

MKE Local Stakeholder Group Workshop, 10/10/18

Vision & Objective Setting Flipchart Notes

Note: these are the written-up notes from workshop and record the comments made on the night. They do not imply consensus on any one point but set out the range of views expressed by the individual attendees.

Many of the points below were discussed/ developed further in the round table spatial planning exercise.

1. Transport & Connectivity

Cycling routes & connections:

- The cycling network outside the borough boundary is irrelevant
- Essential that the cycle network on MKE links into the MK redway network
- Suggestion that a suitable cycle link over the M1 would be one of the existing bridges which is unsuitable for cars/ vehicular traffic, although It may be difficult to cross the V10.

Connectivity:

- Minimise the barrier effect of the M1 by introducing as many connections as possible.
- Milton Keynes has a dispersed character – multiple destinations and the transport system needs to respond to this (ie journeys are not just to and fro CMK).
- Do not recreate the city streets.

Mass Rapid Transit (MRT):

- Consider possibility of a monorail – works in other places eg Singapore, Kuala Lumpur
- Elevate the monorail route to 'fly' over roundabouts on the grid network.
- Query of costs to develop a monorail vs those for a form of MRT?
- MRT a good way to reduce trips by car.
- A system based on autonomous vehicles would respond more effectively to the dispersed / multiple destinations character of MK.
- It will remain difficult to change hearts and minds and get people to move away from their cars.
- MRT likely to be unaffordable.
- How might autonomous vehicles impact on the road/ movement networks of the future?
- Introduce car parks/car lots for transfer from car to MRT or other form of transport.

Internal connectivity an essential part of the development – enabling movements to schools, shops, jobs, preferably without or minimising car use.

Innovation - MK already make use of app technology to manage car parking spaces in CMK and direct drivers to free spaces .

Managing increased traffic levels: traffic assessments essential to accompany the development in order to assess its impact on the wider, strategic road network, eg increasing journey times on the A509 Olney road/ impact on M1 J14.

2. Housing & Built Environment

- Avoid rear parking courts
- What is being built at MKE? Is it an urban extension or a new settlement? One view expressed that an urban extension was the preferable approach and that the grid system should therefore extend into the new development.
- Seeing the negative impact of rapid growth at Cranfield, impacting on neighbouring villages.
- Discussions about MKE and new development needed with Central Beds Council.
- Density? Concern that potential average density for MKE could be c 45 dph. Milton Keynes traditionally associated with lower densities (c 27 dph). NB – no density set for the development in Plan:MK.
- People want lower density development than 45 dph – concern that higher densities impact negatively on mental health, crime rates etc.
- Milton Keynes has a wide range of housing typologies and many years of experience in terms of what works and what doesn't. Learning from the past and those lessons are being reflected in the policies in Plan:MK.
- Concern expressed about Oakgrove - popularity of Waitrose resulting in car traffic/ parking issues; also experience of lack of community/ isolation.

3. Environmental

- Low carbon opportunities already being implemented in MK
- The anaerobic digester at the Pineham sewage works operates effectively.
- Car share/ car pool to reduce car usage and encourage switch to electric cars.
- Incorporate all of the Imagine 2050 Low Carbon Living Strategy for MK into the new development.
- Concern that developers promise low carbon initiatives (eg micro generation promised by Crest Nicholson – on Oakgrove??) but fail to deliver.
- Opportunity to require all development at MKE to be carbon neutral - build that requirement in to the development now (not building for profit for the landowners but to create a good quality development).
- Biomass doesn't work – unable to generate enough locally.
- Wind turbines unlikely to work on MKE as too low lying .
- Link the linear parks/ GI together - recreate the linear parks approach in MK and continue the wildlife corridors.
- Link MKE to the existing linear parks in MK and continue the linear park through the site, north into Newport Pagnell, link to the Riverside Walk.
- Use green and blue infrastructure to define the development
- Work with the Parks Trust – need to start discussions early to incorporate their views

- MKE will require SUDS/ flood alleviation measures to address flooding on existing watercourses.

