development opportunities for the campus over the next 20 years. It would be sensible that any further aspirations that MKC have for Cranfield University are discussed with the University and CBC and are considered against the emerging Masterplan and areas of growth identified in this area. Development should be limited to the land within MK borough

- This direction of growth involves development in Central Bedfordshire, on the east of the M1 motorway. As discussed above, development in this area has previously been discounted as it was not required by either CBC or MK to meet their respective housing requirements and it was considered that there were more sustainable locations for the delivery of growth. There were also concerns identified in relation to coalescence with smaller settlements and the setting of a precedent in relation to development north of MK and east of the M1. These concerns are still valid in relation to the proposal in Plan:MK. Plan:MK does not specify the level of growth anticipated in this growth option and what the scale of growth would be in Central Bedfordshire. However, Plan:MK discusses long term growth and how the area could deliver in the region of around 26,000 homes together with associated infrastructure and facilities. It is not clear how this long term growth figure for growth has been derived at and what the figure for growth will be for the Plan:MK period. Plan:MK states that this option could provide a focal point for longer term growth to the east of MK. The creation of this new self-sufficient growth area will significantly alter the character and setting of the existing villages in CBC; Salford, Hulcote and Cranfield. We do not consider there to be any justification for allocating growth on this scale which will have significant impact in CBC and cannot support this option. Similarly to Direction of Growth 1, Plan:MK also fails to address the landscape implications with regard to development in this area. The Aspley Guise Landscape Sensitivity Study, January 2007 identifies this area in terms of landscape of a medium sensitivity. This study identified the area around Moulsoe as having more scope to accommodate growth, with it being less sensitive in landscape terms. The land around Salford and Hulcote is more sensitive, as the Hulcote and Salford valley provide a sequence of small scale hamlets which would be overwhelmed by anything other than minor growth as the setting of the villages are crucial to their identity. Therefore, CBC recommends that development is restricted in scale to the area south of Moulsoe within MK. However there is potential for development to also extend up to Junction 14 of the M1 and out towards Newport Pagnell. The transport connections from MK into CBC across the M1 are currently

limited to that of the Broughton Road (A422), which runs from the new estates of Brooklands and Broughton in MK through Salford and Hulcote to the A421 and M1 J13. This road is already used as an alternative route and thus additional links would be needed. Plan:MK does suggest that links across the M1 would need to improve to facilitate integration and movement across the M1. However, this would require significant infrastructure and funding which would have an impact on the feasibility and viability of any proposal east of the M1. We also suggest that existing routes would need to be upgraded and mitigation measures put in place to limit the impact on these villages. Included as part of this Direction of Growth 2 is a new junction on the M1 between Junction 13 and 14. This new junction is not something that CBC would support without seeing evidence for the need for this junction. This evidence would need to demonstrate that it would not erode the strategic value of the M1 as well as demonstrate the implications for the highway network in Central Bedfordshire, particularly the impact on the villages such as Salford, Hulcote and Cranfield. The M1 has traditionally been seen as a barrier which provides a limit and protection of the open countryside to the east. As such CBC are concerned that any development in CBC east of the M1 would result in a precedent and pressure for further incremental development in CBC. This is also premature given that we are undertaking further work on growth options for Central Bedfordshire. Given the reasons stated above; landscape implications, character of the area, feasibility and viability of infrastructure delivery, transport implications and unknown scale and impact of the proposal, we have significant concerns about the proposals for growth east of the M1 in CBC.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- It is suggested that development east of the M1 could accommodate 26,000 homes and associated infrastructure. This is a significant scale of development which would need to be supported by water and water recycling infrastructure and is likely to require a degree of phasing to align the scale of development with appropriate infrastructure. Further technical work would be required to establish whether there is available capacity within the foul sewerage and water supply networks to accommodate further development in the proposed urban extension or whether improvements would be required to accommodate further development. Similarly further consideration would need to be given to the cumulative impact of additional development as outlined in this option on both water resources and water recycling centre(s) (formerly sewage treatment works).
- A relatively small part of this development area at the western edge lies within the Ouse Valley BOA and the Ouzel Valley BOA. So the points made above in relation to BOAs would apply to these areas. There are also some designated sites and priority habitats within this area so again these would need to be buffered.

What industry (e.g. landowners, site promoters) said:

- The allocation of a strategic employment site at MKE anchored by the commercial demand for next-generation logistics space and the economic need to support growth in advanced manufacturing and high performance engineering - should be regarded as a key component to meeting the sustainable development and infrastructure needs of MK and for planning for its future. Development on land to the east of the M1 is now the only realistic choice available in Milton Keynes for achieving large-scale development. MKE can deliver the large scale, high quality employment site that is required to meet latent and future demand, delivering benefits in terms of both job creation (10,000 jobs) and economic growth (£1.6bn GVA) and gross levels of business

12 . Question 9

rates (approximately £36m by 2031). MKE would facilitate further expansion potential east of the M1 and expedite current infrastructure improvements in accordance with the MKC approach to infrastructure planning. Berkeley considers that Direction of Growth 2 should be prioritised (but not necessarily on a mutually exclusive basis) as it provides the most sustainable and logical direction of growth, which has the potential to support further expansion in the future. Land to the east of the M1 is well placed to provide a strategic gateway to Milton Keynes and to take full advantage of the connections to the M1, Central Milton Keynes and to Cranfield Technology Park.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Milton Keynes is not the planning authority for Central Bedfordshire and cannot require new houses to be built with Central Bedfordshire to meet need arising within Milton Keynes.
- Disappointed there is not recognition of the Forest of Marston Vale designation. Any proposals should ensure that the 'forest city' of MK is continued into new area through extensive woodland and green infrastructure provision.
- Proposal would be expensive and have an unacceptable impact on Moulsoe, North Crawley, Salford and Cranfield.
- Proposal would have fewer negative impacts on existing communities compared to others and is more central to the rest of MK.
- Expansion in this direction was supported by Keith Holland as the area is less sensitive in landscape terms
- No, development to the north of the city between the railway line and the M1 is a much better location for road and transport connections.
- It is DWHSM opinion that 26,000+ homes is too large a scale for a single plan period but a realistic vision longer term. There will be a requirement for this number of housing to enable the infrastructure required to integrate development in this location to the existing urban area, potentially through mass transit public transport. This direction for growth offers excellent opportunities to integrate Milton Keynes with Cranfield University and with transport links including the M1. Development to the west of Milton Keynes will increase pressure on traffic travelling through the existing settlement to the M1 and on the A5. Growth to the east of the M1 will allow for an integrated planning approach to provide links to the existing transport network and provide new links. Development should be encouraged in this plan period for development in the northern and southern extremities of the Direction of Growth 2, where there are existing connections to the existing urban area with bridges over the M1. This will provide the certainty and environment required to allow for longer term planning for a large number of dwellings and the infrastructure required to integrate development on this side of the M1. Plans should also consider the provision of a new road (potentially incorporating mass transit public transport) bypassing Salford, linking Milton Keynes and Cranfield University.
- 2.41 This development option is the subject of objection. 2.42 Whilst there may be a great deal of capacity for such an approach in terms of housing and other development delivery, and there could be a focal point for longer term growth and a critical mass of residents, this option would be a draw away from Milton Keynes and existing settlements and could risk undermining existing social infrastructure rather than reinforcing existing shops, services and facilities. 2.43 There is an important urban morphology point to consider in addition, in so far as the longer term growth of Milton Keynes will effectively be straddled by the M1, one consequence of which is that the M1 would be irreversibly altered in character and utilised by future

occupiers for short distance trips which runs counter to the objective of motorways serving the strategic highway network. 2.44 This is precisely the difficulty in the West Midlands with the M6 and M5 cutting through the wider conurbation and with the consequential significant congestion issues that have arisen and cannot readily be mitigated

- This proposal will impact adversely on Moulsoe and North Crawley and our neighbour, Central Bedfordshire. The scale of the impact and new infrastructure on Moulsoe and North Crawley would be such as to destroy the character and the important history of these villages.
- In the opinion of Rey Construction, the previously stated reasons for resisting development to the east of the M1 continue to exist; namely, that the M1 represents a barrier which prevents the good connections and easy accessibility which it is reasonable to expect between any growth area and the city centres higher order services and facilities. As a consequence, it will not be possible for new urban extensions in this area to be planned and delivered as a sustainable form of development.
- Whilst the scale of development suggested may be approximately correct, compared with Direction of Growth 1, this option is significantly lacking in clarity, coherence and deliverability, and this is acknowledged to a significant extent within the consultation document itself. Key problems include: 1. Integration with existing MK : this development area would need to cross the M1, whilst at the same time being seamless and fully integrated with the rest of the city. It is stated on p.25 that: "To be truly successful, the transport connections between any growth area on this scale to the east of the M1 and the existing Milton Keynes urban area need to be seamless and fully integrated, and will need to deliver effective, good quality road and public transport routes. Figure 4 shows that these connections would need to be put in place, but as yet we haven't done the work to identify how and where those would need to go, or how many would be needed, so the crossings shown on the map are purely indicative and illustrative at this stage and are not intended to show proposed locations." 2. Infrastructure delivery. The consultation document states the following at p26: "At this stage no work has been done on the details of the primary infrastructure that would be needed to make this option work. The feasibility and viability of creating a number of new or improved transport links across the M1 requires considerable work, in particular to identify suitable locations for where that might be possible. Therefore, while we have highlighted possible infrastructure improvements and links, there are no current plans for these. The Department of Transport has been clear in its response to previous consultations that it has no plans for a new junction on the M1 in the location that the workshops identified, but looking longer term it is possible that the situation may change." Little further comment is needed: this passage clearly confirms that Direction of Growth 2 is problematic in principle, with numerous prerequisites and uncertainties that are unlikely to be resolved in a timely way to deliver within this plan period. Development funding: As noted on p.26 of the consultation document, this Direction of Growth " will require the provision of a large amount of primary infrastructure up front" , and it is noted that "we would need to put a new development funding mechanism in place so we can forward fund the early delivery of the critical pieces of infrastructure" . This compares unfavourably with Direction of Growth 1 where urban extensions have a closer relationship with the existing built-up areas and existing infrastructure and are therefore more deliverable earlier in the plan period. 4. Public transport connections . The consultation document states (p.26) that there would be access to the East-West rail route, but the accompanying diagram (figure 4) would seem to contradict this, with the potential

12 . Question 9

development areas being significantly separated from East-West rail, both in distance terms and by the M1. In contrast, as shown by Figure 3, East-West Rail runs around much of the fringes of SW, South and SE Milton Keynes, through and close to various areas of potential development, with additional possibilities for new services/ stations.

5. Co-operation with Central Bedfordshire . The consultation document correctly identifies the need for Central Bedfordshire to bring forward this development area. However, as noted in response to Question 5, Central Bedfordshire are at an extremely early stage in plan production under a new Local Development Scheme, with little firm evidence to suggest a commitment by that authority to bring forward sites east of Milton Keynes. On the other hand, Aylesbury Vale has identified sites SW of Milton Keynes as a preferred option in their emerging plan which is also at least 1 year more advanced than Central Bedfordshires.

6. Possible benefits: Page 25 refers to a range of potential benefits including schools, leisure, district centre, health care, and employment, with an oblique reference to potentially extending the city even further than indicated in the diagram. However, these are not an advantage per se of this Direction of Growth; they are equally applicable to Direction of Growth 1.

7. Delivery: Page 26 of the consultation document also confirms that "the planning and delivery of a large growth area, relatively disconnected from the existing urban area, would take longer to get off the ground than building a number of smaller sites within an established urban area." This again compares unfavourably with Direction of Growth 1 where there are live planning applications and substantially evolved proposals such as those prepared by Crest Nicholson for Shenley Park (attached).

- I write on behalf of my Client, the St Albans Diocesan Board of Finance in respect of the Strategic Development Directions consultation, which closes on the 6th April 2016. The opportunity to comment at this early stage of plan making is welcomed. My client currently owns a number of sites within the area of influence of the Milton Keynes Plan; these include land adjacent to the village of Salford, and land at Broughton Road, east of the M1 and also a number of sites surrounding Cranfield. These sites are within Central Bedfordshire; however, consideration is given as they have the ability to play a strategic role in the cross boundary delivery of development to meet the needs of the area. Plans providing the locations of these sites are enclosed with this letter. My client also has additional land holdings within Central Bedfordshire. Direction of Growth 2- Land East of the M1 Motorway includes Salford village and the surrounding area and this relates very well to my clients land to the south of Salford for housing development and also to the site at Broughton Road east of the M1 where employment uses would complement the existing edge of the settlement at this location. Direction of Growth 2 also has potential to complement growth in Cranfield and capitalise on the skills and jobs that are created both within, and as a result of the University. This provides for a holistic option for delivering jobs and homes for the wider Milton Keynes Housing Market Area. On behalf of my client, I have only responded to the questions that are considered relevant to this option. However, I wish to expressly state that my client raises no objection to any of the options presented and understands that the final option within Plan MK will be based on a number of factors, including delivery and technical evidence.
- My client acknowledges that the final growth direction may be a combination of some, or all of the options presented within this consultation paper. My client particularly supports Direction of Growth 2- Land East of the M1 Motorway. It is believed that this option could contribute to meeting the Duty to Cooperate as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, not least to accommodate some or all of the development needs of the Milton Keynes Housing Market Area that arise within Central Bedfordshire.

