Milton Keynes East
Visioning Workshop
Wednesday 19th December
Summary outcomes Sessions 1 & 2
Group 1 & 2

Key concept plan features
1a Grid roads
1b Alternative route to 1a
1c London Road downgraded
1d By-pass of Moulsoe providing access to Cranfield
2 Carbon neutral housing (red)
3a Community hub
3b Aldi supermarket
4a Secondary School
4b Local centres: Primary Schools, creche, newsagent, doctor etc
5a Industrial/employment (purple)
5b Housing/High Tech business park mix of uses.
6a Green infrastructure (GI) connecting new settlement to MK & Newport Pagnell
6b GI around Moulsoe
7 Green walking & cycling routes
8 Key pedestrian crossings
9a & 9b Alternative park & ride locations
Group 3

Key concept plan features
1a Grid roads
1b By-pass of Moulsoe providing access to Cranfield
2 Housing (red)
3 District Centre/Retail
4a Secondary School
4b Local centres: Primary Schools, creche, newsagent, doctor etc
5a Industrial/employment (purple)
5b High Tech business park
6a Green infrastructure (GI) connecting new settlement to MK & Newport Pagnell
6b GI around Moulsoe
7 Green walking & cycling routes
8 Key pedestrian crossings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1 &amp; 2 combined plan.</th>
<th>Group 3 plan.</th>
<th>Differences if any.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Grid Roads (1a)</td>
<td>Grid Roads (1a)</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 2 also included an alternative route 1b and suggested a downgrading of the London Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>By-pass of Moulsoe (1d)</td>
<td>By-pass of Moulsoe (1b)</td>
<td>Minor road configuration differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carbon neutral housing (2)</td>
<td>Housing (2)</td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 2 aspiring to very low carbon housing. Housing is more extensive in the Group 1 &amp; 2 plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community Hub (3a) (Neighbourhood Centre) Aldi supermarket (3b)</td>
<td>District Centre/Retail (3)</td>
<td>The Group 3 plan located to achieve a larger catchment than the Group 1 &amp; 2 plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Secondary School (4a)</td>
<td>Secondary School (4a)</td>
<td>The Group 1 &amp; 2 plan has assumed the same secondary school location as Group 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Local centres (4b)</td>
<td>Local centres (4b)</td>
<td>Both comprising primary schools, creche, newsagent, doctors etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 &amp; 2 combined plan.</td>
<td>Group 3 plan.</td>
<td>Differences if any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Industrial/Employment (5a)</td>
<td>Industrial/Employment (5a)</td>
<td>Most locations for employment the same. Group 3 plan slightly more employment shown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Housing/High Tech Business mix of uses (5b)</td>
<td>High Tech Business mix of uses (5b)</td>
<td>No housing in ‘this’ area of the Group 3 concept plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Green infrastructure (6a)</td>
<td>Green infrastructure (6a)</td>
<td>Both linking to MK &amp; Newport Pagnell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>GI around Mulsoe (6b)</td>
<td>GI around Moulsoe (6b)</td>
<td>Identical locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Green walking &amp; cycling routes (7)</td>
<td>Green walking &amp; cycling routes (7)</td>
<td>An extensive network of green walking &amp; cycling routes on both plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Key pedestrian crossings (8)</td>
<td>Key pedestrian crossings (8)</td>
<td>Same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alternative Park &amp; Ride locations (9a &amp; 9b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No park and ride in Group 3 concept plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Objectives & Vision Examples
Services

Employment

Transport & Connectivity

High Quality Built Environment

'Schools need to be located centrally within the development to enable walking/ cycling'.

Create a thriving local economy & jobs

Consideration of walking, cycling, public transport & rapid transit

'Select the barrier effect of the M1 by introducing as many connections as possible'.

Served by excellent schools & healthcare

Well designed buildings & public spaces

What is being built at MKE? Is it an urban extension or a new settlement?

Newport Pagnell Town Council opposed to independent shops on MKE as would compete with the NP High Street.
Environmental

Environmentally friendly

1.5MW turbine
Electricity provision: 1200 houses or 75 primary schools
Height: 65m

‘Opportunity to require all development at MKE to be carbon neutral’.

Active & Inclusive

...supportive neighbourhoods and a strong sense of community spirit can all improve health and wellbeing.

‘Issue in new developments of lack of community hub to help build a community - eg lack of pubs or churches that, more traditionally provided somewhere for people to meet’.

Governance

Well run & everyone participates

‘Work with the Parks Trust to manage the green spaces’.

Equity: Mix of housing types & tenures

Full range of housing needs through a varied housing offer, including high quality social, affordable and market homes for people on middle to low income.

‘Fair for Everyone’
(as much a people issue as housing mix)

‘Work with the surrounding communities on MKE to bring them along as the plans progress’.

‘Fair for Everyone’
**Development Objectives**

**HOUSING & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

Grimsby West will contain a **range of high quality housing in a mix of densities**

**ENVIRONMENTAL**

Sustainable urban drainage and high quality landscaping will form a **key structural element** of the environment, with a network of linked green and blue infrastructure..

**TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT**

In particular, Grimsby West will capitalise on the **access opportunities** afforded by Freshney Valley and Cromwell Road that **lead to the town centre**;

**SOCIO/ECONOMIC**

The development will enable all parts of the community to **access** the education and training....including health, **retail and leisure facilities** and at least one ‘hub’ will be created. **Access** the social and community services
Vision

Establishing a strong, up front ‘vision’ is crucial in terms of building consensus in expectations and understanding the alternative positions of key partner stakeholders.

