

# Milton Keynes East Development Framework SPD 2019 Representation Summary

	Consultee	Summary of Representation	MKC Response
1.1	Bill and Brenda Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A509 London Road should be dualled instead of downgrading to road serving houses.</li> <li>Improve J14 instead of building new bridge.</li> <li>New bridge would move traffic onto gridlocked junctions at H4 or H5.</li> </ul>	<p>The eastern perimeter grid road will serve the function of the current A509 by taking traffic to the M1 junction.</p> <p>Motorways are the responsibility of Highways England, who have no plans to upgrade J14. However the layout of development shown in the Development Framework has been done in order to avoid prejudicing a future improvement to this junction. The new bridge will take traffic away from J14. Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that with the proposed mitigation measures development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network.</p> <p>Through traffic routes will be designed as grid roads.</p>
1.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Houses should be separated from main roads.</li> </ul>	
2.1	Craig Gentleman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to officially oppose the plans without putting grid roads and redways as per the rest of MK.</li> </ul>	The Development Framework includes grid roads and redways.
3.1	Fiona Youlton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the point in commenting? Plans will go ahead anyway.</li> </ul>	Noted
4.1	Russell Bennett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would like to object to the framework and the change would be to have it cancelled.</li> <li>Has the environment been considered with pollution of queuing cars and extra traffic?</li> <li>The development would put extra strain on the roads and extra commuters on to the trains, has this been considered?</li> <li>The proposed road bridge will not solve traffic problems just move it to another grid.</li> </ul>	MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK. Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that with the proposed mitigation measures development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Development proposals will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The extent of highway improvements required will be determined by the Transport Assessment.
4.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to the countryside being destroyed on a massive scale and is extremely sad at the loss of countryside to further Milton Keynes development.</li> <li>More traffic travelling through Moulsoe and greater pressure on parking and infrastructure in Newport Pagnell.</li> </ul>	
5.1	Tom Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please can the consultation form be made available to fill in on the website as well as a PDF – this will allow mobile devices to be used to fill in the form.</li> <li>No provision for pedestrians and cyclists wishing to travel east-west across M1 boundary in the southern half of the development area. The</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Amend Framework to include pedestrian/cycle bridge to be provided south of Junction 14.</b></p>

		red way should be extended toward J14 and go over or under the motorway to join up with the network from the Coachway.	
6.1	SGN Ian McClafferty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full extents of works needed are dependent on the nature and location of load requests and will only be clear by developer requests therefore, no extension or reinforcement proposals are developed until confirmed developers requests are made.</li> <li>• Any alterations will be required to be funded by the developer.</li> <li>• Diversion requirements should be established early to avoid delays to development if the need for major alterations arises.</li> <li>• SNG request that early notification requirements are highlighted to developers when in discussions.</li> <li>• If developers plan to use renewable technologies such as biomethane, please locate these next to existing gas infrastructure. Early notification requirements should be noted in discussions with developer.</li> </ul>	Noted.
7.1	Hilary Manning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on Willen – Concerned about extra traffic in an already busy area at rush hour added to industrial traffic from Tongwell.</li> <li>• No option for traffic to head south towards Kingston on Tongwell Street, this will make local road Aldridge Drive a ‘ratrun’. There needs to be a way for traffic to travel south on dual carriageway.</li> <li>• Appears that Willen has been overlooked for access with no improvements to Danstead Way.</li> <li>• Redway needs extending along Portway to the Coachway.</li> </ul>	Design of junction on Tongwell Street has not yet been agreed. This will be determined through the planning application process.
8.1	Garry Hammond	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over the Cotton Valley sewage works – is there enough capacity to cope with extra households?</li> <li>• What mitigation is there of the odour problem and its effects on people living, working and enjoying recreational facilities?</li> <li>• Would the plan consider planting trees along both sides of the M1 to disperse pollution?</li> <li>• Source of pollution should be identified on figure 2.15 with a symbol and 1500m exclusion zone centred on Pineham. This could also affect figure 3.1.</li> </ul>	Not a matter for the Development Framework. Anglian Water has not raised any concerns about capacity of the Sewage Treatment Works during the preparation of Plan:MK or via consultation on the Development Framework. Any application for development at MKE will be required to submit an Odour Assessment, which will identify any necessary mitigation measures. <b>Amend Framework to refer to need for submission of an Odour Assessment and amend fig 2.15 to identify Treatment Works as a source of pollution.</b>
9.1	Barratt Homes Christopher Fry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-operation with neighbouring Authorities – does this allocation account for any housing need that cannot be met by neighbouring areas?</li> <li>• Does the linear park count towards the green infrastructure requirement?</li> </ul>	The allocation is to meet Milton Keynes’s housing need. The linear park is part of the green infrastructure.
9.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some less vulnerable and minor development is acceptable in flood zone 2.</li> <li>• “No built development within a 24 metre easement corridor either side of the tunnel sewer” should be more explicit and should be “that</li> </ul>	<b>Amend Development Framework to state that “Development will be steered away from flood risk zones 2 and 3 in line with Plan:MK”. Amend Development Framework to state that “a 6 metre easement either side of the sewer will need to be kept free of certain types of</b>

9.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>precludes the ability to access the easement strip".</li> <li>4.2.13 Open Space Standard – table and supporting text should make reference to calculations derived from the Leisure, Recreation and Sports Facilities SPD.</li> </ul>	<p><b>built development.”</b>  <b>Amend Development Framework Table 4.1 to reference Plan:MK Appendix C open space standards.</b></p>
9.4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Assessments should not be required for all applications regardless of scale.</li> <li>Is travel planning officer visits enforceable?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that “The submission of a Transport Assessment will be required as part of any planning application that generates significant amounts of traffic movements to determine whether the impact of the development on the transport network is acceptable.” Amend section on travel plans to delete reference to specific measures.</b></p>
9.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.4.1 – Housing - No mention is made to policy HN1 (housing mix) and no mention is made of viability.</li> <li>5.15 – Phasing – the need for green spaces prior to occupation is unreasonable as construction will be ongoing. Green spaces and play areas should be phased in line with occupation rates.</li> </ul>	<p>There is no need to repeat policies of Plan:MK. Any application will be assessed against Plan:MK.  This is included as a general principle, not a detailed requirement.</p>
10.1	Daniel Clarke	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording of the statement about infrastructure needs improving. Development should not take place without commitment to improve the existing grid roads.</li> <li>Do not let developers put traffic light junctions in, roundabouts are the correct approach to keep traffic moving.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan:MK policy requires the delivery of strategic infrastructure to be underway before development of the site can go ahead. Development proposals will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The extent of highway improvements required will be determined by the Transport Assessment.</p>
10.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The commitment to sub-terrestrial underpasses and super-terrestrial ‘green bridges’ is an excellent idea.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
11.1	Newport Pagnell Town Council (TEPM Committee) Patrick Donovan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD is principally sound and manages to maintain the identity of Newport Pagnell.</li> <li>Committee is resolved to support the introduction of the SPD.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
12.1	Colin Weaving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport – concerned about the increase in traffic on the H4 and V11 which are already congested. The increase in traffic to the M1 is also a problem.</li> <li>No real details about a mass transit system. What will this be?</li> </ul>	<p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK. Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site’s allocation showed that with the proposed mitigation measures development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network.  The mass transit system will provide a fast, direct service into CMK. Further details of the system will emerge in line with the Council’s Mobility Strategy.</p>
12.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High density areas will create social problems.</li> <li>There is very little about the environmental costs of the development. What are the energy standards that houses will be built to and where are the plans to push developers to fit solar panels to all new houses?</li> </ul>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that high density development will create social problems. Greater density can help to sustain local facilities and public transport. Walkable neighbourhoods will reduce the need to travel by car.  Requirements for sustainable construction, including energy standards, are set out in Plan:MK.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no thoughts to the effects on Newport Pagnell and Brooklands.</li> <li>• What are the plans to improve social cohesion?</li> </ul>	<p>Consideration has been given in the allocation of the site to the potential impacts on neighbouring communities. The Development Framework makes provision for community centres, and for formal and informal sport and play.</p>
13.1	Natural England Eleanor Sweet-Escott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of the linear park into the site should be a requirement not a possibility.</li> <li>• Linear park should be widened where possible, to provide a wildlife corridor of a width comparable to the current Ouzel Valley Park.</li> <li>• Supportive of the proposal that the flood plain should form the basis of the park.</li> <li>• Recommend any proposed development in the flood plain be prevented.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework Site Context section to state that linear park will be extended into the site.</b></p> <p>Not accepted – it is considered that the proposed extent of the linear park is of sufficient width to provide a significant wildlife corridor.</p> <p><b>Noted.</b></p> <p>Any development proposed in the floodplain would be assessed against Plan:MK policy FR1.</p>
13.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Structural and buffer planting should be native species in keeping with local character.</li> <li>• Recommend inclusion of the following measures within the SPD: Protection of existing flood meadows from ploughing, grassland improvement; Encourage continued management of flood meadows by grazing; Promote improvements to the river, water edge and pond habitats to encourage increased biodiversity value; Promote use of ditches and hedges in place of post and wire as a means of stock enclosure; Promote the management of riparian vegetation including floodplain pollards, new specimens and areas of wet woodland. Support the creation of wet woodland for restoration in appropriate locations, to provide a mosaic of habitats.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to native species.</b></p> <p>These are matters that are better addressed at planning application stage.</p>
13.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local play areas and pocket planting should also be planted with native trees and wildflowers.</li> <li>• Figure 4.1 - ‘Existing Woodland (to be retained where possible)’ – in order to comply with the NPPF para. 174 (b), plans should ‘promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats’. ‘Where possible’ should be removed, and wording should be altered to read ‘retained and enhanced’ in regards to the areas of deciduous woodland priority habitats within the site.</li> </ul>	<p>These are matters that are better addressed at planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework figure 4.1 to state “Existing woodland to be retained”</b></p>
13.4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no mention in the SPD of the requirement to provide a measureable gain to biodiversity; the SPD will be required to propose the use of biodiversity measure for development proposals.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework Development Principles (para 3.3) with regard to Biodiversity to state “new and retained green infrastructure should provide biodiversity gains”</b></p>
13.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural England agrees with the conclusion of the SEA screening statement that a SEA will not be required for this SPD.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
14.1	intu Milton Keynes Ltd Matthew Nicholson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intu support the vision for Milton Keynes East to be a sustainable new community and the development principles set out in section 3 of the draft SPD. Intu also support the text at paragraph 4.4.10.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retail floor space proposed should support the local population but not compete with CMK or other centres within the wider area.</li> <li>• Requirement for Retail Impact Assessment should remain 350sq. m.</li> <li>• Intu supports the phasing of the development.</li> </ul>	
15.1	Galley Hill Residents Association David Tavener	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear that housing provision has been made to consider cradle to grave. Mobility of residents must be considered so residents can stay within a community for life.</li> </ul>	The development of the site would need to comply with policies in Plan:MK governing housing mix, accessibility sustainability and design standards.
15.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mass transit – Why do the mass transit share the already congested grid roads? Why not build an underground or overground?</li> <li>• Underpasses should be installed in advance of development</li> <li>• Install dual carriageways during construction</li> <li>• A509 should be expanded to cater for increased HGV traffic.</li> <li>• Why create 20mph zones when they are proven to be unsafe.</li> <li>• Lack of parking provision for the amount of cars development will generate.</li> </ul>	<p>Mass transit is intended to bring about a modal shift from private vehicles to public transport.</p> <p>The Development Framework proposes underpasses/bridges at key crossing points of grid roads.</p> <p>Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications will determine the required capacity of proposed grid roads, taking into account the provision of infrastructure to support a mass transit link. Eastern perimeter grid road will take through traffic with A509 London Road downgraded.</p> <p>All evidence shows that 20mph zones increase pedestrian safety. Parking provision will be set by the Council’s Parking Standards SPD.</p>
15.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested that the council create a factory in the eastern expansion to provide the 2000 new council homes and employment for residence.</li> <li>• Energy requirements reduced if houses designed and built correctly – solar panels built into roofs would help with reducing energy needs.</li> </ul>	<p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p>Plan:MK sets policy on renewable energy, and any development will be required to accord with local plan policies.</p>
16.1	Andrew Lockley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• North playing fields too close to major road – already a rugby pitch which could be used instead.</li> <li>• A509 should not be moved or downgraded, as it is the access to the motorway from Newport Pagnell.</li> <li>• The south-east housing bloc is too disconnected and lacks a local centre – it should be extended or removed.</li> <li>• The park and ride is too far from the motorway and the existing park and ride is not on the transit route.</li> <li>• West housing area not on transit route.</li> </ul>	<p>Playing fields can provide a green buffer between the A422/A509 and housing.</p> <p>Replacing the A509 with an eastern perimeter road reduces the severance of the main housing area.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include a local centre in the south-eastern housing area.</b></p> <p>Park and ride is located to intercept traffic before it reaches the motorway and is located on the mass transit route and grid road. Most of western housing area is within 400m walking distance of transit stop.</p>
17.1	Brian Salter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No grid road system established, it is a mixture of ad hoc ideas that do not meet the logic of a grid system. Replace current muddle of primary routes to a coherent grid system.</li> <li>• The importance of grade separated interchanges on the A421/A509 has not been emphasised.</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site’s allocation showed that with the proposed mitigation measures development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to firm up locations of</b></p>

			pedestrian/cycle crossings od A422/A509.
18.1	Cllr Roy Adams Stony Stratford Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to raise an objection to the plans as they stand.</li> <li>• Proposals discourage car use via bus and a mass transit system, people will still use their cars and with no grid roads there is potential for congestion.</li> <li>• Parking standards need revising as to build into the plan less parking is bizarre.</li> <li>• To set out to deliberately build something that will look nothing like the rest of MK with features such as no grid road system, higher density housing near the estate centre and reliance on a future (unspecified) Mass Transit system would set a very worrying template for future developments which would destroy the unique character of Milton Keynes.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that with the proposed mitigation measures development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. However, in order to meet the Council's objectives for carbon reduction, the Framework promotes non-car modes of transport, including mass rapid transit.</p> <p>Parking will accord with the Council's Parking Standards. Policy HN1 of Plan:MK allows for lower levels of parking to achieve densities that realise wider strategic objectives.</p> <p>There are other strategic objectives, most notably the need to address climate change, that need to be taken into account alongside the existing character of Milton Keynes. The vision for MKE developed with local stakeholders was of a community with a unique identity.</p>
19.1	James Holland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Downgrading of current A509 would be a mistake.</li> <li>• Grid road features should be protected as these allow safer environments for families.</li> <li>• High Street design should be avoided.</li> <li>• Would recommend a tram or train system for getting across M1</li> <li>• Good to see much needed housing.</li> </ul>	<p>The new eastern perimeter grid road will serve the function of the current A509.</p> <p><b>Amend High Street illustration to more clearly show a space with priority for active travel modes and public transport.</b></p>
20.1	Les Munn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoid homes being built on the edge of main roads.</li> <li>• Provide adequate width of roads for large vehicles to pass safely by each other.</li> <li>• Provide adequate parking even those close to transport hubs.</li> <li>• Space for a future rapid mass transport system is a good idea.</li> <li>• Fully complete the urban development during construction i.e. Dual lane roads and mass transport.</li> <li>• Avoid over development with housing density and high rise. This will cause problems in the future.</li> </ul>	<p>Within the residential areas, streets will be low speed 20mph roads. There would be no direct frontage for houses on the grid roads. Road widths will vary depending on the purpose of the street and its place in the street hierarchy.</p> <p>In order to meet the Council's objectives for carbon reduction, the Framework promotes non-car modes of transport, including mass rapid transit, and active travel. Higher density housing supports local facilities and provides patronage for public transport making it a viable option to the car.</p> <p>Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications will determine the required capacity of proposed grid roads taking into account the Council's Mobility Strategy and the need to encourage modal shift to public transport and active travel modes.</p>
21.1	Buckingham and River Ouzel IDB John Oldfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be noted that flood zone 3 has limitations of coverage.</li> <li>• Development should build its own hydraulic modelling to verify the Strategic flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>• All development required to comply with the Land Drainage Act and the Board's Bylaws. Particular attention should be paid to the Board's main</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>

		<p>strategic network of ordinary watercourse, which may carry flows from outside the development area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Board supports partnership with MKC and other flood risk partners.</li> <li>• The Board supports the Milton Keynes philosophy of strategic, integrated and maintained blue/green linear parks and flood balancing facilities. These blue/green corridors should consider Water Framework Directive objectives and look to maximise ecological potential.</li> </ul>	
22.1	Jahveen Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land Use – no detail of entertainment and diversion. MKE is opportunity to decentralise the entertainment areas of MK.</li> </ul>	Entertainment facilities that would draw trade from a wider area would not be sustainable.
22.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainability – sustainability goals do not go far enough. Within SPD there is no strong statement of intent for compulsory solar energy, wind energy, ground source heat pumping etc. These should be added as to leave them out would be a mistake.</li> </ul>	Plan:MK sets policy on renewable energy, and any development will be required to accord with local plan policies.
23.1	Phil Costin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A509 should be directly connected to Tongwell roundabout over the M1 via a grid corridor.</li> <li>• Grid roads should be maintained but contain narrower carriageways allowing for future forms of public transport.</li> </ul>	The Development Framework includes a grid road from Tongwell to the A509.
24.1	Gloucestershire County Council Minerals and Waste Policy Team Lorraine Brooks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No comments on this occasion.</li> </ul>	Noted.
25.1	Jennifer Searjeant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over road safety in the area. Volume of traffic on Tongwell St makes it difficult to exit Carlton Gate. Will the speed limit reduce on Tongwell as a result of development?</li> </ul>	Development proposals will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The extent of highway improvements required will be determined by the Transport Assessment.
26.1	Wood on behalf of National Grid Lucy Bartley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No record of gas and electricity transmission apparatus in the SPD area.</li> </ul>	Noted.
27.1	Bucks County Council Harpriya Chaggar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed site does not cross Bucks Boundary therefore the does not relate to the County Council.</li> </ul>	Noted.
28.1	Alan Bastable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to object to the plans to expand MK into the surrounding area of Central Beds. It is destroying villages and creating boring architecture.</li> </ul>	MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK. It does not include land in Central Beds.
29.1	Cllr John Bint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The vision is deeply disappointing</li> <li>• Please therefore amend the Vision along these lines to reflect the stakeholder consensus, e.g. adding new paragraphs as follows:</li> </ul> <p>This new site should not become an extension of Newport Pagnell. Nor should it be a continuation of the mosaic of suburban Milton Keynes. Instead, to the greatest extent possible, it should become a new</p>	The vision statement was developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group and is considered to reflect well the feedback gathered through engagement and consultation.