- My client has no specific view in respect of the scale of development. However, given the likely infrastructure required to ensure connectivity between new development and the existing town across the M1 motorway, the development option will need to be of a significant scale to justify the financial costs. As highlighted within the document, development in this direction could provide for a critical mass of residents to sustain a full range of land-uses, services and facilities. My client would support the extension of this option to include Salford and towards Cranfield, which would in turn also assist in meeting the objectives identified within the vision workshop of improving links with the University in this location.
- Our consortium of land owners own extensive tracts of land to the east of the M1. As long term land-owners they have witnessed the growth of Milton Keynes and observed its progress towards the M1 from the western side. The land under the control of the consortium on the east side of the M1 extends to approximately 750ha. It adjoins the village of Salford to the southeast and extends almost to junction 14 of the M1 to the west. This extensive area of land could accommodate about 10,000 dwellings, associated infrastructure and green open space. In our view as an extension to Milton Keynes this scale of growth is within the scope of the plan-making process and is manageable growth that can be suitably envisioned and planned. Too large and the scale of the development will delay its delivery and lose its connection with Plan:MK and as an opportunity to shape the growth of Milton Keynes in the medium term. However, this is not to say that further expansion could not continue to the east of the M1 in future plan-making processes and consequently the urban extension proposed should allow for some expansion of transport infrastructure to be accommodated. By staging growth over successive plan periods a more organic and gradual growth can be achieved which allows for a greater assimilation into the urban network and rural setting. A development of up to 26,000 homes as posed in the consultation documents must be a longer term consideration, but to set a firm parameter at this stage in our view is too rigid. Once the perceived barrier of the M1 is opened, growth to the east should be allowed to flow into the new area in a planned but organic way that is structured and incremental allowing new housing to become established and its green setting matured to support a sense of place. 2.3 In our view planning for a sustainable urban growth of 10,000 homes and associated infrastructure which itself will extend beyond the plan period, is a manageable scale and can commence delivery within the plan period. We agree with the proposition suggested in the consultation document that development in this direction could provide a focal point for longer term growth, but we believe this can be considered incrementally. A growth of 10,000 new homes can provide a high degree of self-sufficiency and further growth if considered acceptable in the future would extend that degree of self-sufficiency. 2.4 The proposed growth area to the east of the M1 is largely outside the Milton Keynes Council area and partly extends into Central Bedfordshire, as such this expansion area can only proceed with the co-operation of the neighbouring Local Planning Authority, Parish Councils and communities. The process of planning for a development such as this will inevitably take time, hence the greater need to identify sites that are deliverable within planned time frame. 2.5 Our vision for the East of the M1 development is set out later in this response document.
- We certainly feel that there is potential for development to utilise the strong network of transport infrastructure centred around Junction 13 of the M1. The introduction of the East-West Rail Link could see the development of a fully integrated commuter hub at this location, the type that the Government are currently seeking to encourage via the proposed changes to the NPPF. The M1 corridor currently serves as a very visible and legible barrier to growth and allows nominal control of the MK urban area.

12 . Question 9

At the same time its breach should not be seen as sacrosanct as a strategy to meet the development needs of the Borough may require a creative and potentially radical solution. There is already a significant commercial hub developing around Junction 13. It is our view that, regardless of the direction of growth proposed by the new local plan, the expansion of this commercial element should continue. Due to the expansive road links stemming from Junction 13, including the M1 itself, the A421 and the A4146/A509 around 5km west, such expansion has the potential to provide a high number of accessible jobs sustaining both the urban and rural based workforce in the Borough.

- No work has been done at this stage on the details of the primary infrastructure required to support growth in this location. Although Milton Keynes Council has highlighted possible infrastructure improvement links, there are no plans for these and the DfT was clear in their response to previous consultations that it has no plans for a new junction on the M1 in the location identified in the workshops but looking longer term, they note that this situation may change. Therefore the scale of development cannot be determined at this stage.
- Development Options: My client acknowledges that the final growth direction may be a combination of some, or all of the options presented within this consultation paper. My client particularly supports Direction of Growth 2- Land East of the M1 Motorway. It is believed that this option could contribute to meeting the Duty to Cooperate as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, no least to accommodate some or all of the development needs of the Milton Keynes Housing Market Area that arise within Central Bedfordshire
- My client has no specific view in respect of the scale of development. However, given the likely infrastructure required to ensure connectivity between new development and the existing town across the M1 motorway, the development option will need to be of a significant scale to justify the financial costs. As highlighted within the document, development in this direction could provide for a critical mass of residents to sustain a full range of land-uses, services and facilities. My client would support the extension of this option towards Cranfield, which would in turn also assist in meeting the objectives identified within the vision workshop of improving links with the University in this location.
- There is a need to adopt a hybrid approach when planning for strategic growth across the Borough. If sites fail to come forward for development at the rates envisaged in the Plan, the strategic priorities will not be met and the Plan could not be said to be up to date.
- No work has been done at this stage on the details of the primary infrastructure required to support growth in this location. Although Milton Keynes Council has highlighted possible infrastructure improvement links, there are no plans for these and the DfT was clear in their response to previous consultations that it has no plans for a new junction on the M1 in the location identified in the workshops but looking longer term, they note that this situation may change. Therefore the scale of development cannot be determined at this stage.
- Given the magnitude of the proposal there must be significant doubts as to whether such agreement would be forthcoming. The scale of development also has major implications in terms of funding, timescale for delivery and the wider impacts of the development. These are all concerns noted in the consultation document and as acknowledged, there are currently no answers/solutions to these issues. To deliver a sustainable development which would be to all intents and purposes be new settlement, there would be a requirement for the early delivery of primary infrastructure up front and alongside residential development so that future residents

would not have to travel to access schools, shops etc. There would be very significant costs associated with this and as noted, a new development funding mechanism would be required. The timescale for delivery would be significantly slower compared to other options e.g. expansion to existing areas where there is access to the main infrastructure elements such as roads, drainage, utilities etc. The scale of development also raises major concerns with regard to the wider landscape impact and connectivity to Milton Keynes. The consultation document acknowledges that no work has been done to assess these issues e.g. crossing points over the M1 and how a development of this magnitude would impact upon the existing villages. 5 It is submitted that the scale of development is excessive and at this stage there are too many unanswered questions regarding the delivery of the development and how it could be achieved in a sustainable way.

- We consider that development east of the M1, on both sides of J14 up to North Crawley but within the MK borders, is appropriate if combined with urban intensification to promote and support MK Centre. This was what was originally planned for MK, and it would still leave a substantial rural area, both east of the M1 and north of the existing urban area. There are, of course, a number of crossings of the M1, including the A422, besides J14. Extending to the east of the M1 was selected by 17 of the 28 Visioning Workshop groups but most of these extensions were within the MK boundary. We note the reference to infrastructure funding, but that would be required wherever MK extended as existing MK facilities, health and education etc., are already at capacity. There is no requirement or need to expand east of the M1 into Central Bedfordshire. We fully understand the attraction of offloading MKCs housing requirement into a neighbouring authority, protecting MKCs rural area, with the added attraction of extending out to Cranfield and incorporating it into MK. However, as stated before, MKC cannot dictate where development occurs in another planning authority. That is a matter for Central Bedfordshire. Nor can MKC dictate linear park extensions in another authority's area. As stated before, the Duty to Co-Operate on strategic issues, should not be interpreted as a Duty to Comply. MKC cannot, nor should it, dictate where development will occur in a neighbouring authority. We note that Junction 13a has appeared yet again on the map into Hulcote and Salford. It should be removed as the Department of Transport has ruled against it and it is not part of Central Bedfordshire's existing nor its developing Core Strategy.
- The consultation document states that a new area to the east of the M1 could provide a focal point for longer term growth including a full range of land uses, services and facilities including schools, leisure, a large local or district centre incorporating primary health care facilities, and employment opportunities. Whilst this is aspirational and promotes positive planning over the plan period, investigation through the evidence base will be required to evaluate the impact of large-scale development in this general area. More importantly, care should be taken not to damage the vitality of CMK. Retail and leisure uses should be directed towards CMK first and foremost to ensure the Local Plan accords with the retail hierarchy.
- Development East of the M1 should be considered but must deliver strong sustainable transport connections back in to MK and not become a new MK as this would result in the decline of the existing city.
- This is the best direction of growth in relation to providing appropriate sites to meet the employment needs of the City.
- Berkeley supports Direction of Growth 2 and development to the east of the M1 as this provides a key opportunity to expand Milton Keynes and deliver a scale of development which will provide significant economic and social benefits to Milton Keynes over the new Plan period.

13 . Question 10

13 Question 10

Final extent of development east of the M1 (Direction of Growth 2)

13.1 If Direction of Growth 2 were to proceed, should we define an eventual 'final extent' of development? If so, where should this be? 168 responses were received.

13.2 The majority of responses indicated a preference for no development beyond M1.

13.3 A smaller number of responses indicated that there should be a final extent defined and that Direction 2 should not proceed.

13.4 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- I don't know, further details needed to inform decision
- Keep development within the MK boundary, more than enough land for development
- There should be no development
- No, a final extent should not be defined
- As shown
- The extent should be Cranfield
- The extent should be Chicheley
- The extent should be North Crawley
- The extent should be North of the city
- The extent should be as far as Bedford
- The extent should be south of North Crawley Road and Brook End and south east of Cranfield Road
- The extent should be around Newport Pagnall
- The extent should not be beyond what has already been defined in the document.
- Development should stop short of Moulsoe village, which lies on elevated ground, but could extend up to Cranfield University campus. Development should stop short of the ridge to Marston Vale
- There should be no development beyond A509
- The extent of development should be no more than in the topic papers
- Keep to original MK concept
- I strongly oppose the plans to extend Milton Keynes towards the villages of Hulcote, Salford & Cranfield.
- No further east than Newport Pagnell and Moulsoe
- The extent should be determined by the time taken to travel to central Milton Keynes, say no more than 20 minutes.

Other

- The development could go up to Cranfield, as the development of the area could allow the university to thrive
- Development east of the M1 should be restricted to the MK Borough area
- Where are the projections of population growth? How are these being assessed? Where is the evidence for high housing demand that is not connected with immigration?

What is the long term impact of immigration? Currently this is high but it is unlikely to continue into the future?

- If the anticipated economic growth projections hold true, and the East - West rail expansion delivers the expected returns, then Bedford and MK could meet in the middle.
- The only area which should be considered is the land immediately south of Newport Pagnell where an appropriate quantum of development land could be identified as a urban extension to Newport Pagnell as oppose to a massive extension to MK.
- I do not know enough about the physical characteristics of the area to make a judgement about this, as there are large areas of marshland and river meadows which might make it an unrealistic and hugely expensive pursuit to cross these natural boundaries.
- Where will those kids go to school? Why are you building houses and not increasing the capacity of the schools?
- Again, developments into areas outside Milton Keynes Boroughs control should come with the cooperation with the relevant Bedfordshire local authorities or with consent to cede control of these surrounding areas to Milton Keynes Borough.
- To expand as far as a line that runs approximately in the direction Chicheley North Crawley Bourne End Marston Moretaine.
- There appears to be no natural barrier, so this is difficult to define. I'd anticipate that the huge cost and scale of developing in this area (including provision of services, transport links and also the crossing of the M1) would justify to the developers an extremely large scale project so there would be resistance from them for limiting the size of this option.
- All land around MK should be very carefully evaluated and only the best and most sustainable locations chosen. The opportunities East of the M1 motorway are undeniable and incredibly exciting not least the potential of Cranfield (technology park and airfield) and Marston Moretaine (employment and recreation).
- A northern limit defined by the road from the Marston Moretaine junction of the A421, north of Cranfield, possibly south of North Crawley and joining the Chichely A422 roundabout might be a reasonable limit.
- I think this depends on the requirement of need for housing.
- Again, we would say it needs a full strategic plan with detailed explanation, rather than just a rough guide of direction only.
- If new housing is built in Central Bedfordshire in the parishes close to Milton Keynes it is counted towards satisfying the need for new housing with regard Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC), not Plan:MK
- We should set down a marker but it missed be accompanied by a time factor in order that we do not constrain future development prospects.
- This seems premature. We should at least create a mirror city with sufficient local resources to be self-sustaining. Ideally, it should have a center and attractions of its own (e.g, olympic swimming pool).
- The eastern boundary of the Borough of Milton Keynes should define the final extent of any development in an easterly direction. Development in the northerly direction can continue from the M1 to Lavendon and the nearby north-eastern boundary which should define the final extent in that direction.
- Expansion to the east of the M1 could allow limitless expansion to the northeast unless boundaries are set. It is essential that any development is strictly limited and zoned. Bedfordshire should be encouraged to do likewise, in order to restrict the onward expansion of Cranfield.

13 . Question 10

- This option appears to be fraught with political and infrastructure challenges.
- Assuming that the phasing would be to utilise sites within the current LA boundary the an area East of the M1 East of A509 incorporating Mulsoe and extending to the edge of Wharley End is probably a viable area. The areas adjacent to the M1 would probably have to be zoned for business or commercial use or have good woodland screening for residential development.
- The new forest should be preserved and developed further.
- The starting point should be to build in a level of strategic thinking that allow for adaptation and change over time.
- It would demand the least new transport infrastructure. The Direction of Growth 2 should only be considered when 4 + 1 options have been fully explored and implemented and cannot yield the necessary number of houses.
- I strongly oppose the Strategic Development Direction 3 (one or more satellite settlements in the rural area).
- This seems premature. We should at least create a mirror city with sufficient local resources to be self-sustaining. Ideally, it should have a center and attractions of its own (e.g, olympic swimming pool).

