

Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting
18:30, Wednesday 25th July 2018
Room 1.02, Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes

DRAFT MINUTES

Attending

Tubo Uranta	Campbell Park Parish Council
Sue Clarke	Central Beds Council, Cranfield and Marston Moretaine Ward
Robert Ruck-Keene	Chicheley Parish Council
Heather Webb	Cranfield Parish Council
Victoria McLean	Emberton Parish Council
Sam Crooks	Great Linford Parish Council and Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward
Nigel Richards	Moulsoe Parish Council
Steve Waters	Moulsoe Parish Council
Shar Roselman	Newport Pagnell Town Council
Lucy McClennan	North Crawley Parish Council
Desmond Eley	Olney Town Council
Steve Clark	Olney Town Council
David Hosking	Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward
Keith McLean	Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward
Peter Geary	Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward
Brett Leahy	Milton Keynes Council
Andrew Turner	Milton Keynes Council
John Cheston	Milton Keynes Council
David Blandamer	Milton Keynes Council

The MKE Local Stakeholder Group

Brett Leahy outlined the intended purpose of the group but made it clear that the group was for the local community representatives to be run by them with MKC providing secretariat support.

Keith McLean and Peter Geary were nominated as Chair of the group, with Peter being appointed as Chair. Suggested that there should be two Vice Chair position occupied by Moulsoe PC and Newport Pagnell TC representatives given they are the areas likely to be most affected. Steve Waters was nominated and agreed as a Vice Chair. Phil Winsor was nominated as the second Vic Chair, but as he was not in attendance it was agreed to confirm this at the next meeting.

It was agreed by the group that all members of the Olney, Broughton, Newport Pagnell North and Newport Pagnell South wards should be members of the group, and that the group is a public meeting that anybody may attend.

Scene Setting

Plan:MK

John Cheston outlined the events and discussions at the recent Stage 1 Examination Hearings into Plan:MK, which focusses on the OAN, plan period and status of the Milton Keynes East allocation. John outlined what the next steps for the examination are, including when the Inspector's interim findings might be published (mid-end of August) the likely possibility of a Main Modifications Consultation in Autumn 2018, and the possibility of receiving the Inspector's final report towards the end of 2018.

The group discussed the five year housing land supply position under Plan:MK. Officers confirmed that, as it stands, it would be 5.67 years at point of adoption but can't say for certain how long the Council would be able to maintain a five year supply going forward. Brett Leahy advised that recent delivery figures were promising, and that Plan:MK would be reviewed within five years in any event.

Brett outlined the new Housing Delivery Test (HDT) which comes into force in November 2018. This will be an extra and more challenging test on top of normal five year housing land supply requirements. MKC are likely to be failing the HDT by 2020 as the thresholds within the HDT are gradually made more stringent. Sam Crooks ask for a briefing on the HDT to be provided to the group (**ACTION 1**).

It was asked if MKC had provided recent information to the Inspector about delivery within the WEA. Brett confirmed it has been provided, which outlined various causes for delay at the WEA but that delivery rates are now increasing. Brett outlined that Plan:MK will address many of the causes of slow delivery, including more outlets per site, more small/medium sized sites and a buffer. John Cheston explained that the current backlog, which makes it hard to have a five year housing land supply at present, will be wiped clean once Plan:MK is adopted.

The group queried whether the Inspector has taken sites out of the plan or reduced them. Officers advised that the Inspector has not suggested this so far.

Housing Infrastructure Fund

Andrew Turner outlined the broad objectives, timescales and scope of the HIF bid which is being prepared for submission in December 2018, with a decision on the bid in March 2019. It was requested that the HIF note being referred to be appended to the minutes (**ACTION 2**).

The group queried whether the HIF bid would be affected if Milton Keynes East is not allocated in Plan:MK. Andrew explained that there is no definitive answer from Government in this regard, but the HIF guidance suggests that not being allocated in Plan:MK would significantly undermine the bid.

The group queried whether a 'no bridge' scenario was an option being put forward by Highways England. It was confirmed that Highways England have asked that a wider range of options, including no new bridges, be considered by MKC akin to an optioneering process which Highways England would typically follow. Andrew Turner advised that the Plan:MK policy and the Council consider that a new bridge is

necessary to support development of the Milton Keynes East site, with the Development Framework informing this and other infrastructure matters that may fall into the scope of the HIF bid. The group queried what the money is to be spent on. Confirmed that a large amount is for bridge crossing and new main roads through the site, but also for schools.

The group stated that it needs to input into the HIF process and the ability to ask further questions about it. The group requested that a presentation on the HIF by officers leading on it be made at the next meeting **(ACTION 3)**

Development Framework

David Blandamer outlined that the main purpose of Development Framework is to expand upon and illustrate how the policy requirements within Plan:MK would be met to inform and guide future planning applications. David clarified that the Development Framework would be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and outlined its broad structure.

