

Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting
19:00, Wednesday 22rd August 2018
Room 1.02, Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Gary Brighton | Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council |
| Tubo Uranta | Campbell Park Parish Council |
| Val Dixon | Campbell Park Parish Council |
| Robert Ruck-Keene | Chicheley Parish Meeting |
| Victoria McLean | Emberton Parish Council |
| Sam Crooks | Great Linford Parish Council and MKC Broughton Ward |
| Diane Webber | Hyas Associates |
| John Bint | Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward |
| Keith McLean | Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member |
| Keith McLean | Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member |
| Peter Geary (Chair) | Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member |
| Phil Winsor | Newport Pagnell Town Council |
| Desmond Eley | Olney Town Council |
| Steve Clark | Olney Town Council |
| Steve Waters | Moulsoe Parish Council |

Officers attending

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| David Blandamer | Milton Keynes Council |
| John Cheston | Milton Keynes Council |
| Sarah Gonsalves | Milton Keynes Council |
| Andrew Turner | Milton Keynes Council |

Item 1 – Apologies

Cllr Sue Clark, Central Bedfordshire Council, Cranfield and Marston Moretaine
Cllr Robert Morris, Central Bedfordshire Council, Cranfield and Marston Moretaine
Heather Webb, Cranfield Parish Council
Cllr Catriona Morris, Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward Member
Cllr David Hosking, Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member
Lucy MacLennan, North Crawley Parish Council

Item 2 - Minutes of previous meeting

Peter Geary opened the meeting and asked for any comments/feedback on the previous meeting (25.07.18).

The group queried the 5th bullet, page 4, re the proposed bridge across the M1.

Peter Geary confirmed that no decision on the bridge had been taken and people's views were only discussed at the last meeting. Minutes to be amended to reflect this.

Item 3 – Election of Vice Chairs

Phil Winsor and Steve Waters were elected as vice-chairs.

Some members of the group expressed concern that no representatives of communities west of the M1 were vice chair of the group to present their views and opinions. Peter Geary clarified that the role of the chair/vice chairs was principally administrative (agenda setting, etc) but was content to elect another vice chair. No nominations were made from the group. This matter remained open and it would be discussed at the next meeting.

Item 4 – Clarification of Members of the LSG and their representatives

Peter Geary explained the overall purpose of the group and its intentions. It was confirmed that being a participant at the meeting or attending future meetings did not constitute support for or objection to development of the site, and all participants could freely voice their opinion outside of this meeting. However, consistency was felt to be critical for the forthcoming meetings. Peter Geary therefore asked for everyone to make every effort to make themselves available for the forthcoming meetings or nominate a deputy to attend in their absence.

The group queried the constitutional status of the group and its meetings. Andrew Turner confirmed that it was not a formally constituted group. Instead the group was set up to enable the local community to voice their views about how development of the site could and should occur and for those views to influence the Development Framework. This follows recent practice by MKC when preparing the Development Frameworks for the WEA, EEA and SLA.

Andrew Turner reinforced that participation at this meeting or forthcoming meetings did not mean participants either supported or objected the proposal east of the M1, which is clearly expressed in the Terms of Reference for the group.

Item 5 – Timetable for the Development Framework

Andrew Turner provided the group with an overview of the timeframe/key milestones for the development framework. An indicative gantt chart was provided to the group. Andrew Turner confirmed MKC would be engaging with all of the statutory consultation bodies such as Natural and Historic England to determine if a Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) would be required for the site. However, much of this work has been undertaken as part of Plan:MK and therefore officers were not foreseeing the requirement to provide a SEA. The group were then asked for any comments/feedback on the proposed timescales.

Group discussion

There was a general feeling amongst stakeholders that the timescale was too ambitious and unrealistic, and there was concern that the key milestones could not be achieved. This included:

- Further consideration required regarding the pros and cons of the bridge across the M1.
- If a SEA was required how would this impact the delivery of the site and the proposed programme of the Development Framework?
- Have officers gathered the correct technical information/data to make informed decisions (e.g. traffic data)?
- What is the constitutional decision?
- Potential impacts of the proposed retail development on the existing centre/surrounding area of Newport Pagnell. This could either support or be detrimental to existing retail centres.