What Town and parish Councils said:

- Yes, this should follow appropriate detailed evaluation of the landscape characteristics and only when the extent of housing need required is known. It would be inappropriate to define any final extent now until such further work is carried out. There should be no development outside the Milton Keynes borough boundary for the reasons given above in the answer to question 5.
- There should be no large scale development east of the M1. We have no faith that the necessary huge infrastructure improvements will be delivered on time or possibly at all, leading to significant problems. Additionally the cost of such improvements will be such that this option is unlikely to be viable. A small amount of redevelopment in Newport Pagnell may be desirable to make use of previously industrial areas (Aston Martin). Dualling of the A509 to Olney should be a priority, even at current traffic levels. Similarly, even at current population levels the North / Rural North part of the borough lacks facilities for recreation and sport and these would be desirable now regardless of any further development.
- The M1 motorway should continue to represent the eastern boundary of Milton Keynes
- This should include Cranfield and its airport. There should be no definable final extent as the boundary should be moveable to ensure that sufficient infrastructure is in place to enable MK to grow in a sustainable way. There should be a sufficient bund between any residential area and the M1, or preferably to develop commercial area close to the M1 which would benefit business with easy access to the motorway. The road network should be an extension of the existing grid road system.
- No more than in Topic Papers
- The final extent of this option could define a north to east boundary, being the strategic green park running from Newport Pagnell, through Olney to Turvey. The boundary could then follow the existing borough boundary from Turvey to Bourne End before heading South-East towards the east/west rail line, and finally turning south west following the rail line until it intersects with the M1 motorway, thereby incorporating the exciting opportunities offered at both Cranfield,Marston Mortaine, Liddington, Brogborough, Junction 13, Newport Pagnell Services and Junction 14. Such a decision would solve the 'expansion problem' for at least the next 50 years,

and in the process give certainty to existing and future residents and provide the creative, exciting opportunities necessary for the next generation of MK Town Planners.

- As there is more than sufficient land available within MKB to meet all of the towns need for new housing well beyond the period covered by Plan:MK we believe that the MKB boundary is the most appropriate final extent of development.
- The current consultation is misconceived and misleading. 26. All of MKs need for new housing can and should be delivered within MKB. Any new houses delivered in Central Bedfordshire as part of the MKSHMA assessed housing need will go to satisfy the requirement for new housing arising in the Central Bedfordshire portion of the MKHMA not the requirement arising in MKB. 27. The consultation presents four Options for the growth two of which include areas for growth outside the MKB boundary. The consultation gives the impression that new housing delivered outside the MKB boundary in these two Options will reduce the need for this number of houses to be delivered within MKB. 28. This may lead respondents to the consultation who live in MKB to inappropriately favour Options 1 and 2. 29. Some of the wording in the consultation has led some to question whether the consultation is proposing a boundary change to achieve the expansion of Milton Keynes. This has led to concern and confusion amongst our residents. However, we have been assured by MKC officers that no boundary change is being proposed by MKC as part of Plan:MK CBC is also currently engaged on the preparation of a Local Plan which is the process through which development within Central Bedfordshire should be planned, not Plan:MK. 30. CBC is also currently engaged on the preparation of a Local Plan and has recently issued a call for sites including a full range of alternative sizes: new settlements of 2,000 or more dwellings urban extensions of 500 or more dwellings between 10 and 500 dwellings, where these have not been previously submitted or are improved resubmissions with enhanced detail 31. This process is likely to bring forward a number of sites in the Central Bedfordshire part of the MKHMA, possibly including those identified in Options 1 and 2 of the consultation, which CBC will assess as part of the preparation of its own SHLAA. If these sites are chosen for development the new homes built on them will satisfy the need for new housing arising within Central Bedfordshire and will not result in a reduction in the number of new homes to be built within MKB. 32. Option 1 of the current consultation includes a specific site allocation for the delivery of new housing in Central Bedfordshire. Where new housing should be delivered within Central Bedfordshire should be determined by the CBC Local Plan process not Plan:MK. The same applies for any sites within Central Bedfordshire east of the M1. 33. If CBC determine that sites close to MKB are necessary to satisfy the need for new housing arising within Central Bedfordshire, those sites should be brought forward in the CBC Local Plan and developed through a process of joint working between the two councils. It is not acceptable for MKC to seek to unilaterally force development in these areas in an attempt to reduce the number of new houses to be built within MKB.
- Having been party to the discussions that have contributed to the Joint Response which you will have received on behalf of the eight parish councils neighbouring the south-east corner of Milton Keynes Borough, Hulcote and Salford Parish Council fully endorses this document (Also attached to this email) and all the points made within it. However, we should also like to add the comments below which refer specifically to this parish. If any expansion by MKB into Central Bedfordshire were to take place towards the south-east then this very small parish would be the first to suffer. Given the proximity of the 'Brooklands' any further development in our direction would effectively join Hulcote and Salford to an urban estate resulting in a complete loss of its integrity as an ancient rural parish. Squeezed as it is between the M1 on one

13 . Question 10

side and Cranfield on the other it is difficult to see how its identity might be protected as has happened, with varying degrees of success, to villages within Milton Keynes. When completed, 'Brooklands' on its own will inevitably cause a significant rise in traffic through Salford and Hulcote along a winding road that is woefully inadequate for the demands now being made of it. The road already suffers from its use as a 'rat run' and from HGVs illegally using Broughton Road through Salford. The speed, and at peak times, the density of traffic already poses a danger to vehicles and cyclists attempting to enter from side roads and adjacent properties. It must also be noted that junctions along Salford Rd, including the new A421 and M1 J13, are failing to function as designed due to the peak flow volumes. Any further development towards, or indeed in the vicinity of, the parish will exacerbate this problem. It would be unacceptable to consider such development on the basis of what we believe to be a flawed consultation process unless specific traffic planning were considered first. We note from the Plan: MK Development document, "Direction of Growth 2" the suggestion of a "Potential Green Space and Linear Park Extension" which might encompass much of Hulcote and Salford and include the projected waterway. While this might sound an attractive feature we would point out that the suggestion would involve the waterway surmounting Brogborough Hill; that this area is already predominantly a green space which contains ancient woodland (Hulcote Wood) and newly planted woodland (Reynolds Wood); and that a Linear Park implies an extensive route such as that so successfully implemented in Milton Keynes. That clearly is not a possibility within the limited area shown on the plan. Such a strategy will become even less viable if the electrification of the Bletchley to Bedford rail line is undertaken with the resulting closure of several level crossings. The maps illustrating the Options include the possibility of a new Junction 13A on the M1 motorway. A proposal for a new Junction 13A was considered during the public examination into the dualling of the A421 between Bedford and Junction 13 but was ruled out by the Highways Agency on both cost and safety grounds. Although the Joint Response, to which this council has subscribed, has covered the point in considerable detail we wish to state our most strongly held opinion that MKB should develop within its own very extensive boundaries before seeking to cross into those of another authority; that it should concentrate on regenerating its own urban areas; and that pressure should be brought onto any developers within Milton Keynes who are failing to build on the land that they already own. Finally, we would reiterate that any housing built within Central Bedfordshire to meet Milton Keynes' needs would not subtract from Central Bedfordshire's housing requirement and that it is for Central Bedfordshire to determine where development should take place within its own boundaries.

- If Direction of Growth 2 were to proceed, should we define an eventual final extent of development? If so, where should this be? This should include Cranfield and its airport. There should be no definable final extent as the boundary should be moveable to ensure that sufficient infrastructure is in place to enable MK to grow in a sustainable way. There should be a sufficient bund between any residential area and the M1, or preferably to develop commercial area close to the M1 which would benefit business with easy access to the motorway. The road network should be an extension of the existing grid road system.
- The final extent of development should not subsume villages such as Moulsoe
- No more than in topic papers
- We consider option 2 as too modest. If the development is to go in this direction, it makes sense to go as far as Cranfield in order then to base the new university campus there alongside the existing post graduate institution. If there is a need to build a major new hospital, then this is one of the areas which could find room for it. However

we recognise that it may be better to build on the existing links between MK and Buckingham. A development in this direction would have the benefit of the new A422 as well as the M1 corridors as the major transport arteries. The M1 would then become a useful main artery to the city as a whole in much the same way as the A5D. Expansion into the east improved would require additional motorway bridges and where they link into the existing grid roads, it would be necessary to widen some of these, particularly where they are still single carriageways.

- Yes, a final extent should be defined; where this should be depends on the development requirement, which is as yet undefined in terms of final population size.
- Yes it should. It should be MKB boundary. But development east of the M1 should be limited to continuity with the existing urban area where there is lower landscape sensitivity for example up to Newport Pagnell. For the reasons described above a large area of urban development should not extend into the rural fringes of MKB eg around Moulsoe.
- We believe that all of MKBs need for new housing can be accommodated within MKB and therefore the MKB border should be the final extent of development.
- It was of the Town Councils opinion that the Direction of Growth number 2 would be the preferred option out of the four presented, noting that this is the case as the other remaining options would not be fit for the proposed development and growth of Milton Keynes. The Direction of Growth number 2 (East of the M1 Motorway) was agreed by Committee in the absence of an alternative proposal that would suit the needs of Milton Keynes.
- Direction of Growth 2 Development East of the M1 motorway [That is the area between Newport Pagnell and Junction 13 going East/North East] This would be our first choice because it would allow the successful city to expand with all the successful features (noted below) built-in, in the manner it was originally planned. But as it requires substantial investment (bridging the M1) not to mention involvement in the neighbouring Authority and Whitehall it is not an immediate option. Nevertheless negotiations with the above would have to start NOW so that it becomes a viable option as soon as possible. The destruction of attractive countryside would be minimal in that the majority of the area is farmland. Villages could be subsumed in much the same way as those within the current city boundary, which is to say to maintaining their integrity as much as possible. Cranfield would be welcomed as part of the city infusing it with its technological and academic expertise.

What Ward Councillors said:

- There should be final extent, which should be the MKB boundary. However, extending the urban area out to the MK boundary at Mousloe and North Crawley is not supported because this would be harmful to those village settings, and have a harmful the effect on the rural road network, which would impact Central Bedfordshire villages, especially Cranfield. A major urban settlement east of the motorway would have a harmful effect on all of the villages and the rural road network across the whole of my ward.
- We should consider a green belt buffer between MK and Bedford. That might then be used as a new linear park for the settlement. It may be that settlement in this area should be a separate settlement from Milton Keynes, (ie option 3) in which case a buffer between it and Milton Keynes would be appropriate. Since Central Bedford shire is also building in this direction, a joint plan for what might eventually become a combined settlement might be appropriate.

13 . Question 10

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- CBC consider that there should be a final extent of development defined in this area should this Direction of Growth 2 proceed. Given the landscape implications in this area and the sensitivity of development around Salford and Hulcote, CBC consider that development in this Direction of Growth should avoid these sensitive villages. Development should be restricted to the area south of Moulsoe, which has more scope to accommodate growth and less sensitivity in landscape terms.
- Whilst it is appreciated that views are sought on workshop outputs, it is very difficult to comment on growth options when there is little indication of the level growth involved, the likely homes / jobs balance proposed and the source of the growth needs. As a starting point, MK growth should be accommodated within the MKC boundary. It is not clear from the consultation documentation how much growth is required to meet the needs generated by Milton Keynes and how much capacity there is within the MKC area to accommodate this, both in the period up to 2031 and beyond. It would be helpful to see this evidence and we would welcome the opportunity to meet to discuss this in due course. Spreading into surrounding local authority areas only serves to put more pressure on and limits the options for the respective areas to meet their own growth needs. However, if for example MKC were proposing to accommodate unmet need from other nearby authorities then the Growth options which propose expansion into surrounding local authority areas may be more sustainable. There is also merit in looking ahead to identify locations which meet more immediate and future needs together rather than a more piecemeal approach. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you at your convenience.
- It is essential that the boundaries are precisely defined so that all parties are aware of the implications
- In respect of Direction of Growth 2 - Development East of the M1 motorway South Northamptonshire Council raises no objection in principle, and would support the principle of this direction of growth.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- It is DWHSM opinion that no final extent of development should be made. It is considered that this would be against sustainable development principles. The artificial restriction of growth has the effect of increasing pressure on existing areas and potential to drive up house prices due to the restricting factor on supply. It will be important to ensure that suitable infrastructure is in place to ensure thriving communities in these locations but no restriction on the growth that can be achieved. Natural and environmental constraints should be the only constraints on growth in this location.
- A final extent of development for the purposes of this plan should be identified in order to provide certainty for both communities and stakeholders delivering development.