---

settlement in its own right, a kind of modern small town.

This new settlement should incorporate the spatial features that are widely credited with having made MK so successful, including green street scenes, generous green open spaces, a well-integrated (pepper-potting and tenure-blind) mix of market and “Affordable” properties, good connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists, facilities that enable fast, frequent public transport on major desire lines, a separation of through traffic from local traffic, and the provision of community amenities in every local community. The new settlement should learn from (and avoid replicating) less successful aspects of some recent estates within MK.

- Changes may need to be made elsewhere in the document to help achieve this improved vision.
- Definition of grid roads is needed in or around paragraph 4.3.3
- Please therefore insert text as follows:

A “Grid Road” for the purposes of this document is a dual-carriageway (2 lanes in each direction) or single carriageway (2 lanes in total) urban freeway (with bus-stops in laybys), with no development fronting onto it (except occasional petrol filling stations), and infrequent junctions (typically at least 400 metres between junctions) that intersect at roundabouts, all within a green corridor (of c 80 m for dual carriageway gridroads).

A Grid Road should give convenient grade-separated porosity/permeability between the developments on both sides, for pedestrians, cycles, ecology corridors and motor vehicles, preferably by having the grid-road several metres higher than the surrounding developments, e.g. on an embankment.

- Please tweak the current para 4.3.3 to make it clear that the grid-roads are as much for “through traffic” that want to go straight past the new settlement, as for traffic entering or exiting the new settlement.
- Please clarify (within Table 4.2, within Fig 3.1 & 4.2, and anywhere else as necessary) that the “Local Distributor” road is what MK residents recognise as a single-carriageway grid road.
- Please correct the wording to state that it’s for through traffic, without parking or development frontages, and it should normally be 60 mph (“national speed limit”).
- Please correct the text so it states that the road layout should give

**Amend Development Framework para 3.3 to cross-reference Table 4.2 (Street Hierarchy)**

Table 4.2 of the Development Framework states that the local distributor is for through traffic, and that there is no direct frontage onto the road.

It is considered most important for pedestrians and cyclists to have

29.2



	grade-separated porosity (permeability) between the areas on each side, for pedestrians, cycles and motor vehicles wishing to move around within the new settlement, not “at grade junctions and crossings”.	grade separated access between residential areas in order to encourage active travel. Permeability of development for cyclists and pedestrians would be required under Plan:MK design and transport policies.
29.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please add text (eg in a new paragraph after 4.3.8) to say the following: Within each residential neighbourhood, the street pattern will be expected to comply with the “estate backbone and lots of culdesacs” principle as set out in the New Residential Developments SPD, para 3.7.32 onwards. These estate backbone roads (“Primary Streets”) must be internal to the estate they are serving and accessible from outside the estate only from a grid-road. Such roads must explicitly not provide direct external access to MKE.</li> <li>This estate backbone road is shown in the diagram as Type 5 but logically this is a misprint for Type 6 (Primary Street).</li> <li>Fig 3.1 will need changing please to make it match the above text and the NRD SPD.</li> </ul>	The Residential Design Guide does not promote a particular form of layout.
29.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please reconsider and then re-write what is intended for the street arrangements around the District Centre.</li> <li>Please amend the diagram to show passing traffic going PAST the District Centre, not THROUGH it, and please revise the narrative accordingly.</li> <li>Once the document has been amended to show roads leading TO the District Centre but not through it, please amend all relevant parts of the document to give a suitable name, purpose, specification (table 4.2) and description for these roads, which will supersede the “High Street” typology in the draft document.</li> <li>Please amend Figs 4.3 and 4.4 to avoid implying a rectilinear block road structure and to avoid implying an expected cross-section that looks and feels like Countess Way. Please add cross-sections, plan layouts or photos that make it clear something very different is required.</li> </ul>	<b>Amend Development Framework to include revised layout for the High Street, showing vehicles going around the centre which will be accessed by pedestrians/cyclists and the mass rapid transit.</b>
29.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please add text somewhere relevant to make the following point: The scale and massing of buildings should be consistent with a small “market town” of 5000 homes, with a relatively small urban “core” and its own suburban character areas.</li> <li>The table of typologies will please need amending to reflect this, with less emphasis on tall residential buildings.</li> </ul>	The High Street cross-section is different from Countess Way in that it includes on-street parking within a landscaped verge, wide footways for pedestrian, dedicated redways for cyclists, a mass transit route and four rows of tree planting. Table 4.3 of the Development Framework establishes the character of the different areas within MKE. In order to increase patronage for mass transit higher densities and taller buildings within the central area are appropriate.
29.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please amend the layout (fig 3.1 and any others) to show the Secondary School adjacent to the District Centre rather than in an entirely residential area.</li> <li>Please remove all references to the timing of when schools should be</li> </ul>	The secondary school is located as close as possible to the district centre, without being bisected by the proposed open space link. The timing of the schools provision has been determined in line with

29.7	<p>opened. Please insert text along the following lines: Community infrastructure should normally be made available in line with the first phase of residents who will use that infrastructure. Where any other phasing is proposed, the developer must put forwards detailed arrangements for how the needs of early residents will be met (e.g., evidence of available capacity in conveniently located schools, shops, GP surgeries etc. elsewhere), including an assessment of the carbon footprint of this additional travel.</p>	advice of the Council’s Education department.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please revise the text on “parking”, to say the following: The Council’s current parking standards must be met until and unless a Mass Transit System is fully funded and under construction, such that it will be in operation by the time the relevant homes are built and occupied. Once that has happened the Council will consider evidence that such schemes lead to reductions in car ownership as well as reductions in car usage.</li> <li>• Wherever “parking courtyards” are mentioned positively, these should always please be specified as “front” parking courtyards.</li> <li>• One exception you might like to add is that, for apartments, rear parking courtyards can be considered.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that where lower levels of parking are proposed, developers will need to demonstrate that there is good accessibility to frequent public transport services.</b></p>
29.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhere (e.g. near paragraphs 4.4.1-5), the document should please say the following: The residential density overall is expected to be close to (but not more than) 35 dph net. The Council offers no guarantee that an acceptable and policy-compliant design can be created that will achieve 5000 homes together with all other land uses described in this SPD.</li> <li>• I figure 4.7 please amend the narrative and fig 4.7 to show that the densities should taper down to “rural edge” (10-30 dph) at all points where residential areas constitute the edges of the site.</li> <li>• please add a paragraph at some suitable point in the SPD along the following lines: Notwithstanding the creation and adoption of this Development Framework SPD, detailed studies must been undertaken and suitable mitigation measures agreed, on the impact of the proposed uses of this site on affected areas nearby and existing traffic, including noise, air quality and traffic/travel, prior to any planning applications being approved.</li> <li>• please add text at some suitable point in the document, along the following lines: There should be extensive community facilities for meetings, indoor &amp; outdoor sports and other events, suitably located within the overall site to meet the needs of residents (and where applicable, the people working in the employment areas).</li> <li>• please add the following text at some relevant point to encourage</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to distinguish between front courts for townhouses and rear or front courts for apartments.</b></p>
		Plan:MK requires the provision of around 5000 homes.
		<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include requirement of submission of the following reports: Air Quality Assessment, Odour Impact Assessment and Energy and Climate Statement.</b> The Framework already requires submission of Transport Assessment, and Noise Impact Assessment.</p>
		<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include new section on Community Centres.</b></p>
		Detailed guidance for affordable housing is more appropriately

Developers to actually take note of our aspirations:

provided in the Affordable Housing SPD.

Affordable Housing should be available across a range of property sizes (bedroom numbers), types, and tenures, broadly in line with the latest Council position on the Borough’s strategic need for Affordable Housing.

- Market Housing should offer a mix of bedroom numbers. Within each bedroom count category, there should be a range of sizes and styles, giving future residents a wide choice across a range of value propositions (e.g. from basic to much more luxurious).
- Affordable and Market Housing should be well distributed within the settlement and should visually be “tenure blind”, in design and external materials.

30.1	Stephanie Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We bought in the knowledge that land searches by solicitors stated that Milton Keynes Council had no plans to build near our houses.</li> <li>• Natural boundary for property is 30ft high trees. What are the developer’s plans up to that boundary?</li> <li>• What do the developers plan for the views from current residence?</li> <li>• Value of my property will be devalued with this development. What redress do the property owners who bought their property in good faith have?</li> </ul>	<p>MKE was allocated for development in Plan:MK (adopted March 2019). Any new development will need to ensure that it does not adversely affect the amenities of existing residents. However, there is no right to a private view in planning.</p>
31.1	Historic England Tim Brennan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion that a clearer reference to the historic environment could be included in section 3.3 Development Principles under the Quality Placemaking bullet point.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Section 3.3 Development Principles to include reference to historic environment.</b></p>
32.1	MK Cycling Forum Craig Broadbent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.12.1 Linear Parks – Future potential of extension is unsatisfactory non-car connections are required from the outset.</li> <li>• Access and Movement- the bullet point “Development should link into the existing redway and rights of way network, and extend it into areas of development” should be extended to say “Further it should connect to destinations within easy reach by bike, including Newport Pagnell centre, Milton Keynes South and Cranfield University”.</li> <li>• Current proposals fail to promote cycling and walking.</li> <li>• At least one crossing South of J14 and one just North of J14 are required, as well as many other smaller infrastructural changes.</li> </ul>	<p>Development Framework cannot require extension of linear park into Newport Pagnell. However, the proposed linear park will connect to the existing linear park to the south.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include pedestrian/cycle crossing to south of M1 junction 14.</b></p>

32.2

- 3.4.1 Core concept – please amend the following statement “pedestrian/cycle connections across the M1 and A422” to “Cycle network needs to be better connected and more direct than road network”.
- Please amend the following statement “partial downgrade of A509 London Road through the site” to “full downgrade of A509 London road such that it is non-through road”.
- All bridges across the River Ouzel should be paved red ways. 4 Bridges are needed considering the length of the river.
- Remove the word necessarily from paragraph 4.3.3.
- High street should not connect grid roads.
- Amend table 4.2 as; Local Distributor
- ~~Through traffic. No through traffic~~  
A509 Purpose, Continuous route for cyclists and pedestrians but not necessarily vehicles
- ~~Opportunities-Proposed pedestrian/cycle bridge/underpass~~
- Park and Ride could be renamed Mobility hub.
- Paragraph 4.6.1 please add “Cycling and electric micromobility aid modal shift from private cars and extend the catchment areas of Public transport. A comprehensive safe network is important to encourage sustainable transport modes”.

**Amend Development Principles ‘Active modes’ bullet point to state that “walking and cycling will be prioritised and promoted throughout the site...”**

**Amend Development Framework Core Concept bullet point to read “downgrade of A509 London Road through the site to avoid it becoming a through route.”**

Details relating to crossings of river in the linear park will be determined through the planning application process.

**Accepted.**

**Amend Development Framework to include revised design of the High Street.**

The purpose of the local distributor is to allow through traffic.

**Amend Development Framework to remove reference to ‘opportunities’ for pedestrian/cycle bridge/underpass.**

The importance of a good network of cycling routes linking public transport is already sufficiently covered.

33.1 MK Natural History Society  
Dr Mervyn Dobbin

- Section 2.12.1 please reword the first two paragraphs as follows:  
  
Existing woodlands/stands of trees/tree groups should be retained for landscape structuring, ecological, historical, and recreation use unless the reasons for removal can be fully justified.  
  
The future development plan for the area should show that every endeavour has been made to retain existing hedgerows including individual trees within the hedgerows and strengthen them with new planting. To ensure their long-term maintenance they should be incorporated within the public realm where practicable.
- Replace paragraph 4.2.9 with:  
“In order to contribute to ecological connectivity, an extensive landscape buffer should be provided along the length of the eastern edge of the development site, between the A422 and the southern site

**Amend Development Framework para 2.12 Habitat and Vegetation to state “Existing woodlands should be retained for landscape structuring, ecological, historical and recreational purposes unless the reasons for removal can be fully justified.”**

**Amend Development Framework para 2.12 Habitat and Vegetation to state “Existing hedgerows should be retained and strengthened where possible.” and para 4.2.4 to state “In order to create developable land parcels and provide road access, it may not always be possible to retain every hedgerow in its entirety. However, every effort should be made to ensure existing hedges are retained, improved, where necessary, and incorporated into the development.”**

**Amend Development Framework section on Edge Treatment to include sentence “Edge treatments will contribute to ecological connectivity.”**

		<p>boundary. One section of this landscape buffer will ensure a clear separation between the new development and Moulsoe village”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 4.4.21 - add text to the para after ‘...good access to the highway network’ as follows: ‘The space allocated for burials should be an element of and integrated within the landscape and open space strategy.’</li> <li>• Would like to be notified when SPD is adopted.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include sentence in section on Burial Space to state “The opportunity should be taken to integrate the space allocated for burials into the green infrastructure network, through landscape and tree planting.”</b></p>
34.1	Berkeley Group Ashley Spearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.11 Utilities - The easement for the strategic tunnel sewer is 12 metres (6 metre either side) and once the sewer tracing survey takes place, the exact location of the sewer’s 12 metre easement can be documented. Suggest that the wording “easement either side of the sewer will need to be kept free of any built development” is amended to read “easement either side of the sewer will need to be kept free of certain types of built development”. The current wording suggests hardstanding (highways/car parks) cannot cross the easement which is incorrect.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that the easement of the sewer is 12 metres, and that certain types of built development, such as hardstanding, can cross the easement.</b></p>
34.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree with the green buffer around Moulsoe village. Scheme is already mitigated by the site’s eastern boundary that follows the north-south ridge line.</li> <li>• Page 34 final sentence should be amended from “The development should seek to improve overall local water management and local flood protection” to “The development should seek where possible to improve overall local water management and local flood protection with all proposals subject to the Environment Agency’s approval”.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that the eastern boundary for much of its length follows the north-south ridgeline.</b></p> <p>The development principle is sufficiently flexible to allow for any requirements of the Environment Agency.</p>
34.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework should be more explicit with regard to Mass Rapid Transit and reference key locations that the service may connect.</li> </ul>	<p>It is not possible, in advance of the 2050 Strategy, to provide greater detail with regard to the mass rapid transit system.</p>
34.4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reservations about the phrase “not negatively impact on the health or vitality of Newport Pagnell”, as if this were to prevent the District Centre being built to the required scale.</li> <li>• The current locations that are indicated as “Proposed Pedestrian/Cycle Underpass/Bridge” and do not fall on the existing public footpath network should be marked as indicative locations.</li> <li>• Clarification needed that the indicative locations of both the residential and employment land parcels set out within the Framework and specifically within the following plans are indicative and subject to the master planning process.</li> <li>• We may look to consolidate the employment land parcel in the south-east corner of the scheme.</li> </ul>	<p>Any retail proposal would have to be subject to a retail impact assessment that would consider the impact of development on other town and district centres.</p> <p>These proposed pedestrian/cycle underpass/bridges are intended to provide crossing points of grid roads. Typically these crossings are located at grid road junctions.</p> <p>There is need to have some certainty about the location of key uses such as housing and employment within the Development Framework. There is room for some flexibility within the masterplanning process but any changes will need to be justified.</p> <p>It is considered that consolidation of employment land within this south-east corner would have an adverse impact on the village of Moulsoe.</p>
34.5		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Until the locations of the employment and residential parcels are</li> </ul>	<p>The Council’s Education officers consider that the proposed</p>

settled flexibility should be allowed within section 4.4.18, specifically flexibility in the number of form entries each primary school could provide, such as 1x4FE in lieu of 2x2FE, to ensure the best use of land and the most cost effective solution.

