

Annex B

Summary of representations received on the draft South East Milton Keynes- Strategic Urban Extension Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document 2021

1. Foreword

- 1.1 The South East Milton Keynes Development Framework takes forward the policy in Plan:MK that allocates the site for a development of around 3,000 houses (policy SD11). It is a Supplementary Planning Document and, as such, can only supplement this policy. It cannot introduce any new policy requirements. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the Council at application stage. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.

2. Stakeholder engagement

- 2.1 Stakeholder engagement on SEMK took place during the preparation and examination of Plan:MK during 2017 and 2018. This continued after adoption of Plan:MK in March 2019.
- 2.2 Local stakeholder involvement in 2018 included meetings with the Danesborough Forum. Meetings took place to discuss the involvement of local representatives in the preparation of the SEMK SPD which led to organising independently facilitated workshops in Autumn/Winter 2018/19 with members of the Danesborough Forum. During the workshops the concept, vision and high-level layout of the site were discussed and formed into a draft report produced by the independent facilitator.
- 2.3 Parallel discussions with the landowners promoting the allocation on concept, vision and high-level layout of the site continued.
- 2.4 The South East MK Local Stakeholder Group (SEMK LSG) was formed in place of the Danesborough Forum in 2019 to enable a wider membership. In Autumn/Winter 2019 limited meetings with the SEMK LSG and the separate developer group took place to discuss issues related to SEMK. Discussions with the developer group also extended to the principle and broad content of a Tariff-style Framework Agreement, in line with Policies INF1 and SD9 of Plan:MK.

- 2.5 In mid-2020 meetings with the developer group continued and a meeting with the SEMK LSG took place where the concepts emerging from previous discussions with the group were discussed.
- 2.6 Two dedicated SEMK SPD workshops were also held with the Planning Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) in August and November 2020 to discuss the emerging concept and framework. Subsequent written feedback was gathered from Planning CAG members and other stakeholders after the workshops, which was taken into consideration by Officers and the Leader of the Council ahead of a Planning CAG meeting on the 9th December 2020 where a draft SEMK SPD was presented to and discussed by Planning CAG members.
- 2.7 In November 2020, Officers also met with the SEMK LSG and another local stakeholder group, the 'MK South Group', formed by residents in the area. Each group had the opportunity to raise concerns and ask questions in relation to matters previously discussed with the Planning CAG. These meetings were facilitated by independent facilitator.
- 2.8 Following the iterative process of engagement, a draft version of the SEMK SPD was consulted on between 8 February and 19 April 2021 (which was extended to 9 June 2021 to allow respondents to review EWR Co's non-statutory consultation alongside the draft SEMK SPD. We publicised the draft SEMK SPD document, including details of the consultation, a consultation response form, consultation statement, guidance notes for respondents and a Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) screening statement, on our website. The SPD was also publicised via our consultation finder page.
- 2.9 In addition to the statutory provisions made for the consultation, officers held two online workshops during the course of the consultation. The officers also prepared Frequently Asked Questions Document. Officers attended MK Forum event to respond to questions around the draft SEMK SPD.
- 2.10 The updated SEMK SPD was presented at the Planning Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) meeting on 13 October 2021 where it was requested that the phasing chapter for the site contain a requirement for early delivery of the infrastructure and Gypsies and Traveller site

3. Schedule of responses received and Council's response

- 3.1 We received over 1,500 responses from 1411 respondents. The greatest number of response (over came from members of the public. In addition, we received:
- Representations from Parish and Town Councils and Councillors,
 - Representations from other local authorities: Central Bedfordshire Council, Gloucestershire Council,
 - Representations from Developers or Agents who have interests in the site or land adjacent to the site,

- Representations from Statutory consultees such as Environment Agency, Natural England, Forestry Commission,
- Representations from utilities/infrastructure providers,
- Representations from organisations and partnerships including: CPRE, Marston Vale Community Rail partnership, The Greensand Trust, MK Cycling Forum,
- Representations from local liaison groups,
- Representations from local businesses,
- Comments from officers of MKC and external partners,
- Representation from East West Rail company.

3.2 Please see Table 1 for the list of respondents and Table 2 for the Summary of Responses received and Council's response.

Table 1.

ID	Respondent
1	Adams, Michael
2	Addyman, Peter & Jenny
3	Alderson, Jim
4	Andrew, David P
5	Andrews, Annemarie
6	Anglian Water
7	Appleton, Joanna
8	Ardern, Robert
9	Arnold, Amanda
10	Arnold, Jolyon
11	Arshad, Aadi
12	Arshad, Fareen
13	Aspley Guise Parish Council
14	Atack-Lee, Jayne and Lee, Reynold
15	Atkins, Julia
16	Atkins, Stella
17	Ayres Davies, Lorraine
18	Barker, Judith
19	Barker, Richard
20	Bartram, David
21	Bartram, Sally
22	Beard, Adrian

23	Beaumont, Richard
24	Bell, Lesley P
25	Bell, Sarah
26	Bingham, David
27	Bircham, Anne
28	Bircham, Sarah
29	Biti, Paola
30	Blanchard, Marilyn and Bill
31	Boote, Karen
32	Boville, Angela
33	Braddish, Arthur
34	Braddish, M
35	Bridgman, Sarah
36	Burchell, Kim
37	Cakebread, Mike and Liz
38	Campbell Park Parish Council via Jones, Tracey
39	Carrivick, Adam
40	Cavanagh, Craig and Sicily
41	Chaney, Andrew
42	Churchley, Neil
43	Clark, Jean
44	Cohen, Peniel
45	Coles, Stephen
46	Collins, Barry
47	Connelly, Rob
48	Connelly, Sally
49	Cope, Steve
50	Cooperwheat, Peter and Kathlyn
51	Corbett, J and M
52	Cousins, Richard
53	CPRE via Salisbury
54	Crosswell, Linda
55	Cullinan, Gerry
56	Central Bedfordshire Council
57	Smith, Alison
58	Smith, Andrew
59	Dalvi, Munaf

60	Darcy, Jon
61	Davis, Barbara and Tom
62	De Fraine, Susanne
63	Dray, Jon
64	Eady, Tripta
65	Elinor, Ashby
66	Evans, Keith and Claire
67	Ewing, Alistair
68	Exon, Rex
69	Fahy, Fin
70	Felton, Pippa
71	Cllr Ferrans, Jenni
72	Fisher, Ed
73	Floyd, Jill
74	Forestry Commission
75	Forrester, Robert and Helen
76	Fotouhi, Abbas
77	Fred Roche Foundation
78	Frosts Garden Centre
79	Galloway, Neil and Aoife
80	Goh, Josephine
81	Goldney, Alison
82	Goldney, Ed
83	Goodger, Eric and CO
84	Goodwin, Angela
85	Goodwin, Ellen
86	Goodwin, Henry
87	Green, Paul
88	Green, Paul 2
89	Greenwall, Ralph and Janet
90	Grounds, Trevor and Jenny
91	Grove, Barbara
92	Hamer, Janet
93	Hamlyn, John
94	Hancorn, PD
95	Harbottle, Paul
96	Harper, Patricia and Johnson, Matthew

97	Harris, Gillian
98	Hasson, Steve
99	Hayden, Jan
100	Headford, Alan
101	Holbrook, Graham
102	Hume, Alex
103	Husborne Crawley Parish Council
104	Hyland, Nick
105	Isbister, Peter
106	Jacobsen, Rosario Lopez Estergaard
107	Jamieson, Penny
108	Jeffreys, Jacky
109	Jenkins, Alice - Danesborough and Walton Ward Councillor
110	Jenner, Adrian and Jean
111	Jenner, Chris
112	Jevgrafova, Anastasija
113	Johnson, Carol
114	Jones, Steve
115	Joslyn, Lynda
116	Kemp, Rosemary
117	Khiani, Raj
118	King, Samantha
119	Kingston, Amanda
120	Kuanda, Renu
121	Kuhle, Karl
122	Lawrence, Rhonda
123	Layton, Laura
124	Leigh, Edward
125	Leighton Linslade Planning and Transport Committee
126	Lewis, Gillian
127	Lynch, Gerard
128	Lynn, Anthony
129	Macdonald, Emma
130	Maple, David
131	Martin, T E
132	Mayman, Alistair
133	MK Forum

134	MK South Group
135	Moore, Belinda
136	Morris, Elizabeth and Richard
137	Morrison, Dee
138	Mott, Graham
139	Mould, David
140	Mullarkey, Marianna
141	Mullarkey, Stephen
142	Murley, Ruth
143	Murphy, Philip & Elizabeth
144	Myers, Moira
145	Nattrass, Petronella
146	Neale, Rosie
147	Norman, Brian and Janet
148	Norwood, Brian
149	Norwood, Christine
150	O&H Land via Pippa Cheetham
151	O'Keefe, Helen
152	Old Stables, Woodleys Farm via Smith Jenkins LTD
153	Owen, Jayne
154	Page, Rachel
155	Panesar, Himat
156	Patel, Jeeten
157	Paton, Ian
158	Payne, Noel
159	Percival, Jennifer
160	Pettman - Tideswell, Helen
161	PLP
162	Plummer, Philip
163	Pollard, Anne
164	Porter, Garry
165	Prentice, Nigel
166	Price, Julian
167	Proctor, Lynne
168	Prosser, Steve
169	Rawlinson, Alistair
170	Rawson, Gilmour and Gene

171	Read, Shirley
172	Redrow Homes Ltd
173	Reeves, Peter and Rita
174	Richard, Andrew
175	Rix, Jonathan
176	Robinson, Les
177	Rosewell, Jon
178	Rushton, Mark
179	Russell, Val
180	Schimmel, Anthony
181	Scott, Keith
182	Scudamore, Jon
183	Sear, Lindsay
184	Singer, Alyson
185	Skelton, Peter
186	Sleight, Stephen - Marston Vale Community Rail Partnership
187	Smith, Daniel
188	Smith, Lindsay
189	Smith, Matthew
190	Smith, Mike
191	Smith, Sally and Bill
192	Spencer, Jennifer
193	Spencer, Richard
194	Sport England
195	St Michaels Church
196	Stewart, Iain
197	Stockgrove Homes Ltd
198	Street, Emma
199	Summers, Chris
200	Templeton, Trevor
201	Thomas, Geraldine
202	Thomas, Amanda and Bromfield, Margaet
203	Thornton, Alan
204	Thurgood, Julia
205	Tone, Patricia
206	Trehy, Rosemary
207	Trendall, Matt

208	Trendall, Paul
209	True, Amanda
210	Wagstaff, Nick
211	Wall, Amy
212	Wall, Samm
213	Wallis, David
214	Walls, Karen
215	Walton, Anthony
216	Wandsworth, Jane
217	Ward, Elizabeth
218	Warner, Phil 2
219	Warner, Phil
220	Wathen, Mark
221	Wavendon Fields Residents via S A Nichols
222	Weber, Maggie
223	Welch, Richard
224	White, Andy
225	Wickens, John
226	Wickens, Jon 2
227	Williams, Dominic - Strategic Lead Education
228	Williams, Ian 2
229	Willis, Peter
230	Willis, Sue
231	Wilson, Christopher
232	Youlton, Fiona
233	Ziya, Adam
234	Burn, Nadia
235	Burn, Stephen
236	Williams, Ian 3
237	Williams, Sue
238	Wood, Martin
239	Abraham, Neil
240	Abrams, Peter
241	Adler, Maria
242	Adler, Richard
243	Afonja, Korede
244	Afonja, Olugbenga

245	Agathokli, Michele
246	Aiyetan, Omoniyi
247	Akhtour, Karen
248	Akintoye, Ola
249	Alairn, Syed Reham
250	Gallafent, Valerie
251	Aldridge, Geoff
252	Aldridge, Libby
253	Aldridge, Robert
254	Allbutt, Jason
255	Allonby, Lewis
256	Allonby, Pauline
257	Alsatari, Moufeida
258	Alton, Yvonne
259	Anderson, Stewart
260	Anguera, Andrea
261	Ansell, B
262	Anstiss, Darren
263	Aris, Darren
264	Arnold, H
265	Ashe, Anne
266	Asif, Asad
267	Aspinall, Vivienne
268	Astell, Roger
269	Atkins, James
270	Atkins, Ryan
271	Atkinson, Harry
272	Atkinson, Lynn
273	Axten, Fiona
274	Bailey, Simon
275	Baker, Carole
276	Baker, Roger
277	Balaint, Tamas
278	Baldwin, Diane
279	Bannister, Lesley
280	Barber, Peter
281	Barden, Jonathan

282	Barnard, Michael
283	Barnes, Elizabeth
284	Barnes, Gary
285	Barrett, John
286	Barrett, Wendy
287	Batchelor, Mr and Mrs
288	Bateman, Rosalind
289	Batemen, John
290	Baulk, Geoff
291	Bayliss, Anu
292	Bayliss, Stephen
293	Bean, Zoe
294	Beech, Helen
295	Beechey, Carole
296	Begum, News
297	Bhatt, Ajay
298	Bhatt, Hitesh
299	Bilics, Istavan
300	Binks, Alex
301	Blackeby, Mr and Mrs
302	Blake, Marjorie
303	Bligh, Michael
304	Bloye, Amanda
305	Boakes, Gary and Cris
306	Bolton, Joanna
307	Bonney, Paul
308	Boomer, James
309	Boreham, Susan
310	Botterill, Fred
311	Bouchier, Keshmira
312	Boulden, Ian
313	Bowen- Cassie, Mrs
314	Brairy, Anita
315	Brandes, Helen
316	Bridgeman, M
317	Brocklehurst, Paul and Green, Carol
318	Brooking, C

319	Brooking, Peter
320	Brookman, Matthew
321	Brooks, Joanne
322	Brown, Kevin
323	Brown, Ray
324	Brown, Sandra
325	Bruce, Peter
326	Bruen, Paul
327	Bryant, Jane
328	Bucknau, A D
329	Bugarszki-Falcsik L
330	Bundock, Paul
331	Burgess, Margaret
332	Burgess, Nigel
333	Butterworth, Michael
334	Byrne, Barry
335	Cadle, Alison
336	Caldwell, Karen
337	Cameron, Lisa
338	Carbert, Stephen
339	Cardenas, Tryna
340	Caron, Charlotte
341	Carron, John
342	Cartwright, Francis
343	Casewell, Jane
344	Chalk, Jonathan
345	Chammings, Paula
346	Chana, Parminder
347	Chana, Sarinder
348	Chana, Shveta
349	Chance, Philip
350	Chapman, Rachel
351	Chapman-Ballard, Adam
352	Chapman-Ballard, Tate Andrew
353	Cheadle, Matthew
354	Cheema, Ravinder
355	Chesterton, Patricia

356	Cheval, Suzanne
357	Chidley, Roy
358	Christmas, Jamieson
359	Cinquemani, Giuseppe
360	Clark, Ashley
361	Clark, Dawn
362	Clarke- Hager, Katrina
363	Clarke, Delisa
364	Clarke, Linda
365	Clayton, Elizabeth
366	Clement, Isabelle
367	Coldwell, Deborah
368	Cole, Adrian
369	Coleman, Mark
370	Brookman, Colin
371	Coll, Joseph
372	Collarbone, Barry
373	Colley, EJ
374	Colley, Kathleen
375	Collings, James
376	Collins, Gillian
377	Conroy, Marie
378	Cooper, Jemma
379	Cooper, Roger and Coombs, Ann
380	Copeland, Fiona
381	Corbridge, Sharon
382	Costin, Nicholas
383	Coulter, Anita
384	Cox, Sheila
385	Craig, Louise
386	Crane, Sandra
387	Croft, Robert
388	Crook, Clare
389	Crook, Joel
390	Crook, Lily
391	Crook, Stuart
392	Cross, A

393	Cross, D
394	Croucher, Laura
395	Crron, Charlotte
396	Csorba, Dorina
397	Cudjoe, Linda
398	Cudjoe, Michelle
399	Cudjoe, Robert
400	Cupples, Andrew
401	Curley, Linda
402	Currall, Verity
403	Curran, Raymond
404	Cutler, Pamela
405	Daly, Michael
406	Daly, Rachel
407	Daniels, Jeff
408	Danks, Dawn
409	Davies, Ian
410	Davies, Leslie
411	Davis, Kate
412	Davison, Tony
413	Dazley, Peter
414	Deacon, Harry
415	Degrosso, Anthony
416	Delyth, Bill
417	Deria, Amina
418	Dewhirst, Amanda
419	Dewhirst, Peter
420	Dewhirst, Stephen
421	Deycon, Charles
422	Diaz, Sofia
423	Dickens, Caroline
424	Dickson, Andrew
425	Diltan, Sue
426	Dimmock, Colin
427	Downie, Ashlea
428	Drage, Ruth
429	Drake, Mark

430	Drake, Stephen
431	Dring, Matthew
432	Drummond, Ian
433	Drummond, Marguerite
434	Drury, Ann
435	Dry, Mervin
436	Dubicki, Louise
437	Duckworll, John B
438	Durkin, W
439	Dwyer, Amitabh
440	Dyke, Suzanne
441	Dynes, Robin
442	Eames, Stephen
443	Eastaff, David
444	Easter, Christine
445	Eastlake, Andy
446	Edmands, Chivone
447	Edoyard-Betsy, Mario and Laurie
448	Edwards, Emma
449	Edwards, Hilary
450	Edwards, Kevin
451	Ellerby, Sandra
452	Ellis, Brian
453	Ellis, Gillian
454	Embleton, William
455	Emens, Jackie
456	Emens, Sean
457	Emms-Davies, Mayya
458	Engledow, Nichola and Peter
459	Entsie, Maxwell
460	Evans, Christopher
461	Evans, Claire and Jim
462	Evans, James and Beverley
463	Evans, James
464	Evans, Katie
465	Evans, Katrariina
466	Everard, Ross

467	Evermore, Ben
468	Every, Ian
469	Fabrizio, Anthony
470	Facunti, Hannah and Anthony
471	Fairfull, Lynese
472	Faris, Frances
473	Farman, Gillian
474	Farmer, Robin
475	Farringta, Carol
476	Farrow, David and Paula
477	Featherstone, Mark
478	Fellows, Cheryl
479	Ferguson, Ian
480	Fernandes, Carolyn
481	Fernandes, John
482	Fiddy, Dale
483	Fisher, Mark
484	Fletcher, Gavin
485	Fletcher, Sarah
486	Footman, Cassie
487	Foster, Gavin
488	Francis, Neil
489	Franyo, Hajnalka
490	Frederick Tripp, Malcom
491	Frederickson, Jim
492	Friaia, Kim
493	Gadsby, Megan
494	Gallivan, Jane
495	Gammudi, Clare
496	Gardner, Peter J
497	Garrity, Patricia
498	Geoghegan, Debbie
499	Geoghegan, John
500	Ghamsory, Deborah
501	Gibbs, Andrew
502	Gibbs, Geoff and Sherralyn
503	Girard, Lydie

504	Girvin, Stella
505	Gomersall, Wayne
506	Gonclaves Heneghan, Claudette
507	Goodwin, Emma
508	Gordania, Deswin
509	Gordon, Helen
510	Gorman, J
511	Gowen, Jill
512	Gowen, Matthew
513	Grant, Anita
514	Grant, Henry
515	Gray, Andrew
516	Gray, Denise
517	Gray, Emma
518	Greenway, L
519	Grier, Elizabeth
520	Grier, Robert
521	Griffin, Janet and Michael
522	Grinstead, Lesley
523	Grist, Farley
524	Grove, Rachel
525	Grove, Tom
526	Guerin, Kirsty and Rob
527	Gurnung, Trinidad
528	Hager, Lee
529	Haigh, Paul
530	Haigh, Sara
531	Hamid, Adnam
532	Hammond, Graham
533	Hammond, Lorraine
534	Hammond, Lynsey
535	Hammond, Neville
536	Hanney, Debs
537	Hanney, Stew
538	Harmes, Mr and Mrs
539	Harper, TE
540	Harris, Emma

541	Harrison, Catherine
542	Harriss, Laura
543	Harvey, Chris
544	Harvey
545	Harvey-Smith, Bryan
546	Hatton, Debbie
547	Hatton, George
548	Haughey, Eva
549	Haughey, Peter
550	Hawes, Jonathan
551	Hayter, Paul
552	Hayward, Helen
553	Helmmy, Andrew
554	Hembrow, Edward
555	Hembrow, Gemma
556	Hender, Sarah
557	Heneghan, Thomas
558	Henley, Hunter, Chris
559	Herrington, Kathleen
560	Hibbard, Stephen
561	Hidalgo, Rafael
562	Higgs, Madelyn
563	Higgs, Tom
564	Hill, Chris
565	Hill, Clare
566	Hill, Mrs P
567	Hills, Angela
568	Hillyer, Victoria
569	Hilton, Robert
570	Hindry, Patrick
571	Ho, John
572	Hobday, Joanne
573	Hobday, Timothy
574	Hogan, Gaynor
575	Holliday, Caroline
576	Holliday, Dudley
577	Holly, Brian and Sam

578	Holly, Samantha
579	Hopkins, Gillian D
580	Horne, Lauren
581	Horne, Martin
582	Horsego, Ann
583	Hough, Carole
584	Housden, Jade
585	Housen, Jamie
586	Howkins, Sue and Colin
587	Hpa, Darryl
588	Hundt, Tanja
589	Hunt, Heather
590	Husband, Valarie
591	Hutchison, J
592	Huxtable Sue
593	Hyde, Angelina
594	Hyde, Peter
595	Ifould, Barry
596	Ita, Isabelle
597	Ive, Robert
598	Jackson, Andrew
599	Jackson, Lesley
600	Jackson-Krkoska, Gracie
601	Jackson-Krkoska, Luis
602	Jagne, Alhagie
603	Jamieson, Andrew
604	Jarvis, Paul
605	Jasper, Richard and Janet
606	Jaward, Jane
607	Jaworski, Michal
608	Jawson, Mr and Mrs
609	Jazdejska, Magdalena
610	Jenkins, Paul
611	Jocelyn, Michelle
612	John, David
613	Jones, Mr and Mrs
614	Kaloyirou, Adam

615	Keene, Andy
616	Kellard, John
617	Kelly, Christine
618	Kelly, Ian
619	Kelly, Irene
620	Kelly, John
621	Kelly, Mervyn
622	Kemp, Carolyn
623	Kemp, Sean V
624	Kemsley, M
625	King, Graham
626	Kings, Richard
627	Kingston, Michael
628	Kirk, George
629	Kirk, Susan
630	Knight, Diana
631	Knight, Michael
632	Konrad, Lars
633	Kovac, M
634	Krehan, James
635	Krkoska, Vladimir
636	Kruse, Meg
637	Kuhle, Biema
638	Kupateick, Gary
639	Kybelksties, Dieter
640	Lacina, Nicole
641	Lafford, Ivor and Christina
642	Lambert, Eleanor
643	Lambie, Tracey
644	Lambourne, Kevin
645	Lambourne, Miranda
646	Lau, Man Sing
647	Lawford, Rodney
648	Leach, Mark
649	Leadbetter, Louise
650	Leadbetter, Richard
651	Leadbitter, Kim

652	Ledlie, Sarah
653	Lee, Janice
654	Lee, Valerie
655	Leiu, Vincent
656	Lemee, Lawrence
657	Lemee-Winfield, Hector
658	Leon, Amy
659	Lester, Callum
660	Letts, Janet
661	Letts, Melvyn
662	Levai, Jessica
663	Levai, Matthew
664	Lever, AJ
665	Leveridge, Angela
666	Lim, Alyssa
667	Lipska, Katarzyna
668	Liszkowski, Marzena and Szymon
669	Littler, David
670	Littler, Paula
671	Lloyd, K&S
672	Lock, Andrew
673	Lock, Jason
674	Lock, Rachel
675	Lomax, Matthew
676	Lopez, Gillian
677	Lopez, Peter
678	Lucassen, Mathijs
679	Luke, Anthony
680	Lundburg, Freda
681	MacCarter, David
682	Mace, Doug
683	Madden, Isobelle
684	Maher, Edward
685	Maher, Sandra
686	Mahoney, D
687	Makwana, Ajay
688	Mansfield, Paul and Rudge, Phillippa and George and Maliharet, Amya

689	Marchant, Rachel
690	Marfleet, Wendy
691	Marriot, Robin and Margaret
692	Marsh, Linda
693	Marsh, Nigel
694	Marshall, Lesley
695	Martin, Christopher
696	Martin, Danny
697	Martin, Marie
698	Martin, Maureen
699	Martin, Paul Keith
700	Martinkova, Leslia
701	Masad, Annalise
702	Masad, Azmi
703	Masad, Farris
704	Masad, Jane
705	Masad, Reane
706	Master, Shaveen
707	Masterson, Ian
708	Mawby, Emma
709	Mayer, Andrew
710	Mayes, Irene
711	Mayes, Kevin
712	McCallum, Gaile
713	McCarthy, Gerard
714	McColl, Ian
715	McDonald, James
716	McDonnell, Linda
717	McMahon, May
718	McNulty, Cat
719	McSweeney, Timothy
720	McVicar, Gillian
721	Meijer, Helen
722	Melbourne, Jeanette
723	Merton, Harry
724	Miller, Diedre
725	Miller, Robert

726	Milligan, David
727	Millington-Wallace, Joanna
728	Mills, Rebecca and Robert
729	Milsome, Natalie
730	Milson, Michael
731	Mistry, Pravin
732	Mistry, Tarun
733	Mitchel, Gary
734	Mitchell, David
735	Montrose, C
736	Montrose, Donna
737	Moran, Alex
738	Morgan, Rachel
739	Morris, Steve
740	Morris, Daniel
741	Morris, Gary
742	Morrison, M
743	Murden, Barry
744	Musgrave, Susan and Simon
745	Myers, Karl
746	Mynard, Tony
747	Nash, Beverly
748	Nash, Derek
749	Nathwani, Dilip
750	Nathwani, Hiteshree
751	Nathwani, Nishay
752	Nathwani, Shonak
753	Naylor, Brian
754	Naylor, Carolyn
755	Neil, Francis
756	Neil, Younger
757	Nel, Ryno
758	Ness, Sarah
759	New, Carol
760	New, Geoff
761	Newland, J
762	Newman, Clare

763	Newport, Roger
764	Newton, Ronald
765	NG, YC
766	Nicewicz, Katarzyna and Jaroslaw
767	Nicholls, Gordon
768	Nicola, Brookman
769	Nicolas-Famourakis, D
770	Nix, Katie
771	Nolan, Mr
772	Norton, Carole
773	Novrse, Phil
774	O'Brien, Grace
775	O'Connell, Claire
776	O'Fathaigh, Samantha
777	Oldbury, Michael
778	Oliver, Babette
779	Oliver, Gary
780	Ollier, Susan and David
781	Osuna, Edgar Rizo
782	Packman, Gill
783	Packman, Mick
784	Paine, Paul
785	Paine, Roger Payne
786	Pallett, Annette
787	Palmiero, Nina
788	Panesar, Himat 2
789	Pardy, Sue
790	Parker, Anna
791	Parker, Sandra
792	Parks, Alexandra
793	Parmer, Mira
794	Parsons Mr and Mrs
795	Parsons, Carl
796	Patel, Jayaprakash
797	Payne, Roger
798	Pearson, P
799	Penfound, Janet

800	Penley, Mike
801	Penley, Tim
802	Percival, Jennifer
803	Perry, Ben
804	Perry, Martin
805	Perry, Mike
806	Perry, Rob
807	Peters, Elizabeth
808	Phillips, Samantha
809	Pickering, Duncan
810	Piggot, Catherine
811	Piggot, Clive
812	Pilkington, William
813	Pinaitiene, Svetlana
814	Pledger, T
815	Pollard, Caroline
816	Poon, Charlotte
817	Poon, Jason
818	Pope, Ian
819	Porte, Alan
820	Potter, Joe
821	Potter, Spencer
822	Pow, Chris
823	Poyner, Philip
824	Poyner, Sheelagh
825	Pratley, Louise
826	Pratley, Simon
827	Preece, Angela
828	Preece, Richard
829	Price, Simon
830	Pritchard, Gillian
831	Pudney, Patricia
832	Purdon, Ruth
833	Raciborski, Elizabeth
834	Raftery, L
835	Ravenscroft, Alan
836	Reed, John

837	Reed, Lucy
838	Reeves, Katarina
839	Reilly, Alan
840	Renacre, Kathryn
841	Reynolds, Andrew
842	Reynolds, Heather
843	Reynolds, Janet and Tony
844	Reynolds, Terence
845	Richards, Basil
846	Richardson, Emma
847	Richardson, Matthew
848	Richardson, Steven
849	Richardson, Tazeen
850	Richer, Gail
851	Richmond, Charles
852	Richmonds, Susan
853	Rickard, Hannah
854	Riddington, Mr and Mrs
855	Ridgeway, Davidd
856	Rigby, Alice
857	Ripley, Joanne
858	Ripley, Matthew
859	Roberts, Patricia
860	Roberts, Sheena
861	Robertson, Sandie
862	Robey, T
863	Robinson, JA and DJ
864	Robinson, Jacqueline
865	Robinson, Kellyssia
866	Rofe, Tony
867	Rogers, Lorna
868	Rosewell, Patricia
869	Roy, Bishwadip
870	Roy, Mohua
871	Russell, Jane
872	Rutter, Lesley
873	Ruziwa, Cecilia

874	Ryan, Damien
875	Ryan, Daniel
876	Ryon, Aaron
877	Sadler, Clinton
878	Sahota, Baldip
879	Sahota, Hilary
880	Sahota, Mavinder
881	Sahota, Satvinder S S
882	Salgarkar, Anagha
883	Salgarkar, Santosh
884	Salker, Mangesh
885	Samme, George
886	Sauvarin, David
887	Schotter, Lionel
888	Scott, Elizabeth
889	Scott, JTC
890	Scott, KA and Fox, AE
891	Scott, Thomas
892	Sealey, Alison
893	Self, Sam
894	Seryte, Egle
895	Shackel, Michelle
896	Shacklady, Chris
897	Sharland, Penny
898	Sharma, Amrita
899	Sharp, Paul
900	Shateri, Neda
901	Sheldon, Elizabeth
902	Shell, David
903	Sherratt, Daniel
904	Sherratt, Lisa
905	Sherratt, Martin
906	Shipway, Donna
907	Shoel, Andrea
908	Shopov, Pavlin
909	Showler, Emma
910	Siddall, Jane

911	Simper, Gary
912	Simper, Russel
913	Simpson, Elizabeth
914	Singh, Dhanraji and Kevin
915	Sinton, Lisa
916	Sippitt, Lynne
917	Sippitt, Paul
918	Skeldon, Elizabeth H
919	Skinton, Lisa
920	Skottfelt, Jesper
921	Sleafer, Brenda
922	Small, Melissa
923	Smeaton, Lucy
924	Smith, Alan
925	Smith, Alison 2
926	Smith, Gwenyth
927	Smith, Ian
928	Smith, Julie
929	Smith, Keiran
930	Smith, Natalie
931	Smith, Richard
932	Snowden, Heather
933	Sobera, Patrycja
934	Southwell, Colin
935	Speed, Melissa and Vanessa and Lovell, Tony
936	Spencer, Helen
937	Spencer, Tim
938	Squire, Jonathan
939	Stainton, Hayley
940	Stallard, Susan
941	Stanford, Katia
942	Stanley, Michelle
943	Stanton, Nigel
944	Starkey, Nicola
945	Starr, Alison
946	Steel, Robert
947	Stephenson, Norman