- Limit it to 1km distance from the M1, whilst fully protecting Moulsoe and Salford villages and Roundhill Spinney woodland. No development SE of Salford.
- As stated in respect of Question 7, we would suggest not using terminology such as final extent, since all Development Plan Documents must be reviewed in the fullness of time and it would be wrong to suggest that there is an outer perimeter beyond which Milton Keynes could never extend.
- Yes. Every good plan needs boundaries.
- As set out above we consider that setting out a final extent of development would be premature at this stage in the plan-making process. A strategic landscape assessment will be a key element of the evidence base that will help to define a limit to development east of the M1, this together with a strategic infrastructure assessment of the capacity of the highway network and its relevant and viable improvement. In our view if the Council wish to define a limit to development this will need to be soundly evidence based.
- It is considered helpful to have a final extent defined within the plan. However, this should be kept under review. My client does not have a specific view in respect of the development limit, but would support the inclusion of Salford and Cranfield within the area. The final area should be informed by detailed landscape and other technical work, including consultation with local residents, landowners and other stakeholders.
- It is considered helpful to have a final extent defined within the plan. However, this should be kept under review. My client does not have a specific view in respect of the development limit, but would support the inclusion of Cranfield within the area. The final area should be informed by detailed landscape and other technical work, including consultation with local residents, landowners and other stakeholders.
- Direction of Growth 2 should not proceed.
- An explicit final extent of development should be specified at whatever the agreed boundary becomes. It is important for people choosing to live near, but not within, Milton Keynes to be reassured that their choice will not be compromised in future years.
- Should this option proceed, the final extent of the development area must be identified so as to determine a suitable and sustainable approach to resolving the wide range of planning issues that would result from a development on this scale.
- All development should be within the MK boundary but, subject to that, we would suggest the limit to the urban extension should be North Crawley to the east and Newport Pagnell to the north. Those limits combined with urban intensification, should be more than sufficient both now and in the future. We would not support MK becoming an urban sprawl up to its boundaries, nor would we support loss of green space/trees in or around MK Centre. However, we would support urban intensification and regeneration of the older estates, above the height limits set out in the original plan, as indeed has already occurred in Central MK, to keep MK centre vibrant and healthy.
- As mentioned in Question 7, an appropriate solution to this matter would be to define the extent of the area and detail in the Local Plan what uses would be strategically envisaged for the area. An SPD could be produced following the adoption of the Local Plan to provide further detail as to how the site should be delivered. This will be much simpler to achieve if the area of development remains within the MK boundary. Should it stretch beyond the boundary, adjoining authorities will need to identify whether they can accommodate Milton Keynes unmet need. The Council should realistically await the findings of the evidence base to identify the development need, and enter discussions with the adjoining authorities before consulting on this issue.

13 . Question 10

- Where it best fits into the landscape, and existing infrastructure network, ie between J13 and 14 of the M1.
- It is considered that the Council should use robust and sound evidence to inform the level of growth required and to plan appropriately for this. Berkeley considers that the location east of the M1 provides a key opportunity to accommodate the future growth requirements of Milton Keynes given its location as a strategic gateway to the city and its ability to deliver a range of development. Given its location there is the opportunity for the site to provide connections further afield including to Cranfield and this should be taken into consideration when assessing the extent of development. 4.23 Given the opportunities the land to the east of the M1 presents, Berkeley considers that the Council should be considering not just the medium term growth requirements of the city but also the longer term requirements to ensure Plan:MK delivers a holistic and long term plan. As part of Plan:MK the Council will be assembling a range of evidence base studies to inform the amount and location of growth and it should be these, as well as key information on the availability and suitability of land, which will assist in informing the extent of development. 4.24 Berkeley has undertaken a range of infrastructure, ecological and landscape assessments to confirm the suitability of MKE for development. These surveys are discussed in detail in section 3.0 and should be considered as part of the response to this question. They do not identify any overriding constraints to development of the site with the technical work identifying a range of mitigation and enhancement measures which can be delivered on the site
- As stated in respect of Question 7, we would suggest not using terminology such as final extent, since all Development Plan Documents must be reviewed in the fullness of time and it would be wrong to suggest that there is an outer perimeter beyond which Milton Keynes could never extend.

14 Question 11

Treatment of existing settlements in Direction of Growth 2

14.1 This question asked how the character and integrity of existing settlements could best be maintained whilst growth occurs around them, by either using green buffers to keep them separate or by integrating them into new development as has happened at Great Linford and Loughton. 145 responses were received.

14.2 Overall, a clear majority of members of the public, parish/town councils and local groups supported the use of green buffers to separate existing villages from any new satellite settlements. The second largest preference was for existing villages to be sensitively incorporated into new urban areas. Industry bodies were more evenly split, with a small majority favouring a case-by-case approach. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

14.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- If development east of the M1 is required then significant green buffers and separation between Salford, Hulcote, Moulsoe, Cranfield, Ridgmont and Brogborough and new development should be provided to protect character and avoid coalescence.
- A minority consider that the existing villages should be sensitively incorporated into new urban areas, taking into account the villages' character and careful layout, density and design of new development.
- Eastern expansion should not occur at all. This area is itself a green buffer between the Milton Keynes urban area and existing villages east of the M1.
- Integration of villages into MK urban area has resulted in the loss of their identity and character, such as Loughton and Milton Keynes which have lost their identity.
- Green buffers should consist of landscaping, farmland and woodland with villages and new urban areas linked by parkland and redways, and not just grass verges alongside busy roads.
- Integration should be done in a similar way to Stony Stratford, Shenley, Broughton and Loughton which have their own identity but are well-served and successful parts of wider Milton Keynes.
- Central Beds should be the authority which decides what development and green infrastructure occurs east of the M1
- New development should have its own character, in a similar fashion to Newport Pagnell, and not just mimic Milton Keynes.
- Integrate Moulsoe, but keep Salford and Cranfield separate.
- Whilst they could be sensitively integrated, the history of integrating villages into the MK urban areas indicates that green buffers would be preferable.
- Not convinced that a green buffer approach would be successful, in terms of retaining rural character of villages.

14 . Question 11

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- If development east of the M1 is required then significant green buffers and separation between existing villages (including Salford, Moulsoe and North Cranfield) and new development should be provided to protect character and avoid coalescence.
- Eastern expansion should not occur at all. This area is itself a green buffer between the Milton Keynes urban area and existing villages east of the M1.
- Central Beds should be the authority which decides what development and green infrastructure occurs east of the M1
- Favour integration of settlements in the same as Great Linford
- A case-by-case approach should be taken depending up the character of the village in question and an analysis of the local area

What Ward Councillors said:

- Communities within the villages affected should be given the choice.
- Should be informed by a masterplan approach, taking account of the existing character of villages, network of roads, and how new development is laid out and designed.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- The Hulcote and Salford valley would be overwhelmed by anything other than minor growth and the settings of the villages are crucial to their identity. They also have very limited services and infrastructure, with Salford identified as a small village in the adopted Core Strategy. CBC is therefore concerned that any development moving across the M1 eastwards towards these villages would have significant impacts and erode their rural character.
- Neither approach would be suitable as major growth east of the M1 is not appropriate. Any development in Central Beds will be determined by CBC.

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents...) said:

- Both approaches have merit, therefore a case-by-case approach should be taken depending up the character of the village in question and an analysis of the local area
- Significant green buffers and separation between new development and existing villages to protect their character would be preferred to integration
- Integration would be preferred
- Green buffers would be cautiously welcomed provided they provide useable space and do not prohibit development in around the existing villages.
- It is unlikely that any of the villages would require a green buffer or integration during the plan period as the areas of new development would not be close enough to the them

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Significant green buffers and separation between existing villages and new development should be provided to protect character and avoid coalescence.
- The existing settlements in the Marston Vale including Hulcote, Salford, Ridgmont, Brogborough, Cranfield, Lidlington and Marston Moretaine are not part of MK and coalescence between these settlements and the new town is unacceptable. A green buffer would have little positive impact.
- Central Beds should be the authority which decides what development and green infrastructure occurs east of the M1
- There should be no expansion east of the M1 into Central Beds.

15 Question 12

Size of new settlement(s) in Direction of Growth 3

15.1 This question asked if it would be better to have one larger new settlement that is self-sufficient in terms of infrastructure and services (e.g. a Garden City) in the northern part of or adjacent to the borough, or several smaller new settlements. 481 responses were received (including comments on Figure 5).

15.2 Overall, a clear majority of respondents across all categories did not support the creation of new satellite settlements, for the reasons set out in the summaries below. Of those who did support the concept of new settlements, the majority favoured a single larger settlement over a number of smaller settlements. A notable number of members of the public, parish/town councils and industry bodies supported expansion of the existing rural settlements, in particular Newport Pagnell and Olney, instead of establishing new settlements. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

15.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

Against satellite settlements and significant development in the rural area

- The northern areas are not suitable for large scale development due to the quality of the landscape; flood risk; lack of suitable railway, roads and connections; lack of infrastructure.
- They would destroy the character, identity, history and beauty of the rural area and the existing villages there.
- They would be disproportionate to the scale of existing villages and would overwhelm existing infrastructure in the rural area.
- Any new local centres that are built within new settlements would leave historic village centres derelict.
- New road building to serve and connect the new settlement(s) would have devastating environmental impacts (landscape, wildlife, river corridors and wetlands)
- Construction would cause major disruption and adverse impacts to rural communities
- A new station or reopened station at Castlethorpe on the WCML is unlikely due to sale of the land and practical constraints. The railway line is already at capacity and reliant on HS2 freeing up capacity which is unreliable, so would not be able to accommodate new services and additional passengers.
- The rural areas provide attractive countryside and wildlife habitat, which is a key part of the MK offer and is a major benefit to MK. This should be protected, and not lost.
- They would be detrimental to MK's unique identity of a mix of city, market towns and villages.
- They would be more expensive than other Directions of Growth options, due to the investment that would be needed in new infrastructure (principally new roads, connections and crossings to MK) and funding to deliver it when needed is not guaranteed.

- The M1 is a significant barrier that would require new crossings. Junction 14 is already overloaded
- MK has already urbanised the countryside enough
- It would lead to urban sprawl
- It would move away from the One City principle of MK
- It would dilute and detract from central MK, with facilities and services split between MK and any new centres, to the detriment of MK overall.
- A Garden City would be too close to MK to become a self-sufficient settlement with its own identity.
- They would just be commuter dormitories that could not connect to the grid and would not be suited to mass transit and public transport systems, generating high levels of journeys by car and traffic/congestion.
- It would create continuous development between MK and Northampton.
- It would lie outside of the vision to expand the city
- It would result in the loss of good and very good agricultural land
- No viability work has been done to inform this options
- Object to the idea of a garden city or satellite settlement around Olney. It would not be suitable due to flood risk and landscape quality. A new bypass to facilitate development would not be possible for these reasons.
- Object to the idea of a garden city or satellite settlement around Castlethorpe
- Object to the idea of a garden city or satellite settlement around Hanslope
- The rural areas and villages should be protected with green belts and green belt status
- Object to the idea of a garden city or satellite settlement around North Crawley
- There is still sufficient space and permissions within MK to meet housing needs. Intensifying the centre of MK would have the advantages of social integration and creating opportunity for an integrated public transport system.
- There is already an infrastructure deficit in the rural areas (e.g. Woburn Sands). This should be addressed before any further growth in the rural areas is considered.
- The necessary transport infrastructure needed would be a distraction from improvements to the southern transport corridor and East-West Rail. The new infrastructure may incentivise Northampton to focus its growth around this new infrastructure
- There should be no development of the villages to the east/north east to keep this site of the borough as a green heart to the vibrant city.

Favour a new larger self-sufficient settlement

- It would not clog up roads in MK.
- It would be easier to plan holistically.
- It would be more cost-effective for investment and running services (e.g. healthcare, schools) due to economies of scale than spreading growth over a number of settlements.
- It would support, and be supported by, a direct public transport link into MK.
- It would be able to support services so it is self-sufficient but not entirely standalone.
- It would limit the impact on the character of existing settlements.
- It could develop its own identity and distinct appearance, and protect the identity of MK
- New single larger settlement to the north along the railway line around Castlethorpe and Hanslope

15 . Question 12

- New Garden Cities should be created at Cranfield and Winslow
- New Garden City could be created at Deanshanger

Prefer new smaller satellite settlements

- They would have better community spirit
- They would be more respectful and proportionate to the existing villages in the rural area
- They would not detract from or undermine MK's current offer
- They would allow new residents to assimilate to MK
- They would provide the opportunity to live in semi-rural environment with access to central MK and jobs.
- A larger settlement would compete with Northampton and Bedford to the detriment of these settlements.
- They could more easily be sited to make use of marginal agricultural land unlike a larger settlement which will affect higher quality land.
- Several new satellite villages should be created akin to Mawsley in Northants.
- Three new settlements of 5,000 homes linked by linear parks and rapid transport links between them and MK, and in future, with Northampton.
- Any smaller satellite settlements should also be self-sufficient, with amenities, leisure facilities and a secondary school so they can establish their own community identity and economy (e.g. independent, craft based enterprises)

Prefer expansion of existing settlements in the rural area

- Should expand Newport Pagnell perhaps to the north or west instead, supported by appropriate investment in roads and infrastructure
- Should expand Olney instead (perhaps to a Garden City), supported by appropriate investment in roads and infrastructure (e.g. bypass for Olney, new railway station linked to Northampton-Bedford route and connection to CMK)
- Smaller rural villages such as Moulsoe should be allowed to grow sympathetically to their character and history.
- Should expand Wolverton/Bradwell instead which have a lot of brownfield and redundant land and good connections.
- Should expand Hanslope instead, supported by appropriate investment in roads and infrastructure
- Expansion of rural settlements to proceed along in line with the settlement hierarchy set out in the existing Local Plan and Core Strategy (e.g. key settlements and selected villages)
- The rural villages should only have a limited amount of development to sustain existing services and amenities (e.g. shops, pubs, post office).
- Should expand Castlethorpe and Bradwell instead which have a lot of brownfield and redundant land and good connections.
- Extending existing settlement means housing would be delivered more quickly and provide the opportunity to maintain and develop existing communities

