

Q5.5

We don't believe this policy is positively prepared – it has been subject to some degree of controversy and upon a final acceptance of the area as an SRA MKC decided to follow up an opportunistic bid for HIF when it was originally ear marked for possible development post-2031. Even as an SRA it was clear that housing needs would be satisfied by both identified development areas in MK and the number of approved planning applications that are simply waiting to be started and are stagnating because land developers are simply land-banking rather than building homes.

The area East of the M1 is far from being considered to be a high-demand area and any case to promote it to be such should be fiercely challenged. Additionally, the cost of the key infrastructure project is bridging the M1 at an estimated cost of £25 to 30m – how many other smaller infrastructure projects could benefit from this funding to develop and improve key elements such as roads, public transport and increasingly vital services such as broadband.

Q5.7

HIF funding has not been approved and the bid still has to be formulated and submitted – it is an open-ended initiative that should not be included in the plan since there is no certainty of the outcome. Without funding development cannot be brought forward unless significant amounts can be found to cover links over the M1 costing in excess of £25m. Development to the East and the HIF bid should be part of the Plan:MK

Q5.8

There are no options to bring development East of the M1 forward in the short to medium term without funding also Highways England have no plans to deal with additional crossings on the M1 in the short to medium term. They are currently undertaking the smart motorway project from J14. Development of crossings over the M1 will cost significantly more after the smart initiative is complete. Remove development options to the East

Q5.9

The infrastructure requirements are not clearly set out or defined and no developer comments have been made to propose how to overcome constraints. Clearly not enough work has been done re development to the east so this should be removed.

Q5.10

Site connectivity has not been defined with any detail or certainty regarding any of the topics in this question. It has simply been left out so should not be included as a development option. Remove this policy.

Q5.11

The 'fast-transit system' is a concept no detail has been provided and this has been mentioned with regard to Cranfield University not the public/residents who may live in this area needing access to central MK in which case its introduction in the plan is flawed surely it must relate to any development. Remove this policy.

Q5.14

Any development in the East will have huge collateral impacts on transport and traffic flows. Low emission public transport must be part of this but nothing has been talked about or options considered. The roads may or may not be developed – the use of the private vehicle – (low emission or not) seems to be the likely

transport mode which will have impacts on travel times and air quality. Olney already yearns a by-pass with the single carriageway through the town clogged during rush hour. Development in the East is in the wrong place so it should be removed.

Q5.15

As far as we are aware no impact assessment has been carried out since the area was originally designated an SRA for use post-2031. It is likely that a range of adverse impacts will need to be addressed or cause significant challenges that other areas identified in the plan will not be subject to. Remove development in the East.

Q5.16

Policy SD14 currently does not contain sufficient content to inform the preparation of a comprehensive development framework as required by Policy SD12. Policy SD14 does not propose a plan that can be ratified – it proposes an SRA but then makes it subject to a dependency (HIF BID) which has not been planned or formulated as yet and the outcome of which is uncertain and this cannot be the basis of a forward looking local plan. The residents of the areas affected by SD14 have worked tirelessly, long and hard to achieve a degree of certainty and stability in the environments that they live in and support. SD14 simply provides no ability to rely on Plan:MK since as a policy it has too many unanswered questions to be considered a plan. Additionally when recently asking two separate sources within the MKC planning department on whether Plan:MK would deliver a 5yr land supply one said yes, the other said no! Remove this option.