- Flexibility should be allowed within the wording to allow the Health Hub to either be located close to the District Centre or other significant social infrastructure such as the education facilities that are programmed within the early phases.
- Recommend that section 4.6.6 is expanded to include the opportunity to utilise other strategies and emerging alternative technologies rather than be bound to a Combined Heat and Power system when technology is rapidly evolving.
- Guidance is needed on proposed timeframe for adoption of the Tariff Framework Agreement.
- Indicative programme and milestones needs updating.

requirement for four primary schools is the most appropriate solution for the development.

**Amend Development Framework to state that health hub could also be located close to the district centre.**

**Amend section on community energy network to state that other alternative emerging sustainable technologies could be employed.**

The Tariff Framework Agreement is a separate process to the Development Framework, albeit the Development Framework would inform the content of the Tariff Framework Agreement. The Council will work with the relevant parties to progress a Tariff Framework Agreement in a timely fashion.

**Amend Development Framework to update programme and milestones.**

35.1	The Canal and River Trust Jane Hennell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The trust has no comments to make at this time.</li> </ul>	Noted.
36.1	Graham Benjamin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft policy good but strategically piecemeal.</li> <li>• Central Government and neighbouring Authorities need to co-ordinate with MKC to have any hope of responding to our climate emergency and optimise through a Development Corporation.</li> </ul>	These are not matters that can be addressed through the Development Framework.
37.1	Clare Ranger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns for the increased pressure on the hospital of more housing.</li> <li>• Would like to see inclusion of green energy such as heat sunk energy converters and solar panels.</li> <li>• Concerned for the impact so many more cars will have on the existing road network and Junction 14 of M1.</li> </ul>	<p>The development would make financial contributions to healthcare provision. Plan:MK sets policy on renewable energy, and any development will be required to accord with local plan policies.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that with the proposed mitigation measures development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network.</p>
38.1	Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) Andrew Davie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant concerns about the impact on the rural landscape of Central Bedfordshire.</li> <li>• CBC welcomes the preparation of an LVIA.</li> <li>• CBC request that the green buffer and rural edge typology is extended</li> </ul>	<p>The site is allocated for development in Plan:MK. The Development Framework includes mitigation measures, including green buffers, to reduce impact of development on rural landscape.</p> <p>Noted. The proposed grid road runs along the majority of the eastern</p>

38.2		<p>along the full length of the eastern boundary, with a requirement for advanced landscape infrastructure planting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBC request that the green buffer proposed for the south eastern edge adjacent to Moulsoe, is extended along the southern boundary of the SUE and included as part of advanced landscaping infrastructure and planting.</li> <li>• Consider that all development along the eastern edge should be in the 'rural edge' typology, rather than the higher density 'central' and 'general' typologies.</li> <li>• CBC request to be engaged with the scoping and preparation of the LVIA.</li> <li>• Whilst it is understandable that MKC are seeking to futureproof this site as an option for further expansion, the site should be designed as a standalone scheme that responds to the site's context and provides landscape mitigation on its eastern and southern edges.</li> <li>• CBC would like to work with MKC to identify opportunities for biodiversity net gain.</li> <li>• Marston Valley and Marston Gate schemes may be granted consent in advance of MKE and this should be taken into consideration with any transport assessment.</li> <li>• CBC wishes to be consulted on the scoping for the Transport Assessment. Consideration should be given to the impact on Ridgmont Station and the M1 junctions and additional vehicle movements onto Newport Road, through Moulsoe and onto Cranfield.</li> <li>• Contributions should be sought for enhancing existing public transport links to Cranfield University.</li> <li>• Would like to be engaged with further consultation as the SPD progresses and is adopted.</li> </ul>	<p>boundary. The grid road will lie within a landscaped corridor which will provide a buffer along the eastern edge.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that landscaped buffers should be provided on the edge of employment areas to reduce the impact of large industrial buildings on the wider rural landscape.</b></p> <p>Development in the northern part of the eastern edge is close to local facilities and the mass transit route and therefore should be at a higher density.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Development Framework includes green buffers and proposes further mitigation to reduce the impact of large industrial buildings.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
39.1	Sport England Owen Neal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any new sports provision within the MK East development should take account of the findings of the emerging Playing Pitch Strategy (PPS).</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to indoor sports facilities provision to meet the needs of the new development.</li> <li>• A population of this size would generate significant demand for indoor sports facilities, nearly equivalent to a four-court sports hall and up to 2.5 lanes of additional waterspace. Further consideration therefore needs to be given to how the proposed site allocation will meet the demand for indoor sports facilities.</li> <li>• Sport England would expect that any sports facilities and/or playing field are designed and constructed in accordance with design guidance.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that "Development proposals should take account of the most up-to-date version of the Playing Pitch Strategy."</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include requirement for provision of dual use artificial grass pitch and indoor sports hall at secondary school.</b></p> <p>Noted.</p>

40.1	MK Business Council Clive Faine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sport England in conjunction with Public Health England has produced 'Active Design' , a guide to planning new developments.</li> <li>• Steps should be taken to ensure the appropriate level of B1 and B2 uses varying in sizes to meet market demand as well as B8 are provided in the scheme.</li> <li>• There needs to be careful consideration of interface between residential and employment zones, with regards to built form, landscaping and design.</li> <li>• Also need careful consideration of the modes of transport and highways network envisaged to service the Employment land for both commercial and employees' vehicles.</li> <li>• No information is provided on the measures being taken to promote sustainability and zero carbon emissions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to 'Active Design' as a supporting document.</b></p> <p>This will be determined at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include sentence in section 4.4 Land Use – Employment to state “Landscaped buffers should be provided on the edge of employment areas to reduce the visual and other impacts of large industrial buildings on residential areas, the linear park, potential future development and the wider rural landscape.”</b></p> <p>This will be addressed at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Section 4.6 includes a section on 'addressing climate change'. <b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to requirement for developers to submit an Energy and Climate Statement with their applications.</b></p>
41.1	MK Green Party Alan Francis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear how self-contained MKE is intended to be.</li> <li>• The SPD should be followed by a Masterplan for the whole MK East area, not just by small piecemeal planning applications.</li> </ul>	<p>Local facilities will be provided to reduce the need to travel. Where residents need to travel for higher order services and work, the mass transit, cycling and bus services will provide an alternative to the car. Individual planning applications will be guided by a Design Code.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to the Council's commitment to climate change action in the Council Plan and Council motion on the climate emergency.</b></p>
41.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be mention of climate change and visioning goals in Chapter 1 of the SPD alongside Plan:MK and MK Futures 2050, not be left until para 4.6 to be mentioned.</li> <li>• The design of housing estates should be more permeable for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> <li>• Proposed Redways should be shown on the SPD plan, fig 4.8. They are just as important as major roads.</li> <li>• There should be grade separated Redway crossings of grid roads every 500m or less and there should be grade separated Redway crossings every 500m or less on M1 and A422.</li> <li>• There should be a link from new eastern grid road (V13) to N Crawley Rd.</li> <li>• Redways should be built alongside the new road with extension to Cranfield.</li> <li>• Does the 24m easement around the sewer tunnel stop red ways or footpaths from being constructed?</li> </ul>	<p>Ease of movement by creating places that are permeable and well connected is a principle of Plan:MK policy D1.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework fig 4.8 to show proposed redways.</b></p> <p>The Development Framework proposes grade separated redway crossings of the grid roads, M1 and A422/A509.</p> <p>Junction arrangements in the north-eastern corner of the site will be developed through the detailed masterplanning of the site.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to extend road and redway serving south-eastern housing and employment area to edge of site.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that the easement of the sewer is 12 metres, and that certain types of built development, such as hardstanding, can cross the easement.</b></p>
41.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be some minimum criteria for the public transport services</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that dwellings should be</b></p>



	<p>to each residential area/grid square and for employment areas/grid squares.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD should specify that the roads that will be used by MRT/buses are built early so that services can run from first occupation.</li> <li>• The bus services that will be introduced to serve MK East should not just be from CMK to MK East. They should go on to Newport Pagnell. There should be bus services to other key locations in MK, not just to CMK.</li> <li>• Guarantee MRT/buses in perpetuity. There needs to be funding mechanism that will guarantee that the housing can be served by public transport in perpetuity.</li> <li>• The SPD should mandate that the local bus services that serve MK East are operated with electric buses.</li> <li>• Extend H4 Danstead way across the M1 to cross London Rd (V12) and join the proposed new eastern grid road (V13). H4 from V11 to V12 and V12 (London Rd) from H4 to H3 (A422) would be dual carriageways. Other sections would be single carriageways. This would be instead of the V11 extension and new M1 crossing proposed in the SPD.</li> <li>• The new road proposed to serve the housing and employment areas in the south east of the site could be extended to Cranfield.</li> <li>• The speed limit on grid roads should be reduced to 50 mph.</li> <li>• Make other roads safer by introducing 20mph speed limits in the new residential areas and possibly also in the employment areas.</li> <li>• Pedestrianised areas and streets should be encouraged.</li> <li>• There should be reduced parking standards near local/district centres.</li> <li>• There should be Electric Car charge points in new housing and at local centres.</li> </ul>	<p><b>within 400m walking distance of a bus stop.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that highway infrastructure works will commence prior to the building out of the housing.</b></p> <p>Noted. This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework to determine.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The Development Framework is designed to ensure that the future expansion of the city is not closed off, in line with Plan:MK policy. The Development Framework sets the design speed of the grid roads within the development as 50-60mph. This will be further informed by a more detailed Transport Assessment. Streets within the residential areas will be designed as 20mph roads. The High Street will be restricted to mass transit and active travel modes of transport. The Development Framework allows for lower levels of parking around the district centre.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to charging points for electric vehicles.</b></p> <p>The Development Framework requires that a mix of housing is provided, in line with Policy HN1 of Plan:MK. Affordable housing requirements are set by Plan:MK.</p>
41.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-housing, housing cooperatives and Community Land Trusts should be encouraged.</li> <li>• There should be at least 30% affordable housing. The social rent proportion should be more than 5%, we would suggest at least 10%.</li> <li>• All houses in the development should be zero carbon. Most should have solar panels fitted. Housing should be orientated to be south facing to optimise solar gain. Industrial and commercial buildings should be designed to high thermal efficiency standards and assessed against BREEAM or equivalent standards.</li> <li>• Even though employment areas are proposed for the areas immediately</li> </ul>	<p>Plan:MK sets policy on renewable energy, and any development will be required to accord with local plan policies.</p> <p>A noise assessment will be required to be submitted with any planning</p>

41.6		<p>adjacent to the M1 we have concerns about noise from M1 and A422 affecting residents of some of the proposed housing areas that are within about 250m of the M1 or A422.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have concerns about smell from Pineham sewage works. The new housing would be downwind in the prevailing direction. How can this be mitigated?</li> <li>• The High St of the District centre should be on the north-south Primary street, rather than the east-west route which will be treated by drivers as a grid road, even if it is not designed as such.</li> <li>• Each area of housing should have a name and a small local centre.</li> <li>• All mature trees should be retained, with more trees planted as part of the development. Existing hedges should be retained and extended to create wildlife corridors.</li> <li>• Requirement for street trees.</li> <li>• Green buffer should be extended all the way up to North Crawley Rd.</li> <li>• The Ouzel floodplain should remain as natural as possible with increased tree planting.</li> <li>• There should be plentiful allotments and housing should have gardens.</li> </ul>	<p>application for development likely to be affected by noise.</p> <p>Any application for development at MKE will be required to submit an Odour Assessment, which will identify any necessary mitigation measures. <b>Amend Framework to refer to need for submission of an Odour Assessment and amend fig 2.15 to identify Treatment Works as a source of pollution.</b></p> <p>The High Street will be designed to deter through traffic.</p> <p>It is not the role of the Development Framework to name the residential areas. District/local centres are proposed to serve the residential areas.</p> <p>The Development Framework seeks to retain existing trees and hedges.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to the inclusion of street trees.</b></p> <p>The design of the linear park will be considered as part of the planning application process.</p> <p>The Development Framework makes provision for allotments. Private amenity space will be required for all dwellings.</p>
42.1	Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust Fiona Hewer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose the following addition to SD12.7 “...7. A strategic green infrastructure framework and network of green spaces to meet strategic and local requirements that follows guidance in the Council’s Landscape Character Assessment and Green Infrastructure Strategy to ensure, ecological connectivity with wildlife-rich habitats, protect the identity and character of nearby settlements and mitigate any significant impacts on the landscape in accordance with Policy NES....”</li> <li>• We recommend that the extent of the linear park should be limited so as not to overwhelm the River Ouzel Biodiversity Opportunity Area. Recommended that at least 88 ha of the BOA at this site should be prioritised for biodiversity enhancement (over human access and disturbance) by the creation of a Nature Reserve. This amounts to a modest 20% of the total area of this large site for a Nature Reserve.</li> <li>• Amend policy SD12.9 to read “Be informed by appropriate surveys of archaeology, built heritage and ecology to ensure consistency with other policies of the Plan and the NPPF...”</li> <li>• Para 2.6 omits the Broughton Brook wildlife corridor</li> </ul>	<p>Policy SD12 is part of Plan:MK and cannot be amended.</p> <p>The River Ouzel BOA does not lie within the site boundary.</p> <p>Policy SD12 is part of Plan:MK and cannot be amended.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework para 2.6 to refer to Broughton</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend text in Site Context section to identify woodlands that are priority habitats.</li> <li>Every Typology in table 4.3 should include integrated support for wildlife and the environment. We would further recommend explaining and expanding on the need for integrating wildlife and environment benefits in building design in new paragraphs in section 6.2.</li> <li>New paragraphs are needed in section 6.2 on lighting, which has important consequences for bats, and integrating design features to benefit wildlife and the environment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Brook Wildlife Corridor.</b>  <b>Amend Development Framework figure 2.7 to identify woods that are priority habitats.</b></p> <p>The purpose of the character typologies is to identify the key defining features of the different character areas.</p> <p>These are detailed design requirements that will be addressed as part of the planning application process.</p>
43.1	Chicheley Parish Meeting Robert Ruck-Keene	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why has the development of MKE been bought forward? Discussion of the HIF bid is not reflected in the SPD. Is MKC responsible for picking up shortfall of costing from this bid?</li> <li>The houses proposed for Tickford Fields and MKE will increase flood risk.</li> <li>The grid roads proposed should be wide enough for dual carriageways and they should not pass through residential areas without green/wooded verges.</li> <li>The proposed High Street will become a rat run for people avoiding J14.</li> <li>Mass Transit should be supported. A more concrete commitment is required.</li> <li>If 105ha is for Employment how is the remaining 356ha being divided?</li> <li>No mention of the benefits to surrounding villages or impact that this development will have on them. Increased traffic on A509 will have a detrimental effect on Olney.</li> <li>Improvements should be made to J14</li> <li>More detailed explanation on the need for MKE and how it is envisaged in the Oxford to Cambridge arc.</li> </ul>	<p>Development of MKE can commence once the necessary infrastructure to make the site deliverable is funded and is being delivered.</p> <p>New development will be required to not increase fluvial flood risk. Surface water flooding will be mitigated within the development, through the use of SUDs.</p> <p>The grid roads proposed do not pass through residential areas, are capable of accommodating dual carriageways, and have landscaped corridors.</p> <p>Motorists seeking to avoid J14 can use the proposed western grid road.</p> <p>Noted. It is not possible, in advance of the 2050 Strategy, to provide greater detail with regard to the mass rapid transit system.</p> <p>The remaining 356ha is given over to strategic highway infrastructure, linear park, housing, open space, retail and community facilities, and schools.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Highways England is responsible for J14 and currently have no plans to improve J14. However the layout of development shown in the Development Framework has been done in order to avoid prejudicing a future improvement to this junction.</p> <p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p>
44.1	Rob Seeney	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no comment as to regards landscaping within the development. There should be bolder mention of pocket parks and small green spaces.</li> <li>4.3.2 – wording should be changed to “promote pedestrian travel” instead of “discouraging car travel”.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include sentence stating “Street trees should be included within the development to soften the impact of car parking, help improve air quality and contribute to biodiversity.”</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework para 4.3.2 to state “The movement network must be designed to encourage active travel ..”</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extend the grid road into a properly designated high street and the full length of London Road.</li> <li>Future planning for a MTS should allocate adequate space.</li> <li>An underpass should be added in the bottom right of the site (figure 4.2).</li> <li>A district centre is more appropriate for this development not a high street.</li> <li>In some cases it may be better to run redways through the development not alongside the grid road.</li> <li>Is there a better way for residents to park avoiding the use of parking courts.</li> <li>4.5.1 Wording should be amended to say lower levels of parking instead of low.</li> </ul>	<p>The High Street is not intended as a through route but as a pedestrian friendly space at the heart of the development.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Underpasses have been shown where existing rights of way cross the grid roads.</p> <p>The intention is to create a district centre that is at the heart of the development and is accessible by active modes of travel, and by public transport.</p> <p>Redways along grid roads are intended to provide a fast route for commuter cyclists.</p> <p>Front parking courts are acceptable and front/rear courts are appropriate in flatted developments.</p> <p>Policy HN1 of Plan:MK refers to 'low levels of parking'.</p>
45.1	Reginald CT Westwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The street layout of the High Street is more of a city street and is not typical or desired in MK. Its design is inappropriate for a grid road.</li> <li>The mass transit system is undefined and is in effect science fiction.</li> <li>The SPD as drafted is alien to MK.</li> </ul>	<p>The High Street is not designed as a through route and therefore should not be designed as a grid road. It forms the focus of the district centre, where retail and community facilities are located. The Council's ambition is to be carbon neutral by 2030, and therefore the Framework is placing strong emphasis on active travel and public transport. The inclusion of a safeguarded route for mass transit accords with the Council's Mobility Strategy and emerging 2050 Strategy.</p> <p><b>Amend High Street illustration to more clearly show a space with priority for active travel modes and public transport.</b></p>
46.1	Jason Downey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High density housing is not in keeping with the area.</li> <li>Concerns over the mention that development will be expanded to 8000 homes.</li> <li>A509 is already very busy, especially through Olney. Olney should be bypassed. There is no mention of the effect on villages other than Moulsoe, North Crawley and Chicheley.</li> <li>Mass transit on a high street will be a disaster and flies contrary with design ideas of MK grid road system.</li> </ul>	<p>There will be a mix of densities within MKE, with higher density located close to facilities and public transport.</p> <p>There are no proposals to expand the development to 8000 homes.</p> <p>Developers will be required to address the traffic impacts of their development, and not solve existing problems. Development proposals will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. The extent of highway improvements required will be determined by the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The High Street is not designed as a through route and therefore should not be designed as a grid road.</p>
47.1	DLP Planning on Behalf of Bloor Homes Kirsten Ward and Jon Goodall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A better location map exists in Plan:MK (Map 5.2) and should be used instead of the current map.</li> <li>Paragraph 1.5.3 – the word "important" is unnecessary in the sentence "important material consideration".</li> <li>Paragraphs 1.6.5 and 1.6.6 are considered unnecessary as they repeat</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include clearer version of fig 1.1.</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Development Framework is an important material consideration.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to delete paras 1.6.5 and 1.6.6, and</b></p>