948	Stevens, John
949	Stevens, Katarina
950	Stewart, Lauren
951	Stewart, Richard
952	Stock, Theresa
953	Stone, Alan
954	Sturman, Caroline
955	Sturman, William
956	Sung, Simon
957	Sutherland, Ruth
958	Sutton, Susan
959	Symons, Billie-Jo
960	Szymkowiak, Marta
961	Tailor, Nalin
962	Tait, Ginny
963	Tapley, Leigh
964	Tapley, Simon
965	Tappenden, Gregory
966	Tarbox, Glenda
967	Tarrant, Nikki
968	Tattersall, David
969	Taylor, George
970	Taylor, Ian
971	Taylor, Kemi
972	Taylor-Law, Josephine
973	Tehrani, Tatiana
974	Thibouville, Erica
975	Thomas, Trevor
976	Tilby Jeffrey
977	Tilley, Emanuela
978	Tosh, Alistair
979	Townsend, Mark
980	Townsley, John
981	Trio, Reinette
982	Tripp, Beverly
983	Tse, Yiu Wo Tse
984	Turner, Andrew

985	Turner, Angela
986	Tye, Julie
987	Tyler, Margaret
988	Ubhi, Govinder
989	Umole, Franklin
990	Underwood, Carys
991	Unwin, James
992	Unwin, Lorna
993	Valentine, Brian
994	van Biljion, Joanne
995	Vernon, Karen
996	Vooght, AC
997	Waldock, Nicole
998	Walker, Mr and Mrs
999	Walker, Neil
1000	Wallace, Denise
1001	Wallace, P
1002	Wallis, Susan
1003	Walsh, Robert
1004	Walton, Craig
1005	Wang, Reginald
1006	Ward, Joan
1007	Ward, Peter John
1008	Ward, Sabine
1009	Watkins, Cathy
1010	Watkins, Gerhard
1011	Watson, Roy
1012	Watson, Tracey
1013	Weir, Gordon
1014	Weir, Jean
1015	Welsham, Anne- Marie
1016	West, Sally
1017	Westwood, Samantha
1018	Westwood, Will
1019	Wez, Detang
1020	Wheeler, Paul
1021	Whelan, Kimberley

1022	White, Less
1023	White, Lynda
1024	Whitehead, Dean
1025	Whitehead, Shaun
1026	Whittle, Owen
1027	Whitwell, Josephine
1028	Wiatrowska, Anna
1029	Wildi, Karen
1030	Wilkins, Kevin
1031	Wilkinson, Michael
1032	William, Nigel
1033	Williams, Christina
1034	Williams, Marcus
1035	Williams, Maureen
1036	Williams, Michael
1037	Williamson, Valerie
1038	Willis, Lesley
1039	Willis, Tony
1040	Wilmer, Mirian
1041	Wilmot, Jane
1042	Wilson, Ian
1043	Wilson, Julia
1044	Wilson, Sarah
1045	Wilson, Tony and Sue
1046	Winfield, Mason
1047	Wirison, T K
1048	Witlers-Brown, Craig
1049	Wong, Samuel
1050	Wood, Caroline
1051	Wood, Charlie
1052	Wood, Clive
1053	Woodhouse, David
1054	Woods, Kathy
1055	Woods, Simon S
1056	Worth, Glen
1057	Worth, Johnathon
1058	Worthington, Mark

1059	Worthington, Martha
1060	Wotherspoon, Ann
1061	Wright, David
1062	Wright, Leslie
1063	Wright, Stuart
1064	Wright, Veronica
1065	Wyatt, John
1066	Wylde, Sarah
1067	Wylie, Paul
1068	Yan, Jing
1069	Yip, Helen
1070	Yip, Tony
1071	Young, A
1072	Young, Patricia
1073	Young, Steve
1074	Young, Susan
1075	Zachar, Eva
1076	Ziya, Christine
1077	Ziya, Phil
1078	Abdulla, Anthea
1079	Agler, OJ
1080	Ainsworth, Sylvia and Forrest, Ken
1081	Allan, Robert
1082	Andrew, David P
1083	Armstrong, Rolanda
1084	Aspinall, Cecily
1085	Aspinall, J/J
1086	Austin, Joanne
1087	Bascai, Brigitta
1088	Beaton, Ann
1089	Beer, Gaynor
1090	Bloom, Peter
1091	Brawn, Lawrence
1092	Bryan-Gray, Deborah
1093	Byrns, Kyren
1094	Canavan, C
1095	Caswell, Peter

1096	Chadwick, Paul
1097	Channa, MS
1098	Chesney, John
1099	Child, Anthony
1100	Childs, Julie
1101	Clark, Ashley
1102	Cokayne, Nina
1103	Coley, Adrienne
1104	Crawford, Andrew, Sylvia and Tom
1105	Cross, Howard
1106	Cutler, Pamela
1107	Dean, Graham
1108	Demuren, Iyabode
1109	Demuren, Oludare
1110	Dolermashkin, Marina
1111	Donoghue, Paul
1112	Dove, Nicholas
1113	Dowarp, Jessica and Gareth
1114	Drage, Malcolm
1115	Drewett, Simone
1116	Dynes, Susan
1117	Evans, Terry
1118	Farringta, Carol
1119	Fenton, Philip
1120	Fisher, Jennifer
1121	Gale, Robert
1122	Goonetilleke, Richard
1123	Gott, Caryn
1124	Gray, David
1125	Greenhalgh, Diana
1126	Halsey, Andy
1127	Hanrahan, William
1128	Harris, John and Diane
1129	Harris, Mr and Mrs
1130	Hayes, S
1131	Healy, Maura
1132	Hearne, M

1133	Hibbert, Donna
1134	Hill, Andrew
1135	Hon Chu, Liang
1136	Hulcote and Salford Parish Council
1137	Izzard, D
1138	Johnson, Mark
1139	Keenan, Martin
1140	King, Dorothy
1141	King, Ray
1142	Knights, Kim
1143	Kovac, Miranda
1144	Kruse, Meg 2
1145	Lawford, David
1146	Lordon, Michael
1147	Malik, Rukhsana
1148	McFarland, Robert
1149	McGimpsey, Mandy and John
1150	McSloy, Carl
1151	Middlemiss, Lois
1152	Middlemiss, Michael
1153	Mitchel, Gary
1154	Monk, Peter and Carole
1155	Morrison, Samantha
1156	Nicholls, Cynthia
1157	Nutt, Robert
1158	Parisi-Boyd, Gabby
1159	Parr, Russell
1160	Parsons, Ron
1161	Peacn, Sean
1162	Percival, Thomas
1163	Reynolds, Lore
1164	Ritschel, Paula
1165	Roberts, Stephen
1166	Roberts, Terry
1167	Rockall, Reginald and Pauline
1168	Rodrigues, Carlos
1169	Rymarz, Ryan

1170	Savage, Allan
1171	Savage, Penelope
1172	Sayer, AL
1173	Sayers, Mary
1174	Seaman, Robert
1175	Shaw, Sheila
1176	Singleton, Gary
1177	Smith, Alan
1178	Smith, David
1179	Sorrell, D and Diekmann, J
1180	Sterne, Paul
1181	Summers, Chris
1182	Syvestsen, Clare
1183	Talbot, G
1184	Tarbox, Marcia
1185	Taylor, Vicky
1186	Thomas, Imelda
1187	Toto, Mario
1188	Towler, Gillian
1189	Tyers, Leanne
1190	Underwood, Darren
1191	Waldock, Steven
1192	Walker, Christopher
1193	Walker, Mr and Mrs
1194	Walker, Patricia
1195	Watt, Richard
1196	Wells, Neil
1197	Wesley, John
1198	Whitfield-Green, Hazel
1199	Williams, Clive
1200	Williams, John
1201	Wright, David
1202	Badham, Geoff
1203	Badham, Patricia
1204	Beech, Helen
1206	Carrington, Veronika
1207	Down, Natalie

1209	Goodricke, Gary
1210	Harding, Andrew
1211	Hutton, Trevor
1212	Isaac, Glen
1213	Isaac, Linda
1214	Lee, Gary A
1215	Middlemiss, Colin
1216	Middlemiss, Suzanne
1217	Mooney, Peter
1218	Penfound, Roger
1219	Price, Diana
1220	Price, Norman
1221	Price, Thomas Keith
1222	Rose, Alex
1223	Smith, Lisa
1224	Thakker, Yogini
1225	Vigrass, Bob
1226	Vigrass, Brigid
1227	Webb, Matthew
1228	Whear, Chris
1229	Whear, Susan
1230	Millington, Andrew
1231	Millington, Renate
1232	Aspinall, William
1233	Cakebread, Mike
1234	Dray, Jon
1235	Flowers, Michael
1236	Leroy, Mike
1237	MK Cycling Forum/Cycling UK
1238	Preen, Mary
1239	Davies, Mary
1240	Brown, Mark
1241	Environment Agency
1242	Inchbald, Lindsay
1243	Davies, Katie MKC Sport Infrastructure
1244	Local Flood Lead Authority MKC
1245	Cleave, Laura

1246	Gillam, Julie
1247	Kuldo, Katarzyna
1248	Woodward, Keith
1249	Mott, Kate
1250	Harding, Andrew 2
1251	Woburn Sands Town Council via Jordan, Alison
1252	Thompson, Beverly
1253	Marshall, Christopher
1254	Arnold, Joylon 2
1255	Bird, John
1256	Baker, John Cllr
1257	Robertson, J
1258	Bell, Keith
1259	Petty, James FA Bedfordshire
1260	Wavendon Parish Council by JB Planning
1261	Beales, Elizabeth
1262	Sear, Eleanor
1263	Stobart, Eleanor
1264	Young, Diana
1265	Highways MKC via Caves Phil 1
1266	Kellaire Ltd via Smith Jenkins
1267	Flawn, Jan
1268	Aikman, Irene
1269	Smedley, Hilary and Brian
1270	Hamp, Mark
1271	Weber, Gunter
1272	Graham, Paul
1273	Barcham, Glenn
1274	Hayfield Consortium via Savills
1275	The Greensand Trust via Jon Balaam
1276	Aspley Heath Parish Council via Gill Clough
1277	Ludford, John and Heather
1278	Gloucestershire County Council
1279	Cannell, Gill and Dishman, Andy
1280	Bellowhill Veterinary Centre and Bellowhill Stud
1281	BRAID
1282	Berks and Bucks FA

1283	Douglas, Brett CBC
1284	Temp, Caroline
1285	Morris, Frank
1286	Bevan, Edis
1287	Stubory, Doreen
1288	Bishop, Fiona
1289	Farrant, Elizabeth
1290	Natural England via Satchwell, Ellen
1291	East West Rail
1292	L&Q and Fox Strategic Land
1293	Morris, Debbie and Nicholas
1294	Evans, Clare, Bow Brickhill Parish Council
1295	McCormack, Darren
1296	Lippat, Colin
1297	Johnson, Debra
1298	Horne, Colette
1299	Trendall, Alise
1300	Storey Homes via Le Lohe, Annabel
1301	Asplands Medical Centre
1302	TARMAC via Gregson, Kieran (Carter Jonas)
1303	French, Christine
1304	Tett, Chris
1305	Gurney, Chris
1306	BLMK CCG via Nikki Barnes
1307	Berks, Bucks and Oxford Wildlife Trust via Annie Ottaway
1308	Broughton and Milton Keynes Parish Council
1309	Stemson, Jean
1310	Green, Jackie
1311	Doyle, Jackie
1312	Hughes, Claire
1313	Mohammed, Idrees Ahmed
1314	Roberts, Eileen
1315	Fielding, Sandra
1316	Kardasinska, Urszula
1317	Aspinall, William 2
1318	Sayers, PJ
1319	Middlemiss, Yvonne

1320	Askoolum, Usha
1321	Dyke, Susanne
1322	Copeland, Stuart
1323	Alexander, Luke
1324	Allen, Richard
1325	Jones, Shirley
1326	McKay, Anthony
1328	Woughton Community Council
1329	Pettigrew, Eleanor
1330	Brookes, Emma
1331	Taylor, David
1332	Gamble, David
1333	Barker, Peter
1334	Casey, John
1335	Costin, Helen
1336	Mulligan, Pauline and Vincent
1337	Dormon, Shaun
1338	Allan, Robert
1340	Armstrong, DJ
1341	Remy, Gerald
1342	Wavendon Parish Council 2
1343	Ostler, David
1344	Frost Garden Centre
1345	Blakeburn, Nicola
1346	Fennemore, Roger and Sally
1347	Newsam, Malcolm
1348	Beddoe-Newsam, Caroline
1349	Goodricke, Carole
1350	Davidson, Rachel
1351	MK Green Party
1352	Deacon, Pamela
1353	Griffiths, David
1354	Jamieson, Ron
1355	Rose, David 2
1356	Neale, Ingrid and Jennifer
1357	Wesolowski, Henryk
1358	Thakker, Indira

1359	Strangways, Susan
1360	Davidson, Rachel
1361	Goodricke, Gary 2
1362	Taylor, Alison
1363	Hutton, Myra
1364	Eyre, Sheila
1365	Hulance, Sarah
1366	Thomas, Steve
1367	Winnington, David
1368	Bowdler, Paul and Debroah
1369	Groves, Georgie
1370	Dollimore, Helen
1371	Arnold, Jolyon 4
1372	Lands BPA
1373	Historic England
1374	Chamberlain, Mark and Zylene
1375	Hughes, Martin
1376	Reddy, Mercedes
1377	Ramsbotham, Michael
1378	Hughes, Nicola
1379	Martin, P A
1380	Evans, David
1381	Woburn & Wavendon Football Club via Robert Hill
1382	Hill, Robert 2
1383	RSPB
1384	Hartley, Sally
1385	Pillar, Sarah
1386	Scott, Sarah
1387	Spicer, Sarah
1388	T Marlborough/Poppinn
1389	O'Rourke, Tony
1390	Russell, Val 2
1391	Lindsay, Valarie and Robert
1392	Symons, Valerie
1393	Symons, Valerie 2
1394	Skelton, Vanessa
1395	Meacher, Vanessa Frost

1396	Webb, Vicky
1397	Wellington, Vicky
1398	Astley, Victoria
1399	Ardern, Wendy
1400	Mogaji, Yasmin
1402	Swan Hills Homes
1404	Remy, Ava-Down
1405	Bert, Juliette
1406	Bert, Modestra
1407	Smith, Allan
1408	Sheldon, Andrew
1409	Hundy, B B
1410	Bacsai, Brigitta
1411	Dewhurst, Jackie
1412	Alger, O J
1413	Walker, Claire
1414	Hobday, Timothy
1415	Hilmy, Andrew
1416	Ford, Claire
1417	Hensey, Claire
1418	Hickman, Claire
1419	Conway, David
1420	Reynolds, Keith
1421	Beech, Andy
1422	Dean, Brian
1423	Mooney, Jennifer
1424	Bradshaw, Catherine
1425	Bradshaw, David
1426	Carrington, Keith
1427	Booker, Kevin
1428	Sixsmith, Andrew and Sheema
1430	Highways MKC via Caves Phil 2
1431	Jamieson, Angela
1432	Menday, Angela
1433	Brett, Anthont
1434	Jephcott, Cecilia
1435	Batten, Chris and Sue

1436	Bridgman, Chris
------	-----------------

Table 2 Summary of responses received and Council's response.

Response ID	Respondent IDs	Section of SPD	Summary of the responses	Council response and proposed changes to SPD
1	1, 216, 1341	General comment	Respondent agrees with housing need but considers some areas of the SPD require improvement. Respondent suggests that the existing town footprint area should be utilised first since it benefits from existing employment and infrastructure. Some mentioned the loss of open/green space as a concern.	The SEMK site is an allocated site in the Plan:MK (Policy SD11).
2	1, 16, 45, 54, 60, 64, 90, 94, 107, 113, 116, 117, 131, 181, 192, 193, 212, 1235, 1250, 1305, 1315, 1259, 1370, 1396, 1385	4.5.2 Density and Character	The development should respect rural character of the surrounding villages. Respondents mentioned villages of Bow Brickhill, Woburn Sands, and Wavendon. Some mentioned that the infrastructure such as roads should not overshadow the proposed areas. Dwellings should be no more than 2.5 storeys and should guarantee and appearance to be commensurate to the villages. This should be made a requirement of developers.	The SPD has been revised and buffer areas have been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
3	1, 26, 42, 47, 48, 131, 176, 212, 1252, 1251, 1304	4.5.2 Density	Respondents suggests that the number of homes should be reduced (e.g., by a third). Some suggested that the number of homes should be reduced to 2,500 dwellings (density 12.62) and preferably 2,000 (density10.10). A reduction of this order is reasonably consistent with the original idea of "approximately 3,000" and would not create a significant problem for Milton Keynes as a whole (particularly in view of the approval of Milton Keynes East). It would however enable a much more acceptable scale of development in the wider South East of Milton Keynes.	The SEMK site is an allocated site in the Plan:MK (Policy SD11) and it is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes.
4	1	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent suggests that proposed provision of open spaces is inadequate, and more land should be utilised for community needs in the form of natural spaces attractive to local residents to ensure that that new residents do not rely on existing spaces located outside of the site. Examples of what type of open spaces should be provided was given: Shenley Wood, Blue Lagoon Park, Caldecotte Lake, Linford Wood, Willen Lake.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.

5	1	4.4 Land Use	The site should help to achieve the government's objective to protect 30% of land by 2030. The Bucks and MK Natural Environment Partnership (NEP) have set an aim for there to be 20% more habitat for nature in Buckinghamshire than there was in 2010.	In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option. There are a number of policies within the Plan:MK that set principles for a new development and consider nature conservation are Policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5 and NE6.
6	1, 10, 16, 19, 21, 30, 36, 37, 47, 48, 54, 77, 90, 102, 123, 131, 137, 148, 180, 1239, 1249, 234-238, 1343, 1357, 1370, 1261, 1258, 1275, 1260, 1356, 1393, 1386, 1374, 1366, 1366	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondents suggests that the 'green buffers' outlined throughout the plan are needed and some stated that they should be wider. Some noted that the green space adjacent to e.g., Wavendon (& Wavendon Field Apartments), Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands should be widened. Some noted that the proposed road running parallel to Woburn Sands and Wavendon should be shifted further West to accommodate this - as far as Woodleys Farm. No residential development should be allocated East of this. This extension to the green space will allow the necessary space for both people and nature to thrive. Natural space could come in the form of new woodland, meadows, and ponds. The Wildlife Trusts should be consulted for advice in this aspect. It was noted that an additional linear green buffer is needed to protect the hedgerow on the north side of the Bow Brickhill Road.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
7	1, 137, 187, 188, 190	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The existing lake should be made accessible to the public and enhanced by extending the natural area around it. Some suggest a link connecting the Fishing Lake to Caldecotte should be established.	The SPD provides links to the fishing lake and provides the option of the lake being made accessible to the public. It will form part of the wider green buffer.
8	1, 29, 32, 107, 201, 234-238, 1261, 1260, 1379, 1360, 1399	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Existing trees and hedgerows throughout the development should be protected (some suggested that they could be incorporated as the borders between properties, in place of some fencing). Some note historical value of hedgerows e.g. those in Wavendon, Bow Brickhill. And any loss should be compensated for. Some questioned how many trees would be provided.	The SPD notes that some trees and hedges are part of the historic environment in Para 2.6. Protection of hedges and woodlands is underlined in Para 2.12.1 'Habitat and vegetation'. Plan:MK policy NE3 requires protection and enhancement of biodiversity in new development. Fig 4.1 shows existing hedge (to be retained where possible) and principal hedge with ecological value (0should be retained where possible).
9	1, 210	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Natural corridors should be provided wherever possible, allowing wildlife to move around freely and safely.	Para 3.3.10 underlines that the development should benefit from a network of accessible green routes where green infrastructure should encourage biodiversity gains, protect existing habitats, and enhance existing assets as part of the overall network. Plan:MK policy NE3 requires protection and enhancement of biodiversity in new development.

10	2, 3, 5, 16, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 88, 103, 110, 119, 123, 168, 170, 192, 193, 222, 1234, 1245, 1250, 1309, 1343, 1357, 1433, 1358, 1359, 1378	General comment	The proposed development will have an impact on the environment. Respondents mentioned traffic and/or noise, pollution. Concerns raised over the need of appropriate mitigation measures. Suggested measures included a continuous woodland walkway from West to East with meadow pathways for pollinators.	In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option. There are a number of policies within the Plan:MK that set principles for a new development and consider nature conservation are Policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5 and NE6. Policy EH6 of the Plan:MK requires applicants to mitigate against potentially significant health impacts. Policy EH6 requires 'all use class C2 developments and use class C3 residential development in excess of 50 dwellings (...) to prepare Health Impact Assessment'. Milton Keynes Council has recently adopted Health Impact Assessment SPD which provides technical guidance and support to the implementation of Policy EH6.
11	2, 10, 15, 45, 148, 149, 168, 216, 201, 1250, 234-238	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The SPD does not propose adequate buffer zones for the residents of Wavendon. It is mentioned by some respondents that the southern buffer is as low as 5m on the southern side. By contrast, Woburn Sands has been allocated a new park in the buffer which extends up to 100m. Some respondents want Wavendon's green buffer to be extended to match those of other settlements. Some mentioned that this goes against planning principles to protect other Mk villages.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. The Wavendon buffer had been widened to around 100m. The planned width would allow in principle to provide additional playing pitch if needed. Any proposed woodland loss must be supported with a full ecological and tree survey along with a description regarding impact on the landscape character. The SPD highlights that developers should undertake aboricultural and ecological surveys to inform a landscape masterplan which should be submitted with their outline planning application.
12	2, 31, 32	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondents noted that the proposed ROW network is not sufficient. Some noted that e 'walk out' options for existing residents to access open countryside. Some noted need for more redways.	The SPD had been revised and includes additional routes.

13	2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 33, 34, 90, 102, 117, 120, 131, 149, 151, 168, 180, 192, 193, 211, 1245, 201, 1250, 221, 234-238, 1343, 1357, 1299, 1261, 1260, 1356, 1366, 169	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	<p>Respondents stated that the Wavendon location should not be proceeded with and other areas are more suitable to building. Some noted that the site should be located in the development fringes away from the existing properties and recreational grounds. It was noted that the site is not flat and hence not suitable as a G&T site. Wavendon lacks many of the services required by the residents: health, education, schools, shops. The document recommends that the site should be close to sites allocated for business purposes. The other proposed sites would be much more suitable for this. The proposed site will be contained within a large residential area and not in rural or semi-rural location on the edge of a development area. The proposed size of the pony paddock is far too small, only 0.1 hectares. This goes against recommendations made by the British Horse Society. This could result in ponies being allowed to roam outside of the allocated area including the recreation ground. The site at Wavendon is on relatively high ground and will be highly visible, particularly from The Greensand Ridge, contradicting section 2.5.4 of the SUE Frameworks Document. Locating the G&T site in such a position would not respect the character of the village, contrary to section 2.12.1. Other noted that the site is waterlogged, there is a gas pipeline crossing and there is a valuable hedgerow, ROWs and the site could impact on views from the ROWs. It was stated by some that the site has poor access. Gas pipeline was mentioned. The need to deliver to site early on would require extensive infrastructure upfront which is unlikely favourable by developers. Some suggest a site near Bow Brickhill would be more appropriate due to better topography, business links, connectivity, proximity to housing, opportunities for effective screening. Some refer to principles from Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites Good Practice Guide and Planning policy for Traveller sites.</p>	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
----	---	---------------------------------	--	---

14	2, 54, 1261	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>Respondents noted that H10 extension should be developed in a more southerly direction as it crosses Phoebe Lane and following a curve, bridging the railway line and on to the Brickhill / Woburn Sands road. The road projection to cross the Newport Road should be abandoned and the current footpaths and walks developed for people and animal access. A421 should be fully duelled between Junction 13 of the M1 and the outskirts of Far Bletchley. SEMK Plan could use a revised H10 extension to service the new development and provide a buffer zone for Wavendon that is in keeping with other villages in the MK area.</p>	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to bypass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport.</p>
15	3	4.4 Land Use	<p>Respondents' questions what consideration will be given to parking in Greensand View Parklands for people wanting to access the new green spaces.</p>	<p>The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
16	3	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The plans suggests that the whole lake would be incorporated into the new green space. How the public use and fishing use will be managed to ensure they do not interfere each other.</p>	<p>The lake will form part of the wider multi-functional green buffer.</p>
17	3, 29, 40, 97, 1298	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	<p>The pandemic has seen an increase in the use of open countryside (examples given such as the Wavendon Woods and Bow Brickhill area). Some noted that increase visit to the Woods had a negative impact on local residents. Some questioned what consideration will be given to parking requirements. Issues highlighted with the existing parking provision and littering and need for securing s1.06 money to support future facilities need and parking matters (consultation should happen with Bedford Estates, Greensand Trust, Central Beds Council who own/manage woodlands - Browns Wood and Wavendon)</p>	<p>Noted. The Open Space network was amended, green buffers increased.</p>

18	3	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent suggests that area off Newport Road near to Frosts Garden Centre and along railway line should be a green-space for access into Woburn Sands by foot or bicycle only.	The SPD has multi-functional green buffer planned running along the railway line and extending into the edge of development close to Woburn Sands.
19	4, 5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 98, 101, 104, 106, 116, 118, 121, 126, 139-141, 143, 160, 161, 170, 199, 204, 206, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1335, 1084, 1085, 1399, 1377, 1413-1420	General comment	The principles applied elsewhere in MK should be applied to the SEMK development. This should consider density of housing, green open space, freedom of movement and life in safe, pleasant environment.	The SPD was prepared with the consideration of policies within Plan:MK and considers those matters.
20	4, 5, 14, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 81, 82, 91, 97, 98, 104, 106, 116, 118, 121, 126, 139-141, 143, 160, 170, 171, 182, 192, 193, 199, 204, 1246, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1256, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1323, 1322, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1296, 1084, 1085, 1276, 1377, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondents suggest that H10 should be extended eastwards to Newport Road (and then beyond to the A421/M1 J13) to provide provides free movement of traffic from the South East corner of MK and give relief along the A421. Most noted it should be a full grid road. Some respondents noted that this should not use existing access from Church Farm as this splits Byrd Crescent in two and has 'at grade' crossings. Some reference made to CBC's long term plans for 3000 homes north of Aspley Guise and possibility of that development being serviced through A421 but with new roundabouts it will increase delays for MK residents wishing to join M1 J13 therefore the land north of Aspley Guise should be protected. A respondent noted extension of H10 eastwards will provide access from the south of SEMK into CMK. but it will not facilitate residents from south of the rail line travelling to M1 J13.	The SPD cannot provide details of the land use for areas outside the red line of the allocation. The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network.
21	4,5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 98, 104, 106, 116, 118, 121, 126, 139-141, 143, 160, 170, 182, 199, 204, 1246, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1335, 1084, 1085, 1377, 1413-1420, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network/V11	V11 must be extended South, through the reserved corridor. Crossings at Holst Crescent and Morley Crescent must be grade separated. Without this, traffic is forced across to the A5 or V10, which faces the threat of closure at Bow Brickhill level crossing, instead of a recognition that it must remain open.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

22	4,5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 106, 116, 118, 121, 139,-141, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332,1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network/V10	Despite the V10 not being in SEMK, the impact from SEMK will be contra to Plan:MK Policy CT2 B. The proposed Woodley's Road must have a left turn to Woburn Sands, as there is no justification for building a compromised road connection.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan: MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
23	4,5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139 -141, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1252, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332,1337, 1338, 1320, 1335, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network	Grid roads provide more routing options, faster emergency service access, and give future proofing. (Plan:MK Policies CT1, A3 & A4 apply here and define the specification for a grid road, including grade separation, width, noise mitigation, etc.).	Noted. No amendments required.
24	4,5,7,14, 17, 23, 24, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 40, 41, 43, 51, 60, 62, 64, 65, 72, 73, 75, 76, 79, 83, 89, 90, 91, 92, 98, 100, 103, 104, 106, 107, 110, 112, 115, 117, 121, 127, 139,-141, 143, 144, 146, 148, 155, 160, 170, 171, 181, 182, 164, 199, 204, 207, 211, 1233, 1239, 1246, 223, 225, 233, 1263, 1267, 1269, 1270, 1289, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1288, 1332,1337, 1338, 1320, 1335, 1370, 1376, 1384, 1084, 1085, 1434, 1399, 1258, 1397, 1260, 1385, 1392, 1393, 1365, 1386, 1413-1420	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/health	Respondents raised concerns over current status of health services and or general need for health infrastructure (comments on inadequate provision and oversubscription of GP practices (e.g., Asplands Medical) dental surgeries and need for hospital). Most of those noted that appropriate provision of healthcare should be provided based on the projected population growth and needs underlined by NHS. Some commented on increased demand on existing services generally following prior development.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.