Andrew explained that officers have been gathering information/data on the site for Plan:MK and transport modelling (including the proposals at the site) has been part of this study, and the findings have been available on the Council's website since October/November 2017.

Andrew Turner outlined that traffic conditions for 2016 have been modelled, followed by different 'scenarios' to understand traffic and congestion in 2031. These were a 'Reference Case' which included all existing allocations and permissions (e.g. Tickford Fields, Olney NP site) but no development at MKE; the 'Reference Case' plus 3,000 homes and 6,330 jobs at MKE; and 'Reference Case' plus 5,000 homes and 6,330 jobs at MKE. Andrew Turner explained that further work on bridge optioneering is anticipated to be concluded by the end of September. Other transport modelling work is also ongoing to test mitigation schemes.

MKC confirmed no retail impact assessment had been carried out at this stage, which is typically part of the planning application process. Andrew Turner indicated that this issue could be discussed and reflected in the development framework.

The group suggested that officers seemed to have an agenda to bring this site forward (i.e. within the plan period of Plan:MK and thus by nearly a decade) and questioned what authority officers have to do this.

Peter Geary explained that at the last meeting, Brett Leahy (Chief Planner, MKC) felt this provided the group the opportunity to influence development at this site in the event that the Council is successful in securing the HIF bid, which would mean the site could come forward quite quickly within the plan period of Plan:MK.

Group Discussion

- Will there be a vote on the bridge?
- Plan:MK indicates that no more retail district centres should come forward within the plan period and officers should not be supporting proposals which would be out of step with retail policies. However, the group recognised that there could be an exception to this policy.

The group agreed that they could not take a vote on key decisions as the group is not formally constituted, but officers should work with and think very carefully about the feedback of the group.

Item 6 – Presentation and Q&A on the Housing Infrastructure

Sarah Gonsalves provided the group with a high level summary/overview of the HIF bid and proposed timescales. This included:

- Submitted Expression of Interest to government approximately 1 year ago and seen as a proactive response to growth;
- Aim is to improve transport links and Infrastructure to enable growth;
- Also aim to help fund education and health provision;
- MKC has established an officer team for technical input into the HIF bid, and MKC has been recently working with Homes England and MHCLG in developing the bid;
- Cabinet decision on submission of the bid will take place later this year with a potential funding decision to be made by March 2019;
- If MKC was successful in securing this HIF bid, the grant would need to be spent by the end of the financial year of 2022/23.

Summary of points raised by the group

- Confusion over when the grant money needs to be spent as this timeframe is inconsistent with the proposed development.
- £75m did not seem enough for the extent of highway infrastructure needed. £10 million seems too little for a bridge over the M1.
- What would happen to the money if it was not spent, will government request it back?
- Concern over the accuracy of the figures and what the money will be spent on and could the group have a breakdown of the figures in terms of proposed infrastructure costs.
- Queried whether the developers would still be required to provide Section 106 planning obligations to pay for other infrastructure and mitigation.
- The HIF bid makes no mention for the provision of a secondary school – which will be needed.
- Concerns around existing congestion on the local road network (e.g. A509) as it is already at capacity.
- If there was a funding gap who would cover the costs and have MKC fully considered the liabilities for this proposal?
- Would it not be easier to develop on land which does not require such funding and is potentially easier to come forward?
- Do MKC have the opportunity to say we don't want to accept this bid?
- Roxhill planning application felt to be premature and needs to be joined up with the overall development.
- Felt the proposed 3FE primary school would not be big enough and that a 10FE primary school would be more appropriate.
- All new development should link up well with the existing road network and redways.

John Cheston and Sarah Gonsalves confirmed, if funding is available then development can proceed within the plan period for Plan:MK. Sarah Gonsalves then provided an overview of the costings for the bid, which has been prepared on the professional judgement of officers. This was based on the approximate costs:

- £57 million for the overall highway infrastructure (including £10million for a bridge across the M1);
- £8 Million for a primary school;
- £10 Million for a healthcare hub.

