

Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting
19:00, Wednesday 21 November 2018
Room 1.05/1.06, Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees

John Bint	Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward
Peter Geary (Chair)	Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member
Steve Waters	Moulsoe Parish Council
Nigel Richards	Moulsoe Parish Council
Steve Clark	Olney Town Council
Phil Winsor	Newport Pagnell Town Council
Catriona Morris	Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward
Alison Stainsby	Resident
Ian Townsend	Chicheley Parish Meeting

Officers attending

Sarah Gonsalves	Milton Keynes Council
Andrew Turner	Milton Keynes Council
Neil Sainsbury	Milton Keynes Council

Item 1 – Apologies

David Hosking, Olney Ward Member
Douglas McCall, Milton Keynes Council,
Newport Pagnell South
Keith McClean, Milton Keynes Council,
Olney Ward Member
Sam Crooks, Great Linford Parish
Council and MKC Broughton Ward
Robert Morris, CBC
Sue Clark, CBC
Cranfield PC
Hulcote and Salford PC
Emberton PC
North Crawley PC
Malcolm Roberts (Resident)
Bill and Brenda Lewis (Residents)
Alan Mills (Resident)
Robert Ruck-Keene

Item 2 - Minutes of previous meeting

Noted that Steve Clark (Olney TC) had attended the September meeting

Item 4 – Workshop Report

Andrew Turner gave a broad outline of the structure and content of the draft MKE Workshop Report prepared by HYAS. The group discussed the following points:

- Report should note that there were certain matters where a consensus was not reached (e.g. retail strategy for the site vis a vis Newport Pagnell)
- Saw the merit in working towards a single concept, but further detail is needed on certain matters before a consensus could be reached
- The report should not be used to promote the principle or timing of the development
- Wanted to know what Highways England's view was
- Queried what would happen to the work if the HIF bid is unsuccessful, but noted that doing preparatory thinking about the site was still of value
- Getting the spatial element right is not enough, need to set out phasing, delivery, adoption of highways and other place governance arrangements.
- Need to capture views from residents
- Need to reconsider and reconceptualise how place keeping and maintenance is done in light of reduced local government resources and new technologies, such as how waste collection would work.
- Need to ensure S106 and conditions ensure key infrastructure is delivered as promised, e.g. promise of new railway station at the Wixams misled buyers.

Andrew Turner queried whether the group felt it was important to develop a vision statement for MKE. The group made the following points:

- What kind of place is it? Is it an extension to Newport Pagnell, to MK or a place in its own right? Suggested an online survey would be a good way of canvassing views.
- Debated whether it might be a parish in its own right, or that it should be brought under Newport Pagnell Town Council.
- Considered that it is probably a choice between it being a place in its own right or an extension to MK, if its governance would not fall under Newport Pagnell Town Council
- Given its location and distance from CMK, its identity and character should reflect the settlements most near it such as Newport Pagnell and the villages/rural hinterland.
- The site is in two parts, divided by the river corridor, so may need a vision and concept for each part
- Design approach should not be limited or determined based on landownership or site boundaries
- Suggested a follow up workshop would be useful to develop the vision further, or for a small number of group members to draft something for comment by the wider group.

Item 3 – HIF bid

Sarah Gonsalves gave an update on the bid process and progress to date:

- Currently working on the business case which is very complicated – pushed by government to include a greater level of detail and assessment
- Minded to push back submission of the bid to March 2019 due to these additional requirements and to carry out further community engagement work
- Want to share information produced in developing the bid, e.g. transport modelling, bridge location assessments, etc. and sought views from the group on how best to do this. Suggested that the meeting of the LSG in January would be a good time as there would be outputs would be further developed.

The group asked when the completed bid would be ready for the LSG to scrutinise it, in line with Cllr Marland's comments. Sarah was unsure if that was what Cllr Marland had suggested, but the bid was likely to be ready by mid-February 2019

The group strongly suggested that full consultation with residents on the full bid should be carried out before it is submitted, using various channels to engage with residents and seek feedback alongside public meetings with Willen and Brooklands residents with all relevant officers in attendance. The consultation would need to regain the confidence of residents. Noted that the timetable for preparation and submission of the bid would make it very difficult for officers to carry out meaningful consultation, but it still has to happen. If feedback does result in an amended bid then the consultation would be a sham. The group suggested that there should be plenty of time for consultation as it was originally intended to submit the bid in December. Sarah reemphasised that the amount of work going in to preparing the bid has grown due to Government's requests.

The group asked that a timeline be prepared and shared showing when engagement on the HIF for various local stakeholders and residents would take place.

Sarah stated that the bid will be what we are asking government for and will be a representation of the technical evidence underpinning it, so consider that it is more important to consult with people about the technical reports and their conclusions rather than the bid itself. However, happy to share the bid itself

The group stated that it was important for local residents to have an opportunity to challenge the bid as it will have an impact upon them. Also important that there is visibility of the risks and conditionality of funding as well as the technical conclusions supporting the bid

The group asked when technical work would be able to indicate whether a bridge is actually needed or not. Sarah suggested this should be by Christmas. The group asked that to avoid presenting a lot of technical material in January/February in one go, could they see asap the transport scenarios that are to be tested. Sarah agreed that this should be possible.

The group noted that they cannot run the bid, but they can scrutinise it and say whether it is broadly OK, whether it needs to be tweaked, or whether it is wholly inappropriate.

Item 5 Density

Neil Sainsbury provided a presentation on density within existing parts of MK to help people visualise what gross densities can look and feel like as a place (see attached document with minutes):

- Outlined the key place making principles for the site
- Explained the method for calculating gross and net densities
- Explained that MKC are projecting a gross density of 16 dwellings per hectare for MKE as a whole.
- Explained what factors have an influence on densities, such as the form in which open space is provided, inclusion of grid roads, number and size and schools.
- Discussed a range of gross density typologies from 20-90 dwellings per hectare (dph) and real life examples ranging from 10 to 22dph

The group asked what the gross density was for the Redrow Homes Bletchley scheme opposite the station car park.

The group suggested that Broughton Gate is approximately 18dph gross, so not far off what might occur at MKE. However, they stated that Broughton Gate is too homogenous in density, different character areas would need to be created. Should be seeking something very similar to Walnut Tree.

The group suggested that the site is not a city centre location and therefore lots of apartments are unlikely to be attractive to the market. Higher density in an edge of urban location does not make sense, and MKC need to acknowledge to disbenefits of higher densities.

The group debated whether the site could have an iconic building at the centre that help to raise densities overall, alleviating pressure to have higher densities across the site as a whole.

When calculating densities, officers need to take account of grid road and reserves.

Item 6 – December meeting

Agreed that the December meeting should focus on transport modelling results available from the HIF at that point, and to invite Highways England to the meeting to hear plans for Junction 14, how the bridge consent process would work and how it would be delivered in practical terms.

Item 7 – AOB

N/A

Close