25	4,5,7,14, 24, 24, 25, 31, 32, 40, 41, 43, 51, 62, 76, 79, 89, 90, 91, 98, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 112, 121, 141, 143, 144, 160, 170, 182, 164, 199, 204, 206, 1246, 223, 233, 1263, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332,1337, 1338, 1341, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1434, 1399,1365, 1413-1420	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	Respondents noted the need for appropriate school provision. Most noted that Primary and secondary schools should be built well ahead of housing completions and their occupation. Shortage of school places within the site would cause additional traffic and oversubscription of the existing schools. Some respondents also added the need for nursey and toddler facilities. It was noted that local schools are often filled with children from across the borders. Early years provision should be met on site.	SPD addresses the needs in accordance with Policy SD11
26	4,5,14, 17, 23, 24, 25, 31, 41, 43, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 108, 121, 141, 143, 157, 160, 170, 198, 199, 204, 206, 1246, 223, 233, 1263, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1295, 1320, 1335, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	Retail and community facilities should be provided within SEMK as houses get build. Some respondents noted additionally that the existing provision within Woburn Town Centre is inadequate to address the needs of the SEMK residents.	Phasing chapter was amended. An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established.
27	4, 5, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 41, 50, 51, 62, 75, 76, 77, 83, 91, 100, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 115, 121, 141, 143, 160, 170, 177, 178, 199, 204, 1246, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1281, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1258, 1394, 1365, 1366, 1413-1420, 1404-1406	4.5.2 Density	The higher densities planned are out of keeping and uncharacteristic for the neighbouring areas. Some stated that planned densities particularly on the boundaries, should be comparable with the densities of the existing adjacent settlements. Some noted that buildings of more than 2 storeys should be avoided. Some stated that there should be clear density limit in the SPD.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

28	4,5, 24, 25, 29, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 121, 126, 140, 141, 143, 146, 160, 170, 182, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1377, 1413-1420	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	The development site will affect the tributaries to Caldecotte Brook and the adjacent flood risk areas comprising Old Farm Park, Browns Wood, Tilbrook and Caldecotte. Some noted existing drainage issues on Webber Heath.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.
29	4,5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 77, 91, 104, 106, 121, 126, 140, 141, 143, 146, 160, 170, 182,204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1377, 1413-1420	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Concerns raised over Caldecotte Brook drainage capacity (reference made to previous overflow issues and flood damages caused due to drainage overload where terminus at Wadesmill Lane and appropriate interventions by The Parks Trust resolved the issue.) Designed of culverted section of Caldecote Lake deemed to be inadequate - there is a need to learn lessons from this. Other mentioned capacity issues at caldecotte lake and need for studies of capacity to be undertaken prior further development.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.
30	5, 41, 54, 120, 122, 160, 183, 220, 1343, 1357, 1433	General comment	Respondent raised concerns over developments around Woburn sands and or Wavendon that are causing construction traffic. It was noted by some that Woburn Sands is a destination for people to enjoy/ live in an open countryside. The ROW network and associated open spaces will be lost for future generations.	The Open Space network was amended to add additional leisure routes and buffers.
31	5, 24, 31, 41, 51, 62, 72, 76, 77, 80, 91, 98, 101, 102, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 126, 133, 139,-141, 143, 144, 146, 160, 170, 171, 199, 204, 1246, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1281, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1396, 1084, 1085, 1260, 1413-1420	4.5.2 Density	Higher densities could result in decreasing the level of green amenities/open spaces amenities. Some gave Ref to overall density of 30 dph should be reinstated in the SPD (as it was mentioned during Cabinet Advisory Group (CAG) meeting). Higher density areas with surrounding open spaces are not desirable. Some mentioned that SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site, with lower densities towards the edges of existing developments. In Plan:MK Policy HN1 section C it sets out "Net densities of proposals for 11 or more new dwellings should balance making efficient use of land with respecting the surrounding character and context." The SPD proposal to allow a density of up to 50 dph on the southern side of the railway adjacent to the 30 dph of the existing settlements on the northern side of the railway in Old Farm Park is totally at odds with this policy. Some noted the physical, mental and environmental benefits of access to green space.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

32	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 80, 91, 98, 101, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 126, 140, 141, 143, 144, 146, 160, 170, 171, 182, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1335, 1084, 1085, 1399, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network	<p>There is no evidence base to support any of the movement frameworks in the SEMK SPD. Without new evidence Milton Keynes policies must apply as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proper linkage of SEMK to MK and for it to be a sound urban extension. • The requirement for new developments to be self-sustaining and not devastate the adjacent areas. • Adherence to policies for grid roads, redways, grade separation, sound and pollution buffering etc. 	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p>
----	---	----------------------	--	--

33	5, 24, 36, 41, 43, 47, 48, 51, 62, 76, 80, 91, 99, 100, 106, 109, 112, 116, 118, 121, 126, 127, 131, 134, 139, 141, 143, 155, 160, 170, 192, 193, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1224. 1250, 1267, 1270, 1293, 1304, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1260, 1342, 1365, 1366, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	<p>Concerns raised over unknowns in regards to EWR project (reference made to long term delivery of the project and the main consideration being the train services not needs of MK residents) and the need to undertake strategic transport study. Some stated that there is no strategic transport study for the site. MK South group suggested that the study includes: should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEMK development and impact of and on four adjacent parishes plus Aspley Guise, Ashland & Simpson, Bletchley, Eaton Leys and so on. • Church Farm (SLA4). • A421 Development (SLA1, 2 and 3). • East West Expressway. • East West Rail. • South Caldecotte. • South Bletchley developments. • Mid Beds plans for the area near M1 junction 13 (circa 8,000 houses). • Bow Brickhill, Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise level crossings. • Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands stations. <p>In the absence of a study, provision must be made in the SPD to accommodate multiple solutions. Some stated that the SEMK is to be delayed since no finalisation of agreed alignment of routes and impact of new development (SLA's) took place and infrastructure needs have not been assessed yet.</p>	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
34	5, 14, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 80, 91, 106, 116, 121, 126, 131, 139, 141, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 192, 193, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 221, 1309, 1311, 1310, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1261, 1386, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network/ Expressway	<p>concerns raised over Oxford Cambridge Expressway proposal and its impact on SEMK. One resident suggested MKC should, with local MPs, argue that if the Expressway is 'unpaused,' traffic should be diverted along a fully dualled A421, rather than permit an expressway.</p>	The expressway was cancelled on 18.03.2021.
35	5, 24, 36, 41, 51, 62, 75, 76, 80, 91, 104, 106, 112, 121, 126, 139, 141, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network	The SPD should consider change of patterns cause by the pandemic.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

36	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 80, 91, 97, 101, 106, 112, 116, 121, 139-141, 143, 144, 160, 170, 182, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network	Financial viability should not be the matter for consideration in choosing the movement network. Lack of appropriate links in the form of bridges would have an impact on communities, healthcare access and education access.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and has been used to inform the development framework. Various scenarios have been modelled with different bridge crossings. As part of future Planning Applications, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the council's transport model and, where necessary, include additional local traffic data collection
37	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 72, 73, 76, 77, 91, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139- 141, 143, 146, 160, 170, 199, 204, 206, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network	Respondents expect a continuation of the grid roads as it is acknowledged in Plan:MK Policies CT2, A1, A2 & A3 and CT8 A, C & D as well as the Milton Keynes Transport Vision and Strategy LTP3 2011 to 2031. The SPD should explicitly require grid road extensions. Some noted that they would connect SEMK to Bow Brickhill	The detailed design of highways interventions, including any landscaping proposals, will be prepared, and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. The SPD provides details in regards to which roads will be of grid road standard.
38	5, 24, 25, 41, 51, 62, 76, 77, 91, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 140, 141, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 1246, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.3 Movement Network	All road crossings must be grade separated. That is, use underpasses and not zebra or traffic light crossings. Example of areas near Central MK near The Hub and Countess Way in Broughton that 'at grade 'crossings increase risk of serious or fatal accidents. Ref made to Plan:MK Policies CT1 A5, CT2 A4 & A6, CT3 A1 & A3.	The detailed design of highways interventions, including any landscaping proposals, crossings will be prepared and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. The SPD provides details in regards to which roads will be of grid road standard. Please refer to SPD for location off grid road corridors and extensions.
39	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139-141, 143, 144, 146, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The green infrastructure plans should be delivered as described in the 'Open Space' section in 3.4 and 4.2.16 – 4.2.19 of the SPD. Section 4.2.3 & 4.2.24 concerning open space areas for play including minimum size, serving 600 metre catchment areas, separation buffer and checks for conflict with other green infrastructure functions should be adhered to and be detailed on future masterplans, so that these are visible and resonate to future infill.	Multi-functional green infrastructure reserves are planned in the SPD along each side of grid road carriageway (Para 4.2.3). Linear parks network is planned to be extended as per Landscape and Open Space Strategy in the SPD.

40	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139-141, 143, 144, 146, 160, 170, 182, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Section 4.2.25 which references provision of 'Individual Neighbourhoods' should be properly considered and serve the need for multi-use games facilities. Appropriate stakeholder engagement should be considered. Allotments and Sports provisions (sections 4.2.26 and 4.2.28) are vital to build a community and should be detailed on masterplans along with the area of the allocated space to ensure accuracy and provision.	Para 4.2.25 addresses the need to provide a choice of experience and need for wider stakeholder engagement when drawing proposals for Neighbourhood Play Areas.
41	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 118, 121, 139- 141, 143, 146, 160,170, 182, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/community facilities	The Focal Point Civic space should be allocated and detailed on the masterplan and should be accessible to shops, schools, health, other local services and community facilities. The Community Hub should include retail and other facilities to meet local basic needs and should provide sufficient space and parking for a mix of uses.	2 local centers are provided. The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.
42	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139- 14, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.4 Land Use	Section 4.4.18 suggests a potential relocation of the Woburn Sands station. For the avoidance of further uncertainty in the master plan, this should be either confirmed, and if not, other measure be put in place	The SPD was amended and includes primary and reserve movement network.
43	5, 24, 41, 47, 51, 62, 76, 83, 91, 92, 100, 104, 106, 116, 118, 121, 126, 134, 139-141, 143, 144, 146, 160, 170,199, 204, 1238, 223, 233, 1267, 226, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	A specific strategy should be created and implemented to obtain developer contributions towards the necessary infrastructure and facilities mentioned.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.

44	5, 25, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 116, 118, 121, 139-141, 143, 144, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1281, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.5.2 Character and Density	Policy HN1 section C further states “Higher density development will be encouraged in locations with good accessibility to facilities, that are well served by public transport, and where it can be accommodated by existing or improved infrastructure”. SEMK will not be served with accessible facilities initially. With DRT replacing the non-commercially viable bus services, MRT not yet being available, public transport is inadequate. Having a railway station is not the answer in isolation. Section “7. Homes and Neighbourhoods” sub-section 7.9 states “Where higher densities of housing would support the establishment of improved public transport services, for example mass transit corridors, this will be encouraged, provided the quality of development is in line with the requirements of other policies within this plan and infrastructure can support greater concentrations of households in the area.” As mass transit corridors have not yet been established, this cannot be used to justify higher density housing.	Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
45	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 118, 121, 139-141, 143, 144, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Reference made to issues with Caldecotte Brook during development of Walnut Tree and Walton Park settlements. Diversion of brook from natural course to an underground course running under houses and into Caldecotte Balancing Lake. Inlet pipes are believed to be not wide enough to deal with the fast-moving detritus that accompanies high water flow during heavy rain. The inlet is protected with a steel grid that can block under the certain conditions. Such mistakes should be avoided.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.
46	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139-141, 143, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Independent hydrological study of Caldecotte Brook should be undertaken (details of what should it intel where provided and options for funding it via s106).	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.

47	5, 24, 41, 51, 62, 76, 91, 104, 106, 112, 116, 118, 121, 139- 141, 143, 144, 160, 170, 199, 204, 223, 233, 1267, 1270, 1309, 1310, 1311, 1312, 1313, 1314, 1319, 1321, 1322, 1323, 1324, 1325, 1330, 1331, 1332, 1337, 1338, 1340, 1320, 1084, 1085, 1413-1420	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Consideration should be given to appropriate SUDS features (examples were provided and ref made to Bedfordshire Internal Drainage Board and Anglian Water as specialist in the field). Concerns over erosion due to flooding was raised (issues reported already on that matter by residents in Ireland Close, behind Berwald Close in Browns Wood and Bourton Low in Walnut Tree). Need for appropriate hydrological and drainage plans was noted. Some noted climate change should be considered.	Para 3.3.10 notes that SuDS should be integrated effectively into the open space and green infrastructure network to assist in on site water management and to protect against surface water flooding. Wider concept plan (Fig 3.1) identified indicative strategic SuDS locations and Fig 4.8. All proposals will be required to consider Policy FR2 of Plan:MK. Need for SuDS is underlined in Para 4.6.8
----	--	--	---	---

Reference is made to a water pumping station on Bow Brickhill Road as shown on the utilities plan provided. Woburn Sands site in Anglian Water's ownership includes both a water booster (WB) and a water reservoir (WR) and it site should be referenced as such in the Development Framework. Woburn Sands receives water from Ampthill reservoir through a 24" main. Water is taken from the two reservoirs and pumped to the Milton Keynes area and Brickhill Copse reservoir. Three pumps numbered 1, 3 and 5 pumps to Milton Keynes via an 800mm main whilst the five others pump to Brickhill Copse through a 24" distribution main. The Brickhill Copse pumps also feed into Woburn Sands directly. "The site at Woburn Sands has two compartment reservoirs as follows: compartment 1 having a capacity of 4546 cubic metres and compartment 2, 5683 cubic metres. As such the Woburn Sands WB/WR site is critical to enabling Anglian Water to carry out its duties as a water undertaker. As such we would ask that the Development Framework clearly sets out significance of this water supply infrastructure and the infrastructure located on site should be considered as part of the development of the South East Milton Keynes to ensure its continuous use is not prejudiced by the neighbouring development. Matters of noise from existing diesel generator and pumps should be considered in the layout of the proposed development and need to consider any further water supply infrastructure which is provided on site by Anglian Water as part of future investment to enable the supply of water to our existing and future customers. Reference is made to provide an easement width of 6m for existing water main located within the boundary of the site. However, there is also a 12-inch water main which crosses the site which is not shown on the plan provided and this is to be amended (plan provided). In line with n Policy FR1 of the MK Plan to access is to be safeguarded to these water supply assets for maintenance purposes. Developers can apply to Anglian Water to divert existing water mains at their expense where needed to enable the development. For clarity it would be helpful to be clear whether the 6m distance is meant to be either side of the water main and refer to the process for applying to Anglian Water for diversions where needed.

Noted. Text reviewed to add clarity.

49	6	General comment on terminology	There are a number of references to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), but the terminology varies throughout the document. Anglian Water fully supports the incorporation of SuDs to addresses the risk of surface water and sewer flooding and which have wider benefits including water quality. Para 163 of the NPPF uses the term 'sustainable drainage systems' which has replaced the term Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. It is suggested that the Development Framework should be amended for consistency with the NPPF and refer to this term.	Text amended.
50	6	4.6 Sustainability	Reference is made to development proposals complying with the requirements in respect of water use as set out in Policy SC1 of the adopted MK Plan. However, there is no further explanation of what information should be provided as part of any planning application or how this should feature as part of the design of the South East Milton Keynes. We would expect development proposals to demonstrate they have met or improved upon the water efficiency standard for residential development (110 litres/per person/per day). As well as demonstrating how water re-use measures namely water reuse and recycling and rainwater harvesting have been maximised as part of the development.	This is not a matter for the SPD. Local List of validation requirements provides details on what an application should consider.
51	6	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Respondent supports the incorporation of SuDS to addresses the risk of surface water and sewer flooding and which have wider benefits including water quality. However, we would suggest that consideration be given to how to incorporate both SUDs and water re-use measures as part of an integrated approach to water management and this should be referenced in the Development Framework.	Policy SC1 of Plan:MK addresses the need to incorporate re-use and recycle of water and also rainwater harvesting into developments where possible to reduce demand on mains water supply, subject to viability. Proposals in SEMK will be expected to comply with this policy and maximise the use of the above measures subject to the outcome of the viability assessment.
52	6	Fig 4.10	The easement for the water main and 12-inch water main is not shown on this plan. Similarly, there is no reference made to water re-use measures and the extent to which these could be integrated with SuDS on site. [Anglian Water provided a map of water supply assets]	Plans were updated.

53	7, 17, 36, 43, 54, 61, 73, 84, 86, 90, 96, 102, 105, 167, 165, 192, 193, 1237, 1238, 1240, 201, 1297, 1288, 1260	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondents raised concerns over impact of the housing development together with the proposals from Network Rail. General concerns over access and unity of the site. Main concerns raised were around need not to move the railway station from its current position and its Victorian origins, closing of the level crossing resulting in no access to the High Street from Newport Road and dividing the community, cause a detrimental effect on the town, its residents and woodland area. Many noted lacks pedestrian access across the rail line. Some said that we must ensure fair access for all residents/business and a short journey in either direction along Newport or Station Roads shouldn't be made extensive and prolonged.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. IT is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings.
54	7, 43, 61, 83, 84, 85, 86,96, 97, 100, 109, 115, 143, 187, 188, 190, 195	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Concerns raised over lack of strategic road transport study and clarity over who will fund the infrastructure needed to cross the rail line (bridges, crossings).	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
55	7, 61, 84, 86, 90, 96, 165, 1297	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent prefers for the level crossings to be closed for longer period of times rather than not having them at all since his will have negative economic impact on Woburn Sands High street, increased traffic, and pollution. Some respondents note that Woburn Sands High Street should be protected	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings.
56	7, 15, 17, 36, 43, 61, 64, 84, 86, 96, 115, 180, 165, 195, 1245, 224, 1299, 1261, 1260, 1379	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent stated that proposed H10 extension to the Newport Road as part of the grid road network will potentially increase the traffic on the Newport Road. Some noted that this road should be a B grade road only, as is the Newport Road itself. It will also add further pollution to nearby residents and potentially require demolition of some properties. Some were concerned the H10 extension would increase traffic noise in the area and increase traffic in Woburn Sands/Wavendon generally, affecting the 'village way of life'. A respondent requested that it has a speed limit of 30/40mph with thick buffers, natural hedgerows giving wildlife corridors and cycle ways which will dampen the inevitable traffic noise.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

56	7, 61, 84, 85, 86, 96, 179, 195, 224, 1268, 1277, 1288, 1335, 1400, 1397, 1394, 1399	4.3 Movement Network	Part of the road plan - to create a by-pass from Newport Road just north of the new development adjacent to Frosts, past the fishing lakes to Bow Brickhill Road – is totally unacceptable. Traffic would enter Woburn Sands via Bow Brickhill Road. The alternative plan that the by-pass would bridge over Bow Brickhill Road through the allotments and Edgewick Farm at the corner of The Leys and Hardwick Road is totally unacceptable. Hardwick Road and The Leys form part of the heritage of town and already suffer from excess traffic. Theydon Avenue noted to be ‘rat run’ and not feasible and suffers from inadequate traffic calming measures implemented when the Parklands estate was developed. Edgewick farm health and well-being benefits were highlighted, and it was noted that this area should remain undeveloped to prevent increase in pollution (as it's against climate theories and Woburn Sands is already limited on green space per capita). Some mention the increase in traffic poses risks to pedestrians, cyclists, and school children. Some added that Woburn Sands would cease to exist, and the high street will be cut-off from the other side of Newport Road.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.
57	7,17, 36, 43, 61, 64, 75, 84, 86, 92, 96, 115, 187, 188, 190, 224, 1315, 1288, 1397, 1399, 1365	4.3 Movement Network/V10	Proposals to extend the grid road system through the new estate linking it to the Bow Brickhill Road will effectively make this country road into an H11 which is extremely unacceptable. Some noted that the proposed grid road extension, Woodleys Road along the eastern side adjacent to the buffer zone will destroy the natural green buffer and/or potentially substantially increase traffic entering Woburn Sands into the Leys, Hardwick Road or Theydon Avenue.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
58	7, 1264, 1338, 1395, 1396	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The green buffers should be bigger, and number of homes reduced. Large Country Park should be created.	The site is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes as per policy SD11 in Plan:MK. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.

59	8,	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports extending the grid roads to the northern boundaries of the proposed development, each with a new end roundabout, but not within the boundaries of the proposed development. All roads within the boundaries of the proposed development must be 'Grade B' roads. Definitely NO grid roads within the boundaries of the proposed development. Both the Bow Brickhill Road and Newport Road leading to Woburn Sands are 'Grade B' roads suitable for local traffic. As stated in Sub-section 3.1.6, the impact of SEMK on these two roads and Woburn Sands should be (must be) minimised	The detailed design of highways interventions, including any landscaping proposals, crossings will be prepared and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. The SPD provides details in regards to which roads will be of grid road standard. Please refer to SPD for location off grid road corridors and extensions.
60	8	4.3 Movement Network/V11	To extend V11 south to the north boundary with a bridge over the railway and with a new end roundabout immediately south of the bridge that will be the end point of the V11 grid road.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
61	8	4.3 Movement Network/H10	To extend the H10 East to the North-East corner of the proposed development with a new end roundabout that will be the end point of the H10 grid road.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

62	8, 1303	4.3 Movement Network/V10	The existing V10 to extend to the South-West corner of the proposed development with a new roundabout that will be the end point of the V10 grid road. Some respondents would like the e V10 to be extended all the way to the A5 at Kelly's Kitchen roundabout.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
63	9	4.5.2 Density	All development should be south of the proposed H10 extension and away from Wavendon.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
64	9, 10, 1254, 1293, 1297, 1331, 1333, 1336, 1371, 1384, 1261, 1378	4.3 Movement Network	Concerns raised over future traffic on Walton Road which is currently used as a rat run. Some also had concerns that the village of Woburn Sands including Theydon Ave would also become a rat run for M1 traffic. Some noted that Kingston Roundabout and beyond have been creating traffic chaos on the eastern side of the city. The delays have been frustrating on all roads heading eastward and drivers looking for ways to "get round" the problem have been using the Walton Road. At peak times there is a constant stream of traffic along an unsuitable village street. Whilst I appreciate this will reduce once the roadworks has been completed there are always some, who will continue to use it as a short cut. The wholesale development of SEMK will create huge traffic problems, and what we see today as a result of roadworks, will quickly become "the norm" and a further "nail in the coffin" of Wavendon Village as a sustainable and attractive village settlement. Some suggested creating a traffic plan.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
65	9, 10, 14, 103, 112, 147, 1250	4.3 Movement Network/Expressway	Respondent raised concerns over the impact of expressway on the SEMK site. Some stated that it has not been fully decided and it will not until 2025/30	The expressway was cancelled on 18.03.2021.

66	11, 12	4.3 Movement Network/V10	Respondents stated that the SPD should not be approved since it has no grid road extensions and over bridge, there could be long queue, noise at Bow Brickhill level crossing. Increase of Traffic and noise will impact Caldecotte residents.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
67	13	6. Next Steps	Respondent noted that based on p.27 Mass Rapid Transit (MRT) route appears to be heading out towards J13 which would, potentially cross the Parish of Aspley Guise and requested more details of those plans. Respondent noted that Aspley Guise PC are considering the Milton Keynes to Bedford canal and details on MRT was requested. Respondent queried what would the highways interventions cited on page 41 entail.	The detail highway interventions will be reviewed at planning application stage. Matters of MRT have to be considered outside of this consultation since they are not matters for the SPD to consider.
68	13	4.3 Movement Network/H10	H10 - Bow Brickhill Road - increase of likelihood of traffic approaching Aspley Guise. Respondent notes proposed connection of the Bow Brickhill Road to the new H10 extension which will be expected to increased traffic routing way en-route to J13, which would lead the traffic through the village of Aspley Guise, the proposed "Highway Intervention" for limiting wider through movement notwithstanding.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
69	14	4.3 Movement Network	All presented scenarios allow for ingress/egress in North/west direction	Noted. No changes required.
70	14, 79, 164, 200, 1235, 201, 1268, 1276, 1378	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent notes that there are extensive "possible future expansions" between the railway and the M1. The movement network concept for SEMK should consider additional traffic on the A421 and potential "rat runs" through residential areas and country lanes. These include, but sure not limited to, Theydon Avenue, The Leys, Hardwick Road and Walton Road.	The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
71	14	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports movement network with 3 bridges.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.

72	14	4.3 Movement Network	The proposed “highway intervention” at the junction of Bow Brickhill Road and Woodleys Road would block access to Woburn Sands from the West	The detailed design of highways interventions will be prepared and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site
73	14	4.3 Movement Network/H10	The existing H10 grid road is incorrectly shown on figures 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4. The current grid road stops at the roundabout joining Britten Grove and Gregories Drive. Many primary school children from Old Farm Park attend Wavendon Gate School and will have to cross the proposed extension to the H10 grid road at Byrd Crescent. There is no consideration about how these children are supposed to cross a high-speed road. A pedestrian/cycling redway underpass is essential.	The SPD drawings were amended following consultation.
73	14	4.3 Movement Network/H10	It is unclear if Britten Grove and Gregories Drive will still connect to the H10 or if Wavendon Gate and Old Farm Park will remain connected for vehicles. Impact on traffic flows within these residential areas could be significant.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
74	14, 26, 43, 47, 56, 72, 91,110, 113, 1330, 1299, 1360	4.5.2 Density	Respondent suggests that there should not be an area of maximum density and overall low density should be maintained as per surrounding area. Many noted lower density should be required for all housing adjacent to the existing settlements of Woburn Sands, Wavendon, and Bow Brickhill. Since the eastern half of SEMK is in the parish of Woburn Sands it is particularly important that the density and balance of housing in this area are compatible with the existing provision in the parish. Respondents also noted that lower density would give more provision of green space.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

75	14, 214, 215, 1242, 1269, 1271, 1272, 1279, 1284, 1294, 1326, 1295, 1335, 1380, 1387	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Transport links and bridges are completed before housing development starts. Some respondents said grid roads to should be built before development, this should include proper road connections to M1 and other main routes to prevent journeys cutting through existing established villages. Some respondents note that the Bletchley/Bedford railway running through the villages makes planning (infrastructure before expansion) anything but straightforward. Other respondents state that the MRT should also be on place before expansion starts. Some respondents believe that building the wrong movement network and the infrastructure to support it will destroy the quality of life for residents old and new. No infrastructure - no houses!	The updated SPD contains update on phasing and need for early delivery of the infrastructure.
76	14	6. Next Steps	Existing ROWs to be passable during construction phase.	ROW and possible diversions will be considered at planning application stage.
77	15	General comment	Respondent is against the development happening on greenfield site and notes various species that can be observed in the areas. General wellbeing and health benefits are listed.	Matters of biodiversity of the site will be reviewed in detail at planning application stage.
78	15, 16, 179, 1261	4.3 Movement Network/H10	H10 should not become a backdoor to Expressway or a rat run for lorries heading to and from the M1. Some noted it would become a southern bypass and separate the communities into 2. Others noted that a bypass will not solve the traffic problem	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. The expressway was cancelled on 18/03/2021 by the government.

79	15, 17, 21, 30, 36, 37, 47, 48, 64, 90, 92, 107, 108, 111, 131, 149, 192, 193, 195, 1230, 1231, 1239, 1249, 1251, 1316, 1379, 1393, 1374, 1366	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The area around to the west of Woburn Sands should be turned into a country park. Some stated it should include the fishing lake. Comments were made around protecting the orchards. the buffer zone immediately to the west of Woburn Sands, which includes the fishing lakes, should become the Woburn Sands Country Park accessible to residents of both “old” and “new” Woburn Sands. This was originally put forward in 2000 as a Millennium Funding Bid but did not proceed due to lack of funds. Some suggest the buffer should be a continuous leisure corridor and extend from Caldecott Brook and link to the Wavendon Park on the old golf course. Comments suggested that Parks Trust should manage the country park. Details on what the park could offer were provided.</p>	<p>The SPD highlights that the lake will form part of the wider multifunctional buffer. Para 4.2.10 states that the fishing lake should be made publicly available. Future management of the site will be considered in the future with the proposal that the Parks Trust takes offer of future management of the linear parks adding to the existing network.</p>
80	15, 16, 138, 192, 193, 1245, 1250, 234-238, 1299, 1261, 1352, 1260	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Respondents made recommendations around extending Wavendon buffer which included widening it by stretching it from the west boundary with Walton across Church Farm (currently no buffer there) up to Phoebe lane along the northern edge of SEMK and including the area east of the fields. Phoebe lane should be preserved as much as possible with measures such as protection of hedgerows. Some noted that Wavendon fields apartments require buffering along western and southern boundaries. Comments were made on what the Wavendon buffer which was welcomed but is lacking widening south of the existing recreation ground (should be at least 100m at its narrowest point, needs buffering from the H10; green buffers need to be adequate for the eventuality of H10 becoming a more major road. No protection for the west side of the village, including Church Farm (this is missing from the outline Church Farm plans). No provision for loss of country walks and wildlife habitat. Wavendon fields buffer should have views to the south, link country lane and bridleway heading towards caldecotte brook. The buffer would flow into green leisure route through adjacent fields to the 'Wavendon Park' Map provided how it should look. Changes would create buffers similar to other settlements buffers.</p>	<p>The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.</p>

81	16, 122, 168, 192, 193, 1230, 1231, 1250, 1260	4.3 Movement Network	Respondents suggests that the transport study of the impacts of the SEMK proposals on i.e., Newport Road, Walton Road, Lower End Road and Cranfield Road is completed, and appropriate measures are put in place to mitigate against increased traffic flows.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been traffic modelling undertaken (using the MKC Strategic Traffic Model: MKMMM) for the SE MK allocation as part of the evidence base to Plan MK, and subsequent to this to inform the development framework. Various scenarios have been modelled with different bridge crossings and the H10 being extended through to Newport Road or not. • This modelling, as well as other considerations such as multi modal connectivity, has informed the draft development framework for the site comprising two bridge crossings, with the preferred option now being a V10 crossing broadly in line with the existing level crossing, and a crossing to the eastern edge of the site (referred to as Woodleys Road in the framework). • As part of the SE MK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection.
82	17, 115,	General comment	The development should be green and emphasise pedestrian and cycle routes, linked into the grid road system to the north, and respects the integrity and identify of Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill, and Wavendon.	Noted. Additional open spaces and leisure routes were added.
83	17, 36, 43, 108, 111, 115, 188, 187, 190, 217, 1315, 1316, 1391, 1367	General comment	Respondents commented on the provision of the housing in the Swan Hill area north of Woburn Sands railway station. Some opposed to this development since it would result in the loss of the only green space separating this existing settlement to the north with the expansion of Milton Keynes.	Noted. Additional buffers provided in that area.
84	17, 138	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent suggested that additional linear green buffer is needed along the southern edge of the development to protect the hedgerow on the northern side of Bow Brickhill Road. Some suggest it should be expanded to 100m.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
85	17, 36, 43, 64, 92, 107, 108, 115, 1269, 1305	4.3 Movement Network/V11	Grid Roads should form access to, not through this development . Some stated that the extension of the V11 through the state and linking to Bow Brickhill Road, is equally unacceptable.	Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network.

86	17, 108, 224, 201, 1295	4.3 Movement Network	Speeds of traffic should be limited throughout to 30 mph for new developments. The proposals for roads supporting speeds between 40 to 60 mph are incompatible with the aims of sustainability. Some respondents specifically said Newport Rd should be 30 mph and mentioned confusion on the left-hand side as you approach Wavendon from Woburn Sands as there's an electric speed sign suggesting to keep to 30 mph when the speed limit is 40 mph for that area.	The SPD contains a table with design requirements which includes design speeds. The SPD cannot address speeds outside of the allocation boundary. See Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network
87	17, 168, 1283, 1315, 1338, 1295, 1397, 1360	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	The G&T site should be located in the extreme west of the site as close as possible to the proposed industrial site e.g. being developed south of Caldecotte. Some noted it should be in close proximity to Bow Brickhill rail station as it conforms more to principles set out in 4.4.6 and 4.4.7	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
88	17, 47, 64, 115, 1251	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	Respondent supports school provision within the site.	Noted.
89	17, 43, 64, 217, 1289, 1385, 1399, 1365	4.5.2 Density	SEMK is the southernmost estate in MK bordering on an area of outstanding natural beauty, the Greensand Ridge to the south and so it should reflect the rural nature of this southern edge of Milton Keynes by much lower densities of housing than those proposed. The size of this development is not sustainable or environmentally friendly to the surrounding areas, in particular Woburn Sands and the AONB. One respondent suggested that the overall housing allocation (3000) is too high, as in order to provide better green spaces the density needs to be increased to a point that is out of keeping with local character.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
90	18, 77, 94, 96, 102, 152, 1371, 1386	General comment	Respondent is against the development since it will negatively impact existing communities of Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill and Wavendon. Respondent questions the need for new homes in light of recent completions in other parts of MK.	Site is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes in line with Policy SD11 of Plan:MK and forms part of overall housing delivery.