47.2	<p>NPPF guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1.7 is unnecessary in its current form and reflects matters at a current point in time that will quickly become out-of-date.</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.3.4 should as a minimum state specifically that: “Land has been allocated for a proposed Linear Park / Recreation, incorporating an existing playing field and play area, in the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan on land north of the A422 adjacent to the MKE site”.</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.3.6 – first bullet – replace word pollution with impacts to bring in line with NPPF wording.</li> <li>• Figure 2.13 also identifies the routes of the A509/A422/M1 as ‘Noise and Air Pollution Source’. We suggest that these annotations are also amended to refer to the associated impacts.</li> <li>• Requirement for less noise sensitive development to be located adjacent to M1 and A422/A509 corridors.</li> </ul>	<p><b>section 1.7.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan, and the land allocated for leisure use.</b></p> <p>It is considered that air/noise pollution is a suitable term which is widely understood.</p> <p>It is sensible for less noise sensitive uses to be located to major noise sources.</p>
47.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is necessary to ensure that any requirements for LVIA are specific to the details and location of any proposals submitted within the MKE boundary and undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Plan:MK – recommend that the final bullet point in section 2.4 is removed.</li> <li>• The hedgerows identified on the accompanying Figure 2.7 appear not to reflect the full extent of existing coverage within the site. It would therefore be helpful if the evidence base for the existing annotations was provided.</li> <li>• Unless the SPD provides specific justification for those areas of hedgerow identified on Figure 2.15 the annotation the key should simply state: ‘Hedgerow <del>to be retained where possible</del>’.</li> <li>• The wording of final bullet in section 2.9 appears to pre-suppose the requirements for archaeological investigation for the whole of MKE.</li> <li>• Request a reduced easement distance of 6.5m is reflected in the SPD.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to remove reference to LVIA from context section and place in landscape strategy section.</b></p> <p>These hedgerows are considered to be the most important ones, and should be retained where possible.</p> <p>The text relates to the whole of the development area which should be subject to a proper archaeological evaluation.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that the easement of the sewer is 12 metres, and that certain types of built development, such as hardstanding, can cross the easement.</b></p>
47.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 3.3 Permeability Development Principle should refer to the upgrade of Willen Road.</li> <li>• The following suggested changes are proposed in Section 3.3 to more clearly indicate this: (penultimate bullet) - Willen Road to be retained and improved upgraded to a Grid Road; (additional bullet) – The location of a new distributor road from Willen</li> </ul>	<p>The development principles are general strategic statements and not detailed proposals which are considered elsewhere in the Framework.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework para 3.4.1 to state that Willen Road is to be retained and upgraded to a grid road.</b></p>

47.5	<p>Road to be determined at the stage of preparing detailed application proposals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to indicate that the location of the distributor road is indicative given that specific outcomes for projects identified in the Housing Infrastructure Funding bid are still awaited.</li> <li>• The draft SPD should clarify the potential for a phased introduction of mitigation and the potential to deliver a quantum of development from the MKE allocation prior to introduction of a new M1 crossing and including upgrading Willen Road to a Grid Road.</li> <li>• A phased approach to bus service provision is appropriate to enable connections to be provided.</li> <li>• Paragraph 4.2.25 more flexible wording needed. The requirement for playing field facilities should be assessed at the time of submission of any relevant applications for residential development within the allocated site at MKE.</li> </ul>	<p>The Concept Plan is referred to as indicative.</p> <p>Plan:MK policy SD12 requires that development can only commence once the necessary strategic infrastructure required to make the site deliverable is funded and is being delivered.</p>
47.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Para 4.6.1 (Climate Change) - It is important to emphasise that these elements do not constitute additional policy requirements.</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.1.2 proposed wording appears overly restrictive and seeks to dictate the terms and timescales of all future applications. This is particularly relevant where the draft SPD fails to provide a clear outline of opportunities for phasing of policy-compliant development.</li> <li>• Proposed wording does not clearly indicate whether the Council would expect provision of both a new bridge across the M1 and footbridge across the floodplain to be delivered within the first phase, alongside housing.</li> <li>• Paragraph 5.2.3 should be amended to state that the MK Tariff Framework Agreement should be negotiated and applied to individual applications.</li> <li>• Suggested that the draft SPD recognises where policy-compliant planning obligations can be secured for relevant parts of the site.</li> <li>• Suggested that the draft SPD recognises that clauses for payback of Tariff contributions may be required, dependent on delivery of the remainder of the allocated site.</li> <li>• Lack of any phasing plan is a concern, the SPD should provide a plan by first phase of development east of Willen Rd.</li> <li>• Delivery of social infrastructure (including a Primary School) appears unnecessarily delayed until completion of up to 750 units.</li> <li>• Evidence does not support the degree of prescription for the early delivery of units tied to specific infrastructure items.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is important to identify within the Development Framework the appropriate locations for playing fields.</p> <p>The section on Climate Change simply outlines how the Framework seeks to address climate change.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to remove highway infrastructure from indicative delivery programme.. Include new paragraph to state that the phasing of housing development will be linked to the provision of enabling highway infrastructure. Amend delivery programme to bring forward primary school and secondary school from phase 3 to phase 2, and primary school from phase 4 to phase 3.</b></p>

48.1	David Lock Associates Will Cousins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Brief as currently drafted does not provide a clear vision for MK East, neither does it offer a robust and clear set of design criteria or principles which will endure over the long term and provide sufficient clarity to enable the futureproofing of key green, blue and grey infrastructure, thereby meeting the challenge offered in para 1.8.4 of the Framework.</li> <li>• Question whether the outcomes of the Local Stakeholders Group represent the wider community.</li> <li>• Site location plan should be changed to centralise the site and show the eastern extent of the New City.</li> <li>• There is nothing ‘bespoke’ or ‘place-specific’ about the Vision, so it cannot be expected to help define the ‘place’ that MK East is to be. Section 3.3 does not explain how a “unique identity” is to be delivered, nor how a place which is “distinct from adjoining towns and villages” is to be achieved. Suggest that an alternative Vision for MK East should be written which reflects local aspirations for development in this location and gives a clear and place-specific set of design principles.</li> <li>• 1.6.2 fails to reference the full suite of relevant Plan:MK policies relating to high level development requirements – the most notable omission being SCT8 relating to the Grid Road Network.</li> <li>• Many parts of the draft Development Framework do not comply with Plan:MK. No rationale is given in the document as to why the key principles required in SD1 have been rejected and a different design response proposed in the Development Framework.</li> <li>• Para 2.12.1 should be redrafted to provide a clear set of conclusions in a tabular form listing (a) the specific high-level requirements of each of the Plan:MK policies as well as the site opportunities and (b) the way in which they have informed the Development Framework for MK East set out in subsequent chapters.</li> <li>• The Placemaking principles set out in SD1 should be reproduced in the Development Framework in tabular form, with a commentary about how these will be met within MK East.</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that the Development Framework provides a sound basis for the determination of future planning applications. Further detail will be provided through the masterplanning process and the preparation of design codes.</p> <p>The Stakeholder group consisted of representatives of the local community (ward, parish and town councillors).</p> <p>The site location plan is intended to show its relationship to the rural areas to the north of Milton Keynes. The vision was developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group.</p> <p>Plan:MK policies should be read alongside the Development Framework. The policies quoted are the most relevant to the Framework, i.e. the site-specific policy and the general policy on placemaking of urban extensions. The Development Framework is in general conformity with Plan:MK.</p> <p>It is not necessary for the SPD to set out in tabular form how the ensuing framework fulfils each aspect of relevant Plan:MK policies.</p> <p>It is not necessary for the SPD to set out in tabular form how the ensuing framework fulfils each aspect of relevant Plan:MK policies.</p>
49.1	Great Linford Parish Council Eirwen Tagg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD as currently drafted; is unfit to be considered as Policy Document to provide detailed guidance on the development of Milton Keynes East Strategic Urban Extension.</li> <li>• It must be comprehensively redrafted to make it fully compatible with the policies and aspiration of Plan MK with particular relevance to a structure plan featuring connectivity based on grid roads and grid squares.</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that the Development Framework provides a sound basis for the determination of future planning applications. Further detail will be provided through the masterplanning process and the preparation of design codes.</p>

50.1	MKC Waste Service Gill King	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Waste Service is concerned that the development will increase pressure on the Newport Pagnell Household Waste and Recycling Centre which is on North Crawley Road and so very close.</li> <li>Consideration needs to be given to expanding or relocating the HWRC site to make this development viable. Provision for this should be made within the SPD.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include text safeguarding land for a household waste recycling centre.</b></p>
51.1	Marrons on behalf of Hallam Land Management Tom Thornewill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording in paragraph 4.3.17 refers to ‘transport infrastructure’ rather than ‘highway network’ to ensure it is consistent with Policy SD12 C4., and clear that this applies to all modes of transport.</li> <li>Made clearer that ‘future-proofing’ will include the Council securing the ability to control and deliver the extension of transport infrastructure to the boundary of the SUE in order to connect to future growth. Indicate on the Movement Framework (Figure 4.2) and Indicative Development Framework Plan (Figure 4.8) where such points of connection could be secured (if required in the future) through the safeguarding of land. Request that these include a connection with land to the south east.</li> <li>Paragraph 4.3.17 could be amended to require developers to consider the relationship of the proposed built form with the future potential uses on adjacent land outside the SUE.</li> <li>Status of distributor road serving south east portion of the SUE in the light of longer term potential growth.</li> <li>Request the following changes be made to the Movement Framework (Figure 4.2) and Indicative Development Framework Plan (Figure 4.8): Plans be amended to show the connection to the south east to be of sufficient standard to accommodate fast mass-transit system. The plans be amended to show land is safeguarded for the extension of the fast mass-transit system to the boundary of the SUE Primary Street 1 should be upgraded to a fast mass-transit connection.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to ‘transport infrastructure’ rather than ‘highway network’ in para 4.3.17.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that future-proofing could include safeguarding land as adopted highway.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that landscaped buffers should be provided along the edge of employment areas.</b></p>
52.1	Marston Moreteyne Parish Council H. Trustam	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request meaningful engagement with Central Bedfordshire residents and parish councils as the site progresses.</li> <li>SPD has not adequately taken into account the impact on Central Bedfordshire residents in villages such as Hulcote, Salford and Marston Moreteyne. How is the cumulative impact of housing growth in the areas of Eastern and Southern MK and western Central Bedfordshire</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site’s allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with</p>



		<p>(Marston Valley) on both the strategic and local highways network being assessed and mitigated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is the Moulsoe bypass in the Development Framework?</li> <li>• Substantial green buffer needed along full eastern and southern edges of the development.</li> <li>• Clarification is needed regarding the HIF bid – will this site be delivered if the bid is unsuccessful.</li> </ul>	<p>their applications.</p> <p>The Development Framework cannot propose development outside the allocated site. However, the Framework would not preclude its provision in the future.</p> <p>The grid road runs along the majority of the eastern edge and would be contained within a landscaped corridor.</p> <p>The site will not be delivered if funding is not forthcoming to pay for the necessary strategic infrastructure.</p>
53.1	Martin Ferns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development Framework does not clearly demonstrate the required integration/connections with adjoining areas of Milton Keynes or, to a lesser extent, Newport Pagnell.</li> <li>• Transport modelling conclusions need referencing in the document. Assumptions made about balance of public and private transport use, pedestrian and cycle use are not presented.</li> <li>• HIF bid should be mentioned and broken down as to how it will be spent.</li> <li>• Mass transit system poorly thought out – it has nowhere to go west of the M1, how fast will it be using existing grid roads without prioritisation.</li> <li>• Is the grid road a single or dual carriageway?</li> <li>• Downgraded London Road will be used as a rat run through the estate, how will the traffic be prevented from using it as an access to J14?</li> <li>• The new grid road should skirt the linear park and the new bridge moved slightly further SW.</li> <li>• What is the proposed future status of Newport Road leading from the A509 near J14 towards Moulsoe?</li> <li>• The farm/foot bridge SW of Willen Road is not indicated as a crossing point over the M1, after Figure 2.10, where it is shown as a public right of way. Will the right of way and farm/footbridge remain unchanged?</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p>The mass transit system is a strategic piece of infrastructure that will be developed outside of the Development Framework process. The Development Framework reflects the current thinking as it affects MKE.</p> <p>Grid road corridors will be able to accommodate dual carriageways. Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications will determine the required capacity of proposed grid roads.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that A509 London Road will be closed off at its southern end.</b></p> <p>The positioning of the new bridge over the M1 is the optimum location informed by an options appraisal and a feasibility study.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that Newport Road will be closed off at its southern end.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework Concept Plan and Development Framework plans to show farm bridge over M1 as public crossing.</b></p>
53.2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no indication of the balance between employment uses in the employment areas.</li> <li>• Will the Council have any control over employment type?</li> <li>• The largest area in the concept plan (Fig 3.1) is in the south, and looks disproportionate to the housing area there, the 105ha area sacrosanct, since it is stated in PlanMK?</li> </ul>	<p>Balance of employment uses will be determined as part of the planning application process, taking account of market conditions.</p>

53.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is open space planned between employment areas and housing, so as not to dominate the housing environments with the industrial?</li> <li>• Strongly support the clearly stated wish in 5.4.3 and 5.4.4 that this responsibility be given to The Parks Trust, who do such an excellent job throughout Milton Keynes.</li> <li>• There is need to ensure sufficient infrastructure is in place before residents move into the new estate (esp. schools, and the district centre, including the health centre).</li> <li>• Will there be any community development initiatives incorporated in the delivery plan, to facilitate social and community integration and support during the early stages of the new housing area?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that green buffers will be provided on the edge of employment areas to mitigate the impact of large industrial buildings on adjoining residential areas.</b></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>This is not a matter for consideration as part of the Development Framework, but is to be considered as part of the Tariff Framework Agreement.</p>
54.1	Oxalis Planning on behalf of Segro (Newport Pagnell) Ltd. Elanor Wright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplanning should not preclude individually masterplanned areas of the site being bought forward.</li> <li>• Land west of Willen Road is well located to suit and serve a wide range of logistics requirements and it is available now to deliver development which would help to meet this existing demand.</li> <li>• The Development Framework should be more explicit in identifying the two distinct parcels of land which form the site allocation (i.e. east and west of Willen Road).</li> <li>• The Development Framework should ensure that it does not preclude development from being brought forward early in the delivery programme where it can meet demand; be individually masterplanned and delivered; and where it would not adversely impact the delivery of the wider site allocation.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan:MK policy SD12 requires that development can only commence once the necessary strategic infrastructure required to make the site deliverable is funded and is being delivered.</p>
55.1	David Mason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no apparent logic to the proposed grid road network and no forward thinking to integration with the broader grid road network.</li> <li>• The presence of another of the City Street style road as part of the grid is a major failing of the proposed plan</li> <li>• There is inadequate strategic planning of the Redway grid network</li> <li>• Given the prevailing south-westerly wind direction how there can be much in the way of environmental mitigation for the M1 and Cotton Valley Sewage Works.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed grid roads link into existing grid roads to the south of the M1. There is potential to extend transport infrastructure into any future expansion of Milton Keynes.</p> <p>There is no City Street style road included as part of the Development Framework. The High Street is to be designed as a pedestrian friendly route, not a route for through-traffic.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to show additional redway links into the existing redway network.</b></p> <p>Any planning application will be required to submit an odour assessment, which will identify appropriate mitigation measures. Housing development has been located away from Pineham and the M1.</p>
56.1	Moulsoe Parish Council Kay Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why has the site boundary moved further east?</li> <li>• None of the developments can be labelled as affordable or addressing</li> </ul>	<p>The boundary of the allocation is defined in Plan:MK. The eastern boundary follows the topography of the site.</p> <p>The development will include a mix of housing including affordable</p>