4. Services

- Newport Pagnell Town Council already have a lot of information about capacity of schools and health facilities through their work on the neighbourhood plan.
- There will be insufficient capacity at Ousedale secondary school in NP to take additional pupils from MKE therefore a new secondary school will be required to serve the development.
- Residents of NP don't want to send their children to other schools in Milton Keynes - they want Ousedale.
- Importance of I before E (Infrastructure before Expansion) but building schools very early on in the development can mean that the school places are taken up by pupils from existing development. Attracted by the new facility, resulting in little capacity once the new development starts. To be delivered.
- Brooklands Health Centres, a great facility, shows the importance and benefit of thinking big and building in capacity at the start of a development.
- Milton Keynes Hospital will need more capacity as the city grows.
- Newport Pagnell TC, spoke to the CCG when preparing their Neighbourhood Plan, there was sufficient GP capacity in Newport Pagnell for the scale of development proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan but there will not be enough for MKE as well.
- More GP provision on site at MKE is required, but query whether the CCG would support that?
- Schools need to be located centrally within the development to enable walking/ cycling.

5. Economy

- Newport Pagnell Town Council opposed to independent shops on MKE as would compete with the NP High Street. Not opposed to a supermarket on the development.
- Some smaller commercial units on MKE would be ok, just not independent traders.
- Oakgrove discussed – good for some as there are affordable homes, but Waitrose is a significant attractor to outside traffic causing issues of traffic and parking. The community feel is developing but it is taking time. The green space on Oakgrove is not functioning all that well.
- Newport Pagnell High Street works well, but do not recreate the city street model. Broughton Square works well, but concern that the Brooklands Square may not work as well due to relationship with the city street.
- New jobs – preponderance of logistics/ large sheds take up a lot of land but deliver relatively few new jobs.
- Olney residents do not have a local supermarket and so travel into Milton Keynes. A new supermarket on MKE would therefore reduce some journeys over the M1.

6. Social & Cultural

- Existing facilities in the surrounding area, including Moulsoe Memorial Hall, new facilities at Broughton and Brooklands, facilities in Newport Pagnell.
- New cemetery space is always forgotten!
- Spaces for churches/ places of worship required – not necessarily a church but space for people to gather.

- Facilities in Newport Pagnell are likely to serve the new residents – are there additional or complementary facilities that would add to those in NP that could be provided on MKE? This relationship emphasises the need for good connections between MKE and NP.
- Other leisure facilities might come forward in the surrounding area – eg MK Dons training ground, which would provide community facilities too what might the impact of such a facility be on provision at MKE? MKE could provide such a facility.
- Issue in new developments of lack of community hub to help build a community - eg lack of pubs or churches that, more traditionally provided somewhere for people to meet.
- Making a community is not just about the ‘hardware’/ buildings although consider housing design – ie include front porches or garden for people to sit/ spend time and speak to neighbours and passers-by.

7. Governance

- Work with the Parks Trust to manage the green spaces.

8. Equity

- Include affordable housing and a mix of types and tenures.
- There is a need for self-build opportunities (over custom build).
- Shared ownership is. The only way for many to get on the housing ladder.
- The housing mix should include older persons housing.
- Provide another extra care village on MKE.
- Equity with surrounding villages – how will MKE relate to surrounding villages and areas in NP and MK with lower densities.
- Avoid leasehold properties.
- Work with the surrounding communities on MKE to bring them along as the plans progress.
- The bridge - Willen residents concerned and don't want. Bridge over M1; Newport Pagnell does.
- It's not just a question of building a bridge, but of improving transport infrastructure in MK in general – no point in having a bridge over the M1 that then rings traffic straight into a traffic jam.
- Surrounding villages have grave concerns of traffic impact of MKE – backing up of traffic along the A509, for example. This issue maybe needs a focused discussion session.
- Olney perspective – A509 at capacity now; the town experiences very poor air quality (the worst in Buckinghamshire). There is a need for a traffic impact assessment to accompany the MKE development.