

Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting

19:00, Wednesday 13th March 2019

Room 1.25, Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees

Cllr Peter Geary	MKC, Olney Ward
Cllr John Bint	MKC, Broughton Ward
Cllr Sam Crooks	MKC Broughton Ward
Cllr David Hosking	MKC Olney Ward
Cllr Deborah Carr	MKC Newport Pagnell South
Cllr Sue Clark	Central Beds Council, Cranfield and Marston Moretaine
Alan Mills	Newport Pagnell TC
Phil Windsor	Newport Pagnell TC
Keith Button	Hulcote and Salford Parish Council
Robert Ruck-Keene	Chicheley Parish Meeting
Steve Waters	Moulsoe Parish Council
Nigel Richards	Moulsoe Parish Council
Peta Wilkinson	Willen Hospice
Tim Skelton	Resident/MK Forum
Christine Sinfield	Resident
Hilary Manning	Resident
Sue Neighbour	Resident
Ron Robinson	Resident
Paul Herbert	Resident
Peter Bell	Resident
Richard Wilson	Resident
Sarah Wilson	Resident
Kim Weston	Resident
Sandra Herman	Resident
Andrew Herman	Resident
Chris Herman	Resident
Terry Richards	Resident
D Greenwood	Resident
G Noons	Resident
C Adams	Resident
L Adams	Resident
Veronica Massey	Resident
Jeff Temporal	Resident
Deborah Temporal	Resident
Bill Lewis	Resident
Brenda Lewis	Resident
Kim Weston	Resident
David Curry	Resident
Diane Reeves	Resident
Allison Tomlinson	Resident

David Tomlinson	Resident
Billy Gray	Resident

Officers/others attending

Paul Van Geete	Milton Keynes Council
Sarah Gonsalves	Milton Keynes Council
Andrew Turner	Milton Keynes Council

Item 1 – Apologies

Cllr Catriona Morris, Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward (joined the meeting part-way through)
Cllr Douglas McCall, MKC, Newport Pagnell South
Cllr Keith McLean, MKC, Olney Ward
Desmond Eley, Olney Town Council
Stephen Clark, Olney Town Council
Ian Carman, Newport Pagnell Town Council

Items 2 – Minutes of January meeting

The Chair passed over the draft minutes of the January 2019 and February 2019 group meetings to focus on item 3.

Item 3 – HIF Management Case and Cost Breakdown Plan

For the benefit of residents who were attending for the first time, the Chair gave an outline of group's purpose, making it clear that participation in the Local Stakeholder Group did not constitute support or opposition to the development of Milton Keynes East, and that the focus of the group was to ensure the development is done correctly if it does end up going ahead. The Chair invited officers to present the Management Case and Cost Breakdown Plan.

Sarah Gonsalves outlined what the HIF was and how that funding, if secured, would be used alongside the normal planning obligations funding secured from the developers.

Sarah clarified that, if the HIF bid is successful, the funding would need to be spent by the end of 2024.

For the benefit of those who did not attend the last meeting, Sarah outlined the HIF bid materials that had been presented to the group at the 27 February 2019 meeting (Section 1 Project Summary and Section 2 Strategic Case).

Sarah briefly explained what the Management Case and Cost Breakdown Plan were. Noted that, ahead of knowing if the funding had been secured, it is difficult to commit to the exact arrangements and resource MKC would put in place to manage delivery of the infrastructure. Therefore Management Case sets out how the Council would ordinarily manage highway and other infrastructure projects. Sarah finished by outlining the broad timetable for

delivering the infrastructure and housing which is set out in the Management Case document.

The Chair opened up the meeting to general discussion and Q&A. The following is a summary of the points of discussion, questions and statements made:

1. Where did the 3,000 homes in 2040/50 figure, in addition to the 5,000 homes, come from? The fact this figure is in the document confirms a number of suspicions amongst the local community that the Council and developers are trying to increase the number of homes without telling people. Officers advised that the 3,000 homes in 2040/50 is an error due to the legacy of the original Expression of Interest which referred to 8,000 homes, and the fact that Homes England were pushing the Council to include 8,000. Officers confirmed that the bid is in relation to 5,000 homes within the MKE allocation, as per Plan:MK policy. PG asked that the 3,000 homes figure be removed from the bid document, and make it clear it is only 5,000 homes
2. Queried why the site plan shows Link B2 and a rbt on Link C with a stub going off east beyond the red line allocation? Seems as though the HIF is paying for roads which should be ordinarily paid for by the developers. Officers explained that the plan was indicative and may change as the Development Framework emerges further and the scheme goes through the statutory planning process. Clarified that the roads in green are those the Council was seeking HIF money for. Roads in grey were indicative and would be funded by the developer as part of the development.
3. Queried how fixed the road layout was. Officers advised that this was the preferred solution for informing the HIF, but may change as the Development Framework develops further and during the planning application process. The group thought this meant the costings informing the bid were not robust and puts the Council at financial risk if we accept the funding then costs go up. Looks like the Council isn't sure what it is even bidding for so don't know how the Council can cost it properly or manage the risks
4. The group stated that an outcome of the HIF bid call-in was a commitment to carry out consultation. Considered that no consultation had taken place on the proposals, the risks to the Council or costs, and what materials had been shared are marked as confidential. Did not think the presentations to this group to date amounted to a consultation. Commented that a consultation was never realistic due to the commercial sensitivities involved. Disingenuous of the administration to promise something that could not be achieved. Asked if there would be consultation with residents of Broughton and Brooklands as well as Willen. Officers confirmed there would be statutory consultation on the Development Framework SPD during the summer, as well as statutory consultations on any future planning applications.
5. Noted there was strong objection locally to the bridge and associated road improvements due to impact on nearby homes. Considered that the proposed scheme would not work anyway because the roads from it are already congested.
6. Queried whether the Government could offer a lower amount of money. Officers noted this was possible, and the decision to accept any funding would be an executive decision by the administration.
7. Queried whether the developer could fund the infrastructure. Officers advised they could not

8. Queried whether the site could come forward in a piecemeal fashion if only a limited amount of funds were secured. Officers advised that the Plan:MK policy position was that it was 'all or nothing', a comprehensive development of the allocation or nothing at all.
9. Scepticism about MKC's ability to deliver large projects on cost and time, given experience on office refurbishment project. Who would be responsible for cost overruns? Officers noted that any cost overruns would be shared between the Council and Berkeley, with Berkeley covering the first part of any cost overruns. Officers also noticed that cost estimates have gone up reflecting the fact that a greater amount of detailed design has been done for the road schemes.
10. Group considered that the uncertainty around costs presents a financial risk to the Council. Suggested the Audit Committee needs to review the bid and funding offer before it is accepted by the executive, which presents a reputational risk should the administration decide it is too risky to accept the funding offered by Government.
11. Queried if the bid had been approved by the Section 151 officer. Officers noted it would be
12. Queried the cost of the M1 bridge and whether it included costs of closing M1 and Smart Motorways – other examples delivered by Highways England came to £15m each. Have Highways England come back with an indication of the cost for closing the M1 to install the bridge. Officers advised they had not and will follow this up. Officers advised that the costs had been reviewed by two consultants on behalf of Berkeley, and were now with Highways officers and Jacobs for a further review. The reviews was expected to be complete by 15 March.
13. Queried why it was that WSP were doing the drawings and technical work for the Council? Who is writing the bid? Officers advised that WSP were carrying out technical work on behalf of Berkeley, who is supporting the Council in preparing and submitting the bid.
14. Queried what the triangle of next to the M1 north of the sewage treatment works was not included. Advised this was owned by the Parks Trust and is flood plain.
15. Queried if there was any funding for the hospital. Advised that planning obligations would be sought that would help fund improvements for the hospital.
16. Asked when the bid decision would be announced. Officers advised it would be in the summer, but expecting this could change.
17. Seem to be rushing the site to secure the HIF money. Should take time to plan the site properly and therefore we should wait a future funding round.
18. Delivery of the site over 18 years seems to be too long. A development corporation should be set up and take ownership of the site.

At the end of the discussion, PG took a show of hands whether a letter should be sent the Leader of the Council advising him the group do not think the bid is robust and should not be submitted. The overwhelming majority of the group agreed to this. PG also took a show of hands on whether the bid and funding offer should go to the Audit Committee so that the risks to the Council could reviewed before the administration decides whether or not to accept any funding offer. The overwhelming majority of the group agreed to this.

The group agreed not to meet on 21 March as previously suggested. Date of next meeting TBC.

Costings review by Jacobs to be circulated to the group as soon as is possible.
Agreed the bid would be circulated to the group after it has been submitted on 22 March.

AOB

None

DRAFT