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MKC's need for social housing.</li> <li>• HIF-bid money would be better spent further south for a crossing more aligned to the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge (OMC) arc infrastructure. What if there is a reduced HIF award will MKC walk away or will the tax-payer be the press-ganged into funding the short-fall?</li> <li>• Why build so many houses? These large-scale developments provide no benefits to the existing residents of the surrounding communities. Existing residents have chosen to live in a rural location; with this development it will cease to be a rural location.</li> <li>• This fast mass transit (FMT) solution should be looked at in the context of Milton Keynes as a whole, not just for MKE SUE.</li> <li>• A bus or bus system (especially that used in MK currently) can in no way by any sense of the imagination be considered to be an FMT.</li> <li>• Perhaps S106 tariffs could be increased in order to fully implement the FMT system. The plan does not work without it.</li> <li>• The need to get to the M1, across the M1 and MK will promote car use not diminish it. To think otherwise is foolish.</li> <li>• Boundary on the south side of Moulsoe does not respect the character of the village.</li> <li>• A school playing field is not a green buffer since there is a recent history of publicly funded schools having to sell this land to developers for housebuilding.</li> <li>• What would happen to the area between the village and the buffer as currently drawn?</li> <li>• Shift the suggested boundary to line of the bridle path running south of Newport Road to avoid the village of Moulsoe.</li> <li>• Pedestrians &amp; cyclists should be largely separated as in housing developments in Holland.</li> <li>• Connections from Moulsoe into the new area so that residents can use its facilities - not just roads but footpaths and Redways too.</li> <li>• The MKE SUE will not reduce flooding risk: it can only increase it. There is no indication of how effective policy FR2 is and whether integrated SUDS &amp; careful development planning will work, nor is the flooding risk of other continuing developments in MK mentioned.</li> <li>• Figure 2.7 does not show all the existing hedges within the area. This underestimates the existing wildlife corridors and habitat. This could affect the conclusions in section 2.12 where it says all existing hedgerows should be retained wherever possible.</li> <li>• There appears to be no tangible proposition for healthcare facilities or hospital provision.</li> </ul>	<p>housing.</p> <p>The HIF bid is for a specific proposal for the development of MKE.</p> <p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p> <p>The Development Framework can only consider MKE, and reflects current proposals for fast mass transit being developed for Milton Keynes as a whole.</p> <p>The Development Framework promotes alternatives to the car, including mass transit and active travel.</p> <p>The buffer is designed to retain the separate character and identity of Moulsoe.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to move position of playing fields.</b> The playing pitches will not be school playing fields.</p> <p>The area between the village and the buffer lies outside the site boundary and consequently there are no plans for this land.</p> <p>The site boundary has been agreed through Plan:MK.</p> <p>Different solutions are appropriate for different street types.</p> <p>The Development Framework proposes footpath and redway links from Moulsoe into the new area. Incorporation of SUDs will ensure that surface water run-off from the development is mitigated on-site.</p> <p>Figure 2.7 shows the most important hedgerows. Any application for development will be accompanied by a biodiversity report which will identify important habitats, such as hedgerows.</p> <p>The Development Framework includes provision of a health hub within or adjacent to the district centre.</p>
---	---

---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure of local centre &amp; other facilities should be established by the time half the total number of houses are built and should be accessible from surrounding houses.</li> <li>• The Eastern perimeter road should be delivered by the end of phase 2 to avoid the risk of planning creep.</li> <li>• There is no mention or contingency for a Moulsoe by-pass to access Cranfield – this was specifically discussed at the Stakeholder sessions but for some reason has been omitted leaving Moulsoe village exposed as a rat-run.</li> <li>• The development will successfully destroy a large amount of rural land and the associated farming community in the area along with green belt and the natural green spaces we all come to expect around busy growing towns and cities.</li> </ul>	<p>More detailed phasing of development, supporting amenities and site infrastructure (including public transport) will be informed by more detailed masterplanning to inform outline planning applications.</p> <p><b>Amend development Framework to state that the phasing of housing development will be linked to the provision of enabling highway infrastructure.</b></p> <p>The Development Framework cannot propose development outside the allocated site. However, the Framework would not preclude its provision in the future.</p> <p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p>
57.1	Sam Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical representation as Moulsoe Parish Council (above)</li> </ul>	See response to response no. 56.1
58.1	Jonathan Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical representation as Moulsoe Parish Council (above)</li> </ul>	See response to response no. 56.1
59.1	Karen Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical representation as Moulsoe Parish Council (above)</li> </ul>	See response to response no. 56.1
60.1	Steve Waters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identical representation as Moulsoe Parish Council (above)</li> </ul>	See response to response no. 56.1
61.1	Lidlington Parish Council Lizzie Barnicoat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Parish Council wishes to reiterate the importance of ongoing and regular communications with Central Bedfordshire residents during this process.</li> <li>• Such a substantial strategic urban extension will impact the residents of the neighbouring local authority in a range of ways and it was not clearly highlighted to the residents in Central Bedfordshire that this is being planned.</li> <li>• It is short sighted not to engage with the residents in Bedfordshire given the well documented issues with highways infrastructure in particular around Junction 13, 14 and the A421.</li> <li>• There appears to have been no consideration for the current planning application at Marston Vale for 5,000 houses which will add a significant number of traffic movements across the local network.</li> <li>• The Parish Council wish to register their concern over how the cumulative impact is being assessed collectively and collaboratively by the two local authorities.</li> </ul>	Noted.
62.1	Newport Pagnell Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document does not comply with Plan:MK in respect to grid roads or maintaining the vibrancy and vitality of other centres.</li> </ul>	The Development Framework is in general conformity with Plan:MK.

Shar Roselman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD does not plan a grid square system as exists in the rest of MK. A single dual carriageway that makes no effort to join existing roads into the grid does not comply with Plan:MK</li> <li>• Red way must be connected to Newport Pagnell with bridges/underpasses across the A509/A422.</li>   <li>• The SPD makes no effort to demonstrate how it intends to protect the High Street in Newport Pagnell and intends to build a Retail District Centre within 3 miles.</li> <li>• A redefinition of what a district centre is, excluding retail shops (other than a supermarket that does not have a market stalls such as a bakery, cheese stall, fish mongers, butchers or pharmacy).</li> <li>• The district centre should include a meeting place, health centre and dental practise and physiotherapist – there should be no retail.</li> <li>• The positioning of the Park and Ride as part of a noise buffer areas.</li>   <li>• Playing fields could be better accommodated by using the triangle of land in Newport Pagnell. Ensure proper funding and future management of linear parks, grid road margins and public open spaces.</li> <li>• Provision of electric vehicle charging points.</li>   <li>• Reference must be made to Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan which designates land east of Willen Rd, north of A422, for linear park/recreation use.</li> <li>• Paragraph 2.12 wording to be strengthened “The Ouzel Valley linear park should be extended into the site and continue into Newport Pagnell, in accordance with Policy NP8 of the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan”.</li> <li>• Linear Park to connect to Riverside Meadow including the use of CPO power.</li> <li>• The Bloor land north of the A422 should be transferred to the Town Council as part of the green space recreational development to allow expansion of Willen road sporting facilities.</li> <li>• Section 3.3 the penultimate sentence should be supplemented with “Negotiations should take place to acquire land north of the A422 for inclusion as part of the linear park extension to join up with Riverside</li> </ul>	<p>The layout for MKE was developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site’s allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>Developers will be required to submit a retail impact assessment as part of any application containing retail development to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the vitality and viability of Newport Pagnell town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to move Park and Ride site further north adjacent to A509 to act as a noise buffer.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include the triangle of land in Newport Pagnell adjacent to the football ground as a potential off-site location for new playing fields.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to charging points for low emission vehicles.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p> <p><b>Amend development Framework to state that the linear park should be extended into the site.</b></p> <p>It is not the role of the Development Framework to propose CPO of land outside the site boundary.</p>
---------------	---	--

	<p>Meadows, Newport Pagnell. MK Council should be prepared to use CPO powers should the owner be unwilling to negotiate the sale of the land”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 3.1 and 4.2 the words “opportunities for” should be removed as these connections should be made a requirement of the development.</li> <li>• Placing of the footpaths crossing the A422 should be looked at as they are not in the most strategically important positions.</li> <li>• The most westerly crossing should be moved westwards to coincide with the Willen Road/Marsh End Rd roundabout with the A422.</li> <li>• There would be space within the highway verge along London Road for a red way link from A422/A509 roundabout to Downs Field.</li> <li>• Green buffer should be expanded along the whole of the eastern boundary and should also been shown on Figure 4.1.</li> <li>• The diverted A509 to Junction 14 and the new bridge crossing the M1 to the A422 should be dual carriageway.</li> <li>• The new road from the A422 to the proposed dual carriageway in the development should also be dual.</li> <li>• Section 4.4 delete “where this is considered to be beneficial” the land should be offered to the council to maintain, with an appropriate endowment.</li> <li>• 6.5.2 – table should include the omitted Park and ride provision in Phase 3.</li> <li>• Local and district centre provision should not be left as late as phase 4.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to show proposed bridge/underpass crossings of A422/A509.</b></p> <p>The grid road runs along the majority of the eastern edge of the site contained within a landscaped corridor which will provide a green buffer.</p> <p>Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications will determine the required capacity of proposed grid roads taking into account the Council’s Mobility Strategy and the need to encourage modal shift to public transport and active travel modes.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework para 5.4.4 to state that it is the Council’s preference that the land should be offered to the Parks Trust.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to delete highway infrastructure and local and district centres from indicative delivery programme.</b></p>
63.1	<p>Cllr Jenni Ferrans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 4.2 - Reference should be made to Plan:MK policy preference for management by publicly accountable bodies, paid for by commuted lump sum maintenance payments at the time of development.</li> <li>• Absence of information on Health Centres. No health centre and no connectivity to the centre at Broughton. No capacity at Newport Pagnell and Willen.</li> <li>• No provision for NHS dentist.</li> <li>• New road replacing the A509 should be dualled.</li> <li>• Red ways should be distinct from the main footpaths and not placed either side of a distributor road. Distributor roads should be yes to footpaths and “where appropriate” to red ways.</li> <li>• Why are local distributor roads being left free of facing housing?</li> <li>• Non-traffic parts of old A509 to be designated red way.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework para 5.4.4 to state that the Council’s preference is that open space should be offered to the Parks Trust.</b></p> <p>The Development Framework includes the provision of a primary health hub.</p> <p>Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications will determine the required capacity of proposed grid roads taking into account the Council’s Mobility Strategy and the need to encourage modal shift to public transport and active travel modes.</p> <p>Local distributor roads are designed for through traffic and therefore should not have houses or footways facing them.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about new grid road connecting with the proposed high street. Need to be significant traffic calming to differentiate between the two road types.</li> <li>• High Street should be designated one bus lane one vehicle lane from the beginning.</li> <li>• How is the employment area to the west of London Rd to be accessed?</li> <li>• Public Square needs parking provision.</li> <li>• No parking at any of the mass transit sites – people will still use the car to get there.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please specify front parking courts in line with our standards.</li> <li>• No indication of how bus routes are likely to be affected by the new road layout.</li> <li>• The lower parking requirement should be with the rider that clear effective public transport routes to key locations will need to be demonstrated, as stated in Plan:MK.</li> </ul>	<p>The design of the High street will clearly differentiate it from a grid road.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to show access to employment area west of London Road.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to replace public square drawing with indicative plan of high street.</b></p> <p>As it is indicative it is not appropriate at this stage to show parking. Rear courts are acceptable within flattened developments. Bus routes will be developed as part of the development proposals for the site.</p> <p>The provision of the mass rapid transit system will be key to enabling lower parking standards to work.</p>
64.1	Cllr Sue Clark Cranfield and Marston Ward	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stakeholder group wanted a standalone settlement not an urban extension of MK.</li> <li>• Style of development is important as location is rural and market town, therefore, development should follow this style.</li> <li>• Green buffer needs extending along the full eastern and southern edge of the site.</li> <li>• No mention of the impact to settlements in Central Bedfordshire.</li> <li>• There will be significant impact on Central Bedfordshire Highways and routes to the M1 J14/13 and A421 will become rat runs. Highways issues continue to be unaddressed.</li> <li>• Where has the Moulsoe bypass idea gone? If so what mitigation for through traffic has been done?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the cumulative impact of housing growth in the areas of Eastern and Southern MK and western Central Bedfordshire (Marston Valley) on both the strategic and local highways network being assessed and mitigated?</li> <li>• It would be great to see the development framework for MK East incorporating aspirational features from the healthy place programme or other initiatives to address health inequalities and improve the built environment.</li> </ul>	<p>The Development Framework states that the MKE will be a new community that is distinct from adjoining towns and villages. Character of the new development will be developed through the design code stage of the process.</p> <p>The grid road runs along the majority of the eastern edge and would be contained within a landscaped corridor.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>The Development Framework cannot propose development outside the allocated site. However, the Framework would not preclude its provision in the future.</p> <p>The site is allocated in Plan:MK, which considers the impact of development at a more strategic level.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
65.1	Alison Stainsby	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the HIF Bid is unsuccessful MK Council should reconsider bringing this</li> </ul>	Noted.

		<p>development forward before 2031. In the meantime it is prudent to be undertaking forward planning for this development area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every opportunity should be taken to continue a good pedestrian and cycling network across both sides of the M1.</li> <li>• The development should only proceed if there is sufficient capacity at Cotton Valley Sewage Works.</li> <li>• The Parks Trust should adopt all green public open space so that it is maintained adequately.</li> <li>• Broadly in agreement with the proposals as set out in the document.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include requirement for a pedestrian/cycle bridge across the M1 south of junction 14.</b>          Anglian Water has not raised any concerns with regard to capacity at Cotton Valley.  <b>Amend Development Framework to state that it is the Council's preference that public open space should be offered to the Parks Trust.</b>  <b>Noted.</b></p>
66.1	Helen Beauchamp	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposed to any development at all to the east of the M1</li> <li>• Throughout the document, Moulsoe is specifically mentioned in terms of protecting its distinct identity, North Crawley should also be specifically included, as it too will be directly impacted by this enormous development. No mention is made in the document of the impact on North Crawley, which lies only 2.5 km from the eastern edge.</li> <li>• The green buffer should extend further to ensure that the urbanisation of open countryside is not allowed to creep towards North Crawley.</li> <li>• No mention is made of the impact on North Crawley of the position of the park and ride scheme along the eastern edge 'grid' road. Vehicles will travel through North Crawley to access the park and ride.</li> <li>• Thought must be given as to how to divert traffic away from North Crawley and other villages, including supporting the Parish Council with regard to weight and speed limit restrictions along the North Crawley Road.</li> <li>• No mention of the support for the use of electric vehicles and the charge points that they will need.</li> </ul>	<p>The site is allocated for development in Plan:MK.          Moulsoe is more likely to be directly affected by the proposed development due to its proximity and the inter-visibility of the site.</p> <p>The proposed grid road runs along the majority of the eastern boundary. The grid road will lie within a landscaped corridor which will provide a buffer along the eastern edge.          The park and ride will intercept traffic already travelling along existing roads before it reaches Milton Keynes.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to the provision of charging points for low emission vehicles.</b></p>
67.1	John Stevenson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mass rapid transit is a great idea, but needs to be part of a strategic scheme for the whole city.</li> <li>• Land for Park and Ride must be safeguarded, as mass transit may not happen for some time. Could it be used for a temporary community use to avoid it becoming wasteland.</li> <li>• Linear park is great opportunity and also assists with flooding. Draft should be more specific.</li> <li>• Items which need to be addressed now, if only in principle, but attached to adjacent area of residential/commercial zones so the funding is made a condition of undertaking such work.              Things to include:-              Linked community routes - footways, redways</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The park and ride site will be developed in conjunction with a public transport system connecting to CMK.</p> <p>A more detailed brief for the linear park will be developed at the planning application stage.          The Development Framework identifies the key social and sporting infrastructure that is required as part of the development.</p>



