

**Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting**  
**19:00, Wednesday 26 September 2018**  
**Room 1.02, Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes**

**MINUTES**

**Attendees**

Gary Brighton	Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council
Val Dixon	Campbell Park Parish Council
Robert Ruck-Keene	Chicheley Parish Meeting
Sam Crooks	Great Linford Parish Council and MKC Broughton Ward
Diane Webber	Hyas Associates
John Bint	Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward
Peter Geary (Chair)	Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member
Desmond Eley	Olney Town Council
Steve Waters	Moulsoe Parish Council
Nigel Richards	Moulsoe Parish Council
Douglas McCall	Milton Keynes Council, Newport Pagnell South
Shar Roselman	Newport Pagnell Town Council
David Monk	Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council
Robert Morris	Central Beds Council, Cranfield Parish
Steve Clark	Olney Town Council

**Officers attending**

David Blandamer	Milton Keynes Council
John Cheston	Milton Keynes Council
Sarah Gonsalves	Milton Keynes Council
Andrew Turner	Milton Keynes Council
Martin Tate	Milton Keynes Council
Steve Hayes	Milton Keynes Council
Sophie Lloyd	Milton Keynes Council
Paul Van Geete	Milton Keynes Council

**Item 1 – Apologies**

Hulcote and Salford PC  
Emberton PC  
Sue Clark, CBC  
North Crawley PC  
Cranfield PC  
Cllr Catriona Morris, Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward Member  
Cllr David Hosking, Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member

## **Item 2 - Minutes of previous meeting**

No comments on August minutes

## **Item 3 – Housing Infrastructure Fund Bid**

Sarah Gonsalves introduced the paper that had been circulated prior to the meeting and outlined the main points. Clarified that acceptance of the funds, if successful, by the Council would need to be an executive decision and the funds would need to be spent by March 2023.

The group queried whether MKC would actually reject the funding if it was successful. Sarah Gonsalves confirmed that it would be unlikely due to the policy context. John Cheston outlined the Plan:MK policy position as it stood following the examination hearings and correspondence with the Inspector to date, in that it is now a positive allocation but its delivery is still contingent on funding being secured and strategic infrastructure being delivered. John advised that the plan would now include an indicative trajectory for 1,475 homes by 2031, as requested by the inspector, but if there was no funding secured then no homes would be delivered.

The group queried if the developer was comfortable with the cost estimates. Officers advised that MKC is working with the developers to estimate costs, and that the infrastructure works would most likely be contracted out by MKC at a fixed cost. As part of preparing the bid estimates would be market tested and contingency built in, but accepted that estimates would not be as accurate as when tenders come in for the infrastructure works/ Officers noted that a competitive tender exercise may drive down costs, with the savings kept by MKC and recycled within a new tariff arrangement for the site.

The group stated that any legal agreements need to be robust, and asked that the S106 is set higher to ensure all costs of development are met. Officers advised that there are currently pooling restrictions on S106 and that a tariff can't be introduced, but awaiting Governments' response to S106 pooling and that MKC are discussing with Government to have the ability to establish a new tariff for MKE.

The group suggested the cost of the health centre was too high, that no secondary school is included in the scope of the HIF. Officers advised that MKC is only seeking funding for early infrastructure that will enable the site to become deliverable or where there is currently no opportunity to deliver it (such as a health centre), not all infrastructure items that would be needed to support it. The group suggested that Brooklands has spare capacity, so a new health centre is not needed. Officers advised that the Brooklands health centre is due to be filled by new residents at Brooklands, the SLA and other existing commitments in the area

The group queried how the money would be spent. Officers recognised that MKC has a poor track record in spending grant funding. Officers explained that MKC would be paid on an annual basis for what was expected to be delivered that year, and that there is a risk that if MKC is a long way from its forecast expenditure then Government may clawback the funding, however, MKC's governance around capital

projects and expenditure is a lot better than it used to be. The group queried what counts as money being spent. Officers advised that work has to have started for the money to be considered spent.

The Chair asked the group for any comments they would like relayed to the next Cabinet meeting where the HIF bid was to be discussed. Comments raised were the concern that MKC was committing to deliver a number of projects in a short period of time over a small area which raised concerns around achievability; that the development was bound to happen in the future, so assistance from government funding will only be of benefit; that the risks associated with the HIF are valid and that the public sector has a poor record in project delivery so Cabinet have to be aware of this and ensure resources are in place to deliver it if the bid is successful; that the issue of risk was central, and that Cabinet should have advice on the risk profile of the HIF and project and potential liabilities; to question whether we are progressing this site so quickly just to get the money or for the benefit of the community; that growth has been earmarked in this area by Government, therefore it is better to secure additional funding to ensure the necessary infrastructure is forward funded and it is done right to avoid the mistakes of the past; to ask Cabinet to get an external appraisal of the cost estimates and not see the initial £75m ask as being a ceiling.

### **Item 3 – Transport and highways modelling**

Martin Tate provided a presentation on the transport modelling undertaken to date for Plan:MK and MKE.

The group thanked Martin for the presentation, but noted that the modelling is just a prediction. Congestion is already occurring and therefore there is already a case for additional crossings of the M1 and dualling of the A509.

The group queried the rationale for the proposed road layout shown in the transport modelling. Officers explained that this was the proposed road layout of Berkeley at the time the modelling was being done, and was seen as a reasonable set of assumptions to make for modelling purposes, but that the road layout was being re-evaluated via the Development Framework, including via workshops with the group.

The group stated that the effects on Newport Pagnell needed to be better understood and presented. Noted that building a new road and bridge that connects onto a congested route would be pointless, there needs to be an accompanying set of improvements to the existing roads to cope with the additional traffic and to increase public transport patronage. Further capacity along east/west routes was needed. However, no money to do this, so will just result in worse congestion for the community.

Some of the group did not think the modelling results supported the need for a bridge. Asked for more detail on where the delays were occurring. Officers explained these in more detail.

The group queried why MKC was just seeking to accommodate more cars, rather than promote public transport and mass rapid transit.

The group asked if more refined modelling would be done. Officers confirmed it would as the site goes further through the planning process.

The group asked if the roads in the modelling were grid roads. Officers described the speeds and character of the various stretches of road shown. The group felt strongly that the 'city streets' concept should not be pursued again as that was a mistake.

#### **Item 4 – October workshops**

The arrangements for the workshops were discussed and confirmed, with a brief explanation of how they would work and what we would be seeking to achieve from them.

The group stated that the discussions had to be centred on issues rather than trying to reach a single view or conclusion.

#### **Item 8 – AOB**

N/A

**Close**