Sarah Gonsalves reiterated that Section 106 money would still be available and that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) has been submitted as part of Plan:MK, which includes the proposed development site. This was confirmed by John Cheston and indicative costs are outlined in the IDP.

Sarah acknowledged that further negotiations are still required with Government to understand what could happen if the money was not spent within the time period, however, the intention of MKC is to spend the money within the allocated time period. It would be a two way process that would present challenges for all stakeholders, however, by getting to this stage it would be unlikely to get a second chance to decide on if MKC should accept the HIF fund.

The group acknowledged that Section 106 money could potentially raise additional funds (e.g. £20,000 per home) to aid the development of the site.

Questioned if there was a need for this site to come forward and where the demand for the homes might come from, considering other Plan:MK allocations meet the objectively assessed need. Doubt as to whether the market would support more than 1400 homes being built and sold each year. There was also a concern expressed that if the inspector decided not to take forward some of the development sites proposed in Plan:MK this might impact the Council's five year housing land supply.

John Cheston explained that Plan:MK currently has around a 10% buffer and this does not include the proposed site east of the M1. If this site was included within the plan period it would result in around a 20% buffer for Plan:MK.

The group then asked if the Inspector had given the Council a steer on his thoughts concerning the HIF bid.

John Cheston advised that the Inspectors broad overview of the findings and it is available on the Council's Plan:MK examination webpage. He then provided an overview of the initial findings. He explained that the Inspector has requested the Council provide housing trajectories for two scenarios: 1) with HIF funding and; 2) other funding being secured later in the plan period. John advised that under scenario 1, 3,000 homes would be included in Plan:MK's housing trajectory. Under scenario 2, 1,475 homes would be included instead.

At the stage, the Inspector has not commented on the HIF bid, nor is likely to provide any definite clarity. The Inspector might provide MKC a steer on Thursday 30th

August, the last day of the Plan:MK examination hearings, however, is unlikely to make any formal decision at this stage.

Peter Geary thanked Sarah for her time

Item 7 – Development Framework local stakeholder workshops

Andrew Turner explained the benefits and purposes of the proposed workshops which were to understand the key issues and develop a vision and objectives for the development from the local community's perspective. Andrew Turner advised that to ensure the workshops are independent from MKC, MKC has commissioned Hyas to facilitate them. Diane Webber, from Hyas was introduced to the group.

Diane Webber acknowledged that timescales were tight and that it was still unclear if the development would go ahead and when/what impact this could have on the local community. Despite this, Diane proposed two methods for the workshops: 1) a full day; or 2) two workshops held over two separate days. The workshops would include information/discussion around:

- Detailed Information packs in advance;
- SWOT of the proposed development;
- The form and type of development that would be suitable.

Diane stated she was willing to listen to the group to determine how best to deliver the workshops and how the group would gain most benefit from them.

The group decided that there was a preference towards arranging two evening workshops, which would allow for discussion between each workshop. There was a preference for the workshops to be held on Wednesday evenings. The group discussed the merits of including a broader range of stakeholders including the developers and civic groups. Peter Geary suggested each participant nominate two or three workshop stakeholders. Diane Webber stated the importance to try and get a broad range of views from the local community (e.g. youth and business groups). The group agreed it would be helpful to 2-3 different concept 'options' prepared by officers for the group to discuss and debate.

The group felt it would be inappropriate and pointless to give a view on vision, objectives and design of the development without answers and information on the HIF funding and transport work. Andrew Turner suggested there be a third and initial workshop specially dedicated to the HIF bid and highways/transport, with all the officers working on the HIF bid and transport evidence in attendance. The group also asked that Homes England and MHCLG attend as well to discuss what would happen in certain scenarios surrounding the funding and costs.

Peter Geary stated that this group would not be rushed into providing feedback on design until this information was provided. Concern that a Cabinet decision would need to be made by November in order for the HIF bid to be submitted in December.

Item 8 – AOB

N/A

Item 9 – Future meetings during 2018

To be confirmed.

DRAFT