		<p>Community facilities – playgrounds (for all ages and different abilities), allotments, community fruit areas, meeting points (shelters), performance areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of vehicles will come and go from M1 junction 14, as well as from A422. What a great opportunity to progress the grid formation of MK and have an enhanced system with grid route for specific usage.</li> <li>• The grids give residents identity and pride in where they live, without traffic cutting through at excessive speeds. This sort of system is not mass housing developer friendly as it is expensive, but let's incorporate requirements now. Clusters of quiet area where people can walk about.</li> <li>• District centre needs to be more centrally located.</li> </ul>	<p>The form of development proposed in the Development Framework has evolved through discussions with the local stakeholder group.</p> <p>The district centre is centrally located within the main area of housing and located on the most appropriate alignment for a mass transit route. The centre of the site is occupied by the floodplain and linear park, so it would be inappropriate to site the district centre there.</p>
68.1	Mary Freeman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure should be put in place before housebuilding commences.</li> <li>• The downgrading of London Road should be done ASAP as lorries already use this as a cut through.</li> </ul>	Noted.
69.1	Stony Stratford Town Council Lynne Compton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans look nothing like the rest of MK i.e. there appears to be the use of new town standards which look different to the rest of MK.</li> <li>• Objection to the narrowing of a road (and putting in an industrial area) and lack of grid road system.</li> <li>• Principles of the city design should be retained where possible and the principles of the Plan:MK should be followed.</li> </ul>	The form of development proposed in the Development Framework has evolved through discussions with the local stakeholder group.
70.1	Nigel Richards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Framework does not state that the development will not go ahead without the M1 crossing – it should.</li> <li>• There is no comment about the Tickford Fields development and its impact.</li> <li>• No account has been made of increased traffic in Olney.</li> <li>• Figure 2.7 does not show all the existing hedges within the area. This underestimates the existing wildlife corridors &amp; habitat. This could affect the conclusions in 2.12 where it says all existing hedgerows should be retained wherever possible. Fig. 2.15 suggests conserving only a small amount of existing hedgerow because of this error.</li> <li>• Why does the development include land so close to the village of Moulsoe? It would be better to shift the suggested boundary to line of the bridle path running south of Newport rd. Moulsoe, and not go onto the field to the East of the bridle path.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that development will not proceed if funding cannot be secured to pay for the strategic infrastructure, i.e. new bridge over M1 and two strategic grid roads.</b></p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>Figure 2.7 shows the most important hedgerows. Any application for development will be accompanied by a biodiversity report which will identify important habitats, such as hedgerows.</p> <p>The boundary of the allocation is fixed in Plan:MK.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrians and cyclists should have separate cycleway and footpaths alongside.</li> <li>• The Mass transit system proposals give poor and limited indication of where it will go &amp; how it will be funded.</li> <li>• The placing of playing fields) in the SE corner will discourage people from walking or cycling to them. They would be better placed immediately North of Newport Road Moulsoe, in the middle of developments.</li> <li>• Vegetation should be well managed to allow good visibility for all and reduce any personal safety anxieties that are associated with dense, dark vegetation close to Redways &amp; footpaths.</li> <li>• Eastern boundary should be sealed to prevent further development and protect open countryside.</li> <li>• The Infrastructure of a local centre &amp; other facilities should be established by the time half of the houses are built, and accessible from surrounding houses.</li> <li>• Schools &amp; their playing fields need to be in the middle of the development, to be within 5 mins walking distance as the document suggests.</li> <li>• Extra flood prevention measures will be needed to allow for the effects of climate change and Tickford fields and other developments in MK increasing flood risk on the River Ouzel and Ouse.</li> <li>• The Eastern perimeter road should be delivered by the end of phase 2 , along with a grade separated junction onto the A509, or similar, to minimise the bottleneck of 3 roads merging with the A509 to Olney.</li> </ul>	<p>Different solutions are appropriate for different street types.</p> <p>The Development Framework can only consider MKE, and reflects current proposals for fast mass transit being developed for Milton Keynes as a whole.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to relocate playing fields in the south-eastern residential area to north of Newport Road.</b></p> <p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p>It would be poor planning not to future proof the development and to close off the option of future expansion.</p> <p>More detailed phasing of development, supporting amenities and site infrastructure (including public transport) will be informed by more detailed masterplanning to inform outline planning applications.</p> <p>Primary schools have been located around each of the residential areas to ensure that they are easily accessible by foot or cycle.</p> <p>Developers will be required to submit a Flood Risk Assessment with their planning applications which will take account of the impact of climate change on flood risk.</p> <p><b>Amend development Framework to state that the phasing of housing development will be linked to the provision of enabling highway infrastructure.</b></p>
71.1	Cranfield Parish Council Lyn Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green buffer needs extending along the full eastern and southern edge of the site.</li> <li>• No mention of the impact to settlements in Central Bedfordshire. There will be significant impact on Central Bedfordshire Highways and routes to the M1 J14/13 and A421 will become rat runs. Highways issues continue to be unaddressed.</li> <li>• How has the cumulative impact of housing growth in the areas of Eastern and Southern MK and western Central Bedfordshire (Marston Valley) on both the strategic and local highways network being assessed and mitigated?</li> <li>• Where has the Moulsoe bypass idea gone? What mitigation for through traffic has been done?</li> </ul>	<p>The grid road runs along the majority of the eastern edge and would be contained within a landscaped corridor.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>The site is allocated in Plan:MK, which considers the impact of development at a more strategic level.</p> <p>The Development Framework cannot propose development outside</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please can you provide clarification on the status of the HIF bid? If this bid is not secured how will this site be delivered? Will this site still be delivered during the life of Plan MK?</li> </ul>	<p>the allocated site. However, the Framework would not preclude its provision in the future.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that development will not proceed if funding cannot be secured to pay for the strategic infrastructure, i.e. new bridge over M1 and two strategic grid roads.</b></p>
72.1	Rebecca Kurth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft SPD document is not in conformity with the Council's recently adopted Plan:MK.</li> <li>The draft SPD is not fit for purpose and needs to be completely re-worked and re-written.</li> <li>The SPD demonstrates a fundamental lack of understanding of grid roads and why this type of road layout works best for public transport.</li> <li>A key feature of grid roads is that there are no buildings directly fronting the roads, so there are no delays caused by parking, waiting or stopping by vehicles because there is no access to buildings from a grid road itself.</li> <li>The draft SPD encourages fronting development on some routes, which is not only contrary to Plan:MK policy but repeats the disastrous 'city streets' approach in the Eastern Expansion area.</li> <li>The draft SPD fails to take into account the maximum walking distance of 400m to public transport.</li> <li>The SPD does not layout a grid of roads in the MK East area, contrary to Plan:MK.</li> <li>The SPD relies on the concept of a mass transit system to provide public transport to the development area. This is misguided thinking and not supported by policy.</li> <li>There will need to be a network of buses to connect the wider area to the MK East area as well as the proposed mass transit hub, and these buses need grid roads to efficiently and effectively provide public transport.</li> </ul>	<p>The SPD is in general conformity with the policies of Plan:MK.</p> <p>It is considered that the Development Framework provides a sound basis for the determination of future planning applications.</p> <p>Disagree – the grid road network does not work for public transport as it requires dispersed and circuitous service patterns which are often not viable to operate.</p> <p>The Framework does not propose that development should front grid roads or other distributor roads. However, Plan:MK Policy D1 states that development should front streets.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to bus stops being provided within 400m walking distance of each dwelling.</b></p> <p>The layout of MKE has been developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The Mobility Strategy and emerging 2050 Strategy promote the concept of a mass transit system.</p> <p>The development provides grid roads.</p>
73.1	Mike LeRoy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.6.6 Requires a revolution in public transport services and a step change in provision of paths for cycling and walking, this SPD gives no adequate proposals.</li> <li>People moving in need to be able to make their decision to move there on the basis of fast public transport availability that fits their patterns of travel to work available when they move in.</li> <li>There should be a new standard of Redway to encourage a substantial increase in their usage, and to accommodate different types of two-wheeled transport safely alongside pedestrians.</li> </ul>	<p>The Development Framework promotes active travel and safeguards land for a Mass Rapid Transit system.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redway crossings of side roads and driveways should be better designed to provide clear priority to Redway movement over road traffic.</li> <li>• The Redway network for MK East should be demonstrably as important as the network of roads for vehicles. The main network should have been shown on the plan for MK East, showing where and how it would connect with the wider 'city' Redway network.</li> </ul>	<p>This is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to show proposed redways on Development Framework plan.</b></p>
73.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Veteran Oaks and hedgerows should be retained and cherished.</li> <li>• The network of hedgerows which should be retained and enhanced by new linkages to create a more connected landscape.</li> <li>• Opportunities also need to be found for new woodland planting within and alongside MK East.</li> <li>• River form should be retained and the aim should be to restore natural habitats to the river and its banks, with the least intervention possible.</li> <li>• Plans for this should be developed closely with The Parks Trust, and perhaps with advice from the River Restoration Centre at Cranfield University.</li> <li>• There is a need for new survey work to establish the range of habitats and species present in the area.</li> <li>• A Landscape Masterplan is needed, around which plans for development can be provided. This will enhance the attractiveness of the site for residents, those living in nearby areas and passers-by.</li> <li>• It is surprising that a section on biodiversity is entirely absent from this SPD.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Applicants for planning permission will be required to submit Biodiversity Reports, and landscaping plans.</p> <p>Reference to biodiversity is contained throughout the document.</p>
73.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.5.6 Suggest discussions with groups such as MK Ramblers who have plenty of knowledge and expertise about local paths.</li> <li>• 2.6 There appear to be no woodlands at all that meet the Small Woodlands definition of areas of 2 ha or more.</li> <li>• 2.10 A proper acoustic study with noise contour maps is needed before the planning of development.</li> <li>• 4.2.19 Funding should be of a capital endowment and transfer of land ownership to a local body with appropriate skills and experience (The Parks Trust) and should not require ongoing supplementary payments by residents.</li> <li>• 4.3.5 Underpasses or 'green bridges' are to be welcomed.</li> <li>• 4.4.21 the site for this should be in a tranquil location with scope for extensive landscape and woodland around it.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Applicants for planning permission will be required to submit Noise Impact Assessments where development is close to sources of noise pollution.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that proposed burial space site should be integrated into the green infrastructure network, through landscape and tree planting.</b></p>

- 4.5.4 If high density housing is to be provided along the edges of the linear park, it should be limited to 3-storeys high so it does not intrude into the landscape excessively.
- 4.6.5 Such negativity about renewable energy schemes is unjustified. This should be substantially rewritten.
- 5.4.3 The writing of a strategy would be a wasteful diversion from what is needed. There should be a transfer of land with financial endowment to enable a body such as The Parks Trust to manage this land for public and local benefit in perpetuity.
- 5.4.4 the words “where this is considered to be beneficial” should be removed.
- 6.1 The next stage should be the preparation of a Masterplan for the whole of MK East, to be made available for public consultation.
- 6.5.2 Provision should be made for temporary community meeting rooms, temporary health centre and temporary shops alongside a clear schedule for permanent provision.

Building heights will be determined through the masterplanning and design codes process.

**Amend Development Framework to delete para 4.6.6.**

The Council’s desire would be for public open space to be transfer to a public body such as the Parks Trust.

**Amend Development Framework to state that the Council’s preference is that land should be offered to the Parks Trust.**

Masterplanning will be undertaken by developers as part of the planning application process.

**Amend Development Framework to state that provision will be made for temporary community facilities.**

74.1 Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council Vicky Mote

- The proposed layout of the area does not have an adequate road network and appears to have learnt nothing from the mistakes made in Broughton and Brooklands. It needs an internal MK style grid structure.
- The expansion will require more capacity at the interface with the grid road system to avoid congesting H4/H5/H6/V11 and J14.
- Nothing in the SPD appears to deal with the impact of traffic on existing parts of the city.
- The grid road concept is one that is not just about roads but should include redways and local centres as previously deployed rather than the currently proposed centre that straddles a natural highway that wants to serve as a through route.
- While this area of land benefits in its proximity to the M1 it also suffers from the inevitable separation from both the main city and Newport Pagnell. The importance of self-sustaining community facilities will be especially critical to its success for its residents.

The layout for MKE was developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group and other stakeholders.

Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site’s allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications. The District Centre is located to benefit from its position on the mass transit system and to maximise accessibility from within the development, particularly by active travel modes.

Noted. The development aims to provide a range of local facilities.

74.2

- Vision statement is too generic in nature.
- The vision statement should relate to those aspects of the plan that have made MK the city is today:
  - Local communities with individual identity and shared values.
  - Easy travel without gridlock.

The vision statement was developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group.

74.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ City of trees.</li> <li>○ Best pedestrian and cycle mobility in the country.</li> <li>○ Lakes and water courses treasured.</li> <li>○ Extensive linear parkland.</li> <li>○ Companies, schools and facilities widely dispersed but accessible.</li> <li>○ Easy navigation and open feeling.</li> <li>○ Flourishing communities.</li> <li>○ Art and creativity is valued.</li> <li>○ Wildlife is protected.</li> <li>○ Embraces new technology, efficient transportation and ecological leadership.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The plan should include these more explicitly in the vision.</li> <li>● Section 4.3.1 does not tie in to any discussions that were had at the stakeholders meeting.</li> <li>● The design of the High Street running through the District Centre is a disaster in the making. It is a natural through route that should be a grid road.</li> <li>● 4.3.2 and 4.3.4 – section is completely unrealistic – motor vehicles should be discouraged by more effective means of transport not obstructions.</li> <li>● Why has grid road standard been downgraded for this development?</li> <li>● 4.3.6 – ‘retained and improved’ looks completely inadequate.</li> <li>● 4.3.7 – is Broughton all over again with High Street trying to take place of a natural arterial link.</li> <li>● Development cannot assume mass transit system will displace the motor car until it is designed, funded and deployed. Other transportation modes will be needed and create the proper infrastructure required.</li> </ul>	<p>The movement framework broadly reflects the aspirations of the local stakeholder group as a whole.</p> <p>Making the High Street a grid road would dissect the residential area which is something the stakeholder group wished to avoid.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that active travel will be encouraged rather car travel discouraged.</b></p> <p>The design standard for grid roads accords with Plan:MK.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that land will be safeguarded for the highway to be upgraded to grid road standard.</b></p> <p>The High Street will not be designed to accommodate through traffic, as was not the case with the City Streets concept.</p> <p>The Development Framework seeks to strike a balance between accommodating traffic from private vehicles, whilst aiming for a step change in travel by more sustainable travel modes.</p>
75.1	North Crawley Parish Council Sheila Bushnell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Why has the site boundary moved further east?</li> <li>● None of the developments can be labelled as affordable or addressing MKC’s need for social housing.</li> <li>● HIF-bid money would be better spent further south for a crossing more aligned to the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge (OMC) arc infrastructure.</li> <li>● What if there is a reduced HIF award will MKC walk away or will the taxpayer be the press-ganged into funding the short-fall?</li> <li>● These large-scale developments provide no benefits to the existing</li> </ul>	<p>The boundary of the site is defined in Plan:MK. The eastern boundary follows the topography of the site.</p> <p>The development will include a mix of housing including affordable housing.</p> <p>The HIF bid is for a specific proposal for the development of MKE.</p> <p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p>

		<p>residents of the surrounding communities. Existing residents have chosen to live in a rural location; with this development it will cease to be a rural location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This fast mass transit (FMT) solution should be looked at in the context of Milton Keynes as a whole, not just for MKE SUE. The need to get to the M1, across the M1 and MK will promote car use not diminish it. To think otherwise is foolish.</li> <li>• Unrealistic to assume that employment will be satisfied from within, and therefore people will have to travel fro work..</li> <li>• The MKE SUE will not reduce flooding risk: it can only increase it.</li> <li>• Infrastructure of local centre &amp; other facilities should be established by the time half the total number of houses are built and should be accessible from surrounding houses.</li> <li>• The Eastern perimeter road should be delivered by the end of phase 2 to avoid the risk of planning creep.</li> <li>• The development will successfully destroy a large amount of rural land and the associated farming community in the area along with green belt and the natural green spaces we all come to expect around busy growing towns and cities.</li> </ul>	<p>The Development Framework can only consider MKE, and reflects current proposals for FMT being developed for Milton Keynes as a whole.</p> <p>The Development Framework promotes alternatives to the car, including mass transit and active travel. Incorporation of SUDs will ensure that surface water run-off from the development is mitigated on-site.</p> <p><b>Amend development Framework to state that the phasing of housing development will be linked to the provision of enabling highway infrastructure.</b></p> <p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p>
76.1	Parks Trust Steve Revill-Darton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 1.1 Site Location should be replaced with a more appropriate map. The current map is unclear due to the black and white nature and does not clearly show the location of the site in relation to Milton Keynes which is largely omitted from the map.</li> <li>• Oxford-Cambridge Arc opportunity to mention the ambitions of the Arc and their relevance to new development in the Milton Keynes East.</li> <li>• Welcome particular mention being made to the environmental ambitions of the Arc, planning for local natural capital and the concept of biodiversity net gain. Reference should also be made to the Oxford – Cambridge Arc ambition for long-term sustainable growth.</li> <li>• Section 1.6 this section should refer to two additional policies, Policy DS6 and Policy NE4.</li> <li>• Section 1.8 Further reference should be made in this section to the aspirations of Milton Keynes to become the ‘greenest city’ and for green infrastructure to act as a key driver in future place making in the city.</li> <li>• Section 2.3.5 should make further distinction between the linear park in Milton Keynes which forms part of the city’s planned linear park network (and is one of the defining characteristics of Milton Keynes) and the areas of parkland in Newport Pagnell that correlate with the river flood plain.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include clearer version of fig 1.1.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include additional text referring to “The Oxford-Cambridge Arc: government ambition and joint declaration between government and local partners” published by the Government in March 2019.</b></p> <p>The Development Framework should be read alongside the policies of Plan:MK. There is no need to list all relevant policies.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include new section referring to the Council’s commitment to climate change.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to make distinction between Parks Trust linear park and the floodplain north of the site.</b></p>