91	18, 161, 201, 1262, 1256, 113	4.3 Movement Network	Respondents noted issues with current road infrastructure and capacity of roads noting issues in relation to M1 and A5.	Noted. There has been traffic modelling undertaken (using the MKC Strategic Traffic Model: MKMMM) for the SE MK allocation as part of the evidence base to Plan MK, and subsequent to this to inform the development framework. This modelling, as well as other considerations such as multi modal connectivity, has informed the draft development framework for the site comprising two bridge crossings, with the preferred option now being a V10 crossing broadly in line with the existing level crossing, and a crossing to the eastern edge of the site (referred to as Woodleys Road in the framework). As part of the SE MK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection.
91	18, 217, 1288, 1397, 1260, 1395	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondents note possible negative impact on Greensand Ridge area of AONB such as additional traffic, associated pollution, and habitat loss. Some note that views from edge of Wavendon village would be affected.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Future applications will assess any potential impact on the AONB.
91	18, 1239	General comment	Respondent made reference to MKC's Sustainability Strategy and the need to consider sustainable construction options.	Those will be considered through planning application and at building stage.
92	18, 217, 1328	General comment	Respondents noted the need for affordable housing including social rented properties to fulfil the local needs. One considered the proportion of affordable homes in SEMK should be higher. WCC added this could be via developers providing space for council housing (or MKC developing this space itself), by looking at supported self-build schemes, by working with partners to deliver truly affordable housing (not just 'knock 10% off market value' affordable, but actually affordable). Please ensure that levels of housing accessible to the many are maintained.	The Housing Mix will be reviewed at planning application stage.
93	18	General comment	Comments made in relation to sustainable development overall as part of national policy and role of certain organisations in the planning process. Statistics were provided on urban sprawl.	Those will be considered through planning application and at building stage.
94	19, 54, 61, 67, 84, 86, 96, 113, 143, 196, 217, 1263, 1276	General comment	Respondent stated that the work on SEMK SPD should be undertaken in coordination with EWR, to ensure the two projects are aligned. Some stated work should be paused on the SPD until the crossings are known and their funding.	The SPD was amended, and it provides primary and reserve movement options. MKC will continue to engage with EWR.

95	19, 47, 48, 137, 1239, 1263, 1304, 1311, 1316, 1370, 1384, 1399, 1391, 1367, 1365	General comment	Respondents stated that the consultation should be undertaken following lifting of Covid restrictions, or second consultation undertaken following the comments received. Some respondents found the consultation process inadequate or too soon given the amount of housing already being built.	Emergency regulations were imposed by the government allowing us to consult during pandemic. Online workshop events were hosted.
96	19, 20, 21, 81, 82, 160, 183, 1284, 1318, 1323, 1329, 1435, 1386	4.3 Movement Network	Any additional traffic from the site would cause more congestion and add to the existing issues around Aspley Guise, Aspley Hill and/or Woburn Sands in getting to M1. Some also stated that traffic on Station Road in Bow Brickhill will also increase and cause considerable congestion. Some ask that a northern route to the M1 be established. Some said this should not be considered an appropriate route to the M1.	As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection
97	19, 66, 171, 1395	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Respondent notes the need for various infrastructure such as: a high street shops, schools, a village hall, a library, a swimming pool (preferably a lido), a GP surgery, some parks, preferential cycle road junctions, etc. All these will be essential for a suitable quality of life for the residents.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for
97	19, 1263	6. Next Steps	Respondent questions what traffic management will be used within the site.	Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
97	19, 20, 21, 94, 110, 113, 116, 134, 160, 171, 174, 1246, 1332, 1274, 1260	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	The necessary infrastructure should be delivered first. Some respondents identified that this infrastructure should include schools, surgeries and reservoirs.	The updated SPD contains update on phasing and need for early delivery of the infrastructure.
97	19, 89, 107, 165, 187, 188, 190, 205, 1239, 1251, 1263, 1384, 1396, 1399, 1394	6. Next Steps	respondents noted the need for sustainable construction methods and a need for highest building standards. Some noted lack of details on the sustainability provisions in the future construction such as solar panels, grey water collection, lack of details on solutions to protect wildlife, energy efficiency of buildings. Some respondents noted that good quality materials that will last should be used too and the need to create low carbon neighbourhoods.	Those matters will be considered at planning application stage
98	22	General comment	Respondent noted that the forms were easy to fill in comparison to previous consultation.	Noted. No action required.

99	22, 225	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondents supports making the lake accessible subject to appropriate safety measures incorporated to ensure that lake does not become safe. Example of safety issues with Astral Lake Park in Leighton Buzzard were provided. Some respondents said the lake is deep with strong currents making it dangerous and noted how substantial fencing has been needed to put by the Angling Club.	The lake will form part of the wider multi-functional green buffer. The SPD was amended under Para 4.2.10 that while public access to the lake will likely be restricted for security and safety purposes, a public footpath via a leisure route should pass around its northern and eastern edge with surrounding vegetation managed to allow glimpsed views of the lake.
100	22, 103, 211, 217, 215, 225	4.3 Movement Network	Concerns raised over traffic being routed through Woburn Sands, Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley as an alternative to M1. Some mentioned that the 'potential highway intervention', the road network should not lead on to the motorway: we all want traffic using the A421. Some would like a better explanation of what the Potential Highway Intervention means as how they understand it does not seem effective.	The detailed design of highways interventions, including any landscaping proposals, will be prepared and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site
101	22	4.3 Movement Network/H10	If the grid road H10 is extended into Wavendon, there should probably be a similar highway intervention to prevent traffic using Newport Road to reach the A421.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
102	22, 238, 1379, 1391, 1367	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent notes the importance to protect the hedgerows especially one on the eastern part of development proposed which runs all the way to Wavendon.	SPD under 2.12.1 was amended to add that existing hedgerows (particularly those of higher quality) should be retained and strengthened to reinforce their importance as part of the local landscape for visual and biological diversity reasons. All hedgerows thus lost should be replaced by equivalent lengths of new hedgerows within the overall development area.

103	23	4.3 Movement Network/V10	Respondent notes existing traffic issues with the existing rail crossing causing traffic in the Caldecotte and Bow Brickhill housing areas at Bow Brickhill with large volume of traffic that enters south east Milton Keynes from the A5 and A4146. Other notes general traffic issues on V10.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
104	23, 40, 168, 179, 165, 209, 217, 1281, 1289, 1343, 1357, 1433, 1400, 1394, 1391, 1367, 1386	4.5.2 Density	Respondents stated that the development will cause joining MK to surrounding villages of Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands and will impact on their character. Some noted that sufficient buffers should be in place to protect the identity of these villages. Some said current locals will be outnumbered.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
105	23, 117, 155, 1386	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent notes existing parking shortages i.e., Caldecotte, Woburn Sands High street, Aspley Heath car park and states that the SEMK site will make the situation worst.	The SEMK site is required to provide infrastructure needed in relation to the site. The
106	23	General comment	Existing road network in Caldecotte and Wavendon is narrow with cars parked making it hard for the buses to operate.	Noted. No action required.
106	24, 26, 31, 54, 64, 73, 141, 207, 1263, 1293, 113, 1387, 1393	4.5.2 Density	The density of the proposed development is too large.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
107	24, 140, 141, 163, 1341	4.3 Movement Network	The proposals are lacking transport and parking facilities and no extension of the grid system which could divert traffic away from residential areas.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network.

107	24, 26, 32, 148	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The proposed open spaces are insufficient.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
108	24	General comment	MK is noted to be least polluted city with wide roads where pollutants rise and disperse on them. The proposed expansion will make MK less desirable to live.	Noted. No action required.
109	25	General comment	Concerns raised over developers not being concerned around the infrastructure needs.	The Policy SD11 and other policies consider what strategic infrastructure will be required.
110	25, 104, 139	4.3 Movement Network	Movement network to be carefully planned in a sustainable way and not to profit the developers.	As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection
111	25, 112, 113, 154, 171, 184	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent supports the extension to H10. Some stated it will relive A421. One respondent thought it would provide a good link between the A421 and the A5, but that signage should direct through traffic to the A421 rather than through Woburn Sands and neighbouring villages due to adverse traffic impact.	Noted. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
112	25	4.3 Movement Network	Local roads Byrd Crescent, Holst Crescent, and the Bow Brickhill crossing must not be compromised in order to generate profit for developers.	As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection
113	25	4.3 Movement Network	Potential traffic congestion, pollution, emergency vehicle access may not be compromised in order to increase profit for developers .	As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection

114	26	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent raised concerns over potential impact on heathlands and woodlands and questioned whether Health Impact Assessment was undertaken.	Policy EH6 of the Plan:MK requires applicants to mitigate against potentially significant health impacts. Policy EH6 requires 'all use class C2 developments and use class C3 residential development in excess of 50 dwellings (...) to prepare Health Impact Assessment'. Milton Keynes Council has recently adopted Health Impact Assessment SPD which provides technical guidance and support to the implementation of Policy EH6.
115	26, 110, 122, 148, 158, 209, 211, 221, 1385	General comment	Concerns raised increased use of countryside by larger population and this having a negative environmental effect. Issues with littering, noise , pollution etc.	Noted. No action required. Impact on proposed development will be reviewed at planning application stage.
116	27, 28, 75, 97, 110, 113, 124, 137, 195, 209, 1233, 1242, 225, 226, 1284	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent raises concerns over existing and some around future traffic levels generally and on the following areas: The Leys, some also mentioned Hardwick Road and the 5-point roundabout by the Swan /Nonnas/the Fir Tree public house and the High Street. Some respondents suggest a strategic plan for traffic should be undertaken prior to the development. A need for more coordination between council's in relation to informing residents and understanding their concerns. Hardwick Road considered cut through to M1 and A5. Some respondents accept traffic calming measures will reduce speed but state it will not alter volume. Planners should look at current situation with less traffic - poor parking worsened with loss of Nonn'a restaurant car park. Future 3000 homes will create grid lock at peak hour on these roads so workable solutions are needed for safety and wellbeing.	There has been traffic modelling undertaken (using the MKC Strategic Traffic Model: MKMMM) for the SE MK allocation as part of the evidence base to Plan MK, and subsequent to this to inform the development framework. This modelling, as well as other considerations such as multi modal connectivity, has informed the draft development framework for the site comprising two bridge crossings, with the preferred option now being a V10 crossing broadly in line with the existing level crossing, and a crossing to the eastern edge of the site (referred to as Woodleys Road in the framework). As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection
117	29, 148, 160, 1239, 210, 222, 1284, 1436, 1356, 1378	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondents raised concerns over the potential impact the proposed development may have. They mentioned: loss of habitats (incl. hedgerows), wildlife, ROWs, amenity open spaces and light pollution. Some said reduction in green space should be kept to a minimum and focus to increase biodiversity and green spaces. Some said it's also a loss of a 'natural buffer'.	In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option. There are a number of policies within the Plan:MK that set principles for a new development and consider nature conservation are Policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5 and NE6 which will be used to review future applications.

118	29, 57, 58, 219, 210, 1315, 1259, 1247	4.3 Movement Network/V11	<p>Respondents does not support V11 extension. Some states that the railway crossing and access at Woburn Sands and Brickhill should be maintained and do not extend the V11 from the H10 roundabout and across the railway.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that they oppose due to • Loss of local amenity, Environmental impact (noise and pollution), Wildlife habitat, Health and wellbeing of local residents, Road/pedestrian safety, change to the whole character of Old Farm Park and Browns Wood, loss of access to facilities in adjacent areas - severing communities that span the grid road reserve.</p> <p>There will also be insufficient green space to the east of Old Farm Park if access road is placed there. Negative impact on residential amenity including noise and visual impact were mentioned.</p>	<p>The SPD was amended and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
119	29, 1250, 1296, 1259, 1433, 1356	General comment	<p>Concerns raised over building on greenfield land and loss of agricultural land. Some said they strongly object to the loss of open country and expected adverse impact on surrounding parishes and areas environments. Where are the horses to be accommodated and the crops for our food grown?</p>	<p>The site is allocated site in Plan:MK. Appropriate assessments will take place at planning application stage and form part of EIA.</p>
120	29, 32, 91, 116, 140, 141, 218, 1294, 1303, 1309, 1286, 1433, 1381, 1396, 1395	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	<p>Concerns raised over potential flooding due to this development. Some mentioned existing high-water table in the area and waterlogging. Concerns raised over the placing of pitches on recreation ground near Bow Brickhill as drainage is poor. Need for flood defines measures noted by some; retention of flows within SEMK should be considered. New drainage needs to be robust, resistant to erosion and account for climate change and could involve discharge into Caldecotte Brook. A study should ensure subsidence in Browns Wood is not worsened by SEMK.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.</p>
121	30, 40, 119, 152, 154, 167, 181, 1289, 1391, 1367	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Respondent raises concerns over existing traffic issues. The areas of concern were: area near Parklands, Hardwick Road, Theydon Avenue, Station Road, V10, in Aspley Guise are near A421, Woburn Sands generally. Some note there has been a lack of traffic surveys to suggest appropriate transport infrastructure to mitigate these issues</p>	<p>As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection</p>
122	30, 50, 175, 168, 1258, 1366	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	<p>Some respondents do not question the need of the G&T site (some make reference to the GTAA assessment) however some noted that the site should be located away or on edge of from housing (some mentioned proposed Wavendon location). Respondents questioned the requirement to provide the site early.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. To ensure a delivery of the site as per requirements of Plan:MK a phasing chapter was updated to ensure the site is delivered prior the occupation of residential properties.</p>

123	31, 32, 47, 48 ,54, 89, 98, 117, 1250, 1296, 1376, 1385, 1399	General comment	Concerns raised over impact of the SEMK site on existing residents in the areas and natural environment. Impact on environmental and wildlife assets to be considered. Examples give static traffic impact e.g., standstill traffic meeting at the High Street and Weathercock Lane onward bound towards the A5 and M1. Respondents noted the need for environmental impact study and to examine the impacts on all surrounding areas as well as the site to be developed. Some say MKC should undertake a comprehensive EIA and not leave it to other developers. Terms such as “encourage”, “enhance”, “conserve”, “limit” used in an EIA would need to be clarified.	The site is allocated site in Plan:MK. Appropriate assessments will take place at planning application stage and form part of EIA.
124	31, 165	6. Next Steps	Respondent stated the need for sustainable design options and solutions to protect the environment need for wildlife surveys was underlined. Agrees with housing need subject to no adverse impact on the environment and people.	Those matters will be considered at planning application stage
125	35, 39, 1436	4.3 Movement Network/V11	Respondent raised concerns over the V11 extension. It was noted that this would have negative impact on Morley Crescent and Holst Crescent and Browns Wood playing field. Concerns over how the links between Brown Wood and Old Farm being lost and need for them to be replaced. Issues for children going to school. Some suggested to do this safely, major infrastructure would be required e.g., tunnels, but this would risk further flooding in areas that are already prone to do so. Bridges would not be appropriate in a built-up residential area and the use of zebra crossings are not suitable for a high-speed road .Other concerns noted where potential flooding, traffic implications and the fact that the grid road would cross the caldecotte brook linear park impacting local wildlife living along the river.	The SPD was amended and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
126	36, 115, 1396	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports proposed pedestrian and cycle routes linking through to existing settlements. Some said this should be the only type of routes to Bow Brickhill/Woburn Sands Rd.	Noted. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity
127	36, 64, 99, 108, 1277, 1297, 1260	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	The two proposed primary schools and the secondary school should take into account existing local schools in Central Beds but service Woburn Sands as well as the new schools in Glebe/Eagle Farm areas. Early Years provision must be provided. Some said the schools sit within Central Beds Council, so needs co-ordination between MKC and CBC to understand the impact this will have schools already at capacity. Phasing, traffic generation and highways safety needs to be considered when delivering those sites.	The schools are proposed in line with the requirements of the policy SD11.

128	36, 43, 47, 51, 54, 64, 89, 99, 112, 146, 148, 178, 192, 193, 1250, 1251, 1269, 1333, 1343, 1357, 1397, 1385, 1399, 1365, 1386, 1404-1406	4.5.2 Density	The densities proposed are very high, with 3 and 4 storey and blocks of flats and 6 story flats in central hubs. This is noted to be out of character for the area and will impact amenity. Some noted the fact that this proposed development is very near the Greensand Ridge rural area means that housing density should be more in keeping with a rural area. Some suggest there should be height restrictions on flats. Some noted views towards and from Greensands Ridge and towards Watling Street from the ancient Danesborough fort should be retained. Layout should be considered and low density housing near Greensand Ridge. Trees and hedges to be protected.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
129	37	General comment	Respondent questioned why extension to Asplands Medical centre was refused but the SEMK will be allowed.	We cannot comment on refusal of planning applications. Not a matter for the SPD.
130	37, 217	General comment	Why are other areas such as Tiddington are not developed instead of SEMK? Also, why is MKC, with many houses permitted but not built, thinking about further expansion and SEMK?	SEMK is an allocation in Plan:MK policy SD11.
131	37	4.4 Land use	More land should be allocated to the village facilities such as shops, convenience stores, pharmacy etc. to enhance everyday living.	The land use budget was amended following consultation.
132	37	4.5.2 Density	Properties facing Bow Brickhill road should be large and detached.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
133	37, 43, 75, 89, 15, 205, 1259, 1397, 1365	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Support the idea that there should be no merging of between Woburn Sands and the new estate. Therefore, the whole Swan Hills area should be a green buffer. Some stated that There should also be a green buffer on the SOUTHERN EDGE of the development to ensure the survival of the hedgerow along Bow Brickhill road (C). Some stated that the option of including playing fields is a good idea at D in the Country Park since this will be a valuable facility to the residents of Woburn Sands as well as SEMK. Some respondents would like further consultation on green buffers and for them to be a mandatory requirement of planning application acceptance.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.

134	38	General comment	The Planning, Infrastructure & Transport Committee of Campbell Park Parish Council considered this consultation at its meeting on the 1st March 2021. The Committee resolved to support the proposals.	Noted. No action required.
135	40, 42, 43, 47, 60, 75, 83, 100, 107, 108, 115, 123, 163, 181, 165, 1239, 1250, 1277, 1293, 1315, 1332, 1396, 1260, 1395, 1359, 1365, 1366, 1431	General comment	Concerns raised over the need for development. Respondents noted that the area has seen a lot of development in recent years (examples given Parklands, Sandy out, Frosts site, Glebe Farm). Some stated that the need is not there for housing since MK East will provide 5000 homes. Some mentioned 3000 homes being build north of Wavendon. It was noted by some that SEMK The development would merge Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill into MK. Some considered the increase in housing in a rural location to be alien.	SEMK is an allocation in Plan:MK policy SD11. It forms integral part of housing delivery.
136	40, 43, 89	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	The schools also sit within Central Beds Council, of which there is no reference to, or co-ordination between, the MK or CBC councils to understand the impact this will have.	Noted. No action required.
137	40	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Concerns raised over congestion caused by additional rail services and due to potential mechanical failures of the barriers.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings.
138	41	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	1 Will take proactive responsibility to actively monitor the brook ? 2 Review if the planned flood controls were delivered in full ? 3 If delivered flood management measures fail to perform as expected take ownership and provide the funding and corrective action to improve ?	Policies FR1 – FR3 of Plan:MK include locally specific strategic flood risk management policies to maintain and continue the exemplar sustainable drainage model of Milton Keynes which prohibits development within the floodplain and seeks flood management and drainage infrastructure to be provided as strategically as possible and as part of a maintained, multi-functional blue-green infrastructure. Future proposals will include details of any measures where appropriate. As the local Planning Authority for its area, Milton Keynes Council will take account of flooding risks in all matters relating to development control including development plans and individual planning applications, in accordance with Planning Policy Guidance Notes PPG20 and PPG 25

139	42, 43, 54, 64, 75, 107, 108, 109, 115, 129, 159, 167, 187, 188, 190, 202, 225, 1250, 1283, 1293, 1295, 1259, 1258, 1360, 1366	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondent questioned the need for G&T site. Some suggested that extending existing sites should be considered before new ones are provided. Some stated it should be in more industrial location generally away from housing. also stated was the need to complete existing commitments on previous sites before this one. Some would like written proof of the council's reasons and accompanying list of all other sites considered and the reasons they were not selected.	Plan:MK identifies the need for us to accommodate 19 households in culturally suitable housing for Gypsies and Travellers up to 2031. Within Milton Keynes there remains a total of 12 further pitches allocated, but not yet provided. This consists of 8 pitches on a new site at Newton Leys and 4 additional pitches to be provided as part of an extension to the Calverton Lane site. With the retention of these existing allocations, Plan:MK includes the need to provide for an additional 7 pitches over the plan period. The Council intends to allocate the additional 7 pitches in the South East Milton Keynes strategic site, in accordance with the policy in Plan:MK.
140	44, 92, 1396	4.5.2 Density	Density should be lower. Some mentioned no more than 25dph which is more in line with principles of MK.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
141	45	4.3 Movement Network/H10	If there is to be an extension of the H10 to the east, then it should be used to carry the Construction Traffic for the areas around it. H10 should be the access point for works and no access for building works should be allowed via Walton Road	Noted. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
142	46, 124, 189	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent is against the development due to potential increase of traffic converging at the junction of Aspley Heath/ Woburn Sands & Hardwick Road, the road from Woburn Sands all the way through Aspley Guise.	As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection
143	47, 48, 54, 95, 137, 159, 167, 1269, 1277, 1287, 1397, 1398, 1435	General comment	Supports Woburn Sands Town Council response	Noted. No action required.
144	47, 48	General comment	Supports Aspley Heath Parish Council's conclusions around traffic issues	Noted. No action required.

145	47, 48, 132, 138, 203, 1249, 1257, 1297, 1295, 1400, 1356, 1395, 1379, 1399, 1392, 1393	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent is against closure of Woburn Sands level crossing and traffic diverted to bottlenecked Hardwick Road. Some respondents said it would sever communities spanning and access to facilities in Woburn Sands and Wavendon. Some believe no consideration has been given to residents using mobility scooters, wheelchairs, or prams walking to facilities.	MKC does not have control over the future of the level crossing. EWR Co is considering the future of the crossings as part of the DCO proposal.
146	47, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 205, 215, 1315, 1338, 1386	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondents are against relocation of the Woburn Sands train station. Some respondents made comments around uncertainties in relation to movement network and MRT and option of a new redway being provided and/or bus route to the existing station to provide for the new communities. Suggestions are also made that the existing station could be extended, and an adjoining site (Pristine Wheels) could be used for parking and amenity. Some respondents said there is no evidence to suggest its relocation is a more appropriate area by accessibility terms and if this is the rational then an additional station would be a preferred option.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings.
147	47,48, 50	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent is supportive of the need to become a “green” development linked into the grid system but distinct from the existing settlements of Woburn Sands, Wavendon and Bow Brickhill	Noted. No changes required.
148	47	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent questions what is through traffic which is believed is the one going through Woburn Sands. Minimising impact on Bow Brickhill and Newport Road is critical and should be a high priority.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
149	47, 1270, 1281, 1285	4.5.2 Density	The density of the proposed development in the area of Bow Brickhill should consider the character of the area and not be guided by developers’ pressure. Some stated that developers said that if the area for housing were to decreased to provide a larger buffer then the housing density would have to increase which suggests they are building down to a price and not up to a standard.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.

150	47, 48, 83, 100, 111, 131, 1230, 1231, 1251	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The area identified as part of the Swan Hill development between “Woodley’s Road” and Newport Road should not be developed for housing (as shown on Figure 3.1) since this will result in coalescence between SEMK and the existing settlement which is directly contrary to the policies set out in Plan:MK and the Vision. This area should become part of the buffer zone protecting the existing settlement of Woburn Sands (and part of the proposed linear park along the railway line). Some added that Current plans show housing stretching right up to Newport Road and road access through the new estate towards the proposed north/ south connection between the planned H10 extension near Wavendon Fields and Bow Brickhill Road which would lead to congestion of Newport Road and create safety risks for traffic turning in. The buffer would compensate for lack of passing to Woburn Sands playing fields from the north without need to cross the railway line at level crossing which is believed to be unsafe.</p>	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
151	47, 48, 1251	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The WSTC carried out a survey in 2020 to establish priorities for the renovation of the WS Recreation Ground (funded by s106 funds). That survey (completed by over 100 residents) identified the following priorities which could not be accommodated in the Recreation Ground, but which would be very suitable for the Country Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A football pitch • Picnic and BBQ pitches • A jogging trail • A wildlife area • Wood sculptures . The detail layout of the ark would require further study. 	Open space should be provided in accordance with guidance set out in Plan:MK (Policy L4 and Appendix C). The SPD contains Fig 4.1 landscape and Open Space Strategy which shows amongst others, areas of multifunctional buffers and proposed linear open spaces. details of those will be provided through forthcoming planning applications.
152	47, 48, 148, 1251, 1315, 1394, 1360	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Respondent supports linear parks alongside the railway line as valuable recreational areas and wildlife corridors. There is a natural link between the existing linear park in Parklands, the Country Park, and the linear railway parks; this needs to be supplemented by other pedestrian links from Parklands (incl. nearby lake) and the Grove estates in Woburn Sands. All linear parks and the WS Country Park are within the parish of Woburn Sands. It is suggested that the Parks Trust manages these areas (para 4.2.19).</p>	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
153	47, 48, 1251, 1378	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Respondents note the need for the provision of a narrow green buffer along the north edge of the Bow Brickhill Road to supplement the enhancement of the existing hedgerow.</p>	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.

154	47, 48, 129, 1251, 1283	4.3 Movement Network	Main road access should be via the V10, V11, and H10 with appropriate subsidiary access to Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill and Wavendon. Respondents support the proposal for a Bow Brickhill By-Pass.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport.
155	47, 48, 59, 90, 129, 147, 201, 1249, 1251, 1283, 1305, 1315, 1370, 1084, 1085, 1261, 1400, 1391, 1367, 1365	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondents do not support H10 extension as a grid road joining Newport Road. Concerns raised in potential traffic increase and some mentioned potential blight to existing properties and community severance, others oppose the extension on rounds of air pollution and mental health of residents. Some noted that the proposal to continue the H10 over the Newport Road and across the golf course on the grounds would prejudice the future creation of a linear park and contradict the MK 50 plan to designate the land as potential green infrastructure. Some said 70mph into a village is ridiculous.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

156	47, 48, 1251, 1326, 1276, 1375	4.3 Movement Network/H10	A link between the eastern end of H10 and Newport Road is essential to enable traffic to access Woburn Sands and, the M1 via the Kingston roundabout. (Although such traffic would be better routed from the H10 via V11 and H9.) Maybe this should be of an appropriate “B” grade, but a traffic survey is essential to decide on the best solution. Speed limits should also be restricted to 40mph.	Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport
157	47, 48, 1251	4.3 Movement Network	Support the proposal to restrict the junction between “Woodley’s Road” and Bow Brickhill Road (para 4.3.9)	The SPD acknowledges that the additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport.
158	47, 48, 107, 110, 203, 209, 1239, 1251, 1315, 1316	4.3 Movement Network	Essential that only local traffic be allowed to access Woburn Sands through The Leys, Hardwick Road and Theydon Avenue – the town already suffers from an excessive volume of through traffic at times. Some support provided for the concept that WSTC should be involved in discussions concerning how this can best be achieved.	Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport.
159	47, 48, 1239, 1251, 1351	Table 4.2	Respondents have concerns over the proposal to change the standard when Bow Brickhill Road becomes the proposed Bow Brickhill By-Pass. Bow Brickhill Road, as the southern boundary of Milton Keynes, borders the greensand ridge and must be retained as a rural road and not become a Grid Road. WSTC would welcome further discussion on how Bow Brickhill Road becomes the Bow Brickhill By-Pass.	Table 4.2 contains detail of the strategic hierarchy and design of strategic routes.

160	47, 48, 209, 1251	4.3 Movement Network	Respondents noted the need for pedestrian crossing points on the Bow Brickhill Road to enable access to Wavendon and Browns Woods as per the draft Vision (para 3.2). Some respondents suggested safer pedestrian crosses be put on Bow Brickhill road and The Leys. Some recommendations over closures of crossings to preserve integrity of Bow Brickhill Road.	Table 4.2 provides details on Street Hierarchy of strategic movement network including junctions/crossings.
161	47, 48, 61, 84, 86, 107, 108, 164, 1251, 1283	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Public transport links between Woburn Sands and other parts of Milton Keynes are to be maintained; the concept of a Transport Hub is therefore supported in principle. The Woburn Sands Station is a key component of the town's heritage (the Station's buildings are listed). Para 2.9 of the draft document states "Where necessary development within the SEMK site should conserve the significance of these listed sites".	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings.
162	47, 48, 54, 75, 115, 155, 1251, 1269, 1316, 1360, 1391, 1367	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Woburn Sands rail station should not be relocated. Some stated that adequate room exists to extend the platforms if required and space on the North side of the railway to construct appropriate office/ticketing facilities. Given the proposed increase in rail traffic, there is a case for the platforms to be staggered, either side of the Newport Road, to minimise level crossing closures. Furthermore, the Pristine Wheels site is currently for sale and could accommodate both parking and a Transport Hub.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
163	47, 54, 83, 100, 185, 1251, 1351	4.3 Movement Network	Figure 3 does suggest that, in the interest of maximising sustainable travel and reducing car travel, more bus stops than are shown would be needed to ensure that all proposed dwellings lie within 400m walking distance of a bus stop.	SEMK will be designed to accommodate accessible, frequent, and high-quality public transport routing within the site, including being future proofed to accommodate and integrate with potential mass rapid transit as part of a wider system for Milton Keynes. 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. It identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport. As per Policy CT5, A3 where appropriate and necessary, all houses and most other developments will be expected to be no more than 400m from a bus stop.
164	47, 1251, 1316	4.3 Movement Network	Speed of traffic through SEMK should be controlled both for the safety of residents and for environmental and health reasons (30 mph).	Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of strategic network contains details on design speeds.

165	47, 73, 178, 1251, 1315, 1260	4.3 Movement Network	There should also be a network of pedestrian and redway links throughout the development. Some mentioned the need for strong links through to Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill and Wavendon to reduce transport pollution, protect the natural environment and promote improved public health and wellbeing. Need for connectivity between Wavendon village (Church End), wider parish and Woburn Sands is needed by foot and cycle to enable access to local services. Redway between Woburn Sands and Wavendon needs improvement.	A key aim of the pedestrian, cycle and bridleway network within the site is to integrate and connect it with all existing rights of way, redways, footpaths and bridleways that connect with the edges of the allocation. Fig 4.2 Movement Strategy shows the proposed strategic redway network within SEMK which primarily follows the strategic movement network. New leisure routes and bridleways will be primarily located within the proposed open space network connecting to the surrounding area.
166	47, 1251, 1399	4.5.2 Density	No calculations have been provided on how the figure of “approximately 3,000” was calculated. The SEMK development covers 198 hectares so 3,000 dwellings is equal to 15.15 dwellings per hectare. This is very significantly higher than Woburn Sands (even allowing for the increased density of Parklands). Furthermore, it is significantly higher than the density approved for Milton Keynes East – there are 461 hectares in that development for which 5,000 dwellings have been approved (i.e., 10.84 dwellings per hectare).	The site is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes as per policy SD11 in Plan:MK. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
167	47, 48, 1251	Fig 4.5	It is noted that higher densities are suggested for houses overlooking recreational areas (para 3.3.7). Figure 4.5 appears to suggest that there could be four storey flats overlooking the lakes; these would be directly opposite the existing properties in Parklands and would be intrusive. Figure 4.5 also indicates a maximum of 3 storey blocks along “Woodley’s Road” and Bow Brickhill Road. This is not consistent with the Vision.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
168	47, 48, 109, 1251	4.4.3 Affordable housing	Affordable housing (para 4.4.3) should be distributed throughout the site and not concentrated in a few areas to support community integration.	Local Plan:MK policies (HN1, HN1 especially) will apply and matters of housing mix will be assessed through planning application stage.
169	47, 48, 129, 1251, 234-238, 1299	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondents support location adjacent to Bow Brickhill Station since this would seem to be the site with the nearest conformity to the principles set out in 4.4.6 and 4.4.7	Noted. The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.