Other comments

- Growth should be directed to within and the south of the city (Options 1 and 4)
- Prefer this Direction of Growth to Directions 1 and 2

- Milton Keynes has reached its optimum size. Further growth through new competing settlements will lead to gridlock and economic strangulation.
- Any new Garden City or settlement should be community-led.
- Intensification first (options 1) then expand east of the M1
- The level and location of growth should be matched to the existing infrastructure and the maximum its capacity could be expanded by.
- Only an eco-development with services would be acceptable, otherwise a new settlement would make no sense.
- Any new settlement(s) should be centred around the M1
- Growth of amenity poor villages are not the right solution
- The question should be answered in line with the NPPF via a call for sites, assessing their suitability and updating the SHLAA.
- It should be possible to construct new bridges over the M1, considering the bypass around Bletchley is possible.
- Housing should be located close to employment development in order to support the use of public transport.
- There is no discussion of demographic or economic issues raised by the Core Strategy Inspector or assessment of development needs specified by the NPPF
- There is no mention of costs or funding
- There is no consideration of the planning framework or delivery mechanisms regarding implementation
- There is no discussion of the quality or affordability of housing
- Not consistent with national policy to rebalance jobs and the population between the North and the South-East, and it does not consider the effects of Brexit on reduced immigration
- There is land to the north and west which is not constrained which could be used to provide for growth
- The rural areas should take development, instead of the city be condensed detrimentally
- Growth should be met through brownfield development and intensification
- If this option goes ahead, then the quality of life for residents of Castlethorpe and Hanslope should be preserved

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- Should be no rural satellite settlements as this would be unsustainable. Rural area should be protected and conserved with green belts.
- Scale of settlements would be disproportionate to the scale of existing villages and would destroy the character and identity of the rural area and existing settlements, as well as MK's unique identity as a mix of city, town, villages and countryside
- Would overwhelm existing infrastructure in the rural area, and require significant infrastructure investment, and there is no guarantee this would be feasible, deliverable or affordable.
- Should be appropriate expansion of existing villages which have good level of services in line with neighbourhood plans, along with sustainable urban extensions to the east of MK. Larger scale expansion is contrary to NPPF (directing growth to larger urban areas)
- Unlikely that a satellite settlement could be self-sufficient
- Should pursue options 1 and 4 instead of developing in the rural areas
- They would be disproportionate to the scale of existing villages and would

15 . Question 12

- Further technical work is required to inform any decisions on directions and scale of growth. Call for sites should be carried out, with the suitability of sites assessed within an updated SHLAA.
- Large satellite settlements would not deliver the amount of housing required over the plan period or sustainably.
- Should expand Newport Pagnell perhaps to the north or west instead, supported by appropriate investment in roads and infrastructure
- Smaller rural villages such as Moulsoe should be allowed to grow sympathetically to their character and history.
- The option set out in the consultation is not sufficiently detailed enough to allow for proper consideration.
- There is still space with MK city, where infrastructure is already in place, to meet needs.
- Proposals are meaningless without a projection of how the population will grow
- Not consistent with national policy to rebalance jobs and the population between the North and the South-East, and it does not consider the effects of Brexit on reduced immigration

What Ward Councillors said:

- The most undeliverable and unreasonable of all the options. The idea of growing small villages into towns is one that has caused huge concerns in our communities.. We feel that the idea of satellite settlements is unsustainable. The public transport system would be unaffordable and lack of this service would lead to isolation. The estates of the city of Milton Keynes have been often described as being isolated due to the grid roads that separate them, despite underpasses and bridges linking them. The separation by countryside will make this many times worse. It. The idea of a self-contained settlement of 20,000 homes in the north of the borough in our view makes this even worse. We are told that Milton Keynes needs to grow because it needs growth however putting a self-contained settlement to the north of the city will not address those needs. We feel that this exposes the real need that this expansion is for the sake of expansion not for the benefit of the current Milton Keynes. If a "little brother" was built this has the potential for division and competition which would shatter the community that Milton Keynes has and needs. Â Â
- MK needs 980 homes per year a small part of which would occur in rural areas, but it wants the city to grow by an additional 770 homes per year. New settlements in the rural area would not achieve the objective of growing the city. The homes should be built in the city.
- Further technical work is needed to inform answers and a decision.
- 5,000 homes may not be viable, and so 10,000 might be more realistic.
- Smaller settlements close to existing settlements should take place in discussion with the community nearby. Larger settlements will need infrastructure, in particular transport, for the community to be truly mixed and thriving.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- New settlements should have green infrastructure and spaces incorporated into the layout and design for residents, with opportunities to link with green corridors to MK recognised

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Generally support new settlements in the north east of MK provided they are sustainable, self-sufficient and well connected to MK.

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- In the context of the level of growth that Plan:MK will realistically need to accommodate, it should be noted that simple urban extensions, such as those planned in the 2005 Local Plan, on their own, are unlikely to successfully deliver the required level of development. 3.3 Whilst we would support the urban area of the Borough remaining as the focus for the majority of development, we would caution against a strategic approach which relies solely on such an approach.
- New settlements should not be created due to the significant time and costs associated with them, their slow delivery rates, and considering there are other more sustainable options such as urban extensions and expansion of rural villages.
- Review how the larger rural settlements could be expanded which would improve existing infrastructure around established communities and meet housing needs of those communities
- A larger settlement or Garden City would lack provisions of services and be dependent on MK or potentially undermine existing social infrastructure and services. A more sustainable approach would be to locate growth close to existing social infrastructure and services.
- A single larger settlement is unlikely to meet housing needs in MK or of the rural area. Housing in the short term would best be met from urban extensions to MK and some growth of the rural villages.
- New settlements are unlikely to be economically viable if policy objectives are to be met (e.g. affordable housing),
- No analysis has been undertaken to identify potential locations for a new settlement in the rural area (connectivity, accessibility, environmental constraints) or what capacity exists in and around the rural settlements for expansion. MKC should await the findings of further evidence base studies before establishing where development will go.
- Rural communities need new market and affordable homes, but new settlements are not the means to do this, and would be contrary to NPPF in that development in the rural area should enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Rural settlements have the potential to deliver more than 110 dwellings per annum on a rolling basis, helping to provide flexible supply to meet localised needs.
- New settlements would be commuter dormitories with little employment opportunities
- The rural area is not a sustainable location in terms of transport and accessibility, with the exception of the area around Wolverton and Castlethorpe which should be considered (opportunities for rail connectivity).
- A larger settlement, of a scale that is self-sufficient for the majority of people's daily requirements with Government guidance indicating between 1,500 and 10,000, would be more sustainable than a number of smaller settlements, although concerns about funding, timescales and wider impacts exist.
- It would be difficult to keep any new settlement to its envisaged size without it expanding further
- Options that will result in additional traffic on the M1 and the need for a new junction should be avoided

15 . Question 12

- A further Direction of Growth option needs to be considered, based on sustainable urban extensions to MK and an allowance for the delivery of disbursed growth in the rural area.
- Significant road infrastructure would be required. Dualling the A509 and a bypass around Olney would be required, impacting on a number of areas.
- This direction of growth is not a suitable way of meeting MK's employment needs, particularly large scale logistics and manufacturing.
- The plan should provide green belts around existing villages to protect their identity.
- A large self-sufficient expansion north of MK between the WCML and the M1 around Haversham and Castlethorpe could connect with MK, use Wolverton Railway Station and potentially a reopened Castlethorpe Railway Station.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Favour a larger settlement that could be master planned with the right level of infrastructure delivered ahead of housing.
- There is enough land within MK to meet housing needs
- Favour introducing a new junction on the M1, extension of the grid system and new bridges across the M1 (if east of the M1).
- New Garden City would be preferable to satellite settlements attached existing rural settlements
- A new Garden City may compete detrimentally with MK.
- Rural area has valued landscapes and a number of environmental designations which would need to be protected or buffered.
- Do not support the concept of new settlements, but if they are necessary then one or two of innovative design in the north and east of the borough close to railway stations and the A422 with strong limits on future expansion.
- Would not support new settlements east of Moulsoe and North Crawley around the A509. Development in this area is for Central Beds LPA to determine.
- Concerned about the impact on local communities and loss of agricultural land, although would support improved connections to the M1 near Stoke Goldington and the WCML at Castlethorpe

16 Question 13

Possible location of new settlement(s) in Direction of Growth 3

16.1 This question asked whether there are any locations that would be suitable for a satellite settlement(s). 170 responses were received.

16.2 The majority of respondents to this question reiterated their objection to new satellite settlements and suggested alternative approaches instead. However, of members of the public who expressed a preference on location, the majority expressed support for the area north of Milton Keynes between the West Coast Main Line and the M1. The second largest preference amongst members of the public was for the area around Olney. The numbers of respondents express support or objections for certain locations were broadly similar. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

16.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- No locations are suitable. There should be no new satellite settlements.
- North of MK between the WCML and the M1 around Haversham, Castlethorpe, Hanslope and Little Linford provided additional transport and connections are provided.
- Expansion around Olney and Emberton provided infrastructure is delivered. Possibilities linked with the planned Olney bypass
- Not around Castlethorpe, Haversham or Hanslope
- North west of MK around Wolverton, New Bradwell, Stony Stratford, Old Stratford and Cosgrove
- In the area east of the M1 around Newport Pagnell, Moulsoe, Chicheley and North Crawley
- North or Northeast of Newport Pagnell
- A more dispersed pattern of growth should be pursued, with limited growth of the existing rural settlements.
- Not east of the M1 (Moulsoe and North Crawley)
- Must be within MK's borough boundary
- A call for sites of all types and sizes should be carried out, then objectively assessed any promoted sites for their suitability as part of an updated SHLAA
- Unnecessary until there is evidence that high levels of growth are needed post 2031
- Leave areas north of the River Great Ouse untouched
- North of MK for the mid-term needs, then east across the M1 for longer term needs
- Cranfield
- Not south around the Brickhills
- Topography will dictate the best location
- There is not enough information to make a considered recommendation
- All development should be west of the M1
- South of Bletchley near Newton Longville
- Somewhere that does not affect existing villages and provided they are limited to a defined extent.
- Somewhere close to A roads and not the M1.

16 . Question 13

- Both around Hanslope and Stoke Goldington to make best use of any new junction on the M1
- A new settlement should relate to the regional movement network, which means that a joint plan should be prepared to address the wider context.
- Not around Olney
- Go upwards in MK and not outwards.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- No locations are suitable
- Should only be limited growth of the existing rural settlements.
- A call for sites of all types and sizes should be carried out, then objectively assessed any promoted sites for their suitability as part of an updated SHLAA
- Around Cranfield
- This is a matter for Milton Keynes (comment from parish outside of MK area)
- Appropriate landscape and other technical work should be prepared with locations considered and proposals draw up in the context of these studies

What Ward Councillors said:

- East and North East linking toward Cranfield
- West toward Nash
- No locations are suitable

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- North East of Milton Keynes

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- No locations are suitable
- North of MK between the WCML and the M1 around Castlethorpe and Haversham
- A more dispersed pattern of growth should be pursued, with growth of the existing rural settlements.
- North East of Newport Pagnell
- Located near to Central MK to utilise existing services

What national/statutory organisations said:

- Further technical work is required to assess capacity of water supply and sewerage networks as sewage treatment infrastructure to accommodate further development as part of satellite settlements in the borough.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- North of MK between the WCML and the M1 around Castlethorpe, Haversham and Hanslope, as long as appropriate infrastructure is delivered.
- No locations are suitable

16 . Question 13

- A call for sites of all types and sizes should be carried out, then objectively assessed any promoted sites for their suitability as part of an updated SHLAA
- Up to local communities to say via Neighbourhood Plans

17 . Question 14

17 Question 14

Final extent of a new satellite settlement(s) in Direction of Growth 3

17.1 This question asked whether the final extent of development of any new satellite settlement should be defined. 191 responses were received.

17.2 The majority of respondents to this question reiterated their objection to new satellite settlements and suggested alternative approaches instead. However, of members of the public, parish/town councils and industry bodies who expressed a preference, the majority expressed support for limits to be defined. Amongst the other respondent groups, no clear preference on the use of limits was evident. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

17.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- Do not support option of new satellite settlements as:
- They would overwhelm existing infrastructure in the rural area
- They would ruin the character and nature of the villages and countryside in the rural areas forever, including the Ouse Valley which is one of the most attractive parts of the region. Villages should be protected by green belts.
- Change MK's character and identity as a mix of city, market town, village and countryside to that of urban sprawl
- Local centres in satellite settlements would leave existing village centres derelict
- New road connections from the north (around Castlethorpe) to MK would be an environmental disaster
- Construction traffic would have unacceptable impact on existing villages
- They would adversely impact on the heritage and wildlife in the rural areas
- It would adversely impact the health of people living in the rural area
- It would be the most expensive and disruptive option. No viability assessment has been undertaken
- It would require co-operation with neighbouring authorities who are not supportive of this options
- Settlement(s) would be disconnected with poor road connections, and junction 14 would need to be upgraded which the DfT is not supportive of.
- Unlikely that a new railway station would open on the WCML due to lack of demand, lack of capacity on the line and practical constraints.
- Yes, limits should be defined
- More sensible for existing settlements to expand sympathetically. Development should be focussed around larger villages instead (Castlethorpe, Hanslope, North Crawley, Haversham, Sherrington, Newport Pagnell and Olney). Other smaller villages should be allowed to expand to meet local housing needs only. Perhaps Newport Pagnell could develop into a new Garden City.
- Development should be directed to and concentrated on existing urban areas to take advantage of social integration and public transport systems
- Provided the villages are protected by green belts, development to the south and west would be better as it would benefit from the scale of growth (when combined

with growth in Aylesbury Vale) to deliver infrastructure improvements as well as east-west rail, and avoid adding congestion to MK and around the MK Central railway station.