76.2

- Include text to detail purpose of triangular land adjoining the southern edge of the site.
- Further reference should be made in this section to the designation of the River Ouzel valley/floodplain as a wildlife corridor and of strategic ecological significance to the area.
- Section 2.6 Suggest that paragraph three is rewritten to contain the following text: “The Ouzel Valley Linear Park lies to the south of the site, including an area currently managed as a nature reserve immediately adjoining the site. This enhanced linear park typology should be extended through the site and enable further continuation into Newport Pagnell in the future”.
- Recommend that reference is made to the leisure route network and that Figure 2.10 is amended to include both public rights of way and leisure routes to properly demonstrate the pedestrian and cycle network in the areas surrounding MKE.
- Section 2.12 suggest the following wording for this paragraph 3 of this section: “The Ouzel Valley linear park lies to the south of the site; the linear park network is one of the defining green infrastructure and character assets of Milton Keynes and should be extended into the site. The linear park extension should enable enhanced ecological opportunities as well as providing recreation and flood water attenuation functions. The extension of the linear park into MK East will also enable, at a later date, some of the green spaces in Newport Pagnell to be connected to the Milton Keynes park network”.
- Section 2.12 Access and movement paragraph – include reference to leisure routes.
- Suggest that the vision statement goes further in providing the vision for the green infrastructure and public open spaces of the development.
- Reference should be made at this point to the extension of the linear park network through the site, as well as the provision and integration of green infrastructure assets that operate at a number of scales.
- Original grid-road design principles are a proven solution to the mitigation of the impact of the major road network and should be applied to the A422 and A509.
- It is integral that works to the existing transport routes to adapt them and mitigate their impact upon the new development are carried out prior to the commencement of the MKE development itself.
- The potential and proposed grid road corridors should be designed and delivered with the same lease and maintenance arrangements that we have in place with the existing grid roads in the city.

**Amend Development Framework to explain that Parks Trust land on southern edge of the site is managed as a nature reserve.  
Amend Development Framework to refer to the Ouzel linear park as a wildlife corridor of strategic ecological significance.**

**Amend Development Framework para 2.6 third bullet to state that the linear park should be extended into the site.**

**Amend Development Framework to show leisure routes on figure 2.10.**

**Amend Development Framework para 2.12 Habitat and Vegetation third bullet to state that the linear park should be extended into the site.**

**Amend Development Framework para 2.12 Access and Movement to include reference to leisure routes**

The Vision includes reference to connected green spaces. The Development Principles add further detail.

Noted.

Noted.



76.3

- Would welcome the opportunity to help define the brief and work with the designers of any proposed landscape led green buffer areas at the earliest possible opportunity.
- Strong frontages to areas of parkland but this must be combined with well-planned and designed access to the public open space.
- Recommend a qualifying statement is added to this paragraph to highlight the need for integration between the planning and design of housing layouts and of open space and associated facilities such as play areas.
- Recommend that the principle refers to the delivery of an enhanced multi-functional green and blue infrastructure focused upon the linear park extension along the river corridor. This should be of a world class quality and help to set the new precedent for the delivery of strategic scale green and blue in line with Milton Keynes' ambition to be the greenest city in the world.
- Green and Blue Infrastructure paragraph - the final sentence strengthened to say "The development must improve overall local water management and local flood protection".
- Support the inclusion of biodiversity as a key principle for the development but we believe it should be strengthened as follows: "New and retained green infrastructure must be designed and delivered to ensure biodiversity gains, protect and enhance existing habitats and maximise existing assets as part of the overall network".
- 4.2.1 Intention should be more directly stated to make it clear and precise.
- 4.2.2 Stronger and more definitive language should be used here
- 4.2.3 The definition of grid roads in table 4.3 should define them in the same way as the Milton Keynes Planning Manual with a minimum of a 70m corridor. This corridor should have landscaped multi-functional green infrastructure edges. This landscaping must be designed and delivered to a standard that is in keeping with the original grid roads of Milton Keynes maximising the green infrastructure opportunities whilst ensuring a manageable and maintainable landscape.
- 4.2.4 Support the retention of existing hedgerows. Where appropriate these should be restored and enhanced. Strongly support the integration of these existing hedgerows into the public realm.
- 4.2.5 Suggest that stronger more definitive language is used here. The landscape of MKE requires a specific landscape masterplan at the scale

Noted.

**Amend Development Framework to refer to buffer distances between play areas and housing.**

The Development Principles provide a good set of principles, reflecting local stakeholder group aspirations.

**Amend Development Framework to emphasise that existing natural features and topography provide the starting point for creating a distinctive character for the development.**

**Amend Development Framework to refer to structural landscaping including planting.**

Noted.

**Amend Development Framework to refer to submission of a landscape masterplan.**

- of the site.
- 4.2.6 The A422/A509 should be given a similar landscape treatment to the existing grid roads in MK. Any structural landscaping works to create a buffer along this transport corridor must be delivered prior to the commencement of the development.
 

The Development Framework requires the strengthening of the existing hedgerow.
- 4.2.7 It is important that any green margin that forms part of the wildlife corridor is planned and designed to ensure that access for management and maintenance of the area from both the motorway corridor and the development side is possible.
 

Noted.
- Would welcome the opportunity to help define the brief and work with the designers of any structural landscape at the earliest possible opportunity.
- 4.2.11 Landscape along the grid the A509 and M1, the 'green buffer and indeed the Ouzel Valley Linear Park should all be areas of wildlife interest and should together form the green infrastructure network.
 

The Development Framework requires that any woodland loss is fully justified.

**Amend Development Framework to remove reference to the linear park reflecting the character of the River Ouzel Park elsewhere in Milton Keynes.**
- The provision of an ecological and tree survey along with a description of the impact on the landscape character should not be enough support for the removal of existing woodland.
- The aspirations for the linear park should not merely reflect the existing linear parks in Milton Keynes. The linear park extension should be an enhanced landscape that could consist of areas of plantation, new woodland, flood plain forest, wetland habitats, for example. These should be well integrated with existing landscape features to complement and enhance the existing landscape which has been degraded over time due to farming activity and practices.
- 4.2.19 the statement here is not sufficient, suggest that the following text is used here:
 

**Amend Development Framework to state that the Council's preference is that open space should be offered to the Parks Trust.**

"The linear park, and other areas of public open space and green infrastructure, should be planned and designed in conjunction with The Parks Trust as the Council's preferred body for the ongoing management and maintenance. Upon completion the linear park, POS and green infrastructure on the site should be transferred to an appropriate and adequately-resourced stewardship body, such as The Parks Trust as is the Council's preference, to ensure that these spaces are managed and maintained in perpetuity".
- Play areas - recommend that this section is used to outline the play opportunities of the site beyond the existing policy requirements and establish an ambition for the play facilities of the site.
- Recommend that this is an opportunity to explore the use of play provision that is multi-functional, for example the combination of
 

These are detailed matters that will be developed through the masterplanning process.

76.4

wheeled sports provision with flood mitigation and drainage systems like those found in Rabalder Park in Roskilde, Denmark.

- Support the connections across the new grid roads in the form of underpasses or 'green bridges'. It is integral that these are carefully planned and delivered in conjunction with the grid roads so as to avoid disruption once the road network is complete.
- Would welcome the opportunity to help define the brief and work with the designers of any grid road corridor landscape at the earliest possible opportunity.
- Where appropriate the potential and proposed grid road corridors should be designed and delivered to be completed with the existing grid road corridor lease and maintenance arrangements that are prevalent across the city to ensure the same high standard.
- The provision of grade separated footpath and/or redway crossings of the A422 and A509 should not be presented as opportunities but should be a key deliverable of the development framework and form part of the planning policy.
- Further leisure route options need to be identified to the south of the site to connect the linear park across the M1. In a similar manner to the existing linear park, the main watercourses should have leisure routes either side that connect the site to the areas beyond the M1 and into the existing linear park network.
- In the south east corner of the site there is the opportunity to integrate the existing bridleway with the proposed landscape buffer with a minor diversion to the existing route. There is also an opportunity to provide a bridleway through the linear park to connect with the existing network.
- Climate change section requires more ambition to deliver the pledges made by the MKC Sustainability Strategy and the aspiration to be the greenest city in the world.
- 4.6.8 This section should go further to address not only how the development will mitigate its own increases in surface water run-off but how this should be integrated with the larger system at the scale of the city.

Noted.

Noted.

**Amend Development Framework to firm up locations of pedestrian/cycle crossings of the M1 and A509/A422.**

The location of leisure routes within the linear park will be determined through the more detailed landscape plan for the linear park.

This is a matter that should be considered as part of the detailed design of the landscape buffer.

The Development Framework must accord with Plan:MK.

The Development Framework states that the original planning of Milton Keynes planned flood control measures at a strategic level.

76.5

- 5.1.4 Support the implementation of green infrastructure, open space and play areas prior to the occupation of new housing.
- 5.2.1 Recommend that at this point in the development process it is specified that contributions will be sought for management and maintenance of open space and green infrastructure within the development.
- Support the inclusion of a section specifying the need for consideration

Noted.

**Amend Development Framework to refer to management and maintenance of open space.**

Noted.

to be made for the future management and maintenance of open space and landscape. Would recommend that this title is amended to Open Space, Landscape and Green Infrastructure.

77.1	Anglian Water Nathan Makwana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.11 needs to be made clear that the location of the sewer would need to be considered as part of the site layout and access should be safeguarded for maintenance purposes to be compliant with Policy FR1 of the Local Plan.</li> <li>If it is not possible to incorporate the sewer into the site design it may be possible to divert the sewer by applying to Anglian Water if required. The costs of any diversion would be met by the developers in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. 4.6.2 Recommend that the submission requirements include reference to a water conservation strategy or similar which outlines how water efficiency/re-use has been maximised as part of the site design. Should include but not limited to those measures referred to in paragraph m of Policy SC1. There is also scope to include water re-use as part of an integral SuDS strategy (as referred to in para 4.6.8 of the SPD).</li> <li>4.6.8 The inclusion of SuDs features and water-reuse measures (where relevant) should form an integral part of the design process and should be made clear throughout the SPD.</li> <li>An odour assessment should be included as submission requirement to inform the proposed layout of the site. With this being considered as part of the initial stage of site design to section 4 of the Draft SPD.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that the location of the sewer would need to be considered in the design of the site layout.</b></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Submission requirements will be set out in the Council’s Local Validation List, which is to be adopted in 2020.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6.8 adequately highlights the need for SUDS to be integrated within the development.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include odour assessment as a submission requirement for any planning application.</b></p>
78.1	Alan Mills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redways must be connected to Newport Pagnell with bridges/underpasses across the A509/A422. Figure 3.1 and 4.2 the words “opportunities for” should be removed as these connections should be made a requirement of the development. Placing of the footpaths crossing the A422 should be looked at as they are not in the most strategically important positions</li> <li>Linear Park to connect to Riverside Meadow including the use of CPO power.</li> <li>Provide dual carriageway road links between the A509/A422 and MK grid roads.</li> <li>There are no limits on the size of the centre or range of uses allowed within it. Details required of what controls will be exercised to protect Newport Pagnell town centre.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to show proposed bridge/underpass crossings of A422/A509.</b></p> <p>It is not the role of the Development Framework to propose CPO of land outside the site boundary. Transport Assessments submitted with planning applications will determine the required capacity of proposed grid roads taking into account the Council’s Mobility Strategy and the need to encourage modal shift to public transport and active travel modes. Developers will be required to submit a retail impact assessment as part of any application containing retail development to ensure that development does not adversely impact on the vitality and viability of</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The positioning of the Park and Ride as part of a noise buffer areas.</li> <li>• Playing fields could be better accommodated by using the triangle of land in Newport Pagnell. The Bloor land north of the A422 should be transferred to the Town Council as part of the green space recreational development to allow expansion of Willen Road sporting facilities.</li> <li>• Ensure proper funding and future management of linear parks, grid road margins and public open spaces.</li> <li>• Provision of electric vehicle charging points.</li> <li>• Reference must be made to Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan which designates land east of Willen Rd, north of A422, for linear park/recreation use.</li> <li>• Green buffer should be expanded along the whole of the eastern boundary and should also been shown on Figure 4.1.</li> <li>• Para 5.4.4 delete “where this is considered to be beneficial” the land should be offered to the council to maintain, with an appropriate endowment.</li> <li>• 6.5.2 – table should include the omitted Park and ride provision in Phase 3.</li> <li>• Local and district centre provision should not be left as late as phase 4.</li> </ul>	<p>Newport Pagnell town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to move Park and Ride site further north adjacent to A509 to act as a noise buffer.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include the triangle of land in Newport Pagnell adjacent to the football ground as a potential off-site location for new playing fields.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to charging points for low emission vehicles.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan.</b></p> <p>The grid road runs along the majority of the eastern edge of the site contained within a landscaped corridor which will provide a green buffer.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework para 5.4.4 to state that it is the Council’s preference that the land should be offered to the Parks Trust.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to delete highway infrastructure and local and district centres from indicative delivery programme.</b></p>
79.1	Colin Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest that further thought is given to the location of the District Centre. It is unlikely to be able to support much more than two quite small supermarkets. Even these may struggle, as Newport Pagnell, Kingston and even central Milton Keynes are just a few minutes away by car.</li> <li>• Suggest the District Centre as well as one of the primary schools is relocated to the edge of the linear park. Here skilful architect/designer/master-planners could take advantage of the additional interaction of possible waterside leisure, cultural and human activities.</li> <li>• Floodplain could be formed into a lake and higher lakeside residential densities could be designed to emphasise the feel of continual interest and wellbeing.</li> </ul>	<p>The District Centre is located to take advantage of the route of the mass transit system. It is also located at the centre of the main residential area making it easily accessible by active travel modes. Higher density housing around the High Street should ensure that the district centre is active and vibrant.</p> <p>The Development Framework is proposing higher densities alongside the linear park to take advantage of the riverside location.</p>
80.1	Stuart Turner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference should be made to the sustainable principles contained within the MK Sustainability Strategy 2019 – 2050 and the need for these principles to be adhered to, particularly measures that address</li> </ul>	<p><b>Amend Development Framework to include section on Climate Change, including reference to Sustainability Strategy.</b></p>

		<p>clean air and a circular economy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 4.6 should commence with the principles as included below: Green energy - Maximising the use of renewable energy, reducing carbon and providing resilience to the grid Circular economy - Increasing the efficient use of resources to reuse materials, use less water, and ensure the best use of land Low emissions - Reducing the level of emissions from transport, industry and agriculture and ensure clear air.</li> </ul>	<p>Sustainable principles for development are set out in Plan:MK and in the Sustainability Strategy.</p>
81.1	Hulcote and Salford Parish Council Lyn Lyman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green buffer needs extending along the full eastern and southern edge of the site.</li> <li>No mention of the impact to settlements in Central Bedfordshire. There will be significant impact on Central Bedfordshire Highways and routes to the M1 J14/13 and A421 will become rat runs. Highways issues continue to be unaddressed.</li> <li>How has the cumulative impact of housing growth in the areas of Eastern and Southern MK and western Central Bedfordshire (Marston Valley) on both the strategic and local highways network being assessed and mitigated?</li> <li>Where has the Moulsoe bypass idea gone? What mitigation for through traffic has been done?</li> <li>Please can you provide clarification on the status of the HIF bid? If this bid is not secured how will this site be delivered? Will this site still be delivered during the life of Plan MK?</li> </ul>	<p>The grid road runs along the majority of the eastern edge and would be contained within a landscaped corridor.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>The site is allocated in Plan:MK, which considers the impact of development at a more strategic level.</p> <p>The Development Framework cannot propose development outside the allocated site. However, the Framework would not preclude its provision in the future.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to state that development will not proceed if funding cannot be secured to pay for the strategic infrastructure, i.e. new bridge over M1 and two strategic grid roads.</b></p>
82.1	Whaddon Parish Council Suzanne Lindsey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD is supported in its entirety.</li> <li>Exciting opportunity is a step in the right direction and its well-structured and thought through aims and requirements are fully supported, and welcomed.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p>
83.1	Cameron Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will destroy Newport Pagnell, give traffic mayhem and destroy a rural arable area.</li> <li>The people of Newport Pagnell and to the east of the M1 do not want it.</li> <li>A lot of residents do not know about it.</li> <li>Request a full public meeting to be held.</li> </ul>	<p>MKE is allocated in Plan:MK.</p>
84.1	Mrs P Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to plan Newport Pagnell would be swamped and lose its identity.</li> <li>Will cause traffic mayhem.</li> <li>The people of Newport Pagnell have not been consulted and do not know about the development.</li> <li>Newport Pagnell is separate to MK and would like to stay that way.</li> </ul>	<p>MKE is allocated in Plan:MK.</p>