What is needed from this stage is a clear and transparent overall shared ‘vision statement’ and set of objectives that can be used to guide the evaluation, analysis and design process stages.

Key design principles & qualities of a Sustainable Community (below) can be prioritized (right).
Vision

Poor example:

To create a sustainable eastern expansion of Wakefield that will deliver social, environmental and economic benefits and improve the quality of life for its local population.
Creating the 'Garden Grid'

Ebbsfleet's Garden Grid is intended to bring the city's parks and open spaces together into a unified network, allowing residents of every species to walk, cycle, hop and slide across the city within safe, beautiful and sustainable green corridors.
Vision Statement:

North Eynsham will complement the existing town and help deliver a thriving sustainable community for the 21st century. It will be a place with a variety of choices to live, and opportunities for social interaction. It will be a welcoming and sensitively designed environment, with a strong sense of identity and allow nature and landscape to form an integral part of the development.

The future masterplan will seek to deliver a sensitive and sustainable extension north of Eynsham and achieve the following key opportunities for quality place making.

Creating a positive identity to ensure that the development responds to the local landscape and creates a well defined and understandable place, utilising and enhancing landscape features.

Viable and sustainable place, deliverable and a long term thriving place, which contributes to the economic wellbeing of Eynsham, provides new facilities and opportunities for new sustainable transport links.

Connected and safe walkable neighbourhoods, responding to adjoining areas to integrate with Eynsham to the south, and provide wider access to the countryside to the west.

Welcoming place which fosters a strong sense of community and provides a range of local needs and facilities to serve both the development and the existing surrounding communities.

Delivering best practice in development which is responsive to ecology, connecting and protecting features and also creating opportunities for new habitats.

Creating a sustainable place, achieving best practice development and increasing the sustainability of Eynsham as a whole.

Working with landscape assets by retaining and enhancing features, working with local features.

Quality of life, with homes for local need, space to live and play, good access to facilities and a place people can be proud of.

Key components of the North Eynsham development could include:

- Mix of housing including affordable
- Phased delivery of about 1,200 residential units
- New local facilities including a village centre, connected to Eynsham
- A new primary school (rFE)
- New local employment
- Fast link transport hub and Park and Ride for the A40
- Access to a high quality local public transport service
- New allotments/community gardens
- Public open space
- Access to the countryside
- Biodiverse network of green infrastructure
- Multi-functional SuDS network
- Integration with Eynsham to the south
- Enhanced cycle and walking connections within the development and into Eynsham.
MK East:
Development Objectives & Vision
Areas of Consensus & Draft Development Objectives

TRANSPORT & CONNECTIVITY

Good connections & permeability: The need for robust and efficient connections within, across and out of the development, particularly minimising the barrier effect of the M1 and main roads.

HIGH QUALITY BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Protecting existing settlements: Newport Pagnell and existing village settlements should be protected from new development with appropriate green buffering.

AN ACTIVE & INCLUSIVE ENVIRONMENT

Ensuring good social function: MK East needs to function well socially and for all its residents.
Areas of Consensus & Draft Development Objectives

LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT, GI & RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

There was also general consensus on the location of the majority of the main land uses, particularly:

EMPLOYMENT

Mix of opportunities including industrial and office, R&D, higher tech to relate better to Uni Cranfield/ technology. (and to limit large scale storage sheds?)

ENVIRONMENTAL

Green infrastructure: Accessible parkland to integrate with existing such as Riverside Meadows in NP and through to Willen lake. Use of SUDS etc.

HIGH QUALITY BUILT ENVIRONMENT

General locations of residential development: Mix of density and typology to reflect rural character more on fringe with greater intensity along PT corridors and maybe fronting the parkland?
Requiring more discussion...

**EMPLOYMENT**

**District Centre:** The nature and location of the district centre to serve the development, with competing concerns focussing on the potential impact of any new retail development on the health and vitality of Newport Pagnell Town Centre and the desirability of providing easy access to new larger scale retail facilities for residents of the wider rural areas to the north and east who currently have to cross the M1 to shop in MK.

**TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT**

**Rapid Transit:** The approach to ‘rapid transit’ was another area subject to debate, both in terms of potential mode, routing, destination and overall feasibility.

**HIGH QUALITY BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

**Housing Densities:** Density was another matter for further consideration with scope for a range in relation to public transport accessibility, and potential greater density to front and frame key open spaces.
Key strategic questions to inform the Vision

OVERALL QUALITIES & CHARACTERISTICS OF PLACE

Is it an extension of Milton Keynes or Newport Pagnell?

What do we think this place is? What is its character?

STRATEGIC CONNECTIONS

Equal consideration would be needed to the functionality of the site itself and the surrounding areas, especially in relation to transport and movement across the wider (off-site) network.
Concerns about further expansion North and that it will run on. 'Possible new road link near smell'.

‘Businesses and some residents in Olney don’t want a By-pass’. ‘By-pass needed’. ‘Concerns about further expansion North and that it will run on’.

‘Canyon effect in Olney’. ‘Traffic issues as far as Northampton’. ‘Traffic studies relevant to all connections’.


‘Densities definitely 35 or below’. ‘By-pass needed’.

‘Possible MK Dons pitches’.

‘Traffic issues as far as Northampton’. ‘Traffic studies relevant to all connections’.

‘Concerns about further expansion North and that it will run on’.

‘Possible new road link near smell’.

‘Site) needs to feel connected. M1 a barrier’.

‘Canyon effect in Olney’.

‘Density definitely 35 or below’.
Group 3

Possible MK Dons pitches

MK East

Olney by-pass
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Summary
Next steps & close