- The MK borough boundary is the appropriate final extent of development
- Levels of growth are contrary to Government policy of rebalancing growth between the south and north.
- Urban infrastructure of MK will need to be expanded in the population is to significantly rise above 250,000.
- Boundaries for development should be the M1 and areas of flood risk
- Development east of the M1 limited to 10% of housing need
- Unlikely that any limits would be adhered to
- The scale of options considered for Plan:MK are excessive, unnecessary and meaningless until robust evidence is available to clarify the need for growth post 2031. Likely that migration will reduce following Brexit.
- Limit to 5,000 homes
- Yes, based upon the planned population
- Limit to a population of 10,000
- The Rural Topic Paper indicate growth levels of 210 houses per year, which is contradicted by this option in the SDD .
- Any new development should be very tightly contained and have characterful eco homes rather than generic new build
- Should be dependent upon the services available in the settlement,
- Should use natural boundaries and designations to serve as barriers to the settlement
- The limit should be the A422 to Astwood
- Suggest south of North Crawley Road and Brook End, and south east of Cranfield Road as the final extent of development of the urban area of MK.
- Parkland placed in trust could be use to restrict expansion of any new settlement.
- Should not exceed the outer reaches of Hanslope and Newport Pagnell.
- The boundary with Northamptonshire, with a new garden city in this area and a new junction on the M1
- No, Plan:MK needs to have a further second stage satellite settlement for the mid to long term period
- They should be planned to be adaptable and change over time
- Developing a number of satellite settlements will create pressure to infill the gaps between them raising issues around sustainability, transport, environment, disruption and pressure on services.
- We need another hospital
- If there is another junction on the M1 as indicated, the villages will become a rat run
- This option would allow MK to meet its needs without relying on co-operation of neighbouring authorities

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- Do not support this option
- Yes to prevent sprawl
- The MK borough boundary is the appropriate final extent of development
- Yes, based upon landscape characteristics and final understanding of housing need
- More sensible for existing settlements to expand sympathetically, perhaps with Newport Pagnell developing into a new Garden City
- Plan should offer a green belt around the existing villages

17 . Question 14

- New settlement would overwhelm existing infrastructure in the rural area
- New local centres in satellite settlements would leave existing village centres derelict
- New road connections from the north (around Castlethorpe) to MK would be an environmental disaster
- Construction traffic would have unacceptable impact on existing villages
- Unlikely that a new railway station would open on the WCML due to lack of demand, lack of capacity on the line and practical constraints.

What Ward Councillors said:

- Should define an initial intention but be clear that this is subject to change as plans and communities evolve
- Should not pursue this option

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- Reservations about this option due to the lack of work that has been in terms of primary infrastructure that would be needed to make this options work and the view of the Department for Transport

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Consider new settlements in the rural area to be the least sustainable options for growth given the dispersed and unspecified locations indicated
- Any new settlement should be large enough to be self-sufficient and not contribute to urban sprawl from MK
- Satellite locations would require a critical mass to ensure the right infrastructure is provided whilst needing to be conveniently located to existing transport hubs

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- Do not support satellite settlements
- Yes, the Local Plan should define the extent of any new settlement based upon the evidence base and being realistic
- Caution against satellite settlements due to likely local oppositions, practically challenging, no certainty of costs or funding, inability to meet short to medium term needs
- This option is too unclear
- It would be premature to set limits now. Review settlement boundaries every five years as part of the plan review

What national/statutory organisations said:

- Support in principle a new station on the WCML at Castlethorpe, however this would be distant from potential new satellite settlements east of the M1, with limited accessibility to the new station.
- Concerned satellite settlements could be disconnected from existing road network, creating increased pressure on the strategic road network and public transport infrastructure. A potentially less sustainable option than others, due to the spaced out nature of the proposals.

- Depending upon the exact location of growth, the greatest impact of this option would be on Junction 14 of the M1.
- This option would have less impact on the A5 than other options.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Yes to constrain future sprawl.
- The main issue should be ensure a holistic and well planned area of development with appropriate infrastructure rather than the size
- We would hope to see an innovative design of a model village type rather than a replication of MK.
- The MK borough boundary is the appropriate final extent of development

18 Question 15

Intensification and Redevelopment of the urban area in Direction of Growth 4

18.1 This question asked whether the intensification and redevelopment of the existing urban area should take place alongside greenfield development as identified in the other directions of growth. 499 responses were received (including comments on Figure 6).

18.2 The clear majority of members of the public, parish/town councils and local groups supported intensification and redevelopment of the existing urban area for a number of reasons. However, the vast majority of those who offered this support did so provided that the character and identity of Milton Keynes was protected, principally by avoiding development on grid road corridors and open space, and by not developing to high densities. Notwithstanding this, a large group of respondents considered that higher densities should be sought within the urban area, including building on 'surplus' open space and through taller buildings. Of those who objected to this approach did so on the grounds of the impact it would have on the character and identity of Milton Keynes and upon existing residents. A notable number of respondents considered that this direction of growth should be combined with direction of growth 1. The majority of industry bodies considered that this option by itself would not meet housing needs, and should instead be part and parcel of a strategy which included expansion of the urban via one or more of the other directions of growth in the SDD consultation document, or by other means (e.g. expansion of existing rural settlements). A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

18.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- Help to reinvigorate run down areas of MK, including the original estates, Wolverton, Bletchley and Fenny Stratford.
- Improve MK, in contrast to the other options which would detract from MK.
- Replace poor housing with better quality housing
- Complete the original plans for MK
- Accord with the original concept and vision of MK as a place that changes to meet current and future needs
- Help CMK to become more metropolitan and vibrant by attracting younger people/London commuters and support a thriving evening economy and cultural offer in CMK. Younger people are less attracted to living in rural areas.
- Help give MK a clear city identity and city centre appeal, which it currently lacks
- Make best use of vacant and surplus employment/office space
- Be the cheapest option
- Would make best use of existing infrastructure, in particular road and rail transport options, whilst supporting improvements to some of it.
- Would support integrated public transport and a mass transit system. Should dual all roads within the city and introduce a tram system to support this option
- Keep the countryside open and protected from urban sprawl

- Make MK a more sustainable city; the existing low density of housing is unsustainable in terms of transport, services (e.g. shops) and public services, and generating and sense of community and community cohesion.
- Have a lesser impact on the character of MK than continuing to expand outwards
- Be the only approach that allows MK Council to be in full control, rather than requiring cooperation with neighbouring authorities
- Not adapting MK to future changes and challenges risks its decline
- Provide the opportunity for a more varied mix of housing and affordable housing in the city, including other types of housing such as self-build
- Be consistent with the NPPF in terms of prioritising brownfield development and directing growth to established urban areas.
- Enable housing to be delivered quicker than via the other directions of growth
- Allows for greater flexibility in terms of meeting changes in emerging needs (e.g. from housing to employment, leisure or infrastructure such as schools)
- Support greater social integration in MK
- Add interest to the skyline of MK, and CMK in particular
- Enable housing needs to be met whilst allowing time for the comprehensive planning of future expansion across the M1, in terms of infrastructure.
- Improve the incentive to walk places if additional development makes the redways and other routes more welcoming and safe to use.
- Generate less pollution and traffic congestion if it is concentrated around the railway.
- It would help attract wealth generators
- Do not support regeneration, intensification and use of vacant brownfield because:
- Risks losing the principles, ethos and character of MK as a low density, spacious and green place to live, becoming just like any other city
- It would mean losing green and open spaces within the housing estates
- It would destroy the grid road system and separation of housing from roads
- It would make traffic and congestion in the city worse
- It would place too much strain on existing services such as schools and health care
- It would jeopardise social wellbeing, health and community cohesion
- It would result in piecemeal and fragmented development
- The delivery of significant numbers of housing in CMK is not credible
- Tentatively support regeneration, intensification and use of vacant brownfield in the urban area provided:
 - Green and open spaces are preserved, including open space within the housing estates
 - The grid roads are maintained and not built upon
 - Housing should not be high density, with smaller housing crammed into existing estates resulting in overdevelopment - keep to the low-density character and spacious homes of MK
- It does not result in tall buildings above the tree line
- It does not result in a poorer quality of life for residents
- It does not require demolition of people's homes
- It is not the only strategy for providing the amount of housing needed as this would ruin MK's character and original principles
- Provided the development of brownfield sites is prioritised over greenfield sites within the city
- Infrastructure, in particular health care and roads, is put in place or improved to cope with the additional demand

18 . Question 15

- This direction of growth should be pursued in combination with expansion to the West, South East/West
- This direction of growth should be pursued in combination with expansion to the East of the M1
- This direction of growth should be pursued in combination with new satellite settlement(s)
- Increased industrial development is uneconomical and would represent unsustainable job growth
- MKC need to calculate what land is available in the designated area and how many homes this could accommodate, and what regeneration of the old estates would generate
- This direction would not meet all of the housing needs identified
- CMK should not be a focus for residential
- Test higher densities in areas 10 and 11
- The four options are a result of visionary workshops and not technical work. Planning should be supported by technical evidence
- Development in the urban area should be undertaken via a comprehensive holistic approach, rather than piecemeal development.
- This would not support the creation and maintenance of strong and viable rural communities
- Can't see how further growth in the city and greater density would support better improved infrastructure and services. More people and infrastructure to maintain creates greater demand that is not fully offset, despite small economies of scale.
- Need to understand what a sustainable population would be for MK
- There is no discussion of demographic or economic issues raised by the Core Strategy Inspector or assessment of development needs specified by the NPPF
- Doubtful this option could ever be deliver much growth

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- Support this option as there is a lot of under used and vacant land within the city; would aid social integration and public transport; improve CMK and the identity of MK; make use of existing infrastructure.
- This won't meet all of MK's housing needs or provide supply early in the plan due to issues with brownfield sites. A hybrid approach will be required to meet housing needs, with rural and greenfield areas taking some of the growth
- Support provided that the unique character of MK is not lost (e.g. by building on green spaces, grid roads) and infrastructure is provided/improved to support growth
- Redevelopment will be very contentious with existing residents
- Support a modified Option 4 which focuses on densification of the existing local/town centres such as CMK, via redevelopment and regeneration at higher density/height of underutilised employment areas and brownfield sites. Open spaces, station square the grid roads and perimeter parking should be retained and protected as key characteristics of MK.
- Oppose any development of open green space in the city estates.
- Should retain the existing character of MK and preserve open spaces
- Infrastructure provision and improvements will need to be made up front to accommodate this option
- This direction of growth should be pursued in combination with expansion to the West, South East/West

- This direction of growth should be pursued in combination with expansion to the East of the M1
- This direction of growth should be pursued in combination with new satellite settlement(s)
- Do not support piecemeal development via infill due to infrastructure concerns
- Densities should be as per any existing Planning Briefs
- Do not support this direction of growth as it would destroy the character of MK

What Ward Councillors said:

- A credible and desirable option of building homes that residents need and attracting new people to the city. The only option that would increase the population without increasing the total area of the city. All the other options increase the total average household mileage and carbon footprint per capita. Some areas of significant deprivation also suffer from exceptionally low density, with undesirable consequences such as reduced number of potential customers within a walking radius of local amenities or within walking distance of bus-stops.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- Need to consider direct and indirect impacts on the open space network and its accessibility for people and wildlife. It should be invested in to support the additional demands of a growing urban population. Should be assessed against the strategy for green infrastructure. Open space around higher density areas will need greater investment to support the greater needs and demands in those areas.
- Appears to be the most sustainable and deliverable option and fits with national and local policies/strategies.