85.1	Bryan Lloyd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Needs to be a redesign of M1 J14 to aid traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Too many intersections on the new eastern grid road. It should all go from the M1 to the A509 directly.</li> <li>• A509 London Road should be a key road.</li> <li>• Grid design should be maintained and should be direct with few intersections. Grid road with 90 degree angle is poor design. The proposed new bridge will cause congestion on Danstead Way, the A422/M1 bridge should be developed instead.</li> <li>• Cotton Valley sewage works struggles to cope with current volumes.</li> <li>• No mention made of the future road access to Moulsoe and Cranfield.</li> <li>• Significant building development will increase noise levels. Noise bunds not much help but a different road surface might.</li> <li>• The development will relegate Newport Pagnell which was once a thriving place.</li> <li>• Why are the people now having to consider this new development and why were the people not involved in the work concerning the HIF bid?</li> <li>• Does the Berkeley Group really own all the land, or do they have an option to buy?</li> <li>• Why is the land north of the treatment works and M1 not in the area being considered?</li> </ul>	<p>Highways England is responsible for J14 and it currently has no plans to improve the junction. However the layout of development shown in the Development Framework has been done in order to avoid prejudicing a future improvement to this junction. Existing and proposed development needs to have access to the strategic highway network.</p> <p>The eastern grid road replaces the strategic function of A509 London Road.</p> <p>Traffic modelling undertaken in support of the site's allocation showed that, with the proposed mitigation measures, development would not have an unacceptable impact on the highway network. Developers will be required to submit Transport Assessments with their applications.</p> <p>Anglian Water has not raised any objections to development of this site.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to show new junction on Newport Road south of Moulsoe, the detailed design and form of which is to be determined.</b></p> <p>Design of road surfacing is not a matter for the Development Framework.</p> <p>The Development Framework states that new retail development should not adversely affect the viability and vitality of Newport Pagnell town centre.</p> <p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p> <p>Berkeley Group has an agreement with the landowner.</p> <p>This land is in the ownership of the Parks Trust who have no intentions to change the use of this land.</p>
86.1	C.D. Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M1 should continue to be the eastern boundary to MK.</li> <li>• The HIF payment should be used with the east –west expressway and rail line and development in that area not in the countryside east of the M1.</li> <li>• A plan should be produced so that a proper oversight of development is possible. The plan should show all agreed developments and proposed developments associated with the expressway</li> </ul>	<p>MKE is allocated for development in Plan:MK.</p> <p>The HIF bid is tied to the development of land at MKE.</p>

87.1	MK Forum Tim Skelton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about the quality of proposals in the SPD and do not think is fit for purpose.</li> <li>• SPD must conform to Plan:MK and in certain aspects (particularly highway) it does not.</li> <li>• Seems a mistake to plan MKE in isolation and in the absence of a strategic overview for the area.</li> <li>• Important that planning and design work is undertaken now, in conjunction with Highways England, to understand how Junction 14 will be remodelled at a future date so that we can ensure that suitable land is reserved so that the work can be undertaken at the appropriate time.</li> <li>• The proposed new bridge crossing of the M1 motorway is in the wrong place and that the crossing should be made at the Tongwell Roundabout on H4.</li> <li>• The layout shown in the Draft, with an intermediary roundabout on V11 between H4 and H5 (H4.5?) and no E-W grid road within MK East removes the function of the grid for traffic from MKE who are travelling to the northern half of MK.</li> <li>• The basic structure of MKE needs to reflect the basic gridsquare/grid road model that has served Milton Keynes so well.</li> <li>• Argue that there is no need for a second park and ride and the existing one at Broughton could be extended.</li> <li>• It is vital that the RMTR has to be considered as a citywide totality and it cannot be the subject of the type of piecemeal thinking evidenced within the SPD.</li> <li>• RMTR must be provided from Day One to enable its use by the first residents and development should closely relate to it and its stopping points.</li> <li>• A full landscape assessment should be undertaken to protect and enhance the views of The Church of St Mary from CMK, as well as create others through the shaping of development in MK East.</li> <li>• The treatment of Moulsoe should be an integral part of the plan for MK East, if not necessarily as part of the Draft, then as part of a separate, concurrent Village Plan to show how it can be incorporated into development in a sensitive manner in due course.</li> <li>• Opportunity should be taken to create a road into MK East through a junction with North Crawley Road east of its bridge over the A509.</li> <li>• The area does not need a “District Centre” instead it requires three Local Centres – one “Major” and two “Minor”.</li> <li>• Support the requirement for local centres not to compete with Newport</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that the Development Framework provides a sound basis for the determination of future planning applications. The SPD is in general conformity with Plan:MK.</p> <p>The Development Framework states that developers should ensure that the potential for future expansion is not closed off. <b>Amend Development Framework to state that land will be safeguarded next to junction 14 to future proof any proposals by Highways England to improve the junction.</b></p> <p>The new bridge across the M1 is in the optimum location informed by an options appraisal and a feasibility study.</p> <p>The layout for MKE was developed through engagement with local stakeholders.</p> <p>The new park and ride would intercept traffic before it reaches junction 14. The SPD can only consider development within MKE. It reflects wider thinking with regard to MRT, that is emerging from the 2050 Strategy.</p> <p>The Development Framework requires that planning applications in sensitive locations are accompanied by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment. Development proposals will be required to ensure that they do not adversely impact on the character of Moulsoe.</p> <p>The junction arrangements at the north-eastern corner of the site will require further detailed investigation and feasibility studies. Major and minor local centres are not terms that are defined in Plan:MK in terms of the retail hierarchy. Noted.</p>
------	-------------------------	--	--



87.2

- Pagnell Town Centre but, this should not be at the expense of providing a vibrant range of facilities for the residents of MKE.
- The SPD (or subsequent documents) should indicate a clearly agreed pattern of development, potential timescale and provision of facilities – shops, schools and meeting places, using temporary accommodation if necessary.
  - There is no mention within the document about the fact that MKE is downwind of Cotton Valley Sewage Works (the prevailing wind direction in MK is from the south-west). What specific assessments have been made regarding this particular aspect, whether mitigation measures are necessary and, if so, the nature and programme for them?
  - There is no mention of MK strive to be carbon neutral for 2030. To help this development it could build all houses to passivhaus standard, ensure electric charge points for cars in all homes, housing orientated to maximise solar gain for panels on all homes and shade should be obtained by street trees and areas of woodland.
  - Hope that the Council recognises the depth of concern and responds accordingly by arranging a public meeting/workshop at which these matters can be discussed in further detail.
  - Figure 1.2 – eastern boundary should follow natural boundaries not ownership.
  - 1.4.1 - wording should be amended to:  
“.....by Milton Keynes Council, following limited consultation with some local stakeholders and the major landowner interests (but not including groups and civic societies with a citywide remit. The Group did not include citywide groups and organisations such as Milton Keynes Forum”.
  - 1.6.6 – Many of the principles of Garden Cities are not evident in the plan; this issue must be addressed through further engagement with the landowners and the local community as part of the revision to this document.
  - 1.7.1 – add wording at the beginning of section:  
“In advance of the SPD and prior to submitting the draft SPD for public consultation, .....”
  - If the HIF bid is successful, can that bid be used to finance a bridge in a different location over the M1, such as that strongly advocated by the Forum, or would that have to be referred back to the DfT?

A phasing plan will be agreed with developers.

**Amend Development Framework to require the submission of an Odour Assessment with any planning application in the vicinity of Cotton Valley Sewage Works.** The layout of the development has placed employment uses rather than housing in the part of the site closest to the sewage works.

**Amend Development Framework to include reference to the Council’s commitment to tackling climate change and carbon neutrality.** Plan:MK sets the requirements for energy efficiency.

Eastern boundary follows north-south ridgeline.

The local stakeholder group consisted of local community representative to ensure they had a voice and forum in the process of preparing the development Framework alongside other civic and technical stakeholders.

**Amend Development Framework to delete para 1.6.6.**

**Amend Development Framework to delete section 1.7.**

The HIF bid is based on a specific set of proposals for MKE.

87.3

- Figure 2.11 should be amended to include all churches, identify Newport Pagnell as a District rather than a local centre, include the Green Park local centre and identify Ousedale and Green Park schools as separate facilities.
- Figure 2.12 identifies the Caldecote Deserted Medieval Village site, but this does not feature in any of the subsequent land use planning drawings. Land use for this particular area should be put in abeyance until detailed archaeological work has been undertaken. It is an important local feature that should be exploited. It should therefore be shown on Figs 3.1; 4.1; 4.7 and 4.8.
- 2.11 - The precise nature of the Tunnel Sewer easement should be explained as it is a major constraint upon development. Can it be incorporated into private gardens, for example, or must it stay in public land? The sewer easement should be shown on Figs 3.1; 4.2; 4.7; and 4.8.
- 2.12.1 - The wording of the first bullet point on p30 should be changed from “could be extended” to “should be extended”. The wording of the first bullet point under “Heritage” should be amended to read”....hotel within the site, the Deserted Medieval Village and the Grade I.....”

87.4

- 3.1.1 - Amend wording to add “, subject to 1.4.1 above” after “Local Stakeholder Group”.
- 3.2 - Amend wording to add a new opening paragraph...”Milton Keynes East will be planned to be an integral extension of urban Milton Keynes and provide a high level of connectivity with the rest of Milton Keynes (including Newport Pagnell) for both its own residents and the residents of the wider city who wish to visit Milton Keynes East”.
- The Vision should recognise that there are four separate character areas – M1 corridor; Ouzel Valley; Ouzel Valley West and Ouzel Valley East.
- 3.3 - Insert new opening bullet point: “Climate Change: Milton Keynes Council has declared a climate emergency and the development should be designed to be, at worst, carbon neutral and, preferably, carbon negative”.
- “Strategic routes and connections” should recognise the need for residents of MKE to access facilities across the whole of the urban area of MK west of the M1 and vice versa.
- “Quality placemaking” should be amended following reconsideration of the nature of the Green Buffer
- “Green and blue infrastructure”: The opportunity should be created to use this in a dynamic way eg by considering the SUDS requirements

**Amend Development Framework fig 2.11 to include churches, identify Newport Pagnell as a district centre, include Green Park local centre and split Ousedale and Green Park schools.**

Caldecote Medieval Village site is not a designated heritage asset. Developers will be required to undertake an archaeological assessment of the area.

**Amend Development Framework to state that the easement of the sewer is 12 metres, and that certain types of built development, such as hardstanding, can cross the easement.**

**Amend Development Framework to state that linear park should be extended into the site.**

**Amend Development Framework to include Caldecote Mill as a heritage asset.**

The layout of MKE has been developed through engagement with the local stakeholder group.

The Development Principles section recognises that there will be different character areas and character typologies are included in Section 4.5.

The Development Principles provide a good set of principles, reflecting local stakeholder group aspirations.

across the whole area as one to see if it is feasible to create for significant facilities than would be otherwise possible.

- Amend penultimate bullet point to read “Willen Road to be retained and upgraded to full Grid Road status.
- Figure 3.1 – Concerned about the interfaces between the employment and residential areas. Further consideration is needed, particularly in the area west of the Ouzel Valley.
- 4.2.3 - The following wording should be added: “The grid road on the eastern side of the Plan area should be designed sensitively to avoid it dominating the area. The scope for a linear landscape of trees and hedgerows to the east of the road would enhance the area when viewed from all directions and create a connected feature to benefit biodiversity”.
- 4.2.6 - Traffic speeds on the A422/A509 are not “unrestricted” but subject to the national speed limits. Amend wording to read “subject to national speed limits”.
- The “noise measures” should be identified. MKDC used to have a restriction that no dwellings should be placed within the 68dB(A) corridor. Investigations should be undertaken to determine the extent to which noise may “leak” through the gap formed by the River Ouzel.
- 4.2.7 - The Plan should identify the height and nature of any noise bund.
- 4.2.9 - Presumably this means “west” of Moulsoe rather than “south”?
- 4.2.24 - The opening sentence should be deleted. Amend sentence to read “Allotments should be provided on the basis of 0.25/ha per 1,000 population”
- 4.3.6 - There is inconsistency as to whether Willen Road is to be upgraded to a Grid Road and whether it is to be dualled along its entire length, including the bridge over the motorway.
- 4.3.13 - Indicative redway routes should be shown on Fig 3.1 (Concept Plan).
- Running a redway along the middle of the High Street needs to be carefully considered – how will cyclists cross the road at the end of the High Street, for example, where it meets the grid road.
- There should be a redway link to Moulsoe and beyond.
- Figure 4.3 - The precise nature of the “High Street” needs to be properly considered. As designed, it should be severed for car traffic with a “bus only” link in the middle as being the only way to prevent “rat running”.
- Table 4.2 - The Grid Road design speed should be 85kmph.
- The Grid Road corridor should be 40m from the centreline when passing through a housing area, 30m though other areas.

**Amend Development Framework to state that Willen Road will be upgraded to a grid road.**

**Amend Development Framework to state that green buffers will be provided between residential and employment areas to mitigate the impact of employment buildings.**

The Development Framework states that grid roads will be contained within landscaped green infrastructure reserves. The detailed landscaping scheme for the grid road will be developed at a later stage.

**Amend Development Framework to refer to roads being subject to national speed limits.**

Noise measures will be identified at planning application stage through a Noise Impact Assessment.

**Amend Development Framework to delete first sentence of para 4.2.24.**

**Amend Development Framework to state that land will be safeguarded to allow Willen Road to be upgraded to grid road standard.**

**Amend Development Framework to show indicative redway routes on Concept Plan.**

These are detailed matters that will be considered at the masterplanning stage.

A redway link is provided to Newport Road.

**Amend Development Framework to include a revised layout for the High Street.**

87.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is confusion in the table between what is described as ‘design speed’ and ‘speed limit: what is set out appears to be the desired speed limit.</li> <li>• Figure 4.5 - The design of the Public Square needs to be carefully considered.</li> <li>• 4.4.3 - The amount of land for self-build housing is inadequate and does not recognise the demand from this sector.</li> <li>• 4.4.9 - • The range of uses should be widened to include small-scale offices and workshops, such uses should be encouraged to enhance the vitality of the centre. Provision for co-working office spaces should be made in the larger local centre.</li> <li>• 4.6.1 - This needs to be expanded in the light of the Council’s emerging “carbon neutral” policies.</li> <li>• 4.6.7 - The following wording should be added “The opportunity should be taken to think creatively about the SUDS requirements from the whole area and there should be a single co-ordinated plan for this from the outset to ensure the most efficient use of resources and the establishment of a meaningful area of water, if that proves feasible”.</li> <li>• 5.1 - We are particularly concerned about phasing and the build-up of community facilities to support the population.</li> <li>• 5.4.3 - support the early involvement of the Parks Trust and the open space management strategy and its long-term financial endowment is a key matter that should be considered at the outset.</li> <li>• It is important that proper walking routes are planned within the new Linear Park incorporating plentiful crossings of the River Ouzel to enable residents and visitors to make circular walks.</li> </ul>	<p>Streets should be designed to ensure that the desired maximum speed is not exceeded.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to remove illustration of public square and replace with revised layout for High Street.</b> The amount of land for self-build housing is in accordance with Plan:MK.</p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to refer to the provision of small-scale employment within the district centre.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to the provision of temporary community facilities where necessary. Noted.</b></p> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include reference to the provision of informal facilities for physical activity, including circular routes within the linear park.</b></p>
88.1	Councillor Exon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD makes minimal mention of providing facilities for voluntary and community organisations. 4 community centres are required.</li> <li>• Ideal locations for community centres would be adjacent to open space, shared car parking, &amp; shared facilities.</li> <li>• Primary health hub is only mention of community facilities for an urban area equal to Newport Pagnell.</li> </ul> <p><b>Amend Development Framework to include new section on ‘community centres’. Reference to be made to dual use of schools for community use, and community buildings alongside sports pitches, which will include space that can be hired for community use. Expand on description of health hub and include reference to scope for community uses within the district centre.</b></p>