Confirmed that both formal (six week consultation on a draft document) and informal consultation and engagement (e.g. workshops, meetings, presentations) to inform the preparation of the Development Framework would occur, with the Local Stakeholder Group a key part of this.

David advised that to date the Council has been gathering information on the site, outlining the policy context and has begun to have meetings with internal Council teams on technical matters (e.g. rights of way, flooding) to gather information and understand site constraints in more detail.

Andrew Turner outlined the broad programme for preparing the Development Framework, with stakeholder engagement taking place later summer/autumn, formal consultation late 2018/early 2019, with a view to adopting the Development Framework as SPD in March/April 2019. The timings are subject to what happens with the Plan:MK examination (i.e. the Development Framework could not be adopted until Plan:MK is adopted) and aligned to the key milestones for the HIF bid.

The group queried why the Development Framework is being prepared now when Plan:MK states development is for post-2031. Officers advised that Plan:MK does allow for earlier delivery of the site if strategic infrastructure can be funded and delivered. Doing work proactively now is in anticipation of the HIF bid being successful, rather than being reactive to it later on.

It was queried why additional land was being added to the allocation. Officers confirmed the land is owned by MKC, who promoted it for inclusion in the allocation. Officers working on the plan agreed to its inclusion to provide greater flexibility in considering design and layout solutions for the site. Officers confirmed that the proposed changes to the site boundaries would be consulted on in the Autumn if the Plan:MK inspector is happy to proceed to that stage.

It was queried whether MKDP need to be involved in the process, and queried how MKC are involving landowners. It was advised that MKDP would be engaged if they

have a role in MKC's land promotion, and that officers are engaging with Berkeley's who are the main landowner and promoter for the allocation (alongside Bloor Homes and Roxhill who have smaller parts of the site). The group requested a bigger and clear map of the site boundaries. **(ACTION 4)** .

Discussion of MKE

The group raised and discussed some of their initial concerns, thoughts and aspirations for Milton Keynes East, but were clear that further time and future opportunities are needed to properly consider and discuss these matters. Officers outlined the idea of holding workshops for this purpose. A summary of points raised is below:

- Development should reflect the key identifiable features of MK, including extensive areas of high quality and well maintained green infrastructure.
- Concerned about the boundaries of the site being changed without the courtesy of discussing with the local communities
- Newport Pagnell could benefit as a key destination of future residents to access services and amenities, therefore investment in Newport Pagnell's infrastructure will be needed
- Newport Pagnell town centre may suffer if the district centre within the new development draws trade away from the town centre. Needs careful thought on the size and function of these centres.
- A bridge over the M1 is absolutely necessary, along with improvements in connectivity elsewhere. However, a bridge was strongly opposed by Willen residents.
- Will further improvements be made to the M1 and Junction 14 so that people can access the M1 without further delays.
- A509 should be dualled between Olney and the M1 to cope with additional traffic and to negate further rat running through villages in the area. Learn from what happens in Hulcote and Salford due to the EEA.
- Need to seriously investigate whether a bypass around Olney would be needed to mitigate impacts on the town centre.
- Wanted to better understand what a fast mass-transit system is and what the implications of it are, for example on communities and land within Central Bedfordshire
- Discussion about how the development relates to existing villages and communities, for example whether coalescence/merging of old and new should be avoided or whether they should be subsumed into the new development. Officers advised that the boundaries of the allocation do not extend to include any of the villages in the area, however the group wanted to look further into the future in terms of possible further development that would encroach upon and surround the villages.
- Recognised that development could provide an opportunity to upgrade infrastructure in the area, e.g. roads and schools.
- The group queried whether it becomes part of Newport Pagnell or is kept separate, and what the governance would be for the development (e.g. merge with existing town/parish, or have a new parish council)

- Discussed the amount of development, including employment development which is likely to be warehousing and distribution

Future meetings of the group

Agreed to meet on 22 August, preferably at Moulsoe Village Hall. Chair/Vice Chair to meet with Officers to set the agenda **(Action 5)**

Officers raised the prospect of workshops in September in discuss concerns, issues and aspirations in more detail. Chair recommended this be discussed with the Chair and Vice Chairs with a workshop proposal discussed at the meeting on the 22 August

Officers raised the prospect of setting up a website as a central point for resources and papers to be published, rather than via email. Group suggested CMIS should be used for this purpose **(ACTION 6)**

Group were happy with evening meetings, roughly 1.5hrs long.

AOB

Group queried how the group discussions should be communicated to constituents and residents. Chair suggested that each parish should do this as they see best. Minutes of meetings will be sent to parish councils for them to circulate.

Actions

Action 1 – Briefing Note on Housing Delivery Test

Action 2 – Provide copy of Briefing Note on HIF referred to during the meeting

Action 3 – Organised presentation on HIF for 22 August meeting

Action 4 – Provide larger colour map of site allocation including additional land

Action 5 – Organise agenda planning session for 22 August meeting with Chair and Vice Chairs

Action 6 – Publish future meeting documents on CMIS