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Recommend this direction in the first instance to prioritise brownfield development. Need to understand urban capacity. Intensification and redevelopment should complement and enhance the landscape and character of MK, and promote sustainable communities
- Need to consider the impact on local water courses which transfer across the administrative boundary with Buckinghamshire in terms of flood risk and water management
- Support the principle of this direction of growth

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- This won't meet all of MK's housing needs. A hybrid approach will be required to meet housing needs, with rural and greenfield areas taking some of the growth
- Should be the priority over and above greenfield development as it would be supported by existing infrastructure and will improve existing areas of MK
- A level of development in the urban area will occur regardless, but it should not be the only strategic direction as it to meet all housing needs via this option would risk destroying the character of MK
- Smaller urban sites will help to complement larger strategic releases, supporting the provision of a short to medium term housing supply
- CMK should retain its role as a regional commercial centre, therefore only limited residential development should be pursued there

18 . Question 15

- Must ensure there is a balance between homes and jobs in the urban area to ensure sustainable pattern of growth
- Better to comprehensively plan urban extensions as these will deliver/mitigate the infrastructure needed to support growth
- Support growth in CMK and regeneration of older estates, but not infilling on an ad hoc basis. Regeneration should be design-led and respectful of character
- Should review employment allocations and consider releasing them for residential amongst other uses
- Mixed use development in CMK can provide sustainable and high density development. CMK and the Core Shopping Area provide opportunities for realising some of the growth. The Plan should allow flexibility and realistic expectations to allow this to happen.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- No indication of scale of development in the urban area is provided. Further technical work is required to establish the capacity of sewage and water supply networks and what the impact would be.
- The fourth growth opportunity proposed is to focus development within the existing urban area of MK. The SDD highlights that it is currently difficult to quantify how many new homes this growth option could provide but it is anticipated that it will not be sufficient to meet the required housing demand. It should be noted that although the SDD indicates that it will not be possible to provide all development within the urban area, further details regarding where the remaining development could be located is not provided. It is therefore unclear what the impact of this additional development could be on the SRN. If this option is taken forward then further details of the additional development should be provided. We support the principle of utilising the existing brownfield sites, as well as infilling and converting employment sites to residential uses within the existing urban areas where appropriate. It is important however that a balance is achieved/maintained between jobs and residential units to minimise long distance commuting. Depending on the locations of the developments there may be a more limited impact on the wider SRN network when compared with some of the other options, although there is the risk for considerable impact on the A5 within the MK urban area, particularly if the higher density population leads to higher levels of traffic and significant improvements to the network are not possible. We acknowledge that there is potential for this to partly be mitigated by appropriate improvements to the public transport provision to offer a viable alternative for residents to the private motor vehicle, however the potential improvements that could be provided is not outlined within the SDD.

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Support intensification of the urban over expanding into rural and greenfield areas.
- Development in CMK should be the priority before development of other brownfield sites in the city
- Support increasing the density of the city and building on surface car parks, focussing on transport hubs and the older estates.
- Regeneration should not be estate-planned, but rather come forward on a piecemeal plot basis to generate innovation and variety

18 . Question 15

- Oppose intensification and redevelopment, and attempts to build on grid roads which are necessary for future transport solutions, improve air quality, provide wildlife corridors and visual amenity. Design principles of MK should be protected.
- This would challenge the green spaces which support wildlife and the character of MK. The wildlife corridor network should be protected.
- Should be careful to avoid overcrowding which would have a negative impact on social behaviour and wildlife

19 Question 16

Types of Redevelopment or Intensification of the urban area (Direction of Growth 4)

19.1 This question asked whether there were any of the redevelopment/intensification approaches that were particularly supported, or which should not be considered, and if there any opportunities that have not been included? 152 responses were received.

19.2 Overall, there was support for all four approaches being used to meet housing needs from within the urban area. There was particular support for the completion and redevelopment of CMK to provide a greater amount of housing alongside office development in CMK to aid the vibrancy and identity of the city centre. There was a lesser, but strong theme of not supporting intensification and higher densities across the urban area in particular through the use of open green spaces, amenity land and the grid road corridors due to concerns about the impact on the character of the New Town. A number of respondents also raised concerns about the loss of employment land to housing and that this may cause problems in the future, in terms of achieving sustainable communities and economic growth. A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

19.3 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

What members of the public said:

- Support completion, redevelopment and intensification in CMK over other areas of the city. In particular, the area around the railway station should be developed at higher densities with a mix of residential, employment, leisure and culture (including cafés and restaurants); the Food Centre; land north of Campbell Park; land adjacent to Sainsbury's; the Theatre District; surface car parks replaced with Multi storey car parks to free up land for buildings
- All options (intensification, redevelopment/regeneration, brownfield/vacant sites) should be pursued including building at higher densities across the board.
- Do not support infill/intensification on open space (including linear park and woods), amenity land and the grid road corridors as this will result in the loss of the character of MK
- Do not support redevelopment of non-residential uses, in particular employment sites. There needs to be a mix in order to provide job opportunities and avoid all jobs being concentrated in CMK as this would cause traffic and congestion. Should also take a longer term view on the provision of employment land to avoid a potential future shortfall of sustainable opportunities.
- Support redevelopment and regeneration, including CMK and the older estates, but not at higher densities or via taller buildings
- Support redevelopment and intensification in CMK but a balance between employment, commercial and residential uses is needed, not just housing
- Do not support any additional housing
- Some of the considerable existing open space could be developed whilst maintaining a reasonable amount of open space for residents.

- Should not mix residential with industrial uses as this would change the character of MK and they would not be attractive and desirable places to live
- Any regeneration, intensification and redevelopment should be done carefully and sensitively.
- Do not build on car parks
- Do not support regeneration of estates.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- All options (intensification, redevelopment/regeneration, brownfield/vacant sites) should be pursued including building at higher densities across the board
- Open space (including linear park and woods), amenity land and the grid road corridor should not be built upon
- Support redevelopment and regeneration of urban areas including the older estates but not at higher densities or via taller buildings
- There are still areas of the city which yet to be developed. These should be prioritised.
- Support redevelopment and intensification in CMK but a balance between employment, commercial and residential uses is needed, not just housing
- Some of the considerable existing open space could be developed whilst maintaining a reasonable amount of open space for residents. Garage blocks could also be redeveloped for housing
- Can only be informed and fully considered once technical work has been undertaken.
- CMK should not be pressured to deliver more housing if other sites fail to deliver.

What Ward Councillors said:

- Caution against residential development in CMK that could adversely impact its other roles, in particular employment. The priority of CMK should be those things that can only be done in CMK, not housing which the rest of MK is entirely capable of doing. If CMK can deliver more housing as well as more of everything else (eg in taller, mixed-use developments with underground parking) that would be ideal.
- Support intensification and redevelopment of the city centre, provided appropriate infrastructure for residential areas could be provided, and the need for transport modal change for CMK was addressed. Support consideration of employment land, provided the overall need for each type of employment land was met and was well-distributed around the city, but note that some sites are more suitable for certain uses, e.g. dirty or noisy industry, or small-scale industry and start-up businesses in the old towns. As far as possible we should retain employment sites near the areas that traditionally have the highest unemployment. Regeneration should be driven by the communities themselves. Affordable housing would be easier to achieve at high densities together with high quality shared public space. It is essential that this process is resident-driven. Should consider small reserved sites for housing, perhaps particularly if this is used to fund community facility development on nearby sites. Sites originally planned as green space should not be considered unless the communities decide otherwise. Suburban sites should not be developed at higher densities that is the communities' wish.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- Do not support wholesale or piecemeal development of green space. Only areas assessed and deemed to be low value green space should be developed where the

19 . Question 16

benefits outweigh the loss and there is compensation. Financial gain from development on green spaces should be reinvested into the green infrastructure network.

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

19.4 An urban capacity study should be carried out to inform and support such an approach.

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- Support intensification and redevelopment in the urban area, particularly Bletchley and Wolverton, building above single storey retail units. Should not be high rise in order to protect character and distant views of MK.
- Support all four approaches
- Support regenerating the city centre
- There would be negative impacts, such as traffic and congestion, infrastructure is already at capacity and there would be a negative impact on the New Town's heritage.

What national/statutory organisations said:

19.5 N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Support intensification and regeneration
- There should be no intensification in the urban area
- Should be done on a city-wide strategic basis. Taller buildings should be limited to CMK and not pepper-potted around the city

20 Question 17

Other areas suitable for redevelopment (Direction of Growth 4)

20.1 This question asked whether there were other areas suitable for redevelopment within Direction of Growth 4. 125 responses were received.

20.2 Many respondents identified areas already suggested in the SDD consultation document (such as the priority estates, CMK, Bletchley and Wolverton) or reiterated comments made against other questions in the document regarding other directions of growth. These have not been summarised here as they are not relevant to the question and/or have been adequately captured in the summaries of other questions presented in this document. Below are the remaining suggestions that were made which did not feature in the SDD consultation document. The area west of the central railway station was suggested by the most respondents. For other areas suggested, the number of respondents suggesting these was relatively low (1-3 respondents) and broadly even. As far as possible, the summary below starts with the suggestions on which there was most consensus.

What members of the public said:

- West of the central railway station with the railway and A5 being tunnelled to allow high density and high rise development above.
- The National Bowl should be redeveloped as it is not used for events very often anymore
- Newport Pagnell has areas which would benefit from regeneration and intensification
- Stony Stratford has areas which could be suitable for this direction of growth
- Denbigh Industrial Estate would be suitable
- The Food Centre within CMK should be redeveloped
- Bleak Hall should be redeveloped for housing
- Weight should be given to local views as expressed in relevant Neighbourhood Plans
- Develop land around the lakes for housing and leisure
- Redistribute proposed level of growth for CMK to the local and neighbourhood centres
- Cosgrove would be suitable for this direction of growth
- Downs Barn should be regenerated
- Conniburrow should be regenerated
- Fishermead should be regenerated
- Shenley Church End would be suitable for this direction of growth
- Area between Childs Way, Grafton, Saxon Gate and South Row should be developed
- The old Wyevale Garden Centre should be redeveloped
- The Stadium at Manor Field should be redeveloped
- Fill in Willen and Caldecott Lakes and develop for housing
- Use all of Campbell Park for high density housing
- Redevelop Stacey Bushes and other warehouses

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- West of the central railway station with the railway and A5 being tunnelled to allow high density and high rise development above.
- The old Wyevale Garden Centre should be redeveloped
- Need to update the SHLAA and carry out a call for sites to inform this

20 . Question 17

- Should only be considered once detailed technical studies have been carried out
- Former Aston Martin site at Newport Pagnell
- Bradwell Abbey and North Crawley Road industrial areas
- The Food Centre within CMK should be redeveloped

What Ward Councillors said:

- Newport Pagnell has areas which would benefit from regeneration and intensification

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Would expect all possible areas and opportunities to be identified within the city as well as urban areas of towns and villages in MK

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- Penn Road, Fenny Stratford should be developed for housing
- Any redevelopment should be in accordance with the settlement hierarchy

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- A comprehensive review of all sites needs to be undertaken

20.3

21 Question 18

Other approaches for longer term development

21.1 This question asked whether there were other approaches for longer term development, beyond those that came out of the workshops that should be considered. 116 responses were received.

21.2 Many respondents expressed support or objections for options already suggested in the SDD consultation or reiterated comments made against other questions in the document regarding other directions of growth. These have not been summarised here as they are not relevant to the question and/or have been adequately captured in the summaries of other questions presented in this document. Below are the remaining suggestions that were made which did not feature in the SDD consultation document.

21.3 Whilst the SDD included intensification of the urban area as a possible option, around 10% of respondents suggested much higher density and higher rise development should be pursued in CMK compared to that presented in the SDD document. A notable number of respondents also suggested the towns and villages in the rural area should accommodate modest growth. Two industry respondents promoted land for a large expansion of Milton Keynes to the north around Haversham. For other suggestions, the number of respondents suggesting these was relatively low (1-4 respondents) and broadly even. As far as possible, the summary below starts with the suggestions on which there was most consensus.

What members of the public said:

- Should significantly build upwards (40 storeys) and downwards in CMK and Campbell Park
- Existing rural towns and villages should consider modest expansion and development
- Growth north around Haversham/Hanslope/Castlethorpe
- Reinstate grid road network and expand west toward Buckingham as originally intended
- Combination of urban intensification/redevelopment and expansion to the south-west
- Limited expansion of Newport Pagnell and Olney
- Need to examine the sub-regional context and plan at a wider scale with Northampton, Bedford, Aylesbury and Central Beds
- Combination of expansion to the west/south/south-east, new settlement(s) and intensification/redevelopment of the urban area
- There should be a combination of the options presented in the SDD consultation
- A new light railway should be developed on the former line between Newport Pagnell and Wolverton and between Castlethorpe and Wolverton
- The original Master Plan for MK should be reinstated, with the grid road system being extended to allow growth
- Across the Ouse from Stony Stratford towards Towcester
- Develop a new eco-community
- We should not keep growing
- West at Shenley Dens as an expansion to the WEA
- Employment growth north along the A5 corridor linking with the Silverstone Engineering and Technology Park
- Distribute growth across all areas of the borough

21 . Question 18

- We need to understand what the maximum population that is environmental sustainable would be.
- Along grid roads, whilst maintaining a green space/belt between new housing and the roads
- The SHLAA should be updated via a call for sites to identify all suitable opportunities
- Redevelopment of Bletchley station
- Development and growth should be directed to the North of England, in conversation with the Government

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- The SHLAA should be updated via a call for sites to identify all suitable opportunities, including the larger rural settlements
- Growth should be underpinned by a credible forecast of housing need and demand
- Should consider whether this level of growth is actually required or not, and MK should have a period to settle down and consolidate
- Existing rural towns and villages should consider modest expansion and development
- Seeking random options at this stage is unlikely to uncover a large scale solution to the problem, and may erode the cohesiveness of Plan:MK
- All land around MK should be carefully evaluated and only the best and most sustainable locations chosen.
- Should give full consideration to growth near the boundaries of South Northants, Wellingborough, and Bedford and not just Aylesbury and Central Beds.
- Should significantly build upwards (40 storeys) in CMK and Campbell Park

What Ward Councillors said:

- There are no articulated and agreed reasons for continued new town growth rates, nor how big the city should become. There should be a debate and agreement about how big we want the borough of MK and the city to become

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Should investigate the capacity of the urban area and existing towns and villages for housing before considered other greenfield options and land outside of MK borough boundary

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

- Increase in planned growth around the other towns and villages in the rural area. Consider that this could accommodate between 250-350 dwellings per year
- Land around Haversham should be developed as an expansion to MK
- Development should be consistent with settlement hierarchies and the evidence base
- Woburn Garden Centre should be allocated for residential development

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- Should consider expansion north of the MK
- Should consider expansion of Newport Pagnell and Olney as is set out in the Core Strategy

22 Question 19

Your thoughts on the directions of growth

22.1 This question asked whether there were elements of any of the directions that were particularly liked or had particular merit; that would be unworkable (even over the long term future); and whether there were any conditions or requirements that should be put in place for any of the directions to make them a sustainable direction of growth. 174 responses were received.