170	47, 48, 187, 188, 190, 1251	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	<p>Most of the primary level children in Woburn Sands, and many of the secondary level children, attend schools in Central Beds. It is important that, when developing the schools in SEMK, proper account is taken of the CBC Future Schools Programme. The effect of the increased size of the primary provision in Wavendon due to the new school in the SLA needs to be considered when planning the SEMK provision.</p> <p>The location of the proposed schools requires careful thought. The primary schools could have about 600 pupils and the secondary school about 1000, some of whom will come from outside SEMK. These numbers will generate a significant amount of traffic and street planning and parking needs to take account of this.</p>	The SPD addresses the needs of Policy SD11 to deliver primary and secondary places.
171	47, 48, 1251, 1315	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	proposed location of a primary school to the east of “Woodley’s Road” is inappropriate since it would require pupils to cross a busy road.	The SPD and location of schools was amended.
172	47, 48, 187, 188, 190, 1251	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	There does not appear to be any mention made for early years provision; this should be included in the final Development Framework	Early years provision is considered as part of SEMK SPD.
173	47, 48, 177, 187, 188, 190, 205, 228, 1224, 1262, 1251, 1309, 1311, 1323, 1337, 1360	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/health	Very little is mentioned in the draft Development Framework apart from referring to the health centres in Woburn Sands and Walnut Tree (para 2.8). There is currently insufficient capacity in these centres to cope with the existing population. There is therefore a need to provide additional facilities in SEMK which should be developed in conjunction with the existing Medical Centres. It is essential that there is a coordinated medical and welfare service across the whole of SE Milton Keynes including the existing settlements. Some noted transport links to be considered alongside health infrastructure needs.	Noted. The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.

174	47, 48, 108, 187, 188, 190, 228, 1251	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	Developers must be required to include a detailed review of what is already available in Woburn Sands, Wavendon and Bow Brickhill before bringing forward proposals for SEMK. Duplication of facilities should be avoided since that will reduce the economic viability of individual facilities (e.g., existing Sports Hall and large community hall in Woburn Sands, and sports fields with adjacent pavilions in both Bow Brickhill and Wavendon). No mention appears to be made in the draft Development Framework for restaurants and public houses; these (along with recreational facilities such as the Woburn Sands Country Park) are essential to support community cohesion and should be planned to complement similar facilities in the existing communities. All facilities, such as the proposed Community Hub and shopping centres, should be located so that they serve the wider population. Several existing facilities would benefit from a modest injection of resources and this should be covered through appropriate s106 contributions from the SEMK development. 1	Noted. Please see updated SPD for location of local centers and other community facilities.
175	47, 48	4.5.2 Character and Density	Discussions should take place with WSTC in relation to density, balance of housing , community cohesion before more detailed plans are drawn	The site is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes as per policy SD11 in Plan:MK. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Detailed proposals will be reviewed at planning application stage.
176	47, 48	4.6 Sustainability	Respondents assume all properties would be required to include solar panels and other energy saving features and be built to the highest insulation standards; they should also be required to have electric charging points for cars.	Detail design of homes will be reviewed at planning application stage in accordance with policies in Plan:MK
177	47, 48, 215, 1269, 1295, 1322	General comment	More emphasis should be made on how consultation with local communities is going to take place. Covid 19 has restricted the opportunity for people to see and comment on these plans and this democratic deficit must be rectified. Developers must be made aware of how local communities feel and how they can react and incorporate this in their plans. Some want to delay consultation to later in the year with residents from surrounding villages so they can better understand the effects of the proposal. Some want more sufficient weight given to residents of adjacent parishes as they are the experts on the area. What measures will be put in place to better engage residents, particularly when during lockdown?	There has been extensive stakeholder engagement throughout the years since 2018. Online events were hosted.

178	49, 217, 1239	General comment	Respondents agree with need for development but notes it should be undertaken in a sustainable way with the consideration of protection for areas of natural beauty, biodiversity and contribute to the recovery of nature not further decline. Consideration to be given to climate emergency health, quality of air and potential flooding.	Noted. No changes required.
178	49	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The west of Wavendon Fields does not effectively achieve any of the requirements for sustainable development and protection of the area to be developed (area immediately to the west of Wavendon Fields is an area of natural beauty extending across fields to Brickhill and woods beyond).	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
179	49, 90, 158, 176, 192, 193, 1250, 221, 1261	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Need for larger greener buffer west of Wavendon fields. Some respondents suggest a green buffer of tall, dense trees screening the road should be installed between the H10 and Wavendon Fields to protect from light, noise, and air pollution.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
180	49, 221, 1261	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Modification to the proposed route for the H10 extension and provision of a larger green buffer zone to the west of Wavendon Fields ensuring wildlife protection and residents enjoyment. One respondent said route should be modified to protect existing rights of way. H10 could divert further south to cross Newport Road nearer the railway, thus avoiding impacts on Wavendon, or potentially act as a buffer zone for Wavendon.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

181	49, 85, 132, 159, 1287, 1297, 1296, 1260, 1394, 1360	4.3 Movement network/EWR	Moving of the Woburn Sands station would divide the community. The removal of the pedestrian crossing from the railway with no footbridge replacement has already had a detrimental effect on our community. some mentioned residents of Aspley Heath/Weathercock area already have significant distance to walk to the station. One mentioned concern regarding loss of direct access to Asplands Medical Centre/other facilities/services, and reduction in passing trade for existing businesses ,if crossing is closed without replacement.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
182	49, 60, 66, 94, 189, 1296,1376, 1356, 1395, 1386	General comment	Respondent is against development since it will have negative impact on residents. Respondents especially noted those of Wavendon and Woburn Sands. Others mentioned Aspley Guise and Aspley Heaths. Some specify that traffic flow could become chaotic in these areas (some specify Newport Road). One respondent referenced likely increases in air, noise & light pollution.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
183	52, 124	4.3 Movement Network	No consideration has been given to where the traffic heading out of this area towards the M1 will go. The main road through Bow Brickhill becomes a side road as a bypass is built. Through Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise all traffic heading to the M1 will pass through already busy roads (Hardwick Road & Aspley Guise Square).	The junction onto Bow The junction onto Bow Brickhill Road should include some form of highway intervention that will help reduce the amount of through traffic along Bow Brickhill Road to J13 on the M1 (and vice versa).
184	52, 129, 186, 1283	4.3 Movement network/EWR	The potential moving of Woburn Sands Railway Station will push the station even further out of town (it's not the). Respondent supports a transport interchange but that could be at the Bletchley end of the platforms accessed by a new link road which was proposed. The station itself doesn't need to move. Public transport interchange is being proposed after all local buses have just been withdrawn. Will this be rail interchange only? Argues that there appears to be adequate room to extend the platforms if required and space on the North side of the railway to construct appropriate office/ticketing facilities. The railway crossing may be closed more regularly with EWR, which is in keeping with the nature of the village. A transport hub could be accommodated in the current location, with appropriate links (including pedestrian).	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings. SPD noted that Existing bus services should be retained and extended, where appropriate, within the new development. Services should serve key destinations and thoroughfares. SPD was amended with additional paragraph which clarifies that Transit Interchange Hub will serve potentially relocated train station, bus stop as well as future proofed to accommodate the end/start point of MRT route. Fig 4.2 identifies a zone within which the interchange can take place but ideally it will be as close as possible to the Woodleys Bridge to aid interchange.

185	53	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Mitigating and adapting to climate change is elaborated on in chapter 14 of the NPPF. reference made to conserving and enhancing the natural environment by chapter 15 of the NPPF. The Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment emphasises that, inter alia, new development should “promote indigenous plant species” and “promote hedgerow restoration and improvements throughout the area to provide visual and ecological links between existing and proposed woodland”. These objectives are mentioned on page 25 of the SEMK SUE Framework, but in para 2.5.5 simply states that “the majority of these points can be address [sic]”. That paragraph then goes on to specifically highlight how some objectives will be met (e.g., incorporating views and encouraging informal recreation) but fails to explain how the objectives relating to the ecology of the area will be achieved. Page 41 (Figure 3.1) suggests that large parts of the proposed development will provide no buffer at all between residential building and existing woodland, notably to the south east of the development which abuts Wavendon Wood, a Priority Habitat. Respondent states that this must be an omission.</p>	of highway intervention measures which
186	53, 151, 1258	Para 2.6	<p>Paragraph 2.6 of the SEMK SUE framework claims that “Much of the site is in agricultural use with limited ecological value”. As page 18 of the SEMK SUE document makes clear, the land to the south of the railway line in particular “includes numerous features (natural and buildings - some not within the allocation) that gives it a less open ‘feel’ or character than that part of the allocation to the north of the railway line. The document claims that pictures on page 18 confirm that, respondent states that the area is largely open fields. It is misleading to suggest that the land can be generalised as having “limited ecological value”. benefits of farmland were underlined e.g. valuable habitat for many wildlife species. Importance of protecting hedges was underlined. Some respondents highlight that there are numerous active travel routes and suggest that paragraph 2.2.6 is expanded to paint a more accurate picture of the existing uses. Some stated that destruction of farmland changes character of the villages</p>	will allow residents of SEMK to access the

187	53	Fig 4.10	Number of the sections of hedge identified on page 26 do not appear in Figure 4.1 setting out the open space strategy. The implication is that some hedgerows will be removed. It should be noted that as per page 44, "Existing woodlands and hedges should be retained and incorporated as part of the public open space network unless the reasons for the removal of woodland can be fully justified. Any proposed woodland loss must be supported with a full ecological & tree survey, along with a description regarding impact on the landscape character."	facilities within Woburn Sands Town Centre
188	53	General comment	Ref is made to the Environment Bill and min 10% increase in biodiversity. It is not clear how the site will achieve this knowing the loss of agricultural land. The gain in biodiversity is highlighted (see in particular page 39, page 43 and page 44) but the only measures relating to biodiversity are those which are intended to limit loss – rather than provide a net gain. Indeed, these measures are in themselves very limited, consisting of the very narrow wildlife corridors and planting street trees (page 43). Given that biodiversity gain is described as an "integral element" of the build out of SEMK (page 44) it is concerning how little attention is paid to how this will be achieved in the framework.	(and vice versa) but will also help reduce
189	53	4.5.2 Density	Higher densities should be considered to make effective use of land (chapter 11 of the NPPF). respondent notes para 123 which highlights that low density housing must be avoided where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land. The site is surrounded by existing settlements to the north, east and south edge of the site and the importance of respecting the character of these settlements (see e.g.: page 34) and preventing coalescence (see e.g.: page 44), it can be said that there is clearly only a finite amount of land available and a failure to meet housing needs with this development would be a problem that could not easily be resolved in future. While the SEMK SUE demonstrates an intention to increase housing density, we believe it does not go far enough and the average density needs to be increased further. To achieve this, higher buildings are going to be inevitable, but also buildings need to be closer to the roads.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
190	53	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Para 170 of the NPPF is noted. While of obvious benefit to the residents of the proposed development, open space consisting of linear parks, play areas, allotments, playing fields and civic spaces is not the equivalent of natural countryside – yet these are the only types of open space highlighted in the relevant sections of the framework (pages 44-47).	Brickhill Road to J13 on the M1 (and vice

191	54	General comment	Respondent states that there has been a lack of public information, meetings around development of the SPD.	versa).
192	54	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The field alongside Frosts Garden Centre and bordering Newport Road has a footpath which has been a complete marshy bog for the last six months. The Parklands development has impacted on the holding Lakes between the railway and this field adding additional run off water drainage affecting this area. The proposal to build on this field will only be detrimental to drainage and increase the size of the Lakes killing off the orchids which should be blooming in May. The proposed green buffer alongside the lake will be impassable.	The lake will form part of the wider multi-functional green buffer. The SPD was amended under Para 4.2.10 that while public access to the lake will likely be restricted for security and safety purposes, a public footpath via a leisure route should pass around its northern and eastern edge with surrounding vegetation managed to allow glimpsed views of the lake.
193	54, 132, 149	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondents noted that railway crossing closure will turn Newport Road into a Cul de Sac. Examples given around issued for future access to for local community in Woburn Sands, our Doctor, Pharmacist, Dentist, Church and Bank as well as the other businesses currently used regularly by residents of Chantry Close . The bus service has recently been abolished with a green alternative the train service has been virtually inoperative, future impact due to rail changes. Summerlin Centre and new adjoining Sports Centre in Parkside will require a much greater distance to walk and even further to drive. Children travelling to school from the Tavistock Close area will have a much longer journey to Swallowfield and Fulbrook schools. These schools are planning expansion for more pupils.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
194	54, 61, 84, 86	4.3 Movement Network	Access to allotments on Edgewick Farm may be lost to some residents. Road development threatens the allotments, a long-standing amenity for some 300 local residents, which predates development in the village. Some respondents are not aware that there is any other site for allotments locally. All previous developments have been without any additional facilities. (Parklands Sports Hall is not yet completed and seems to have limited parking.) Pre-existing facilities are at capacity, how will they serve such a large increase in population.	The SPD's indicative budget shows allotments in the green buffer with indicative area of 1.0ha (table 3.5). The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. Fig 4.3 Identifies primary Movement Network with V10 bridge. If EWR proposes a bridge at V11 then a reserve strategic highway network has been prepared and is included as Appendix C to the SPD.

195	56	General comment	CBC support the work of Milton Keynes Council (MKC) in producing a Development Framework to guide the development of this site. It is recognised that for a site of this scale, early engagement with partners is more likely to lead to positive outcomes. We have provided some general overarching comments, below, alongside some more specific comments on Ecology, Landscape, the relationship with Woburn Sands, Highways, and Strategic Transport.	Noted.
196	56	4.3 Movement Network	CBC support the recognition in the Foreword to the influences and uncertainties around East-West Rail (EWR), the completion of the MK grid-system, and the potential for a Mass Rapid Transit through Milton Keynes. We recognise the potential for these infrastructure proposals to impact upon the strategic movement strategy at SEMK. Respondent considers that there could be other options available to protect existing settlements (which is supported), maintain character and reduce the likelihood of any 'rat-running' through existing residential areas. One of the benefits of extending the MK grid system would be the protection of existing communities by removing traffic from residential areas. However, considering the proximity of the site to the CBC border, respondent has some concerns around the proposed mitigation measures for SEMK.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
197	56	General comment	Respondent supports the development of a Rapid Mass Transit System, as the enabler of MK's ambitious model shift targets, alongside the proposals for the extension of the Redway cycle routes, installation of electric charging points for each dwelling, with rapid and fast charging points to be provided at key locations including local centres and school. Respondent questions how the requirement for every dwelling to be fitted with a charging point (which goes further than current CBC policy) might impact on viability and how this would be delivered alongside all other necessary infrastructure.	Noted.

198	56	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>Respondent recognises the benefits of the proposals to future-proof the strategic routes within the site, to enable possible future expansion beyond the site, if required in the future, particularly in reference to the H10 extension, respondent hopes that opportunities to extend the Rapid Mass Transit System and the Redway cycle routes within Milton Keynes will also be considered as part of this. The extension of the H10 to Newport Road is futureproofed in all three Responses, which is supported by CBC. The indicated potential point of connection to Newport Road is such that, in combination with robust vehicular access restrictions at Bow Brickhill Road / Woodleys Road, it has potential to encourage drivers to route to J13 along the more suitable route of Newport Road (north) and the A421. Whilst longer in distance, the journey time is potentially shorter, and this could help alleviate impacts through Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. Strategic modelling detailed within an outline planning application should, deal with the most likely scenario as further information is made available about East-West Rail. Sensitivity tests may be appropriate, and one such test could be connection of the H10 to Newport Road to establish what effect this has in terms of relieving traffic through Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. CBC would also be interested to understand any potential impacts on other villages such as Husborne Crawley and Woburn and any transport modelling undertaken should allow for this.</p>	<p>Noted. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians, and potentially public transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
199	56	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>In relation to Aspley Guise triangle. Information is provided on the status of the site within CBC LP. Respondent welcomes the acknowledgement of potential future growth areas and the consideration of cross boundary issues, particularly in reference to the extension of H10. However, it is important that any reference to the future development of this site makes clear that it is within the CBC area and any decisions around the timing and quantum of development would be for CBC to make. Respondent notes that this site does not have any status within the CBC Local Plan 2015-2035 and that the MK Futures 2050 document does not give this site any status.</p>	<p>Noted. SPD was amended see Para 2.3.10</p>
200	56	General comment	<p>reference to the potential future development to the East within the Vision, we recognise that this does also refer to some land proposed within the Milton Keynes boundary identified for potential future development. It would be helpful if clarification could be provided to make clear that the vision relates to land within the administrative area of Milton Keynes only.</p>	<p>Noted. Clarity added in the text.</p>

201	56, 108, 111, 125, 1316, 1260, 1386	4.5.2 Density	<p>Respondents raised concerns in relation to the potential for coalescence with Woburn Sands. The Vision at section 3.2 makes clear that SEMK would be distinct from Woburn Sands, but provides no detail on how this would be achieved (e.g., is it through location landscape buffers, built form, or scale and character)</p>	<p>Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.</p>
202	56	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The Framework Plan (FP) suggests there will be a buffer (lake area), but we would question whether this will provide a meaningful gap. The FP . Paragraph 2.12.1 states that SEMK will ‘respect edge conditions’, this could be strengthened and more specific. In addition, the FP refers to the buffer with Woburn Sands as a ‘multifunctional landscape’ and states that it could take the form of a park with formal playing pitches (sections 3.1.10, 3.4, 4.2.10). respondent thinks that this would not be sufficient to avoid coalescence, as the presence of formal sports pitches and any associated infrastructure / pavilions would be an extension of the site and effectively link the development to Woburn Sands. The concept plan also shows the sports pitches very close to existing homes in Woburn Sands. In addition to the coalescence issue there are amenity considerations with locating these uses so close to existing housing.</p>	<p>The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Fig 4.1 identifies preferred indicative locations for playing fields.</p>
203	56,	General comment	<p>Paragraph 3.1.6 discusses the impacts of SEMK on adjoining transport routes. This should also refer to Woburn Sands. There should be a strong emphasis on engaging with adjoining authorities (including CBC) as proposals develop, and also a clear commitment to preserve the setting of nearby Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas. The FP lists the amenities at Woburn Sands as an opportunity for the site.</p>	<p>The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

204	56	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The railway line bisects the Strategic Urban Extension (SUE), with the majority of the development area falling to the south and at present, no direct road crossing is present. This is recognised within the SPD, and it seems clear that the intention is for SEMK to integrate with and face the existing built form of Milton Keynes, whilst protecting the distinct character of settlements such as Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands.</p> <p>Successfully achieving this could also help limit the impacts for CBC's highway network. Notwithstanding, there will inevitably be a draw of trips towards junction 13 of the M1 and through nearby villages that lie within Central Bedfordshire. It is important that the highway arrangements with the right turn only proposal at the junction of the link road and Bow Brickhill Road do not serve to disconnect Woburn, Aspley Heath, and Aspley Guise.</p>	<p>The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
205	56	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Respondent raises concerns in relation to responses 1 and 2. There would be potential for significant increases in traffic through Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise for access to and from J13. Whilst it is acknowledged that the SPD is not intended to identify mitigation measures, respondent considers it should acknowledge the sensitivity of this route and junctions along it, and the likely need for mitigation. Indeed, a future outline planning application should account for CBC's Marston Vale strategic allocation for 5,000 dwellings, which is also expected to increase traffic through J13 and Aspley Guise. It would be helpful if examples of interventions envisaged at Bow Brickhill Road / Woodleys Road could be provided to the council, along with an understanding of how effective they could be.</p>	<p>SPD had been revised. Fig 4.3 Identifies primary Movement Network with V10 bridge. If EWR proposes a bridge at V11 then a reserve strategic highway network has been prepared and is included as Appendix C to the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
206	56	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Highway intervention does not feature in Response 3. With vehicular grade separated crossings of the railway line at V10 (Brickhill Street) and Woodleys Road, in the same way as Response 1 (plus an additional crossing at V11), the reason for this is not clear and elaboration on this point would be appreciated. The accompanying text for Response 3 acknowledges that it 'encourages vehicular movement towards Bow Brickhill Road, exacerbating traffic through Woburn Sands (The Leys & Hardwick Road)'. If additional traffic is expected to be induced due to the additional crossing at V11, CBC would be interested to understand whether this would increase the requirement for the intervention.</p>	<p>SPD had been revised. Fig 4.3 Identifies primary Movement Network with V10 bridge. If EWR proposes a bridge at V11 then a reserve strategic highway network has been prepared and is included as Appendix C to the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

207	56	4.3 Movement Network	Response 2 presents a scenario whereby V10 is either stopped up due to closure of the level crossing, or there are significant delays at the level crossing. Both Responses 2 & 3 identify uncertainty around the viability of a railway crossing at V11. However, a crossing at V11 would be particularly important in Response 2 because otherwise all traffic would be directed to the eastern side of SEMK and Woodleys Road, with likely encouragement of additional traffic through Woburn Sands.	SPD had been revised. Fig 4.3 Identifies primary Movement Network with V10 bridge. If EWR proposes a bridge at V11 then a reserve strategic highway network has been prepared and is included as Appendix C to the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
208	56	Fig 3.1	Figure 3 does suggest that, in the interest of maximising sustainable travel and reducing car travel, more bus stops than are shown would be needed to ensure that all proposed dwellings lie within 400m walking distance of a bus stop. This could feasibly free-up some capacity on the external highway network for journeys which require a car.	Noted. No changes required.
209	56	4.3 Movement Network	Paragraph 4.3.12 also infers that primary streets within SEMK would only benefit from bus services when sufficient development has been built out and the route is commercially viable. A SUE such as this should be striving for high levels of sustainable modes of travel. To assist future occupiers to adopt sustainable patterns of travel from the outset, it is considered that the developers should, if necessary, be required to provide pump priming for bus services during an initial period, rather than wait for services to become commercially viable.	SEMK will be designed to accommodate accessible, frequent, and high-quality public transport routing within the site, including being future proofed to accommodate and integrate with potential mass rapid transit as part of a wider system for Milton Keynes. 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. It identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport. As per Policy CT5, A3 where appropriate and necessary, all houses and most other developments will be expected to be no more than 400m from a bus stop.
210	56	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent is keen to understand more details about this new station and be involved in any future discussions with Network Rail about this, to understand what the impacts may be on residents at Woburn Sands.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.

211	56, 107	6. Next Steps	South-western part of the SEMK site lies within the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area and ecological enhancements should be delivered here woods protected.	Noted. No changes required.
212	56, 108	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	South of the SEMK site is bordered by woodland which lies within the Milton Keynes area, however, despite the buffering of the existing settlements at Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill using green corridors, there is residential development shown right up to the boundary of woodland in the south. Respondent would expect to see a meaningful green buffer around the whole site. The woodland to the south of the site connects through to Wavendon Heath and Aspley Woods CWS in CBC, and there are existing Rights of Way that would bring new residents into this woodland and increase recreational pressure.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
213	56, 152	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Concerns raised over additional recreational pressure on the Aspley Woods, contributions should be sought to mitigate any potential impact on these assets and to ensure that suitable and sustainable solutions are provided for people to access the woodland, parking arrangements to prevent informal parking	Planning obligations are legal obligations entered into to mitigate the impacts of a development proposal. They must be: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms; directly related to the development; and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As per Para 5.2.1 contributions will be sought towards necessary infrastructure and facilities. An overarching section 106 agreement known as the Tarff Agreement will be established.
214	56	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	SEMK site to be self-sufficient in terms of open space and recreational space.	Open space should be provided in accordance with guidance set out in Plan:MK (Policy L4 and Appendix C).
215	56	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	There is a Wildlife corridor on the edge of the site, adjacent to Woburn Sands, but there is a lack of detail in relation to this within the document. It would be helpful to understand the implications for this wildlife corridor and whether mitigation is required would also ask whether there will be a commitment to achieve net gain in biodiversity on this site. It would be helpful to have a bit more information in terms of the environmental impacts of the scheme.	Para 4.2.11 Plan:MK Policy NE3 requires the protection and enhancement of biodiversity in new developments. The Framework seeks to protect a network of wildlife corridors, which provide ecological and pedestrian links. Biodiversity net gain across SEMK will be an integral element of the Open Space and Landscape Strategy as part of the build out of SEMK. At planning application stage local ecology will be reviewed in accordance with the planning policy requirements.

216	56	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The Landscape Character Assessment (Gillespies, 2016) has the land classified as Wavendon Clay Lowland Farmland. Our understanding was that this area lies within the national Character Area 90 – The Bedfordshire Greensand Ridge. The site is influenced by the proximity to the Greensand Ridge and the character of the Greensand Ridge villages. CBC is a leading partner in the ‘Greensand Country’ Landscape Partnership HLF funded project, which is now aligned with the National Character Area and has just adopted its Forward Plan. As the SEMK site is covered by both the Nature Improvement Area, as discussed earlier in this response, and the Greensand Country designations, it is suggested that both designations should be mentioned within the SPD. The Greensand Country promotes high quality, responsive design to celebrate and reinforce a sense of place. As with the Nature Improvement Area, it encourages high quality green infrastructure benefitting ecology.</p>	<p>The SPD refers to Landscape character Assessment (2016) which was used as an evidence base for the Plan:MK which provides review of the landscape character of the Borough. Throughout the SPD references are made to Greensand Ridge, including the need for the open views across landscape character area of Brickhill Greensand Ridge to be retained.</p>
217	56	General comment	<p>three parallel IDB watercourses run from the Greensand Ridge northwards to the railway. We feel there is an opportunity to make more of these watercourses within the Concept Plan, which have the potential to contribute to Biodiversity net gain. CBC would expect to be consulted on the Design Coding for any land parcels in close proximity to our boundaries. The concept plan (fig. 3.1) appears to have some discrepancies when compared to the landscape and open space strategy plan (fig. 4.1), for example the location of pitches and the extent of woodland and lakes. It would be helpful to have clarification on this matter.</p>	<p>Noted. Matter not for the SPD but for the upcoming planning applications.</p>
218	56, 75, 133, 1273	6. Next Steps	<p>Respondents question what changes will be made to the Movement Framework and the whole SPD following the EWR consultation. Consideration should be given to Making Meaningful connections document. EWR should work jointly with MKC. Given the future of the A421 through MK and Bucks remains to be resolved, and there are decisions to be made on EWR that will affect Mk and beyond, the development of a local transport strategy needs to involve not just Mk Council but neighbouring authorities, Network Rail, EWR, EEH, Highways Agency and SEMLEP.</p>	<p>The SPD was amended to provide primary and reserve movement options.</p>

219	56	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	4.2.2 that 'Advanced structural landscaping including planting with native species should be provided, particularly in buffer areas' is welcomed. However, due to the sensitivity of the heathland and native woodland that border the site to the south, we would recommend the statement is amended to say '...based on native species...'. The reciprocal views from the Greensand Ridge are important, and trees and hedgerows should be mainly of native species to accord with landscape character.	Noted.
220	56, 1370	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	4.2.6 rather than just a reference to 'street trees', we would recommend a requirement for landscaping or trees and hedges, to be used to soften the impact. The railway line referenced at 4.2.8 connects through to CBC. We believe that the use of native stock will be very important in the 'Edge Treatments' referenced, which would include buffering to the railway line. 4.2.9 (Bow Brickhill/ Woburn Sands Road) we would encourage some reference to the inclusion of appropriate evergreen material, such as holly and Scot's Pine included within the proposed landscape buffers and open space. If this is deemed to be too much detail, then perhaps a statement emphasising a requirement for extensive screen planting, to include appropriate evergreen species may be more appropriate. Some said MKC is reducing landscaping and green areas, so they don't have to pay ongoing costs for landscaping. MKC landscaping department have confirmed this to me. Its unacceptable. The landscaping in Central MK 50 years ago is superb. Now its all housing and no greenery. Ghettos of the future.	Noted.
221	60, 129, 147, 165, 217, 1232, 1271, 1272, 1293, 1304, 1316, 1331, 1333, 1259, 1388, 1395, 1391, 1367, 1365	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondent objects to G&T site within the development.	Plan:MK identifies the need for us to accommodate 19 households in culturally suitable housing for Gypsies and Travellers up to 2031. Within Milton Keynes there remains a total of 12 further pitches allocated, but not yet provided. This consists of 8 pitches on a new site at Newton Leys and 4 additional pitches to be provided as part of an extension to the Calverton Lane site. With the retention of these existing allocations, Plan:MK includes the need to provide for an additional 7 pitches over the plan period. The Council intends to allocate the additional 7 pitches in the South East Milton Keynes strategic site, in accordance with the policy in Plan:MK.
222	61, 64, 75, 84, 86, 99, 108, 183, 200, 209, 224, 1251, 1277, 1297, 1303, 1304, 1315, 1316, 1321, 1338, 1259	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/health	Medical facilities seem to be missing from the housing plan which must be considered in association with existing Medical Centre (example give Asplands) and other neighbouring surgeries. Asplands and other local doctors are already exceedingly busy/oversubscribed.	The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.

223	61, 84, 86, 224, 1288, 1391, 1367	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	Two proposed schools should also take into account local schools - Swallowfield, Aspley Guise and Fulbrook - which happen to be in Central Bedfordshire rather than Milton Keynes	Noted. No changes required.
224	61, 84, 86, 215, 224, 1262, 1297, 1288, 1378	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Concerns raised over loss of green space buffer around town area	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
225	63, 168, 201, 228, 1285, 1299, 1356, 1358, 1359	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Concerns raised over potential impact from H10 extension. Impact on tranquillity of the area and villages as well as the detrimental effect to the wildlife that uses and residents in this area (e.g., Wavendon Fields & Phoebe Lane and the pollution to the surrounding area. Concerns raised included effects from the proposal to extend H10 through green fields and the golf course to join Junction 13 causing potential noise, traffic, impact on wildlife, green hills, recreational fields and their use by pedestrian. Some suggested to include underpasses, pedestrian and cycle bridges but be visually sensitive and regarding light disturbance to wildlife. One respondent highlighted the rich heritage of Phoebe Lane which would be blighted if it is severed.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
226	64	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	If a G&T site is to be included, it should be in the extreme west of the site as close as possible to the proposed Industrial site being developed south of Caldecotte.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. To ensure a delivery of the site as per requirements of Plan:MK a phasing chapter was updated to ensure the site is delivered prior the occupation of residential properties.
227	65, 142, 174, 201	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent raise concerns over additional traffic caused by 3000 homes.	The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer, and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.

