

Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting

19:00, Tuesday 29th January 2019

Room 1.05/1.06 (moved to 1.02), Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees

Unfortunately a record of group members' attendance was not taken

Officers/others attending

David Blandamer	Milton Keynes Council
Paul Van Geete	Milton Keynes Council
Sarah Gonsalves	Milton Keynes Council
Steve Hayes	Milton Keynes Council
Sophie Lloyd	Milton Keynes Council
Martin Tate	Milton Keynes Council
James Williamson	Milton Keynes Council
Allan Norcutt	WSP obo Berkeley Strategic
Penny Mould	Highways England

Item 1 – Apologies

Cllr Catriona Morris, Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward Member
Cllr David Hosking, Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member
Desmond Eley, Olney Town Council

Items 2 and 3 – Transport modelling and bridge study

Officers with the support of Allan Norcutt provided a presentation on the results of a Bridge Study Report and recent transport modelling undertaken in support of preparing the Housing Infrastructure Fund bid and the Development Framework (presentation appended to the minutes)

The following is record of queries and comments raised by the group. They are not attributed to individuals, nor reflect any consensus amongst the group.

- Both options presented are horrible for Willen residents. We must ensure adequate considerations for Willen residents as well. Has the modelling included the fact that the H5 is effectively stationary for large periods already and that the second proposed scenario will only exacerbate this? Have we factored in that we have slowed down getting onto the Pineham roundabout and the impact this will have elsewhere?

- Individual slides were presented for Olney and Newport Pagnell, Why did we not do a slide for Willen. It appears the impact for Newport and Olney has been thoroughly considered but not so for Willen. Can we please model delays for Willen residents in terms of getting out of Willen.
- Given the modelling appears to show that the two options are broadly comparable in terms of their impact, are the costs of the two schemes broadly comparable as well?
- Specific local knowledge of residents (e.g. those in Willen) will need feeding into this process at a later.
- When reference baseline data was derived did it include rat runs, such as Little Linford Lane in Newport? Martin Tate advised that if it were significant it ought to have been built in, but we can check specific routes.
- Roxhill have put a planning application in for their part of the site, albeit now withdrawn. In their application they said that they would pay to dual Willen road and improve links, routes etc. Has this been considered and factored in to modelling and if not, why not? or, are we looking at the 'as is' situation? Martin Tate/Cllr Geary confirmed that we are looking at the 'as is' situation and that the Roxhill application is not live and the site does not have planning permission, therefore any proposals within their application were not built into the model.
- Don't see why it's an option of a new bridge or widening Willen Road. Why isn't both an option? An option including both should also be modelled. Decision has been made by government to build east of the M1 so we need to decide on how we are going to get traffic across the M1. Think we need both bridges, plus dualling of Willen Road and A509 up to J14 should also be dualled.
- What about the impact on rest of the network? Traffic gets over the M1 but are we going to be dualling the H4 for example? The wider impact on the western side of the M1 needs looking at seriously as well.
- Wolverton road which goes under the M1 and is therefore another existing crossing point of the M1 which should be considered as well, as this is particularly relevant for traffic coming from the north. Martin Tate advised that when looking at previous incarnations of east of M1 scheme we tested it against some of the potential mitigation measures west of the M1. We have deliberately not done this, at this stage, this time, until we knew what improvements were needed for crossing the M1. Also found that network to the west has more options and traffic disperses more easily.
- We do need some ideas of what mitigation will be done west of M1.
- Quite a lot of traffic coming from the north of the Borough (Corby etc.) isn't trying to get to MK but instead to get onto the M1. Has any thought been given to discussing this with neighbouring authorities to look at what could be done on other routes within their

boundaries to reduce traffic coming down A509? Steve Hayes advised that this hasn't been looked at specifically, but we could look at how the model has captured it.

- Queried what period we are measuring am/pm peaks over? Martin Tate advised that it is 8-9am and 5-6pm.
- What work has been done in terms of modelling the cumulative impact of growth in Central Beds? Has any thought been given to the rat run from Broughton down to J13? What work has been done separately and in collaboration with C Beds? Thought joint modelling was due to happen? Martin Tate advised that there was some discussion around modelling J13 which has now been taken over by Highways England. Penny Mould (HE) advised that a piece of work has been started; it is however still early days, to look at impacts on J13 with C beds, MK and Beds Borough. This has come out of work done in relation to recent local plans. There will be something coming forward in about 6 months' time in terms of what might be appropriate for mitigation at J13. Doesn't look at rat running.
- There is another question relating to the impact of this site and highways work etc. in neighbouring authorities. Steve Hayes advised this data is in the modelling, so if there is specific info required by neighbouring authorities we can provide it.
- Are there any plans to do remodelling of J14? Is there anything that needs to be reserved to able future work to be done? Penny Mould (HE) advised that she was not aware of any studies recently done on J14. Next autumn HE will be publishing what's in their next investment strategy. Not aware if MK put forward any expressions of interest in terms of having J14 as part of that strategy and as yet we don't know what will be in the next investment strategy. The group requested that HE take this back and let MKC know ASAP if there are areas that are needed to be reserved for HE works on J14. Allan Norcutt advised that work was done on looking at reserving land on east of M1 site for future J14 works to come forward.
- The group previously looked at how the road around the MKE development would flow off to Cranfield. Hope this hasn't been forgotten. This needs to be looked at.
- Rat runs through Moulsoe to Cranfield, through Chicheley to the A509 and through North Crawley, is getting worse, has this been taken into account? Martin Tate advised that the roads mentioned are included in the modelling.
- The modelling shows that if we do nothing, traffic and congestion reaches an intolerable level. How much development could we do east of the M1 before reaching this tipping point? What level of development east of M1 could be done without any work? At what point do we need to start building infrastructure. Martin Tate advised that the modelling showed something in the order of 500 dws or less could be accommodated before reaching a tipping point. Allan Norcutt also advised that it also depends on where those houses are located as the impacts on the network would vary.

