

Plan:MK Examination

Our ref 12491/03/MS/MT
Date June 2018
On behalf of Berkeley

Matter 7: Infrastructure and Viability

1.0 Issue 1 – Whether the overall approach to transport is justified, effective and consistent with national policy

Q7.1 What is the likely effect of the proposed scale and distribution of development in Plan:MK (above the reference case (existing planned/committed growth)) on existing transport infrastructure and traffic levels? How has this been assessed and is the transport evidence up-to-date and robust? Are the impacts from the proposals in Plan:MK on the strategic road network understood and is there sufficient detail in the LIP on the likely costs and funding sources of any strategic road network improvements?

- 1.1 MKE and other Plan: MK development scenarios have been assessed using the Milton Keynes Multi Modal Model (MKMMM) as set out within the evidence base document MKMMM Impacts of Plan:MK ((Ref. MK/TRA/004) as well as AECOM’s Technical Notes 20 and 21 (Ref. INS1c and INS1d respectively).
- 1.2 There is a Memorandum of Understanding between Milton Keynes Council (MKC) and Highways England (HE) within the Duty to Co-Operate Statement March 2018 (Ref. MK/SUB/008 – Pages 45 – 51). This sets out that Highways England has reviewed the Local Model Validation Reports (LMVR) Milton Keynes Multi Modal Model (MKMMM) and considers it to be satisfactory for informing and testing the emerging spatial strategy within Plan: MK and is capable of providing a satisfactory assessment of the impacts upon the A5 and M1.
- 1.3 As set out in the Memorandum of Understanding (Ref. MK/SUB/008 – Pages 45 – 51) the congestion and delay in 2031 that can be attributed to Plan: MK is relatively small and localised to those junctions and roads in close proximity to the strategic sites included within the scenarios tested. The impacts of Plan: MK currently identified via the modelling work are not insurmountable and can be managed through a range of transport and highway interventions (Ref. MK/SUB/008, Paras. 3.5 and 3.6, P47).
- 1.4 The modelling suggests congestion and delay at J14 of the M1 will experience a degree of worsening under Plan: MK in 2031 over and above that occurring under the Reference Case 2031. However, MKC and HE also agree that under Scenario 2b the “built in” mitigation measures associated with MKE would accommodate the majority of additional movements across the M1 that are associated with it.
- 1.5 Modelling work undertaken by MKC has also taken account of congestion and delay at M1 J13 and the stretch of the A421 from J13 to the MKC boundary.

Q7.2 Does Plan:MK reflect and assist delivery of the latest MK Local Transport Plan?

- 1.6 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.

Q7.3 Are there strategic proposals to manage traffic levels within MK in the medium to long term, for example Park & Ride, bus priority measures and rapid mass transit systems? Is there any certainty of their delivery within the Plan period or evidence to justify laying foundations (such as route safeguarding) in Plan:MK for their future implementation?

- 1.7 There are emerging strategic proposals. Within the Development Framework for MKE an area will be identified for a new Park-and-Ride site which could accommodate up to 2,000 car parking spaces. This Development Framework would also identify the use of bus priority measures within the strategic and local road network serving MKE where applicable. A limited stop bespoke new bus service serving MKE will be provided which will provide fast connectivity into Central MK, the railway station, Newport Pagnell and enable interchange with other bus services to key employment and leisure destinations.
- 1.8 A fast mass-transit system has been identified to deliver part of the vision for MKs 2050 sustainable transport strategy. This would represent a fast, limited stop service between Milton Keynes Station, Central MK, a P&R site at M1 J14 serving MKE and Cranfield. Where possible this system would be segregated from other vehicles and could extend further east towards the potential Expressway and the East-West rail line, possibly at Ridgmont Station thereby providing inter-connectivity with the wider Cambridge – MK – Oxford Arc growth corridor. MK has commissioned a study to consider how this system might operate, preferred routes, technologies, etc. which is due to be completed in Q4 2018.
- 1.9 It is considered that the safeguarding of a route through the MKE site for the “*fast mass-transit system*” is integral to protecting the ability for such a service to be delivered in the future and not compromise the ability for Milton Keynes to fulfil its ambitions of being a world class connected town. A route can be safeguarded through the MKE site without compromising the ability to deliver housing, employment, complementary land uses and the strategic infrastructure.
- 1.10 The allocation of MKE is important in the delivery of these strategic infrastructure proposals, providing both land (with associated safeguarding) and a strategic/spatial context (with MKE and Cranfield providing an eastern anchor for such public transport) to lay the foundations for these.

Q7.4 With reference to MK Local Investment Plan, what specific improvements to transport infrastructure or policy responses are proposed or will be required to support transport demands arising the Plan’s overall strategy, including levels of growth?

- 1.11 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.

Q7.5 As part of transitioning to a low carbon future and securing modal shift, does the Plan sufficiently recognise the potential of new transport technologies (i.e. electric vehicles) as well as increasing non-car modes such as public transport, walking and cycling?

1.12 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.

2.0 Issue 2 - Infrastructure to support growth

Q7.6 Does the infrastructure evidence demonstrate that Plan:MK is soundly based and that the proposals within the Plan can be delivered in a timely and satisfactory manner?

2.1 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.

Q7.7 Through existing, expanded or new provision, would there be capacity in infrastructure and services to serve the planned housing growth with reference to:

- i) Power (gas/electricity networks)**
- ii) Schools**
- iii) Health facilities**
- iv) Leisure, public open space & allotments; and**
- v) Waste water treatment**

2.2 In respect of the MKE allocation, it is envisaged that there is the ability to deliver infrastructure upgrades such that it can address its own needs. This would include new provision of schools, health facilities and leisure/recreation facilities, as well as necessary upgrades to utilities infrastructure to serve the site. This is set out in the Development Statement appended to Berkeley's SoCG with MKC.

Q7.8 Are there contingencies for the potential non-delivery of infrastructure? Is the Plan sufficiently flexible to deal with this?

2.3 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.

3.0 Issue 3 – Policy INF1

Q7.9 Is Policy INF1 justified, effective and consistent with national policy? Does the policy strike an appropriate balance between providing certainty that the planning obligations sought by the development plan meet the 3 tests at NPPF paragraph 204 and the caution at paragraph 153 of the NPPF that SPD should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development?

3.1 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.

Q7.10 Is the Council contemplating CIL? Where off-site infrastructure is required is there evidence of a deliverable approach that would not contravene the pooling restrictions? Is the approach in Policy INF1 to voluntary agreements for joint infrastructure, across sites, robust and effective?

3.2 This is considered a matter for the Council to comment.