

Milton Keynes Council Development Review Forum

13 May, Civic

Meeting Notes

Attendees

| NAME | ORGANISATION | E-MAIL |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Neil Sainsbury (Chair) | MKC – Head of Placemaking | neil.sainsbury@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Tracy Darke | MKC – Director: Growth, Economy and Culture | tracy.darke@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Joanne Trueman | MKC Housing | joanne.trueman@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Julia Banham | MKC Housing | Julia.banham@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Elizabeth Verdegem | MKC Planning | Elizabeth.verdegem@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Steve Revill-Darton | The Parks Trust | s.revill-darton@theparkstrust.com |
| Cllr Anthony Browne | Milton Keynes Council | Anthony.browne@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Tim Skelton | Milton Keynes Forum | colesbourne@btinternet.com |
| Graham Kime | Gardner Stewart Architects | Graham.kime@gsa-studios.com |
| Ed Heppenfell | Mapeley Estates Ltd | Edward.heppenfell@mapeley.co.uk |
| Kevin Twigger | KRT Associates | admin@krtassociates.co.uk |
| David Bainbridge | Bidwells | David.bainbridge@bidwells.co.uk |
| Hugo Reeve | Crest Nicholson | hugo.reeve@crestnicholson.com |
| Mike Robinson | Strutt and Parker | mike.robinson@struttandparker |
| Amelia Cherry | Countryside | Amelia.cherry@cpplc.com |
| Nick Butcher | Pitman Tozer Architects | nick@pitmantozer.com |
| Chris Bath | BPTW | cbath@bptw.co.uk |
| Peter Williams | Countryside | peterwilliams@cpplc.com |
| | | |

1. The Chair welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of the Forum, ie allowing stakeholders an input into the emerging design and layout of schemes as well as raising the quality and profile of design in Milton Keynes

Tattenhoe Park Phase 2: Countryside Scheme

2. Countryside presented their scheme for 319 units. Following conclusion of the presentation there questions and discussion about the following:
 - 2.1 The affordable housing mix and where are they located. Crest explained that the mix was determined in the s106 and is 25% affordable and 5% shared ownership. The breakdown is Private Sale 196 units, Affordable 96 units and Modern Methods of Construction 27 units.
 - 2.2 The type of housing provided as affordable. It was agreed that Mike Robinson would e-mail the chair with the exact breakdown while MKC Housing indicated that the preference is for family housing rather than apartments.
 - 2.3 There was a question about speed of delivery which Countryside responded too.
 - 2.4 A comment was made that the layout looks rather monolithic, boring and repetitive and should be more innovative. Countryside responded that development alongside the H1 edge was arranged such that residents when standing in the street to the front of the house could

see both the linear park to the west and tree planting along the H1 edge giving residents the perception of a very green development. The developer also explained that 'simple' is sometime best and simple rigour gives everyone a view of the development. In terms of innovation the developer stated that volumetric units built in 3 parts will be delivered 6 a day.

- 2.5 It was questioned why development did not back onto the H1 as is largely typical across MK. The response was so that development could face onto the green space and provide surveillance over the redway to the front.
- 2.6 There was also a discussion about the need for the development to maximise solar orientation in dwellings.
- 2.7 It was questioned whether there was any self build. No self build would be provided, however it was explained that extendable homes were part of the offer.
- 2.8 It was asked who would deliver the play area. Countryside responded that they would deliver it.

Tattenhoe Park Phase 3 – Crest Nicholson Scheme

3. Crest Nicholson presented their scheme for 128 units and explained that through a land swap (which extends beyond phase 3) between the Parks Trust and Homes England a better scheme had been created as it allowed a through route to be included instead of the entire development being a cul-de-sac. Following conclusion of the presentation there questions and discussion about the following:
 - 3.1 There was a lot of discussion about the proximity of the apartment block adjacent to the north of the existing football pitch and being directly behind the goal posts. Crest explained that would look at the position of this apartment block again.
 - 3.2 Similar questions were asked about the affordable housing mix, location and what types of housing it included. Crest explained that approximately 80% of the homes would be apartments as agreed in the s106 whereas MKC Housing explained their requirement as being only 19% with the remaining being family housing. It was questioned whether the s106 could be amended to reflect the actual MKC need for affordable housing. Crest to discuss this with MKC Planning and Housing. Crest also explained that the affordable housing was spread out to north to south across the site, with the northern provision to be located early on in the delivery programme given this is where overall development is commencing.
 - 3.3 It was asked whether any innovative housing was being provided as outlined in Policy D4 of Plan:MK. It was explained that Policy D4 was not a requirement but rather something to be encouraged. Crest also pointed out that it was their opinion that the scheme will have crisp, contemporary finish that is simple rather than a pastiche.
 - 3.4 The issue of a lack of landscaping/trees down the main street (particularly on the eastern side) was raised. Crest said that they would look at this and the landscaping scheme still required further evolution. It was said trees would be particularly be included at key corners.
 - 3.5 The nature of the green strip adjacent to North Bucks was queried – what was its purpose and can it be accessed through the cul-de-sacs. Crest explained it was part of the land swap and was mounded and would not be likely to be publicly accessible. Crest indicated that they would give further consideration to this issue of access for maintenance.

- 3.6 The relationship to the listed Tattenhoe Bare Farm was raised and again Crest said they would consider this further but did think backing onto it with private rear gardens was the appropriate response.
- 3.7 Crest were challenged as to whether the scheme met the standard of Oakgrove for example. Crest indicated that the scheme was work in progress and would reflect on this comment and certainly have aspirations for a high quality scheme.
- 3.8 There was a question whether the scheme would bear any relationship to another Crest development nearby over the border in Aylesbury Vale. Crest indicated there was no relationship between the two.
- 3.9 Crest were asked whether they have over-committed in MK and whether this would affect quality and speed of delivery. Crest explained that this was not the case.
- 3.10 Finally it was asked about the proposed play area around the playing fields nearby to the proposed community centre and when that would be constructed in terms of the proposed new housing. It was indicated that this was outside the site boundary that Crest had and was to be discussed with Homes England.