228	67, 122, 1276, 1261	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent stated that there is no up-to-date analysis of the current flow of traffic within SEMK. Even if there was, the traffic flow will change over the next few years with the building out of the SLA and with the other current housing developments along the Newport Road. Moreover, an analysis of the effects of the various possible changes proposed by East West Rail, e.g., the level crossings at Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise being closed, or even just being open to road traffic for a reduced period of time, is needed before any realistic Development Framework can be produced. There has also be no modelling of flows from M1 J13 to anywhere in MK via Aspley Guise or Salford, this in an incredible oversight from a document over 100 pages long.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
229	67	General comment	Producing the SPD now will be costly and likely in need of change in the future. If the developers prepare applications and the framework will be changed in the future, they could seek compensation or judicial review.	Noted. No changes required.
230	68	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	Based on the existing settlements where around 1100 homes exist 1 and one community hub the SEMK estate will need at least 2-3 community centres. Existing ones where 1 is provided per 1100 are at full capacity on weekday in the evenings.	2 local centers will be provided.

231	68, 1370, 1384, 1392	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	<p>There is a recognised lack of youth facilities across Milton Keynes. For example, there is a waiting list of over 1300 places for children in the Milton Keynes Scout District, and similarly for the Guides, music, martial arts, Boys Brigade, and other organisations. The waiting lists are not due to a lack of volunteer leaders, but a lack of places available and affordable for them to meet.</p> <p>Some added that we took away the par 3 golf course and promised to relocate it at Wavendon and then never did. The sports hall in Woburn Sands although a massive building only has a small footprint, only big enough for badminton courts and 5 a side football and nothing else. It also has limited parking.</p>	Noted. No changes required.
232	68	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	<p>Location of community hubs should consider the following: Adjacent to shared car parking. Adjacent to open space: Linear Parks and playing fields will provide greater utility for user groups. Adjacent to shared facilities: Schools and Parks will have opportunities for shared infrastructure. Community centres can be complimentary to but should be independent of (adjacent school / health centres or similar).The Strategy makes reference to a community hub south of the railway line, integral to the heart of the new community. This is welcome. However: The community hub proposed north of the railway line it is noted is dependent on the relocation of the railway station. This is not welcome. The SEMK design guide should specifically ensure that provision of a community facility is required, independent of any changes to the railway station.</p>	Noted. Detail design will form part of application stage.
233	68	Page 35	<p>Reference is made (pp35.) to the local centre in Wavendon Gate. This local centre is in Walnut Tree, and it should be recognised that it is over 1 kilometre from the boundaries of SEMK, recognised that it is 2 kilometres from the proposed new community hubs.</p>	Noted.
234	69, 161, 162, 1295, 1300, 1292	General comment	<p>Respondent is in support of the proposed development. The respondent supports increase in housing and eventual increase in facilities and new initiatives for this area. Some also support future development of areas outside SEMK</p>	Noted.
235	70, 97, 1264, 113	General comment	<p>respondent raised concerns over future development of 3000 homes , potential rail development which may cut the village in two and road infrastructure development in the Woburn Sands/Wavendon area.</p>	Noted. MKC is not proposing to close any level crossings. Review is undertaken by EWR.

236	71, 95, 99, 108, 113, 115, 133, 134, 1238, 1251, 1260, 1346	General comment	Concerns raised over undertaking the consultation in pandemic and lack of face-to-face meetings. Requests made for a second round of consultations once restrictions are lifted by some. Question raised over what measures will be put in place to engage with residents of adjacent parishes. One respondent did not think consultation process met Gunning principles and reserved right to challenge any future adoption.	Government imposed emergency regulations which did allow for the consultation to take place. Over 1,500 comments were received.
237	72	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Respondent stated that: it's not clear where the drainage coming in from the south by Browns Wood at the east end of Bow Brickhill goes to. It's likely that that currently ends up in this site, so it's important to resolve that. Ideally a clear statement is needed that in recent years the IDB has sharply restricted any increases in run-off into its water courses since regular flooding is already occurring downstream.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.
238	72	Page 27	Respondent suggests to check if the data is still accurate since there have been changes to bus services recently.	Noted.
239	72, 1330	Para 2.8	Many of the existing facilities listed are at their capacity and this should be noted. Some notes that existing facilities will benefit from the development but that they should not be the sole source of provision for SEMK.	Noted. No changes proposed.
240	72	General comment	There is a lack of clear guidance on non-residential provision within the SPD which may prove matters difficult at future Development Control committee meetings for the decision makers. Respondent suggests adding that that convenience retail sufficient to serve the south west portion of the site will be required there.	the SEMK site will be mix use residential led development.
241	72, 144, 146	Para 3.1.7	The density statement is somewhat concerning. The CAG advised against having low density against all existing development because this would put too high a pressure on the density in the central areas. Suggest modification to: SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing rural development, and the rural edge, notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. The remainder is fine. Some respondents believe that this paragraph should make specific reference to higher density areas adjacent to the relocated Woburn Sands station	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

242	72	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	If the Woburn sands station is not relocated, then convenience retail will still be required for the northern area, so a smaller site should be shown as an alternative, more central to the northern area .	MKC does not propose any relocations of stations or closure of crossings. Those are proposed by EWR company.
243	72	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>4.2.12 The wording sounds as though this is an idea for consideration. It should be reworded to be clear that these corridors should be retained and enhanced.</p> <p>4.2.27 add “and surrounded by a clear, closed boundary”.</p> <p>4.2.28 not clear what the point is about vehicular access. All playing pitches need vehicular access for equipment deliveries and team vehicles, disabled access, etc.</p> <p>4.2.30 Respondent believes that the bus is no longer operational</p>	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Details will be approved at planning application stage.
244	72	Table 4.2	T junctions on busy grid roads are rapidly proving unsafe and need routing improvements – lane separation islands, or at absolute minimum, clear white lines marking routes across them. Primary street: School should not have a direct access onto this street as the queues will block the whole street. This street needs to provide reasonably timely access in and out of the estate, so concerned at on-street parking. Ideally this should be in a separate physically demarcated lane as on the new provision on Countess Way, not just white paint delimiters. Consider crossing points so that children waiting to cross are visible.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council’s strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

245	72	4.5.2 Character and Density	<p>There are two mentions of rear parking courts. Respondent believes that MKC policy is that those are only supported in extreme circumstances because they are simply not used. Therefore, following comments were made:</p> <p>Primary residential street. If apartments are to have rear parking courts, there must be an entrance to access them from the front, and visitor parking must be properly catered for with access from the front, since that is where visitors will naturally come. Otherwise, people will park on the primary street in large numbers.</p> <p>Railway edge – if the railway space is being used as the public open space, there must be a defensible barrier (e.g., thorn hedge!) between that and the railway itself. Rear parking courts – as before.</p> <p>Apartments should still have some enclosed outdoor space where toddlers can play safely, etc. and people can get outside in lockdowns. While it may be communal for the block, ideally there would be more than one area so people can be outside separately. The complete separation of types of housing between the character areas goes against the principle of mixed neighbourhoods. There should be say 10% of other types of housing on each to improve the mix.</p>	<p>Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas.</p> <p>Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.</p>
246	72	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	<p>Respondent suggest to include strategic drainage on or off site, since it's possible to a contribution to a new major balancing lake from developers may be required, and/or individual parcels may not be able to achieve on-site mitigation.</p>	<p>The SPD contains information on Strategic SuDs network.</p>
247	72	6. Next Steps	<p>Respondent suggests adding to 6.1.2 the locations of green and blue infrastructure. (Linear parks, corridors, main SUDS facilities)</p>	<p>The Open Space and Landscape Strategy was amended following comments.</p>
248	72, 107, 164, 1396, 1375	6. Next steps	<p>The SPD should require sufficient parking spaces to be provided off road for all residential development to prevent clogging up streets with parking. Some suggested 2 spaces per property. Thought should also be given to providing parking for residents of Hardwick Road off street.</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

249	72	4.3 Movement Network/V11	Concerns raised over the V11 all movement bridge having negative impact on local amenity causing noise especially on Holst Crescent which is an important street linking Browns Wood and Old Farm Park. It is noted that the raised nature of the road (to get over the railway) could not be mitigated by a noise bund due to size needed and as these are existing dwellings additional sound insulation could not be a mitigation.	The SPD was amended and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
250	73, 213	4.5.2 Character and Density	The development should provide some bungalows to allow people to downsize. There is a shortage of bungalows in Woburn Sands. Some respondents said not everyone wants to live in a retirement home.	Housing mix will be reviewed at planning application stage in accordance with policies of Plan:MK. Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5.
251	73	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The open spaces are acceptable but would like to see a country park included as it would create a more natural area.	Open space should be provided in accordance with guidance set out in Plan:MK (Policy L4 and Appendix C). The SPD contains Fig 4.1 landscape and Open Space Strategy which shows amongst others, areas of multifunctional buffers and proposed linear open spaces. Details of those will be provided through forthcoming planning applications.
252	73, 181, 166, 1303	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	The proposed G&T site is not right since and should be closer to essential services.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. To ensure a delivery of the site as per requirements of Plan:MK a phasing chapter was updated to ensure the site is delivered prior the occupation of residential properties. The SEMK site needs to provide for 7 pitches as required by Policy SD11 of Plan:MK. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.
253	73, 1337	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondent noted that public transport such as a regular bus service needs to be implemented as regular bus service has been stopped.	The SPD makes reference to the Public Transport and how the need for it will be assessed.

254	74	General comment	The Forestry Commission stated that they are not in a position to input into the consultation process for Local Plans. However, they provided information to assist the Council in assessing the appropriateness of sites for future development, and to highlight opportunities for achieving renewable energy obligations.	Noted. No actions required.
255	75, 77, 78, 100, 133	4.3 Movement Network/ Expressway	Respondent questioned what upgrades of roads would be provided instead of cancelled Expressway to service and connect the development of the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. How the development can happen before that infrastructure is planned and decided. Some mentioned requirement to provide strategic links through SPD.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment.
256	75, 176, 210, 1257, 1269, 1299, 1265, 1260, 1365	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Possible permanent closure or partial closure at Woburn Sands level crossing will push traffic onto alternative routes such as Leys and Hardwick Road. Some respondents were against moving of the Woburn Sands station. Permanent closure of the crossing will cut the town into separate parts which will impact on towns character therefore a bridge or underpass should be provided near to existing level crossing and not through SEMK site. Some said its closure would impact schools, shops etc. Some said even a relocation of the crossing would increase travel times creating significant inequality in quality of life, possibly making walking/cycling to Woburn Sands High Street for amenities no longer an option. MKC Highways noted the SPD acknowledges the potential issues but clearly the option of a Woburn Sands bypass with closure of the level crossing (and EWR proposals) will involve significant alterations to traffic movements and modelling and junction assessments will be crucial to this.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC. The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
257	75	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent supports the vision however this cannot be achieved if access to Bow Brickhill road is granted increasing the traffic along The Leys. The part of SEMK to the north of the railway next to Newport Road is within the boundary of Woburn Sands – this should also be part of a green buffer zone. Otherwise SEMK will not be a distinct community.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Details will be approved at planning application stage.
258	75, 1252	4.4 Land Use	Allotment site to be provided. Allotments are Woburn sands are fully occupied.	Allotment site is to be provided within SEMK site.

259	75	4.3 Movement network	Movement Network Scenario's – all 3 will have a devastating negative impact on the Bow Brickhill road remaining a rural road. Traffic is The Leys will be excessive and any plans will have to ensure that only local and not through traffic comes through the Leys, Hardwick Road and Theydon Avenue	The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
260	75	4.3 Movement Network	Woodleys Road Crossing that is shown on the map is not where the Woodleys Crossing currently is, the map shows it at the edge of the buffer zone, whereas it is actually further west. This is confusing and should be renamed something else if it's a new crossing point.	Additional clarification in text provided. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill Road via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extension.
261	75	4.3 Movement Network	The existing accesses from Bow Brickhill Road to agricultural holdings should be closed off to vehicles and hedgerow extended.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
262	75, 205, 1305, 1316	4.3 Movement Network	All roads within SEMK should be residential- not grid roads.	The SPD contains a table with design requirements which includes design speeds. The SPD cannot address speeds outside of the allocation boundary. See Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network
263	75	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	The EWR consultation is also proposing to do a new road across the existing WS Allotment field. This is totally unacceptable as this site services a number of the neighbouring district villages that do not have their own allotments.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.

264	77	General comment	<p>Background information provided in relation to Fred Roche Foundation. Reference made to the original Plan for MK by Llewelyn Davies and implementation undertaken by MKDP. Respondent stated that SPD fails to meet all major principles set out in the Councils own growth strategy naming especially placemaking, impact on local communities.</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and has been used to inform the development framework. Various scenarios have been modelled with different bridge crossings and the H10 being extended through to Newport Road or not. As part of future Planning Applications, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the council's transport model and, where necessary, include additional local traffic data collection.</p> <p>Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment.</p>
265	77	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Respondent does not support any of the movement network and believes that they have no structure.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.</p>

266	77, 1303	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	<p>If the East West rail plans are implemented cyclists and pedestrians will be forced to use high level bridges to access the area with only one footpath/bridleway with an underpass. Concerns raised that there is no provision for suitable rail crossing for pedestrians</p>	<p>Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport. The SPD acknowledges that the additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.</p>
-----	----------	--------------------------	---	--

267	77, 88, 89, 92, 94, 97, 113, 151, 1238	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Need for strategic coordinated plan for the area needs to be developed with EWR. Some noted that until there is a clear strategy for how the high-speed East West railway will affect the area no further expansion plans should be considered for south if the railway	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
267	77, 1394	General comment	There is no evidence to support a need for 3,500 new homes in the short to medium term. Current levels of demand, less than 1,400 dwellings/annum can be adequately met in MKEast, south of Fenny Stratford and other already started but not completed development areas, like Fen Farm. Comment made in regards to employment areas in MK, comments on national economy and changes due to Covid and Brexit., comments in relation to smaller employment areas and the role of MKDP and Advanced Factory Unit in the past.	Plan:MK Policy SD11 requires that the site delivers approximately 3000 homes mixed sue residential development.
268	77	4.4 Land Use	Due to high densities playing fields are located within limited parkland areas. They have to be by nature flat, tree less and semi-private.	The open Space Strategy was amended. Playing field to be provided in the Woburn Sands Green buffer.
269	77, 1433	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent stated that the land south of the railway should be considered as an open space asset to MK and is needed to protect the important Green sands Ridge and Woburn Woods, building close up to the Woburn Sands Bow Brickhill Road will significantly damage this natural asset. This area was never included in the original plans for MK	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Details will be approved at planning application stage.

270	77, 182, 212, 1279, 1321, 1323, 1337, 1341	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondents stated that little consideration has been given to the impact of the development on schools, health and community facilities, which would likely not support the influx of residents.	Policy SD11 requirements for school are considered in the SPD. The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.
271	77	4.3 Movement Network	Responded stated that the SPD has been prepared without scientific traffic analysis and is based on assumptions such as V11 extension, maintaining Bow Brickhill level crossing or bridge, keeping level crossing at Woburn Sands or providing a bridge. Lack of connectivity to wider regional network where e.g., H10 is shown to end at western Woburn sands bypass and does not continue to Newport Road.	There has been traffic modelling undertaken (using the MKC Strategic Traffic Model: MKMMM) for the SE MK allocation as part of the evidence base to Plan MK, and subsequent to this to inform the development framework. This modelling, as well as other considerations such as multi modal connectivity, has informed the draft development framework for the site comprising two bridge crossings, with the preferred option now being a V10 crossing broadly in line with the existing level crossing, and a crossing to the eastern edge of the site (referred to as Woodleys Road in the framework). As part of the SEMK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection

272	77	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>There has been some suggestion of continuing H10 across Newport Road and across the Wavendon Golf course site and beyond to the A421, but the SPD does not demonstrate that this is feasible, there is no space for a junction with Newport Road, there is an ancient monument on the potential corridor and the Council has served TPO notices across the whole golf course. Therefore, we are left with a large amount of traffic forced to use an extended V11 to access MK and beyond to the north and east. The impact of additional traffic on the H10 and H9 roundabouts has not been considered.</p>	<p>Noted. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
273	77	4.3 Movement Network/V11	<p>If EWR are forced to close the Bow Brickhill level crossing and are not able or willing to fund a new bridge this leaves even more traffic wishing to enter MK from the south to use the new H11 Bow Brickhill bypass and onto the extended V11, that is if the rail bridge is funded by the developers as EW Rail are not required to provide bridges if no existing crossing exists. Despite Council policy now fully endorsing grid roads with underpasses, the SPD only pays limited reference to them and is again calling the new west to east road a Primary Residential Street, another word for the discredited city streets which define earlier expansion areas. The new road from Bow Brickhill crossing to the Woburn Sands bypass should be a grid road along its entire length , H11.</p>	<p>The SPD was amended and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

274	77	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The high-level bridge crossings proposed at Bow Brickhill, V11 and Woburn Sands will not be used by cyclists and walkers and separate bridge or underpasses should also be provided at these locations. In order to meet the same number of segregated crossings enjoyed on grid roads a further two underpasses should be required to provide access across the railway.</p>	<p>The detailed design of highways interventions, including any landscaping proposals, crossings will be prepared and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. The SPD provides details in regards to which roads will be of grid road standard. Please refer to SPD for location off grid road corridors and extensions. Table 4.2 makes reference to design requirements for junctions and crossings of strategic network.</p>
275	77	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The ability to cycle safely into Woburn Sands along Newport Road has long been a failure in the development of MK and no mention of how this should be remedied has been included in the SPD. The redway network indicated on the Concept Plan is totally inadequate as it simply shows routes alongside the proposed new grid roads or primary residential routes without any commitment on developers to provide an extensive network inside the grid linking local centres, schools, open spaces and community facilities. Again, connectivity is poor and does not comply with Council policy to make cycling and walking easier options to car use.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.</p>
276	77	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The road strategy is based on an assumption that high level bridge crossings of the railway are an option. No reference is made to the height and length of these structures and the impact on surrounding homes. An indicative structure has been designed by the Council on V10 to replace the Bow Brickhill level crossing this will be at least 7m high with articulated vehicles on top and 600m long and will have a huge impact on residents in Caldecotte. Using the same design principles, the same will be needed at V11 between Old Farm Park and Browns Wood and will have a major impact on hundreds of existing homes on either side and remove valuable open space along its route. There are no other examples of such major new bridge structures in MK to carry vehicles over existing roads or railways. None of these bridges will be suitable for cyclists or pedestrians. In the case of V11 the crossings to Holst Crescent and Morley Crescent will also need to be addressed.</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

277	77	4.3 Movement Network/MRT	respondent stated that considerable part of the Strategy and this SPD is given over to the development of a Mass Transport Network, without clearly defining it, how it will access all parts of MK and how it will be paid for.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
278	77, 1330	General comment	Respondent raised concerns about the quality of planning and urban design and placemaking and stated that there are no lessons learnt from developments at Newton Leys, Calverton, South West MK, Broughton, Brooklands and Atterbury and that which is emerging from the currently adopted SPD for the eastern expansion area. Concerns over connectivity, local facilities access, Divergence from using grid roads t with separated cycling and walking to city streets. Poor quality standard house builders' products, poor layouts, inadequate public realm, landscaping, homes too close to footways. Not enough attempt to utilise retaining existing hedgerows natura features. Lack of employment area within the site. Housing should not include flats, be of low density, extensive open space, network of cycling and walking. Sustainable grid roads, bus and redway routes.	Detail design matters will be considered at planning application stage.
279	77, 1307, 1370	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Linear park network proposed is not wide enough especially the strip along the railway line. There is a chain of blue blobs running alongside the railway which are supposed to represent water attenuation and indicate blue open space, these will be inadequate to support wildlife or be usable for water activity such as fishing. It is likely that following a full technical and hydrological study of the area that a much larger area of water will be required with sufficient balancing capacity to prevent flooding elsewhere in SEMK and beyond. Berks, Bucks and Oxfor Wildlife added that the linear park should be specifically for wildlife; like a linear nature reserve and recommend a minimum width of 30m. They provide further recommendations for this area.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Details will be approved at planning application stage. The thickness of the buffers is indicative, and details will be approved at planning application stage.
280	77	General comment	General comments in relation to retail patters, impact of pandemic, high streets status and increase use of local shops of use of local shops, office spaces in the pandemic.	Noted.

281	77	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	The plan should therefore encourage greater provision of local shopping with small specialist shops co-located with other community and health facilities, the concept plan shows a suitable central location, but the SPD should require this to be not just a local Tesco or similar small supermarket, these are appropriate but also need to have space for other uses adjacent to provide a range of local services to reduce the need to drive to Bletchley, CMK or Woburn Sands. . The neighbourhood centres from the original Plan for MK with access by foot or bike to a local centre within 1km should be included in all new planning briefs for residential development.	2 local centers are provided in the SPD. The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.
282	77, 1289	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent stated that 40% of land should be given to public open space and high-quality design and landscaping. It should be possible to walk to large areas of open space and water or countryside from all new housing areas. Some said it's not enough open space for the expected population size.	SEMK will accommodate in the region of 3000 dwellings. Appendix C of the SPD provides further details on the SEMK Indicative Land Use Budget.
283	77	6. Next Steps	Housing should have adequate gardens or shared amenity space for flats and provision for allotments should be made. All new housing should ensure that homes include space to accommodate desks to allow adults and children to work from home, not just relying on the kitchen table.	3000 dwellings as identified in Policy SD11
283	78	General comment	Respondent provided background information in relation to the history of its business and current operations. Location map of the Frosts Garden Center provided.	This requires circa 100ha of residential

284	78, 85, 103, 104, 132, 155, 160, 168, 212, 224, 1250, 226, 1343, 1357, 1299, 1260, 1379	4.3 Movement network/EWR	Concerns raised over potential closure of the Woburn sands level crossing and possibly lack of vehicular access e.g., bridge provided to replace that level crossing. respondents note that the SPD fails to propose appropriate arrangements to mitigate the potential loss of the level crossing for new and existing residents and businesses, access to schools. Some stated that residents should make the decision whether crossing at Woburn Sands is closed for longer or diversion is to be provided. Some added that scenarios do not accord with the requirement of Policy CT1 of Plan:MK to promote a safe, efficient and convenient transport system and Policy CT2 to minimise travel and improve accessibility to services. extension of the MK Grid further to the east to Newport Road and beyond would assist in addressing this by increasing east to west connections where they are currently limited and provide alternative routes to the level crossing on Newport Road. Some respondents said safe pedestrian access must be included and want clarity if this will be implemented and if the road will be shut.	It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport. The SPD acknowledges that the additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.
285	78	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports vision to ensure that vehicular accessibility is achieved by linking to the MK grid network. MK Grid is extended further east including a link to Newport Road, to ensure the area of Woburn Sands to the north of the railway line remains accessible.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.

286	78	4.3 Movement Network	Under the current proposals, any traffic travelling eastward will be limited to using Bow Brickhill Road to the south of the SUE, which is a convoluted route and still relies on a level crossing at Brickhill Street. This will largely only be beneficial to those seeking to join the M1 motorway at Junction 13 and does not support increased east-west connections across the SUE to extend the MK Grid nor future-proof it for longer term development further east. The views of Woburn Sands Parish Council which seek to ensure a link road onto Newport Road to provide an alternative access route into Woburn Sands are supported. Plans as they stand are in all 3 scenarios considered to be not well connected or integrated. The deliverability issue is considered to since 2 scenarios propose access routes beyond the red line of the allocation. Lack of clarity around ERW, MRT means plans are premature.	A key aim of the pedestrian, cycle and bridleway network within the site is to integrate and connect it with all existing rights of way, redways, footpaths and bridleways that connect with the edges of the allocation. Fig 4.2 Movement Strategy shows the proposed strategic redway network within SEMK which primary follows the strategic movement network. New leisure routes and bridleways will be primarily located within the proposed open space network connecting to the surrounding area.
287	79, 138, 148, 179, 180, 1234, 201, 228, 1249, 1250, 1299, 1261, 1260, 1379	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondent does not support G&T site location near Wavendon. Concerns raised around the general growth in the area of Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. The site would have a negative impact on the character of the area. Some suggest that other proposed G&T sites have better facilities nearby, and that the site would obscure the view of the Brickhill's if located in Wavendon. Further concerns about poor drainage, sloping and poor access of site.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. To ensure a delivery of the site as per requirements of Plan:MK a phasing chapter was updated to ensure the site is delivered prior the occupation of residential properties.
288	81, 82, 117, 222, 1319	General comment	Respondent raised general concerns in regards to potential impact of the site on conservation area and wildlife, traffic, pollution, pedestrian crossings risks.	Those matters will be reviewed as part of EIA process and planning application stage.
289	83, 100, 108, 110, 117, 119, 123, 158, 160, 168, 181, 217, 1252, 1277, 220, 1305, 1433, 1353	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent raised concerns over reduction of open countryside and/or merging of the surrounding areas with the SEMK. Many noted that rural character of the villages should be maintained. Some Ref made to "drop-ins" at Woburn Sands Memorial Hall in November 2014, and other similar events where it was noted that there will be countryside left between MK and existing older settlements. One raised concern that existing resident's way of life would be negatively impacted.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
290	83, 100	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	respondent supports the two western sites which would allow spreading densities elsewhere on the site.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. To ensure a delivery of the site as per requirements of Plan:MK a phasing chapter was updated to ensure the site is delivered prior the occupation of residential properties.

291

87

General comment

Concerns raised around wording of the draft SPD where the use of words such as 'will start' or 'it is necessary to progress' suggest that decisions have been made and consultation process will not change that. Respondent raised concerns over accessibility of the evidence base documents. Any adverse impacts from the development should be mitigated.

The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

292	88	General comment	<p>The work on SPD should not be progress until the findings of the forthcoming England's Economic Heartland (EEH) connectivity study have confirmed revised transport and infrastructural priorities.</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and has been used to inform the development framework. Various scenarios have been modelled with different bridge crossings and the H10 being extended through to Newport Road or not. As part of future Planning Applications, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the council's transport model and, where necessary, include additional local traffic data collection.</p> <p>Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p> <p>The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment.</p>
293	88	General comment	<p>respondent does not agree that the 5-year housing land supply and need for it to be maintained should be used as an aa argument to progress the work on the SPD. Respondent does not agree that not delivering this site would result in a shortfall of planned housing growth.</p>	<p>The site is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes and is integral part of housing delivery of Plan:MK</p>

294	88, 1284, 1341, 1310	General comment	Respondent stated that studies shown that the site will have detrimental effect on local environment (ref made to Sustainability Appraisal of the Plan MK). Comments made in relation to Ox-Cam arc that this development is at odds with the principles to support lasting improvements on environment, biodiversity and green infrastructure. Consideration should be given to flooding matters, better access to green space, sustainable energy and waters. Some said the area is a water stressed region and continued development puts a strain on the sustainability of future water supply. More focus should be put on increasing biodiversity and green space.	Plan:MK Policy SD11 requires that the site delivers approximately 3000 homes mixed use residential development. Detail design matters will be considered through planning application process. Strategic matters are considered in the SPD.
295	88, 110, 185, 1250	6. Next Steps	concerns raised around air quality by respondents. Some respondents questioned how traffic will be mitigated and what will be acceptable thresholds for increase noise, air pollution. How will assess potential impact on natural sites such as Greensand ridge or impact on health of local communities from e.g., air-borne toxicity. Some noted that potential impacts should be detailed in a report.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions and appropriate assessments will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce various reports which will identify any mitigation measures required. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
296	89, 103, 117, 164, 1253	6. Next Steps	Proper transport infrastructure must be provided, including adequate and sustainable public transport. Some noted need for cycle routes (including redways). The need for the cycle routes to be constructed to the same standard as the roads. It was noted by few that inadequate public transport is planned for.	Detail design matters will be considered at planning application stage.
297	89	6. Next Steps	Proper protection is given to wildlife and the natural environment. This includes the protection of current habitats, particularly around the Plysu/Fisherman's Lake area and adjacent scrubland and uncultivated fields. These areas, along with the worked fields either side of the Bletchley to Bedford Railway line are home to a wide range of species including hare, fox, marbled white butterflies and numerous birds. With reference to birds, the species we have seen include Fieldfare, Redwing, Mistle Thrush and Skylarks – all of which are classified as red list species, meaning that they are endangered, and their numbers have significantly declined. Loss of habitat due to land development may further undermine these species survival chances.	The referenced matters will be considered at planning application stage and subject to EIA assessment.

298	89	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Support the approach and recommendations of Woburn Sands Town Council regarding the need for low density housing, green spaces, wildlife corridors and sensible transport infrastructure. This represents the least-worst option for development. However, the best solution would be to retain the fields between Bow Brickhill as agricultural land and an environmentally friendly green belt on the south-eastern flank of Milton Keynes	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
299	92, 195	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent supports provision of playing fields in Woburn Sands	Noted. No changes required.
300	92, 238	4.3 Movement Network	Existing redways around Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill and Wavendon are not used much and poorly signed putting cyclists and rode users at risk. New redways and roads in the plan should consider road users safety.	The detailed design of cycle routes, including any landscaping proposals, crossings will be prepared and reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which identifies any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site.
301	93, 215, 1433	General comment	Respondent does not support the SEMK location due to impact on open space and countryside. Respondent stated that there are other undeveloped areas in MK that should be utilised. Respondent believes that the development is developer lead and not in accordance with the MK framework. Some questioned whether investigation into the availability of brownfield sites been considered?	Noted. The site is an allocation in Plan:MK Policy SD11.
302	94, 1391, 1367	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondent noted that the site should be providing a local shopping centre, post office, medical centre, church or religious centre, village hall and pub to support a community of up to 10,000 inhabitants. Some of these are planned, but not all.	2 local centers are provided in the SPD. The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.
303	97, 1294	General comment	Respondent is concerned that few links are being shown into the existing urban areas of Milton Keynes, and for those living South of the railway line, the main exit points will be onto the Bow Brickhill Road and not to the grid network	The SPD was amended, and additional leisure routes provided. Primary and reserve options for movement network feature in the SPD.