22.2 A large number of respondents reiterated their general support or objection to one or more of the directions of growth. As these were general comments that did not express any particular merits, problems or requirements of the directions of growth, they have not been included in the summaries below.

22.3 The comments by each respondent group are summarised below by the merits, problems and requirements of each direction of growth that were cited, as well as a group of general comments that were not limited to a particular direction of growth. The majority of comments made covered a range of issues and therefore no strongly recurring themes were evident; however, the following could be discerned:

- Direction of growth 1 would be consistent with and benefit from the East-West rail and recent infrastructure improvements linked to other developments, although concerns about rail crossings were evident.
- Direction of growth 2 could provide a significant number of homes, but faced challenges in terms of new crossings over the M1/improved or new junctions.
- Direction of growth 3 would require significant infrastructure investment, and it was not certain whether this could be achieved.
- Direction of growth 4 would reduce the impact on the countryside, help reinvigorate the urban area and provide housing to meet short to medium term needs, although it could not meet all needs and risked losing the character and identity of Milton Keynes.
- All directions of growth would require infrastructure investment to support growth and avoid making existing deficits/problems worse.

22.4 A number of other detailed points and variations on these themes were evident.

22.5 As far as possible, the summaries below start with the issue on which there was most consensus. The summary below is best seen as an overview of the points made. In some cases there are directly conflicting opinions put forward by respondents.

General comments

- Growth should fit in with the 2050 Future works, city of Culture bid and create a buzz and atmosphere for the city
- A frequent network grid of public transport
- Campus university with STEM research
- Proper integration of the East-West rail with the city and WCML
- Infrastructure should be provided ahead housing wherever possible (e.g. health, schools, amenities, digital, leisure/sporting, open amenity space, routes)
- New enhanced east-west road and rail links

- Continue the original vision and philosophy of MK, and be mindful of its special green city character.
- Need a clear and strong vision for the city
- Encourage design innovation and smart solutions
- Detailed plans for the NHS services should be published to explain how expansion will be catered for.
- Need to maintain and improve the diversity, character and choice of living options across the borough.
- Need to properly consider the provision of low cost housing which is affordable in reality
- Continue the grid road system and redways.
- Create a semi-green belt with parkland in areas that most require preserving or enhancing.
- Do not build small houses
- New housing and employment development should have its own on site method of generating energy (e.g. solar, ground source)
- A low energy mass-transit system should be created for the city area. Potentially need a redesign of MK's transport infrastructure.
- Keep development within the boundaries of MK to reduce dependency upon neighbouring authorities.
- Link areas of regeneration to existing and active areas of development toward the south-west
- Any development in the rural areas should be done in the form of eco-communities of architectural merit and not as a generic extension/urban sprawl
- We need a balance between jobs and housing
- Warehousing should have rooftop housing to minimise the footprint of this type of development
- Seek Government commitment to finance new crossing of the M1.
- Need to consider achieving a modal shift from private, personal transport to a city which has efficient public transport and uses the main grid roads to extend and concentrate development of the city. Expansion should be closely linked to CMK through increased density, H5 and H6 expanded west, and V6/7/8 extended north and south
- Growth will result in an ongoing net cost to the public sector in terms of servicing the increased population. How will this be funded?
- The OAN should be based upon an up to date SHMA (Central Beds Council)
- Welcome discussion with MKC about how water and water recycling infrastructure will be considered as part of the selection of a preferred development option(s) (Anglian Water Services Limited)
- Green city concept should be carried on, with green infrastructure included in any new growth as a structuring element. Ensure there is a joined up and deliverable infrastructure network that can be sustainably maintained (Parks Trust)
- Essential that designated sites are protected, buffered and linked. Must ensure that green space provision and protection of sites does not create conflict at a later stage of plan making, making development undeliverable (BBOWT)
- It makes no sense to build in the rural area if the aim is to increase the population of the city. Access to the city from growth in the rural areas would also be poor due to the limited number of pinch point routes (MKC Ward Councillor)

22 . Question 19

Direction of Growth 1 (West, South West and South East)

What members of the public said:

Merits of the direction:

- Coincides with the East-West rail
- Could help to relieve congestion around Bow Brickhill/Woburn Sands if road infrastructure is improved with new crossings over railway
- Regeneration of Bletchley as a service and employment centre, as well as Fenny Stratford
- Could be in line with growth strategies of Aylesbury Vale
- Limit use of greenfield land and would not massively expand the city
- Consistent with the original vision for MK

Problems with this direction:

- Lack of soft infrastructure (health, education)
- Complicated by the railway and very limited scope due to the hills and woods.

Requirements for this direction:

- Must include substantial and well-managed areas of open space including indigenous species to provide strong natural buffer between new urban areas and the rural area.
- Should be done in close collaboration with local communities
- Should be preceded by new/upgraded infrastructure
- Connectivity between the M1 and M40 should be improved before any development in the south west.
- Any development around Apsley Guise should be outside of the village boundaries
- A421 should be dialled before further development in the south/south east
- Additional traffic calming and parking within the villages to the south of MK to help manage growth in this direction.

What Town and Parish Councils said:

Merits of the direction:

- Would benefit for infrastructure improvements already occurring due to growth in this area

Problems with this direction:

- There is no suitable east-west route for traffic on the southern edge of MK, and local roads are incapable of accommodating extra traffic
- A comprehensive, deliverable and full funded traffic strategy is needed for this area before any expansion should occur.
- Existing A421 is already at breaking point

What Ward Councillors said:

- N/a

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- N/a

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:Merits of the direction:

- Development to south, south east and south west (e.g. around Wavendon) would benefit from recent infrastructure improvements and the proposed East-West rail.
- Proposed grid road extension in this area would relieve traffic from surrounding villages
- The extensive assessment process that has been previously undertaken as part of previous plan making processes provides certainty that any risks/issues associated with growth in this direction can be properly addressed.

Problems with this direction:

- Would be difficult to achieve the landscape screening that would be required of any westward expansion and southern expansion (in terms of the Ouse Valley and Woods)
- Railway will act as barrier to expansion south, and between new communities created there and MK.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:Problems with this direction:

- East-West rail will result in more frequent closure of the rail crossings
- Adverse impact on the designated Area of Landscape Value

Direction of Growth 2 (East of M1)**What members of the public said:**Merits of the direction:

- Make use of existing road connections and grid system

22 . Question 19

- New junction would ease congestion at Junctions 13 and 14
- Contribute significantly to the required housing numbers

Problems with this direction:

- No funding for junction or motorway improvements
- Hugely inefficient, expensive and wasteful

22.6 Requirements for this direction:

- Must include substantial and well-managed areas of open space including indigenous species to provide strong natural buffer between new urban areas and the rural area.
- Should be based upon the original MK principles and aspirations for sympathetic integration and modest expansion of existing villages, and extending the grid road system
- Should be done in close collaboration with local communities
- Should be preceded by new/upgraded infrastructure

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- N/a

What Ward Councillors said:

- N/a

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- N/a

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

Merits of the direction:

- Would contribute significantly to the required housing numbers
- Would be a natural extension of growth area 5.7 and the EEA.
- Could provide a strategic employment sites that cannot be accommodated in the city, supporting local and inward investment
- Would provide sufficient critical mass to facilitate delivery of infrastructure including public transport, with potential links to Cranfield

Problems with this direction:

- New M1 crossing would require negotiations with Highways England and various developers, therefore likely to be slippage of timescales.
- Unable to provide smaller areas of development that can come forward to meet short to medium term needs.
- No assessment work has been done for this option.

Requirements for this direction:

22.7 • Would require significant investment in new infrastructure, including a new M1 crossing

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- N/a

Direction of Growth 3 (Satellite Settlement(s))**What members of the public said:**Merits of the direction:

- Northeast of the M1 could generate links to Northampton, Bedford and Wellingborough
- Distant enough from CMK to discourage London commuters from living there and contributing to traffic into central Railway Station

Problems with this direction:

- Impact on biodiversity
- Local roads would not be able to cope with additional traffic and congestion.
- Create enormous demand for new infrastructure and transport connections to the city, causing damage to rural communities and countryside
- Hugely inefficient, expensive and wasteful
- Flood plain and pattern of existing villages and agricultural land
- A new junction on the M1 or extension to J14 would not be possible

Requirements for this direction:

- Should be commensurate with the scale of the existing villages, in a similar fashion to Cambourne in Cambridgeshire
- Should be standalone entities and not contiguous with existing settlements (e.g. 2km gap)
- Should be easily connectable with main transport routes.
- Must include substantial and well-managed areas of open space including indigenous species to provide strong natural buffer between new urban areas and the rural area.
- Should be done in close collaboration with local communities
- Should be preceded by new/upgraded infrastructure

What Town and Parish Councils said:Problems with this direction:

22 . Question 19

- Infrastructure delivery would lag behind housing resulting in overloading of existing infrastructure in the rural area

Requirements for this direction:

- Detailed consideration of infrastructure requirements should be given

What Ward Councillors said:

- N/a

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- N/a

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

Merits of the direction:

- Expansion around Castlethorpe/Hanslope would be close (4 miles) to CMK shopping centre and Wolverton railway station
- Growth of a garden village north of Newport Pagnell would be consistent with the aims of Plan:MK and the tradition of innovative planning in MK.

Problems with this direction:

- Would require significant investment in infrastructure and may be potentially be an unsustainable location
- A new junction on the M1 is not an option.

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- N/a

Direction of Growth 4 (Intensification, Redevelopment and Completion of the urban area)

What members of the public said:

Merits of the direction:

- Reduces the impact on the countryside/villages

- Limits use of greenfield land and creates opportunities for redevelopment of underutilised and poorly designed areas.
- It will focus attention on creating a great urban space

Requirements for this direction:

- Need higher density, interesting architecture and preferably a more interesting skyline.
- Should be preceded by new/upgraded infrastructure
- Do not increase density to the extent that green/park areas are lost or moved outwards

What Town and Parish Councils said:

- N/a

What Ward Councillors said:

- N/a

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- N/a

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:

Merits of the direction:

- Can help meet short to medium term housing needs.

Problems with this direction:

- Unlikely to deliver the amount of housing required to meet overall needs
- May compromise the original concept and well-planned sense of place of MK

What national/statutory organisations said:

- N/a

What local organisations/interest groups said:

- N/a

23 Question 20

Order of preference

23.1 This question asked which of the directions of development respondents would consider being the last resort / the one that they would find most difficult to support. Similarly, it asked which one they thought is the most sensible or sustainable direction/ should be considered as a priority. 247 responses were received.

23.2 The summary of responses is presented in terms of how many most preferred/supported and least preferred/objected to each of the direction of growth. In most cases, respondents preferred (or objected) to more than one direction. All preferences (or objections) have been counted in these instances, and therefore the tables, when added up, will result in a greater number than the 229 respondents to this question. In some cases, alternative directions or suggestions were made in preference to any of the four directions of growth presented in the SDD consultation.

23.3 In summary, the clear majority of members of the public favoured direction four with direction one (and the south and south-east areas in particular) the second most preferred. A clear majority consider direction three the least preferred. A large number of members of the public preferred a combination of two or more directions, with the clear majority being for a combination of directions 1 and 4. The order of preference is more mixed amongst the various organisations and bodies who responded to this question, as the tables below illustrate.

What members of the public said:

Table 23.1

Direction of Growth	1	2	3	4
Support/Prefer	49	31	18	94
Object/Least preferred	31	34	64	15

Other comments/suggestions

- Keep within the Milton Keynes Borough Boundary
- Small scale development in the rural villages
- Keep to the west of the M1
- No growth
- Plan:MK is premature in terms of the coming ahead of the outcomes of the MK2050 project

What Town and Parish Councils said:**Table 23.2**

Direction of Growth	1	2	3	4
Support/Prefer	3	5	0	9
Object/Least preferred	4	4	9	1

Other comments/suggestions

- A call for sites should be carried out and the SHLAA updated to find the best sites.

What Milton Keynes Council departments said:

- N/a

What neighbouring and other local authorities said:

- Cannot support any directions of growth within Central Bedfordshire as we are at an early stage of preparing our Local Plan

What the industry (e.g. landowners, developers, agents) said:**Table 23.3**

Direction of Growth	1	2	3	4
Support/Prefer	10	7	2	5
Object/Least preferred	0	3	4	1

Other comments/suggestions

- Small scale development in rural villages

What national/statutory organisations said:

- Anglian Water has no preference. Further technical work will be required to assess capacity for water resources and recycling

23 . Question 20

What local organisations/interest groups said:

Table 23.4

Direction of Growth	1	2	3	4
Support/Prefer	0	4	1	2
Object/Least preferred	5	1	1	1

Other comments/suggestions

- Keep within the Borough boundaries.