- It was queried that Plan:MK shows 800dws as the max, therefore this is an example of how the development framework cannot be agreed until we know what is coming, is it 500 homes, 800 homes or 5,000? We need to hammer out where the roads etc. are going to go before we can plan for where the house etc. are going to **[post meeting clarification: Plan:MK, following a request by the Inspector during the EiP, now includes a minimum of 1,475 dws by 2031, but delivery of these is still dependent on the infrastructure being funded and delivered ahead of any housing going ahead. The development framework is being prepared to guide development of the entire site, therefore 5,000 dwellings plus employment land].**
- A general comment was made by a number of attendees regarding the impact of Plan:MK showing 800dws without provision of any infrastructure.
- The group stated that it was not clear what improvements on junctions around local roads are built in to the model. eg. Signalising etc.? Allan Norcutt advised that the Reference Case scenario has some highway improvements included in the model which are associated with the existing committed development coming forward by 2031. In terms of the MKE assessment (both for the Willen Bridge widening and the New Bridge scenarios) other than the new infrastructure proposed at MKE no other off-site junction improvements were included in the model runs. However, it is recognised that there will be off-site improvements necessary at some junctions and those will be identified, and improvements secured through a S106, in due course and through the planning application process.
- There will be a knock on effect on junctions in MK and east of the M1 and work will be needed on this. The current application for Tickford fields which is being drawn up and the proposals for junctions that this is recommending show this.
- Noted that presentation shows a 5 % increase in Olney; there are already existing issues here. What is happening with long standing proposal for bypass of Olney, has this been built in? Steve Hayes advised that this has not been built into the modelling for this scheme and no funding will be available for an Olney bypass through the HiF bid. Transport Infrastructure development plan work which is ongoing will however be looking at this option and assessing it in the longer term.
- Impact of all this growth will mean Olney bypass funding will need to be found at some stage in the future.
- The words unacceptable and intolerable are being mentioned a lot this evening, but what do we actually mean here? Do we have an understanding of what levels these actually are? Steve Hayes advised that these are very subjective, is the current situation tolerable because we accept it? We are showing a quantitative analysis of percentage increase in traffic, journey times etc. tonight, each one of us will have an idea of if these are intolerable. The model will not provide an answer to this, we need to assess and make a judgement of what the model is telling us.
- Rat runs west of M1 will need to be considered as well, such as those through Willen.

- Members of the group queried how residents are going to turn into and out of the roads in Willen if the roads are duelled when they are already rat runs which are blocked now and have been since 1985. A J14a should be put in. Cllr Geary noted that because of the timing the HiF is too immediate now to look at a new motorway junction.
- Members of the group questioned the assumption that it is a government imperative to build in this area. Were this to be true then the government would also be considering some mitigation to this. E.g. junction improvements, are these being considered?
- The group queried whether the indicative figure used in the HiF bid was the right amount of money required to build a bridge over a live motorway? Penny Mould (HE) advised she would have to take this back to check. Cllr P. Geary noted that the group has already asked for examples of this, but understands a precise answer cannot be given until exact details of the bridge are known.
- A request was made for a follow-up meeting to look at traffic impacts of other areas not covered tonight that have been raised this eve, albeit preferably not next meeting. Steve Hayes acknowledged it would be helpful to delve into this in more detail we would be happy to do so, but it is a tricky process to draw data out of the model, so could we therefore have requests in advance of what areas would like to be looked at so as we can prepare this.
- The group queried if they could have a presentation of the 2016 data again.
- If we have focused on a new bridge as the option, how does this impact on the designs etc. for the site that we have looked at previously? Cllr P. Geary noted that we haven't agreed on a new bridge being the definite answer, but if we are going to build significant development East of M1 there will need to be significant improvements, but questions are where and what etc.
- If we were to leave MK East and the Hif bid, could we not delay this for a long time and look at potential for J14 improvements/ a new junction? Cllr P. Geary noted that we are where we are with regards to the HiF bid, but HiF does need to be successful first. Does not agree with the HiF bid, but administration have put forward a bid so we have to deal with what we have and look at planning for this, but it HiF may still not be successful.
- Noted that it has not been mentioned that a reason for dismissing options in the presentation was because land wasn't in ownership of council. A lot is done outside of MK land ownership on other developments, therefore we should not drop these options for this reason alone.

Item 4 AOB

Cllr P. Geary noted that Cllr Bint had brought in some slides in response to the request by HYAS during the 19 Dec vision working. Cllr Geary noted that time will be provided at the

next meeting in February for Cllr John Bint (and others where applicable) to go through his slides on place making ideas etc.

DRAFT