304	97, 1370	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent stated that there has been no traffic survey or modelling around traffic heading to M1 or impact of SEMK on existing railway crossings.	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and has been used to inform the development framework. Various scenarios have been modelled with different bridge crossings and the H10 being extended through to Newport Road or not. As part of future Planning Applications, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the council's transport model and, where necessary, include additional local traffic data collection.</p> <p>Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p>
-----	----------	----------------------	--	---

305	97, 104, 185, 1289	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	<p>Respondents noted that EWR does not need to consider future growth in their plans. Respondents noted that since the affected section of EWR is not due to take any more trains until the end of decade EWR has no pressure to deliver the necessary infrastructure. No date of delivery of travel survey being undertaken by EWR. Some said there has been no collaboration with EWR and their proposals</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p>
-----	--------------------	--------------------------	---	--

306	97, 1276	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>Milton Keynes Multi-Modal Model Update Highway Model Local Model Validation Report V1.4 AECOM. (2012) In this paper, on page 82, Table 38: Observed and Modelled Journey Time inter-peak, and Table 39: Observed and Modelled Journey Time peak, there has been no measurement or modelling on travel from M1 J13 into anywhere in MK via Aspley Guise or Salford - coming in at Lower End Road (Appendix A –route choice calibration). This modelling does not provide any information on traffic flows using this route to the M1. Respondent stated that this is an oversight and makes a no sense of in relation to traffic flows now and in the future through the Leys, Hardwick Road and Aspley Guise. respondent stated that there is no evidence that this route to the M1 has been looked at or factored in to the SEMK expansion with any logical rational. If it had, it would be obvious that the largely single lane Hardwick Road is of insufficient capacity to take traffic from a 3000-home development, in the absence of an easy connection via the H10 extension to the Newport Road. Q&A session on H10 it was stated that this SDP cannot go beyond red line for H10 extension. Appendix V of the SA Report of Plan MK (filename Plan MK – SA Note 180622 v2.pdf) on the subject of transport provision for SEMK in the case of Scenario 2 (higher housing provision) it states: Although there is significant extra housing growth, the impacts are mitigated by the new link between H10 and Bow Brickhill Road bridging the railway line just to the west of Woburn Sands, and the additional road network linking H10 through to A5130 (Newport Road).” This quote shows that early on, in 2018, the plan was to build an Eastward extension of the H10 grid road. No justification has been given for the removal of this essential infrastructure provision. And approach not in line with MKFutures2050 document says that the policy is 'I before E' - Infrastructure before Expansion- Failure to build the Eastward extension of H10 at the onset flies in the face of this approach.</p>	<p>The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.</p>
307	97	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>MKC20/02682/FUL has been submitted to build 12 dwellings to the west of the Newport road on land reserved for the H10 extension. This area is outside the MKSE expansion boundary, but within the ‘corridor reserve’ allocated for the H10 grid road extension to the Newport road. If approved, this development would occupy some of the land needed for the grid road and inhibit future extension of the H10. The land needed for the H10 extension must be safeguarded from development, and the H10 extension built before the SEMK development 5 is occupied.</p>	<p>The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.</p>

307	97	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>EWR recent consultation shows the need for H10 extension to Newport Road. On P57, they state “Given the safety concerns associated with level crossings, it is a primary objective of the Office of Rail and Road (which regulates the railways) to close level crossings permanently”. This means that all road traffic in Woburn Sands could be cut off from the Newport road to the North when the EW high speed rail link comes into use and the level crossing is closed. This will force all residents of Woburn Sands, Aspley Heath and the other villages to use Hardwick Road and the Leys in order to reach the Kingston Centre and beyond, to Milton Keynes. Residents who wish to drive to Woburn Sands facilities such as Frosts and the Woburn Emporium garden centre will need to use the H10 ‘Woodleys’ extension to cross the railway line, but will then be obliged to follow a very circuitous route, heading West away from their destination, North up to the A421 before doubling back onto the Newport Road unless the H10 is connected to the Newport Road</p>	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
308	100	General comment	<p>why MKC now wish to add the additional houses south of the railway line, plus the extra employment site (against expert advice), and why, astonishingly, it called for sites after Plan MK was published? The high housing density now proposed is against your recent publicly stated intent.</p>	<p>Plan:MK Policy SD11 requires that the site delivers approximately 3000 homes mixed sue residential development.</p>
309	102	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>H10 extension should be designed to ensure there are sufficient buffers between this main road, and the residential areas, as the original grid areas of MK are designed. There must be no access option available to connect with Newport Road, to prevent through traffic towards A421/M1 as even if this isn't the designated route satnavs will naturally divert it this way. Need for underpasses and green buffers alongside was noted.</p>	<p>The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

310	103	4.3 Movement Network/V10	Respondent stated that there appears to be a width restriction on Bow Brickhill Road as it enters Woburn Sands to divert HVG's. HGVs shouldn't be entering Woburn Sands anyway.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
311	103	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent supports H10 extension. It should continue up to Newport Road. Traffic heading to M1 should be encouraged to use newly duelled A421 to access M1 junction 13.	Noted. The SPD cannot provide details of the land use for areas outside the red line of the allocation.
312	103	4.3 Movement Network	Concern was expressed at the fact that there is no mention of not allowing commuter traffic from travelling through Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley on their way to M1 Junction 13.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
313	103	4.4.3 Affordable housing	respondent questioned the need for affordable housing in light of the needs in the Arc itself.	Local Plan:MK policies (HN1, HN1 especially) will apply and matters of housing mix will be assessed through planning application stage.
314	104, 146	General comment	respondent questioned whether standard policies should apply within the site requiring for the development to be self-sustaining and not impair adjacent areas, need for grid roads, redways and grade separated crossings, pollution and sound buffers.	Noted. The site is an allocation in Plan:MK Policy SD11. All of the referenced are considered in the SPD.
315	105, 152, 179, 1333, 1379, 1378	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Erosion of green areas has increased over the last few years. Green buffers need to be increased.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
316	105	General comment	respondent made general comments around infrastructure provision (health) in MK, fly tipping, waste collection, taxes and poor design on SEMK plans.	Noted. No changes required.

317	107	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The field area behind Frosts serves to separate Woburn Sands from the ever-encroaching Milton Keynes and should not be lost. The whole development should include the planting of trees for the benefit of all into the future.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
318	107, 1343, 1357, 1260, 1366	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent is in favour of connecting a linear park from the linear park already in existence from Caldecotte Brook / Wavendon continuing on and beyond the M1, thereby facilitating leisure activities by foot, bike or horse riding to a wider public. This could route to/past Wavendon House. Wavendon PC provided plan showing proposed buffer	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. The SPD plans highlight proposed future links.
319	109, 157, 157, 1299	General comment	Some respondents raised concerns over the timing of the consultation which was undertaken during purdah period and that has stifled the ability for the Councillors to discuss this significant and important document in a free manner and certainly and allow elected members to discuss the document within the local press. Some respondents raised concerns in relation to timing of ERW and SEMK consultations where ERW's was running till June and it is believed that allowing late representation is not the same as live consultation. residents were unable to ask questions in the context of EWR's proposals and many responses were submitted prior EWR's plans. Additional consultation events and allowing amending of responses to be allowed. Some I am thankful for the consultation, but it discussed use and specifications that may well be hugely impacted by decisions made outside the scope of the consultation.	Emergency regulations were imposed by the government allowing us to consult during pandemic. Online workshop events were hosted. necessary to progress the SEMK SPD toward adoption in 2021. The Council considered the possibility of delaying progress on the SEMK SPD in order to align it with the East West Rail Company's statutory consultation on their proposals for the railway line (see Question 5 for further details). However, on balance, it was felt that this was not appropriate given previous delays to the East West Rail Company's consultation which had originally been expected to occur in autumn/winter 2020.
320	110, 120, 1284	General comment	Concerns raised around environmental impact of the site, carbon emissions. Some mentioned the impact of this on health and wellbeing due to increased traffic.	Noted. No changes required.
321	111	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent opposes to H10 extension unless it can be secured for MRT or local traffic only.	Noted. Please see update SPD for movement options (primary and reserve) and criteria for a bridge.
322	111	4.3 Movement Network/V11	Respondent opposes to V11 extension unless it can be secured for MRT or local traffic only.	The SPD was updated and provides criteria for a bridge (V10 or V11)

323	112, 1331	4.3 Movement Network/V11	Respondent supports V11 extension.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
324	114	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports movement scenario since it will provide most access in/out of SEMK site.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport.
325	114	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent proposes for there to be a turning in and out of Woburn Sands at the south end of Woodleys road. No parking zone to be implemented on Hardwick Road to ensure it is not single lane like road. The proposed H10/V12 roundabout should join to Newport Road and linked to A421 to ensure no traffic on H9 between V10 and A421 which is already congested.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
326	116, 211, 1341, 1308	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent stated that the SPD is not well planned for the extension of grid roads which are needed for the planned increase of traffic and extensive use on amenities. Some have concerns about lack of grid road extensions and underpasses planned. Broughton and MK Parish Council also request explicit grid roads leading to and through SEMK (including Newport Road, the former A5130 to the east of Wavendon) to set the possibility of connectivity beyond the site. They believe current text covering pretend/implied/hinted-at grid-roads and reserved corridors is very unsatisfactory and will lead to similar problems of EEA City Streets.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development. Table 4.2 provides design requirements for strategic movement network.
327	117	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	The plans do not deliver local infrastructure with all local amenities within 15min walk. Car dependency won't be reduced.	Additional leisure routes were provided within the SPD and open space network amended.
328	126	4.3 Movement Network	Inclusion of left turn from Woodleys Road to Woburn Sands	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport.

329	127, 1279	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	respondent questioned the need for the site to be over 1ha and question was raised around future management of the site.	A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.
330	128	General comment	Respondent questioned the future of the Woburn Sands bus service which is upon demand atm. Will that be reviewed in the future. Ref refence provided to literature on what challenges villages like Woburn Sands are facing.	Noted. No changes required.
331	130, 133, 1385	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Concerns raised in regards to turning the fishing lake and area around it into a country park. Query around the process and timescales involved. Safety concerns over the depth of the lake, which is over 30 feet deep in the middle, undercurrents. No swimming or boating should be allowed in the lake, equipment used to dig the lake is believed to be left in the middle of it. Respondent noted that club fishing lake is the most appropriate use of the lake due to the mentioned concerns. Clarity around lake designation needed. Lake is privately owned therefore should not be included in in calculation of green space.	The SPD provides links to the fishing lake and provides the option of the lake being made accessible to the public. It will form part of the wider green buffer.
332	131	4.3 Movement Network/H10	The possible H10 extension should be incorporated into the strategic network with consideration of connectivity between MK, Woburn Sands and Wavendon.	Noted.
333	131	General comment	Respondent stated that the plans should have input of environmental economics. Environmental costs from the change of land sue should be calculated.	Noted. No changes required.
334	132	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports overall principles and creation of grid network including the linear park.	Noted. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport.

335	133	General comment	Substantial delays with this SPD to resolve the transport issues could result in unacceptable pressure upon the Council from the developers of the land within SEMK and issues around the Five-Year Land Supply. We therefore feel that it is vitally important that, alongside the SPD, the Council begins urgent, cross-border discussions with the adjoining local authorities with a view to producing a bold co-ordinated plan for the southern boundary area of Milton Keynes as a matter of urgency to give comfort and certainty to residents and developers about development and connectivity.	Noted. No changes required.
336	133	General comment	Vision is not bold enough in setting out the type of place that SEMK could become. Respondent suggested some aspirations for the site. No indication how the SEMK sits within contest of planning consents that have not been implemented in the area and the city. Examples of permissions: land east of Old Farm Park, Church Farm, Wavendon road patterns, sites such as Eaton Leys, South Caldecotte.	Noted. No changes are proposed.
337	133	4.3 Movement Network	Movement network scenarios around EWR contort the discussion. Best to provide one scenario with arguments around it. Respondent thinks that these are in the wrong place within the document – their current positioning only serves to obfuscate the arguments. It is necessary to separate the general design principles for the infrastructure from the alternative scenarios to enable people to understand the arguments. Pp 53-55 are critical to the planning of the whole area and need to be treated separately.	Noted. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport.
338	133	Fig 3.1	Fig 3.1 a) does not distinguish between existing and proposed grid roads and b); has two differing types of open space: “Multi-functional Landscape Buffer” and “Linear Open Space Network” where one (“Open Space”) would be a sufficient description	Open Space and landscape Strategy in the SPD was amended. Additional open spaces provided and leisure routes.
339	133	Fig 4.5 and Fig 4.6	Respondent thinks that the cross sections refer to Woodleys Road alone.	Noted.
340	133	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	There should be a landscape strip of grid road character between Woodley Street and the western edge of Woburn Sands, but we would query whether it is appropriate to widen it to fulfil some form of additional recreational purpose. We consider that it would be better to reallocate the space thus saved into the general open space network with the SEMK development area.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. As per Para 4.2.3 Along grid roads landscape multi-functional green infrastructure reserves will be provided along each side of the carriageway.

341	133	General comment	Respondent stated that it would be beneficial if an ownership map was created for the site to allow understand the deliverability of the site. Suggested to add a para 2.12 with land ownership consideration and information around EWR Works order: <i>Land ownership and the restrictions on land use imposed by the current EWR Works Order are vital components in the delivery of the overall plan and, in assessing planning proposals in accordance with Plan:MK Policy SD10, it is important to understand the feasibility for completing the development in accordance with the proposals. The submitted comprehensive development framework should therefore indicate the ownership of all land within the plan area and the nature of any agreement between the development parties</i>	Noted. The ownership of the site may change therefore it is not advisable to include it in the SPD.
342	133, 201	General comment	Concerns raised over individual planning applications coming forward some potentially ahead of the adoption of the SPD which is a requirement in SD10	Noted. No changes required.
343	133	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The open space network within SEMK should be planned so that it enables a multitude of route options and circuits around the area, particularly for those taking exercise such as dog walking, jogging and walking. Such routes should extend into the Brickhill woods, which is a vital component of the open space network for this area.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
344	133	General comment	Respondent believes that there should be a requirement within the site to provide land for custom build housing in line with government requirements.	Noted. No changes required. Policy HN5 will apply.
345	133	4.5.2 Character and Density	Respondent suggests that indicative density in terms of dwelling numbers should be set and proposes the following areas: H10 North, Railway North, Railway South (West), railway South (East. Commentary on character of each area is provided. The density of the development should increase towards railway station; detail study of the railway station area is needed to ensure the area is not too congested.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.

346	133	6. Next steps	<p>The SPD does not mention MKC's ambition to become 'Greenest City on the Planet' therefore the following sustainability matters developers should be challenged on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. SEMK will be a no-gas development unless hydrogen becomes a viable option; b. Houses are all built to Passivhaus standards to avoid upgrading almost on completion; c. SEMK will be a no-concrete site, with alternatives used for foundations (screw piles), and all other materials using concrete; d. SEMK will be a no-plaster site, with alternatives to plasterboard etc. e. The use of other materials will be scrutinised so that especially harmful ones are not used; f. The use of plastic should be minimised. 	Noted. No changes required.
347	133	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Provision of SUDS areas can be used as an excuse not to provide other more usable open space (comment around links through railway north from old park and church farm).	Open space should be provided in accordance with guidance set out in Plan:MK (Policy L4 and Appendix C). Future proposal will have to be in accordance with Policy FR2 where Pat B4 states: SuDs will be designed as multi-purpose green infrastructure and open space, to maximise additional environment, biodiversity, social and amenity value, where possible. The use of land to provide flood storage capacity should not conflict with required amenity and recreation provision- floodplains and floodplain habitats should be safeguarded.
348	133	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Railway borders: The SUDS should be used as an opportunity to create a linear feature (with permanent wetland, if possible). The sides of the SUDS should be carefully profiled with gentle gradients as both a safety feature for young children and to avoid the appearance of "bomb craters".</p> <p>Development along this route should be orientated to provide natural surveillance – there should not be runs of back garden fences.</p>	Future proposal will have to be in accordance with Policy FR2 where Pat B4 states: SuDs will be designed as multi-purpose green infrastructure and open space, to maximise additional environment, biodiversity, social and amenity value, where possible. The SPD contains Fig 4.1 landscape and Open Space Strategy which shows amongst others, areas of multifunctional buffers and proposed linear open spaces. details of those will be provided through forthcoming planning applications. Indicative Strategic SuDs location is shown on Fig 3.1
349	133	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>North-south link to Brickhill Woods: This is a major opportunity for a significant landscape link in and out of Milton Keynes. The image of a "corridor" shown on the Concept Plan (Fig 3.1) is inadequate. At its heart, should be a significant and broad public space to act as a natural focus for the local community and its events. The Local Park in Two Mile Ash is a particularly good example of what can be achieve</p>	Concept Plan Fig 3.1 had been amended. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Potential neighbourhood Play Area was identified with connecting proposed cycle/ pedestrian routes.

350	133	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	concerned at the use of the phrase “Community Hub”, which first appeared in the SPD for Milton Keynes East. It introduces a new phrase (without definition) that does not appear in the retail hierarchy within Plan:MK and we think that this can only lead to confusion and therefore needs to be changed. We feel that it is perfectly adequate to term such developments as “Local Centres”. What is a difference between community hub and local center.	Updated to state local centre.
351	133	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent supports relocation of the Woburn Sands Station. More work to be done around levels of the road and how it crosses the railway and how it will impact neighbouring buildings. Relocating it westwards into SEMK where it can have car park to enable travellers to use the train as a convenient alternative to travel into CMK and elsewhere	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council’s strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer’s own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
352	133	4.3 Movement Network	Woodleys Road should be renamed as V12	Woodleys Road will be a strategic route carrying through traffic, potentially MRT. Grid road corridor will be reserved. Road will not be provided of grid road standard therefore naming it V12 is not appropriate.
353	133	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	There should be a general statement upon street trees and the amount that are to be provided together with some typical cross sections of road verges to demonstrate that the space will be of sufficient width to enable larger trees to grow to full size. The matter needs careful consideration to ensure a) that trees are appropriate for the designed spaces and b) that suitable spaces are left for the provision of large trees that provide not only visual beauty but shade and the ability to modify humidity.	illustrative cross sections are provided in Fig (A) 4.3 and 4.4 (B). Details will be provided at planning application stage.

354	133	Para 1.7	Respondent noted some stray wording on the top left-hand corner of the inset map	Noted.
355	133	Para 2.3.11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third bullet point: The Woburn Sands road does not have an “unrestricted” speed limit – it is subject to national regulations, and a reduction in speed limit to 50mph, or even 40mph, would be appropriate. • Fourth bullet point: The wording implies that the railway line is protected under Policy NE1 Other respondents highlighted that the second bullet point references that some of the existing properties along Newport Road have access out onto the footpath network. It seems unlikely that these are authorised connections and should not be references in the SPD. It may be necessary to divert some of the existing Rights of Way in the future and it is unhelpful to give a status to private connections where there are no legal rights. The second sentence of the second bullet point should be deleted. Respondents believe that a blanket approach to the assessment of edge conditions has been adopted with the permitter of the site being assessed as almost entirely 'attractive'. It would perhaps have more impact as a planning tool if some areas were neutral. Respondent suggests that the area adjoining the permitted Church farm scheme should be recorded as neutral but accept that there is a more attractive edge closer to Wavendon. 	Detail proposals and ROW redirections will be reviewed at planning application stage. Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
356	133, 1236	Para 2.7	Respondent suggests amending the reference to redways to within MK there are shared paths for cyclists and pedestrians which have a red surface and are known as redways.	Noted. No changes proposed.
357	133	Para 2.11	<p>Add to end of third bullet point: “although, for amenity purposes, we expect that they will be buried during the course of the development”.</p> <p>Comment: This is a simple matter of amenity.</p>	Noted. Wording added.

358	133	Para 2.12	<p>Amend wording of second bullet point to “Existing hedgerows should be retained and strengthened to reinforce their importance as part of the local landscape for visual and biological diversity reasons. They should be used as structuring elements in the overall planning of sites and their removal will only be permitted to accommodate roads, infrastructure or wider open space elements such as playing fields. All hedgerows thus lost should be replaced by equivalent lengths of new hedgerows within the overall development area. To ensure their long-term maintenance, hedges should be incorporated within the public realm where practicable. All hedges within private ownership should be protected by suitable restrictive covenants within the land sale documentation”.</p> <p>Comment: Hedgerows are an important component of the local landscape and important for biodiversity.</p>	Noted. Wording added.
359	133	Para 3.18	<p>Add following wording: “There should be appropriate provision, at the outset, to ensure that new residents are able to form strong community links either through the provision of temporary facilities until permanent ones are available, or by associating with existing groups and organisations in the local area”.</p> <p>Comment: We are concerned that community provision is too often overlooked in the development of new areas and developers should be encouraged to work with organisations such as Community Action:MK and the Milton Keynes Community Foundation.</p>	Noted. Change not made. Infrastructure provision will be made as per phasing requirements.
360	133	Para 3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete first two sentences and replace with: “SEMK will become a thriving new community set within a lush landscape with significant planting of forest scale trees that extends the Brickhill Woods into the Milton Keynes urban area. It will feel an integral part of the wider city enjoying the same excellent levels of amenity, open space provision and connectivity as the rest of Milton Keynes”. • Delete second paragraph. <p>Comment: It is wrong to think of SEMK as an “extension” of Milton Keynes as this implies that it could somehow be something different – it has to be seen as an integral part of the whole, albeit that it might have a different character. The “Vision” has to be bold and reinforce the landscape connection.</p>	Noted. Wording in the vision amended.

361	133, 150	Para 3.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has been misnumbered – it should be 3.1.1. • See comments above about the use of “extension”, landscaping and the green buffer. There has to be a bold vision to create an exceptional place. Some respondents believe that the third sentence of this paragraph should be amended to include Wavendon. 	Numbering re-ordered. Vision amended.
362	133	General comment	respondent would like to see para 4.3.8 to be added: <i>“(The Boulevard) will form the major impression of SEMK for visitors and residents. It should have the character of a lush tree-lined avenue akin to the boulevards in the grid squares surrounding CMK, giving the impression of buildings set amongst trees. It should be a non-frontage road to permit smooth movement of vehicles and public transport (whilst discouraging speeding) and all vehicular access to the buildings should be via parallel service roads or side roads”.</i>	Noted. Change not made. Character and design chapters cover matters of character of the place.
363	133	Para 4.49	Insert new second sentence: “The retail uses with the (Local Centre) should not be of a scale that will compete with the shops in Woburn Sands”.	SPD cannot restrict use types. 2local centers will be provided in accordance with policies of Plan:MK
364	133	Fig 4.4	The redway along V11 should be on the east side rather than the west to provide better access for the residents of SEMK. There should be a proper redway link at the intersection of V11 and (The Boulevard).	SPD had been revised. Fig 4.3 Identifies primary Movement Network with V10 bridge. If EWR proposes a bridge at V11 then a reserve strategic highway network has been prepared and is included as Appendix C to the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
365	133	Para 5.1.2	Policy SD10 (see above) makes it clear that “planning permission will only be granted....following the approval...as a whole”. Therefore “...are likely to be refused” should be replaced with “...will be refused”.	Applications will be assessed on their own merits.

366	133	Para 5.1.4	<p>Add new first bullet point: "The production of a co-ordinated structure plan including, but not limited to, precedent examples, identification of development parcels, indicative housing numbers, price ranges, landscape features to be both provided and retained, retail and other facilities to be provided, accompanied by a draft programme for development of the entire area".</p> <p>Comment: In briefing sites within grid square structure plans MKDC worked on a basis of Starter/Low/Medium-Low/Medium high/High/Very High, with the boundaries being updated as and when appropriate. We suggest that it is possible for developers to adopt a similar formula here, being updated to take account of social housing. It helps people understand how an area is to be developed.</p>	Noted. The principles are based on the Plan:MK policies.
367	133	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	<p>Respondent provided their thoughts in relation to EWR' proposal: .Pony Level Crossing: This is an essential part of the movement network to connect MK to the Brickhill Woods. underpass is the most appropriate, but it would need to be designed to a broad width and with splayed ends to offer the maximum security for users. It should be designed of sufficient height that horse riders do not need to dismount to use it. Woodleys Farm Level Crossing: Unless there is an occupational need to keep this open to accommodate the residents of the Farm, we would have no objection to is being closed as it would otherwise seem to offer no particular benefit to the residents of SEMK. Fisherman's Path Footpath Level Crossing: no objection to closure unless it is fulfilling a requirement of which respondent is unaware. If both this and the Woodley's Farm Crossing are to be closed, they should be replaced with a single pedestrian/redway crossing between the Pony Level Crossing and the new Woodleys Road bridge. Woburn Sands Road Level Crossing: There is no easy solution to this crossing and the alternative road proposals all bring their own level of problems by diverting traffic into the existing streets of the town. We support the general principle of closing the level crossing, but such a decision should only be taken against a full review of the way that traffic moves around the whole of the local area as far as Woburn and M1(J13) so that as much through traffic as possible is removed from the A5130 through Woburn Sands. There should be an additional crossing for the Woodleys Road west of Woburn Sands, as shown in the SPD.</p>	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.

368	133	4.3 Movement Network/V10	V10 (Bow Brickhill Level Crossing): The V10 preferred bridge option is the one left by MKDC which has now been severely compromised by the sale to Red Bull of the land that was reserved for the bridge approaches. All of the E-W Rail alternatives being investigated to determine their feasibility are clumsy and inelegant in the way that they would accommodate traffic entering and leaving MK. If a bridge is to be built, the original "MKDC alignment" is far superior and should be used for either a bridge or a tunnel. Red Bull parking would need to be reallocated in the immediately adjoining area to the west of V10 with a suitable crossing to the main campus	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
369	133	4.3 Movement Network/V11	. V11 (Browns Wood Level Crossing), major road on the eastern side of MK and is dualled for the majority of its length (from H10-H6). V11 should be extended as a dual carriageway across the railway line from H10 southwards to meet the new (H11) to be built as part of SEMK, thus providing an alternative to V10 and the Bow Brickhill Level Crossing. The new bridge should accommodate a redway	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
370	134, 177	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Movement framework and the transport infrastructure should exceeds the needs and comply with existing principles of Milton Keynes. MKC should be specifying the network and transport infrastructure.	The SPD addresses the requirements of Policy SD11 in terms of strategic infrastructure and other policies in Plan:MK
371	134, 1322	Para 2.7	The current planning permission for the H10 extension into Church Farm is not suitable to serve the development beyond Church Farm. It was designed to serve standalone development of 350 houses. It breaches MK grid road rules because it cuts Byrd Crescent and provides at grade crossings for the redway and the bridleway between Wavendon Gate and Old Farm Park. The SPD should be changed to state that SEMK requires this extension to be a grid road, with bunding, fencing and vegetation in place to protect the adjacent housing from noise and pollution. Byrd Crescent should be bridged, and a grade separated solution must be provided for the bridle way and footpath.	Noted. SPD cannot cover matters outside of the red line of the site allocated.

371	134, 182	Para 2.12.1	Bullet one ignores Walton Parish area which is on the northern edge of the site and will be connected via railway crossings. The density of this area must be respected as it is also at levels determined suitable for the previous edge of MK. Add Walton to this bullet point and reference density requirements.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
372	134, 1322	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/schools	Given there are no catchment areas, there is a risk that students from Eaton Leys may use SEMK schools with the associated traffic from the west. • There are proposals for the type of schools and their location. How can you locate these if the road layout is still to be determined?	The SPD cannot address the matters of admission. The site needs to provide forms of entry in accordance with the Policy.
373	134	Para 3.2	SEMK population will double; existing parish boundaries will remain. Sustainability is essential to underpin the SEMK development. This can be achieved by: • Careful specification in the SPD of the scale and type of housing required to create a diverse population. • Judicious use of planning obligation funds, both direct and via section 106. Undertaken with the full support of Bow Brickhill, Walton, Wavendon and Woburn Sands this work will ensure complementarity of provision across the wider area.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
374	134, 142, 1084, 1085	Para 3.7	points 3.17 should be 3.3.7 Density should be confirmed at 30dph as per previous presentations and references and spreaded evenly across development. It should be distributed evenly between north and south. SPD should state how that is achieved.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
375	134	General comment	Respondent believes that owners of the two parcels of land south of the railways do not wish their land is developed. Respondent believes that no full assessment of ownership was undertaken for the SHLAA in 2017. Ownership of the parcels should be reviewed.	Noted. Land register offers a service where anyone can request details of land ownership for a fee.

376	134	4.3 Movement network	<p>Potential impact of development on Walton from traffic, congestion but also use of facilities. Funds from S106 do be used in the area not outside it. When S106/Cil plans will be published?</p>	<p>An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development. S.105 agreements are associated with the granting of planning permission. Milton Keynes Council currently does not implement CIL regime.</p>
377	134	4.3 Movement network	<p>The developments either side of the railway line must be properly connected with MK specification grid roads, redways and grade separation, at V10, V11, a new H11 and V12 (Woodleys Crossing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without railway crossings, SEMK is landlocked with all traffic blocked by level crossings closed for 40 minutes per hour. • Pushes all traffic through Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands (and then through Aspley Guise). • The dwellings closest to the Bow Brickhill crossing will be separated from Bow Brickhill, based on the proposed road layout. • We assume roads are grade separated crossings, with the right mitigation of noise / pollution (space, bunding, mature trees, fencing). • SEMK will build on grid road corridors (H10 and V11) that have been dormant for 30 years. How will this be handled with residents? • What policy is in place re grid road corridor widths, 80 metres? • What about dualling of new roads and corridors? • How has the scale of development south of Bletchley and proposed sites near Junction 13 (Mid Beds) been accommodated. 	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development. The SPD contains a table with design requirements for strategic movement network (Table 4.2)</p>
378	134	4.3 Movement network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the plan for stations at Bow Brickhill, Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise? • What is the plan for crossings at V10, V11 and V12. • What plans are there for mitigation of noise and pollution along the route (for existing residents in Caldecotte, Brown's wood and Old Farm Park, and new residents in SEMK). 	<p>EWR will make a decision regarding closing stations in the area. SPD is silent on the matter which. It is something considered by the East West Rail Company and not Milton Keynes Council. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.</p>

379	134, 1322	4.3 Movement network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCE Paused not dead. • There is a risk that some new grid roads become part of the expressway by stealth. • We believe proposals for CPO in Aspley Guise and Woburn Sands still exist. • MKC signed an NDA, others did not, but we are in the dark re local plans . <p>4.3 Some added that they believe proposals for CPO in Aspley Guise and Woburn Sands still exist</p>	The Oxford to Cambridge expressway project has been cancelled by Transport Secretary Grant after analysis confirmed the proposed project was not cost-effective on 18/03/2021.
380	134	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H10 is extended across Newport Road, causing blight in Wavendon and Woburn Sands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Crossing is included in some of the 2050 work. o It would split communities. o Land is disappearing quickly, e.g., development at Frosts (approved), Cross End, Swan Homes (application), David Wilson (preapplication). o Grid Road reserves in Glebe Farm are not all in the ownership of MKC. Risk of ransom strips and reducing budget for other developments. o Risk of creating an East West Expressway by stealth. • H10 is not extended across Newport Road, causing blight in Walton. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All traffic wanting to travel East, and North would travel through Walton. o Walton already takes all traffic seeking to travel from the A421 to the A5, on top of the internal MK traffic. o The H10 / V10 and H10 / V11 roundabouts are grid locked at certain times of day. o The V10 north of H10 has a 40mph limited . The current planning permission for the H10 extension into Church Farm is not suitable to serve the development beyond Church Farm. It was designed to serve a standalone development of 350 houses. It breaches MK grid road rules because it cuts Byrd Crescent and provides at grade crossings for the redway and the bridleway between Wavendon Gate and Old Farm Park. Movement Network Scenario maps must show grade separation where the H10 extension meets Byrd Crescent. The topography of the area was designed by MKDC to facilitate a bridge. 	Noted. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

381	134	4.3 Movement network	<p>The road layout and road use in Bow Brickhill, Wavendon and Woburn Sands precludes any additional traffic volume.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particularly Walton Road, Newport Road, The Leys and Hardwick Road. • Roundabout at Station Road and Brickhill Street, south of the level crossing, grid locked already during rush hour. • Settlement of Bow Brickhill precludes the conversion of Station Road to a grid road. • Various proposals to close Walton Road between Wavendon Gate and Wavendon. 	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.</p>
382	134, 1322	4.3 Movement network/V10	<p>No design replicates the caldecotte C or South Caldecott briefs. Respondent question if there will be redways, will it be a route for MRT. Only partial upgrade of Brickhill Street for South Caldecotte.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Prevent traffic from the site travelling north up Brickhill St and through Walton to access M1 North, the A421 and M1 South. o Upgrading Brickhill St to a grid road (SD14), only an upgrade from the entrance / exit of the site and south to the A5 roundabout. Some added that when questioned at an SEMK consultation video call with MK Forum, no one from MKC could state how the rest of the grid road would be funded. South Caldecotte/Caldecotte C...no evidence that land has been reserved for a V10 bridge over the railway. and no feasible bridge design is shown in development frameworks. 	<p>The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

4.5.2 Density and Character

Density should be confirmed at a maximum 30 dwellings per hectare, as indicated in previous presentations and documents.

- Further, it must be spread evenly across the development, including affordable housing and infrastructure.
- Housing in Wavendon Gate, Old Farm Park, Browns wood and Caldecotte are mostly two story, including most of the affordable stock. This should be reflected in SEMK.
- This is the final southern urban extension that is possible because it abuts Greensand Ridge. Therefore, the nature of the development should reflect this in building heights, layout, materials used, etc.
- Location of playing fields in the Bow Brickhill buffer is in an area where the ground drains through from the ridge. Bow Brickhill playing fields has been a disaster for that reason.
- Jenni Ferrans' point about the facilities not being central is very sensible. How do you otherwise encourage people to walk and cycle to shops / schools.
- Traveller's site should not be in green buffer.
- Fishing lake to be opened to the public.

Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

384	134	4.5.2 Character and Density	<p>Density should be confirmed at a maximum 30 dwellings per hectare, as indicated in previous presentations and documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further, it must be spread evenly across the development, including affordable housing and infrastructure. • Housing in Wavendon Gate, Old Farm Park, Brown's wood and Caldecotte are mostly two story, including most of the affordable stock. This should be reflected in SEMK. • This is the final southern urban extension that is possible because it abuts Greensand Ridge. Therefore, the nature of the development should reflect this in building heights, layout, materials used, etc. • Location of playing fields in the Bow Brickhill buffer is in an area where the ground drains through from the ridge. Bow Brickhill playing fields has been a disaster for that reason. • Jenni Ferrans' point about the facilities not being central is very sensible. <p>How</p> <p>do you otherwise encourage people to walk and cycle to shops / schools.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traveller's site should not be in green buffer. • Fishing lake to be opened to the public. 	diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
385	135, 1331	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Supports the link between the H10 and the new housing developments between Wavendon and Bow Brickhill. The smaller roads are experiencing a vast increase in traffic, which will be exacerbated by the new development. the H10 is far better equipped to take the increase in traffic.</p>	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
386	136, 149, 1277, 1293, 1305, 1312, 1315, 1318, 1333, 1376, 1385, 1391, 1367	General Comment	<p>Objects to development as a whole- wants to protect the rural nature of existing villages.</p>	Noted. No changes required.

387	137, 195, 217, 222, 1313	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Concerns that the development will overwhelm existing communities and services. Woburn Sands has already absorbed a large development near the railway line, hereby putting great pressure on education and medical services. Some suggest plans should be deferred until the affects from these have been monitored.	The SPD addresses the requirements of Policy SD11 for primary, secondary and early years provision. Nursery. It also safeguards are for potential medical facilities.
388	137, 164, 211, 1289	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	The G&T Site should not be near/in a green buffer zone. Some respondents argue that this is no different to a previous application denied by MKC deemed inappropriate in a buffer area close to recreation grounds	A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension. The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
389	138, 149, 180, 1261	4.3 Movement Network/H10	H10 should remain a single carriageway, with no connection through to Newport Road and the M1, as this would divide Wavendon from Woburn Sand and increase traffic to an unacceptable level. The speed limit should be no more that 40mph	Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
390	138, 148, 180, 192, 193, 1250	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	The level crossing should not be closed, as it would sever Wavendon and Woburn Sands. This would have knock-on effects to businesses in Woburn Sands which rely on Wavendon residents for business. The new bridge will increase traffic on Walton Road, which is already a 'rat run' despite traffic calming measures.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
391	140, 141, 165	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	There are not enough amenities planned, doctor's surgeries, shops, swimming pools, gyms and tennis courts as well as meeting halls.	The SPD addresses the requirements of Policy SD11 and also safeguards are for potential medical facilities.
392	142	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	Question: Are you providing these sites from Council Funds? Will the travellers be expected to pay rent and rates?	MKC Council is required to deliver the sites as per requirements in Plan:MK. The SPD is required to allocate the land within the site. The delivery of the G7T site will be led by Milton Keynes Council with land coming from developers at nil vale as part of Framework Agreement.

393	143	General Comment	This SPD can only be developed by making departures to commitments to build new development areas properly connected to MK with grid roads and segregated movement routes and low-density housing.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
394	145	4.3 Movement Network/ Horse Bridleways	The network of horse-riding routes in MK is renowned nationally as an example of how a public bridleway network for walkers, horse riders and cyclists can be successful incorporated into urban design. The British Horse Society welcomes the reference within the draft framework to the bridleway that bisects SEMK and forms a high priority leisure link. However, there are concerns that this: Is only mentioned in relation to cycling.	Additional detail on bridleway network had been provided in the updated SPD.
395	145	4.3 Movement Network/ Horse Bridleways	The plan on page 49 of the draft indicates that Walton Bridleway 013/ Bow Brickhill Bridleway 014 will be diverted from its current route running roughly north/south through the area, taking it instead to Woburn Sands and joining the V10. This section of the bridleway is particularly important local riders as it is a grass track with safe rubber surfacing at the railway crossing and provides the only access from MK through to the network of public bridleways and permitted tracks at Aspley Woods. The planned linear open spaces within the proposed design indicate some form of leisure route where the bridleway currently runs, but the Development Framework should make it clear that this will be designed for horses as well as for walkers and cyclists.	A key aim of the pedestrian, cycle and bridleway network within the site is to integrate and connect it with all existing rights of way, redways, footpaths and bridleways that connect with the edges of the allocation. Fig 4.2 Movement Strategy shows the proposed strategic redway network within SEMK which primary follows the strategic movement network. New leisure routes and bridleways will be primarily located within the proposed open space network connecting to the surrounding area.
396	145	4.3 Movement network	Asks that the pedestrian crossing of Bow Brickhill road be installed as a 'Pegasus' crossing to accommodate horses as well as pedestrians and cyclists. The current crossing is quite dangerous due to the speed of traffic and the curve of the road which limits visibility	integrate and connect it with all existing rights of way, redways, footpaths and bridleways that connect with the edges of the allocation. Fig 4.2 Movement Strategy shows the proposed strategic redway network within SEMK which primary follows the strategic movement network. New leisure routes and bridleways will be primarily located within the proposed open space network connecting to the surrounding area.

397	146, 166, 1337	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Schools should be built alongside the houses and at the same time as residents move in. Provision of school places in the immediate locale must be available from the outset. Delays in infrastructure delivery will exacerbate existing issues.	The SPD was amended and final location for schools in primary and reserve options selected.
398	146	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	The SPD should include plans to mitigate the loss of proposity of the soil in the development site with water retention features and balancing ponds., which can provide an opportunity for wildlife habitat but will need maintenance. The Parks Trust must be engaged as the premier land management agent in MK.	Para 3.3.10 notes that SuDS should be integrated effectively into the open space and green infrastructure network to assist in on site water management and to protect against surface water flooding. Wider concept plan (Fig 3.1) identified indicative strategic SuDS locations and Fig 4.8. All proposals will be required to consider Policy FR2 of Plan:MK. Need for SuDS is underlined in Para 4.6.8
399	151	4.3 Movement Network/ Expressway	All references to the Ox-Camb Expressway should be removed from the SPD.	Noted. The SPD had been revised and updated to reflect cancellation of the expressway project.
400	151	Fig 2.1	The Figure refers to 'Bow Brickhill / Woburn Sands Rd' and should instead say 'Woburn Sands / Bow Brickhill Rd' as it flows from west to east.	Noted. Text amended.
401	151	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent welcomes the H10 extension as it may support the future growth of MK as set out in the MK 2050 Strategy. The land to the north east of the allocation boundary is now owned by O&H, and will be safeguarded as a future grid road connection in their forthcoming outline planning application.	Noted.
402	151	Para 2.4	Queries whether the Internal Drainage Board indicated what future improvements they would like to see within SEMK to improve existing flood problems downstream? A study has been commissioned to look into this, but the outputs are not publicly available. The fifth bullet point under 'Drainage' should be amended to read 'Water may also drain towards the fisherman's lake at the eastern edge of the site just south of the railway line'.	MKC engaged with IDB on the preparation of the SPD.

403	151, 1383	Section 2.6 Habitat and Vegetation	<p>The notation used for the Wildlife Corridor in Figure 2.6 suggests that the area is rigid and fixed. In practice, the area will be subject to detailed ecological studies and a development proposal put forward that mitigates where necessary and meets the required biodiversity net gain targets. Respondent suggests that it would be better represented by hatched area on the figure. The vision/concept plans go on to show a blurred edge to the Wildlife corridor boundary and respondent would like an undefined edge to be portrayed as well. The fifth bullet point could also be expanded to set out the findings from the IDB study if this were available. Some state that development within the corridor should be prohibited and the corridor should provide a better buffer.</p>	MKC engaged with IDB on the preparation of the SPD. The details will be approved at planning application stage.
404	151	Fig 2.7	<p>Respondent questions if the MRT route should be shown on this plan, as it does not currently exist and none of the other safeguarded infrastructure demands feature on this plan. If it does stay, the plan should be amended to also show to options proposed by East West Rail in their current consultation.</p>	The MRT route is shown on the wider concept plan. MK2050 Strategy was adopted by the Council so indication where routes is appropriate.
405	151	Fig 2.15	<p>Respondent suggests that the SPD should build in flexibility with regard to viewpoints. These are largely taken from the existing PRow network and it may be necessary to divert sections of this. Perhaps a broader aspiration should be to encourage the consideration of views out to the wider landscape as part of the master planning work?</p>	Noted. Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
406	151	Para 3.1.5	<p>Respondent believes it should be expanded to set out the spatial implications of safeguarding a route for a future mass rapid transit. Is the intention that these will be retrofitted into the existing grid road network? If so, the respondent believes this would be the place to set it out</p>	The MRT route is shown on the wider concept plan. MK2050 Strategy was adopted by the Council so indication where routes is appropriate.
407	151	General Comment	<p>Respondent believes the photographs on page 39 bear no relation to the adjacent text</p>	The images related to chapter 3.3 overall.

408	151	Concept Plan/ DFP	<p>Respondent queries if it is necessary to have both a concept plan and a development framework plan which have similar levels of detail but are not entirely consistent. Would it be better to rely on the DFP or make the concept plan less prescriptive. Either way, respondent wishes for the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the notation for the 'Potential Highway Intervention limiting wider through movement'. • Move the notation for the 'Potential Relocated Train Station' to the west of the 'Strategic Movement Network'. • The notation for the H10 Extension should simply be shown as an 'Indicative Vehicular Access Point' in the same way as the other external connections. • Remove the G&T Site from the parcel closest to Wavendon. 	Noted. Additional text in the SPD provided to clarify what each plan reflects. G&T site near Bow Brickhill was selected as final location.
409	151, 1385	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Respondent suggests that EWR Linear Park should be limited to the southern side of the railway line where it can open out towards the east of the site into the Multi-Functional Green Buffer adjacent to Woburn Sands. Argues that it's not sensible to have a policy that encourages active transport routes either side of a railway line. Suggest instead that the park should channel active travel routes towards any future railway crossing and into the linear open space that follows the Caldecotte Brook to the north of the railway. Suggest that the area of proposed linear space in Figure 4.1 should be deleted. Respondent states that there is no ecological justification for safeguarding this area as a wildlife corridor. Some also suggest that a linear park with trains running through the middle is not a restful place for respite.</p>	The SPD was amended to state that linear park with flood attenuation along both sides of the Marston Vale railway line that incorporates the existing wildlife corridor will be widened especially on the southern side to include surface water attenuation ponds and pedestrian/cycle leisure routes. The routes will provide full east-west access across the entire SEMK site. It will be integrated at its eastern end into the landscape buffer adjacent to Woburn Sands.
410	151, 185	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Strongly supports movement scenario 3 as it doesn't include the highway intervention on Bow Brickhill Road, which will potentially limit through traffic towards Woburn sands. Although some respondents do not favour the V11 extension.</p>	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
411	151	Para 4.2.10	<p>Should be expanded to include which green uses will be acceptable within the multi-functional green buffers. Respondent would like to see allotments, school playing fields, SuDS and sports pitches.</p>	All those referenced are included in the SPD.

412	151	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent believes that this section should explain that the safeguarded grid road corridors could function as primary streets in the short to medium term as long as they can be phased into a grid road in the longer term. Especially with the land to the north of the grid road corridor where parcels of land would be inaccessible otherwise. Respondent suggests that paragraph 4.3.8 should be reworded: 'Primary access into SEMK from the north will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham Way) and from the south via a relief road to bypass Bow Brickhill Village with access into SEMK being achieved at both ends of the relief Road (at the western end of a reconfigured Station Road as well as where it connects with Woburn Sands Bow Brickhill Road) (See Table 4.2 - Street Hierarchy). These routes will act as strategic routes carrying through traffic as well as providing access into the development itself. '	Wording of the SPD amended. Additional wording included and para states: Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill Road via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extension. The junction onto Bow Brickhill Road should include some form of highway intervention measures which will allow residents of SEMK to access the facilities within Woburn Sands Town Centre (and vice versa) but will also help reduce the amount of through traffic along Bow Brickhill Road to J13 on the M1 (and vice versa).
413	151	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	The SPD should make it clear that MKC will make the application for the site and that there is no expectation on developers to do anything other than safeguard the preferred site. the precise location should be determined when the outline planning application is prepared for the land surrounding the G&T site	Noted. MKC Council is required to deliver the sites as per requirements in Plan:MK. The SPD is required to allocate the land within the site. The delivery of the G&T site will be led by Milton Keynes Council with land coming from developers at nil value as part of Framework Agreement.
414	152	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent is concerned about the existing local pavements in Woburn Sands. Believes they are too narrow and can be congested at times causing pedestrians to step into the road. Concerned that increased pedestrians/dogs/bikes will exacerbate it.	A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development.
415	153	General Comment	Respondent who is a landowner of The Old Stables are supportive of the allocation and the development and do not wish to be excluded from the development of the area as a result of not being included within the Framework. Request to be included in all future discussions relating to the Draft SPD and all other relevant conversations. The site appears on the maps in the Draft SPD on pages 41 and 63, surrounded by land that is identified for residential development. Respondent believes that the land would be suitable for residential development of a density similar to that of the surrounding area. the site is approx. 1.9 hectares and capable of accommodating ~66 dwellings (35dph). The development of this site will not reduce the northern boundary hedgerow. No landscape reasons not to include this site. Site would be accessible from the road network including the Primary Residential Road to the south. It is a sustainable location.	Noted. SPD amended to include the land. Please refer to land use Fig for land uses.

416	155	General comment	Cumulative impact of the proposed and existing commitments in the area of north end of Newport Road needs to be considered before the SPD is adopted.	Any cumulative impact will be considered as part of planning application process.
417	155	General comment	Respondent suggests that a separate second framework should be built around the new development being more segregated from Woburn Sands, Wavendon and Bow Brickhill, (i.e., more self-contained with all of its own facilities).	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
418	156	General comment	Respondent's comment: 'Everything'	No changes required.
418	1,571,294	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent raised concerns over potential impact of the development on the village of Bow Brickhill. The link road is supported and additional traffic calming measures should be considered to discourage future residents of SEMK from using the village as a main route	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
419	157, 160, 222, 228, 1252, 1294	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondent questioned whether the G&T site should be located in closer proximity to residential area. Some questioned whether it should be closer to appropriate infrastructure and services that can accommodate this.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
420	158, 205	General comment	Respondent made reference to wildlife and habitats present in the area of Wavendon fields and raised concerns over potential impact of the development on the existing ecosystems.	Noted.
421	161	General comment	Respondent provides background on their ownership of the Strategic Employment site at South Caldecotte.	Noted.

422	161	4.3 Movement Network	Off-site highway improvements are required to support development at the South Caldecotte site including works to the Kelly's Kitchen roundabout. Whilst bringing the V10 up to Grid Road standard will help to improve access to the new urban extension. Additional development in the local area that reduces highway capacity and increases journey times for businesses at the South Caldecotte site will be harmful to the continued contribution of this site to the economic growth of Milton Keynes. Additional highway works to support the development of the Urban Extension may also impact on the operation of businesses caused by disruption during construction works on and around the highway.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
	167	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondent stated that instead of providing G&T sites the community should be provided with access to affordable homes.	The SEMK site needs to provide for 7 pitches as required by Policy SD11 of Plan:MK. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension. Affordable homes delivery will be reviewed at planning application stage in accordance with Policy HN2
424	175	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent suggests that sports pitches should be placed next to railway line to avoid excessive noise disturbance to residents.	It is considered that best location for the pitches is in the green buffer on the eastern edge of SEMK to protect the identity of Woburn Sands could take the form of a park, including playing pitches to benefit both the new and existing communities. Fig 4.12 Concept Plan also show indicative location of formal playing pitches (if the need arises) close to the village of Bow Brickhill.
425	175, 166, 1285, 1303. 1331	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent supports the building of the Bow Brickhill relief road, but mitigation should be made for traffic noise and must be built as a priority. Respondent would like to see traffic calming measures to protect Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands. Some respondents wanted assurance that the proposed by-pass will actually be built, and developers won't remove it from plans	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
426	161, 166, 1318	4.3 Movement Network	Removing the level crossing at Bow Brickhill Railway Station and replacing with a bridge link or underpass to cross to not impede the movement of trains will benefit the highway network by allowing unimpeded access across the railway. Other options could adversely impact the South Caldecotte site for strategic employment.	This is the matter for EWR Co to consider.

427	161	4.5.2 Character and Density	Respondent identifies a corner of SEMK that could form an arrival point (e.g., higher densities) that responds to the employment development South Caldecotte	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended, and additional buffers added.
428	176	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent states that H10 extension should be designed with sufficient buffers as the original grid roads of MK are and there must be no access option available to connect with Newport Road to prevent through traffic to M1/A421.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
429	168, 192, 193, 1245, 1250, 1343, 1357, 1258	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent suggested that H10 should be single carriageway with a maximum speed of 40mph with a continuous buffer through to Church Farm development to protect Phoebe Lane and Wavendon Fields apartments. The road should not be continued over the Newport Road since it would become south bypass linking with M1 or A421. extension of land to the East of Newport Road would prejudice the potential of land for recreation and open space (former golf course) which respondent believes is an objective in MK2050 Strategy.	Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
430	176, 211, 201	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	Respondent states that Wavendon site is not suitable for G&T style homes due to the slope of the site. G&T community may prefer a more secluded site that would allow for better access and provision. Some respondents asked whether G&T community have been consulted?	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
431	168, 192, 193, 1239, 1250, 1260, 1399, 1366	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent suggest that to elevate impacts on traffic flows and potential effects of Woburn Sands level crossing closures the Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) pilot scheme should be implemented. Respondents especially mention Walton Road- to calm and reduce the existing traffic and the expected traffic from the new developments prior to the approval of any SEMK development. Introduce an enforced speed limit of 30 mph on Newport Road, Lower End Road and Cranfield Road. Some added that 20 mph is plenty should be adopted and enforced throughout the roads and closure of Cross End should be implemented.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. Table 4.2 in the SPD contains design requirements for strategic highway network including the speed.

432	178	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent states that SPD does not acknowledge the impact of raised road bridges on noise as the area already suffers from traffic noise from the A5, M1, A421 and railway. It is mentioned that noise mitigation should not be left in the hands of the developers. Alongside noise there is light pollution.	The detailed design of highways interventions and any potential light pollution will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
433	164	4.3 Movement Network	Retain H10-V11 link to M1. A link to the existing rail crossing at Bow Brickhill would route traffic north on the V10 and improvements to the road at this point to the A5 would ease flow west. A new rail crossing (over bridge) for all users (walkers, cyclists, horse riders etc) is necessary.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development. Primary access into SEMK will be via extension to the H10 and relief road to bypass Bow Brickhill village. Additional access will be delivered via new Woodleys Road. Linkages to J13 are considered to get to M1
434	164	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	This should be located such that it does not expand beyond the plan (e.g., Dale Farm)	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location.
435	164	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The inclusion of a Country Park would benefit all. Access should be by public transport rather than by placing a car park next to it as once this is full local roads get blocked	A buffer will be provided on the easter edge of the SEMK which will protect the identity of Woburn Sands and it could take the form of a park. See Fig 4.1.
436	164	General comment	The original concept for Mk is being lost in recent overpopulated and high-rise schemes. Consider what you impose on existing and future residents	Noted. No changes required.
437	179	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent is concerned about the extension of V11 through Bow Brickhill and Hardwick Road, at present there is a 7.5t weight limit. Will this be changed?	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development. V11 extension is a reserved option.

438	179, 225, 1284, 1390	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent asks that any construction traffic from the development be routed away from the villages of Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise as the roads are not designed to cope with that amount of traffic.	Construction traffic and any routing is to be considered at planning application stage.
439	185	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent suggests that as SEMK transport infrastructure is speculative then a moratorium should be placed on all development applications until transport studies have been completed and implications reviewed.	There has been traffic modelling undertaken (using the MKC Strategic Traffic Model: MKMMM) for the SE MK allocation as part of the evidence base to Plan MK, and subsequent to this to inform the development framework. This modelling, as well as other considerations such as multi modal connectivity, has informed the draft development framework for the site comprising two bridge crossings, with the primary option now being a V10 crossing broadly in line with the existing level crossing, and a crossing to the eastern edge of the site (referred to as Woodleys Road in the framework). As part of the SE MK Planning Application, the developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation required in response to the traffic generated by the site. This will be informed by the MKMMM, as well as more localised modelling and analysis. Where deemed necessary this will include additional local traffic data collection.
440	185	General Comment	Respondent thinks that the creeping nature of expansion of Milton Keynes into open countryside is in conflict with the vision of the SPD.	No changes required.
441	185	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent refers MKC to Woburn TC submission to the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan consultation in January 2021.	No changes required.
442	185, 201	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Developers should not be allowed to submit applications prior to the SPD adoption and developers must be held account to conditions of landscape and open space especially with respect to the green buffers and wildlife corridors.	As per Para 5.2.1 contributions will be sought towards necessary infrastructure and facilities. An overarching section 106 agreement known as the Tarff Agreement will be established.
443	185, 187, 188, 190, 1315, 1316, 1318, 1323, 1384, 1379, 1385, 1394, 1391, 1367	4.5.2 Character and Density	Respondent supports Woburn TC suggestion to lower the proposed number of dwellings from 3000 to 2500 (or even 2000). It is also noted that respondents feel that 4/5/6 storey buildings are not in keeping with the area and contrary to MKC's LCA guidelines of open views across the area to Brickhill Greensands Ridge. Some noted that densities should reflect that already achieved in Woburn Sands Parish.	The site is required to deliver approximately 3000 homes as per policy SD11 in Plan:MK. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Detailed proposals will be reviewed at planning application stage.

444	165, 166,	6. Next Steps	Respondents noted that future development and roads should/must be tree lined. In addition, some noted that the development shouldn't be overcrowded, and the environment should be protected	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
445	186	4.5.2 Character and Density	Respondent is disappointed not to have been consulted with in the earlier stages of the SPD as the development will irrevocably change the character of the area between Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill.	extensive stakeholder engagement took place in preparation of this SPD. SEMK SPD website contains details.
445	165, 1267, 1370	4.5.2 Character and Density	Any new developments should bend harmoniously with existing city, some respondents stated that it should respect and blend in with any current dwellings and styles. e.g., a. If the current houses are set back 40m from the Newport Rd, the new development should mirror this. b. Need to reflect the population of houses per acre. We are only seeing a deterioration of the environmental factors as a result of constant increased higher density developments. This needs to be reversed. c. No flats are built opposite current houses or bungalows. Respondent notes building density is far higher than rest of MK.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
446	191	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent encourages the extension of the H10 towards J13 of the M1 as this will lessen the impact of the increased traffic on Hardwick Road, The Leys and the Woburn sands area in general and reduce danger to pedestrians.	The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.
447	165, 223, 1399	4.4 Land Use	School developments should have excellent sporting facilities included in them to ensure all sports are provided for and good health. Some respondents said good leisure facilities for all should be provided e.g., multi-use sports hall, cafe, swimming pool, fitness classes, dance, indoor games	Detail design of schools will be approved at planning application stage.

448	198, 1317, 1318, 1332	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent states that closure of the Bow Brickhill level crossing will just cause more traffic chaos and grid roads should be maintained. Some noted the reliance on the crossing which is vital for their daily lives.	MKC does not have control over the future of the level crossing. EWR Co is considering the future of the crossings as part of the DCO proposal.
449	196, 1322, 1397	General Comment	Respondent states that it is premature to be considering SPD and it should be paused until significant, currently unresolved issues have been dealt with (i.e., EWR and Oxford - Cambridge Arc). There may also be significant changes to employment patterns as a result of COVID and these are not yet known. Respondent also feels that consultation during a pandemic has not allowed all people to voice their opinions. Some said transport, property types and demand, city/town centres and movement of families out of centres are all changing in light of covid. Highways Agency are not accepting any traffic surveys done now because of low volumes. Respondent proposes that, in line with Futures 2050 studies, a short consultation is carried out to consider the impacts and inform work on the SPD.	The Council considered the possibility of delaying progress on the SEMK SPD in order to align it with the East West Rail Company's statutory consultation on their proposals for the railway line (see Question 5 for further details). However, on balance, it was felt that this was not appropriate given previous delays to the East West Rail Company's consultation which had originally been expected to occur in autumn/winter 2020.
450	166	4.3 Movement Network	Recommends the introduction of a weight limit, 20mph speed limit and road narrowing in the Station Road and Woburn Sands Road entrances to Bow Brickhill. Respondent also is concerned that few pedestrian and cycle links are shown into the existing urban area of MK as most come into the village	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport including speed limits for strategic highway network (table 4.2). A lot of the detailed assessments, including a transport assessment, will be prepared by the developer and submitted to the council. These would set out the detailed design of the development and mitigation measures necessary to secure a high quality and sustainable development. Primary access into SEMK will be via extension to the H10 and relief road to bypass Bow Brickhill village. Additional access will be delivered via new Woodleys Road. Linkages to J13 are considered to get to M1
451	204, 1264, 1309, 1315, 1319, 1394	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent expresses concern over increased traffic levels and the safety of pedestrians (especially children walking to school).	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
452	206	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	There is no provision for SEN children as the number of places already available is already inadequate.	The SPD addresses the requirements of Policy SD11 for primary, secondary and early years provision. Nursery. It also safeguards are for potential medical facilities.

453	207	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent is concerned that extension of H10 will create a drive-thru community where residents will be confused about what their home community is.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
454	207	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent asks that the access between Wavendon Gate and Wavendon Village be kept open for better access to the church which serves the communities of Wavendon, Wavendon Gate, Browns Wood and Old Farm Park.	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
455	208	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent states that EWR bridges should be sites so that they provide maximum connectivity to MK grid network and that EWR are pressed into making early decisions about closure or relocation of stations. There should also be adequate means to cross the railway on foot.	MKC does not have control over the future of the stations. EWR Co is considering the future of the stations and crossings as part of the DCO proposal.
456	208	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent asks that the DRT will include the new development and that the future MRT also serves SEMK and surrounding villages.	the SPD considers future proofing for MRT.
457	172	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent supports H10 extension. Respondents is pleased that the SPD recognises the importance of the link and require reservation of the corridor through Newport Road. Respondent supports key principles from page 38. This is in line with MK 2050 Strategy. Respondent noted that SEMK should not preclude future extension of grid road across Newport Road which would limit potential expansion into former Wavendon golf course. The need to maintain the opportunity for that connection should be built into Opportunities and Challenges section 2.12. Although outside of the SPD area the land ownership arrangements would allow this connection. This connection would mitigate traffic pressure and respondent believes that the link would be supported by Woburn Sands residents. Link to Newport Road would provide a direct route north south without crossing the town. Concerns raised over CAG's members views over no connection to Newport Road.	The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.

458	172	Para 1.4.4	<p>This paragraph should include policies SD1, SD9, SD11, CT8, CT8 in the policy section of the SPD along with summary of key requirements set out in policies of Plan:MK would help establish more clearly at the outset key parameters for the SPD that it needs to adhere to e.g., 3000 homes to be delivered and associated uses, integration with existing build up area, connection with the local and strategic road network, enable future expansion of MK if appropriate. The link would allow SEMK residents from south east to travel north and east without the need to cross Woburn Sands</p>	<p>The Development Framework does not create new policy for the site but provides guidance and further detail to the development principles set out in the adopted Plan:MK. Appendix A provides a list of relevant policies.</p>
459	172	General comment	<p>Respondent supports acknowledging emerging plans such as MK Futures Growth Strategy page 13. The document contains details on MRT but could benefit from more detailed overview of potential implications of MK 2050 Strategy on the area e.g., extent of growth towards the east, potential key connections for the city.</p>	<p>Not a matter for the SPD to consider.</p>
460	172	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>Respondent is aware that there is no mechanism in the s106 for the Strategic Development Area north of Lower End Road to release the grid road reserves for development (a matter the landowners' solicitors have highlighted in correspondence with the planning department previously in 2016 and 2018), should they be required in the future to facilitate the extension of the grid road system. Respondent states that this weakness could undermine the future growth of the city, and it will be important that the development of the SEMK site does not make the same mistake. A requirement to support delivery of the SEMK development area is already set out in the phasing chapter of the Framework (chapter 5) where there is a requirement for applications to not hinder the delivery of other sites and for developers not to increase the value of their landholdings by failing to provide access to the edge of their sites. This is supported but requirements should also be extended to reflect the need for the SEMK development not to hinder the delivery of further growth to the east, should this form part of the next phase of Milton Keynes' growth. If the decision be made to transfer the grid road reserve to the Park Trust, as is suggested for the wider open space provision in the site, again it will be important for any agreement to ensure that the site is available for development at the appropriate opportunity in the future, and this should be made clear in the framework.</p>	<p>An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development. S.105 agreements are associated with the granting of planning permission.</p>

461	192, 193, 1239, 1250, 234-238, 1295, 1352, 1399	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondents comment on ROW's. ROW network between Woburn Sands, Wavendon and SEMK should be established to support and promote active travelling which offers links with amenities for health care, shopping etc. Some suggested they should be tree-lined. Also suggested is a continuous woodland walkway from West to East.	The pedestrian and cycle paths network were updated following consultation with additional leisure routes provided.
462	192, 193, 1250	4.3 Movement Network/H10	The leisure potential of all green spaces is maximised including within H10 corridor by incorporating, redways, dog walking routes, cycle routes, horse trails etc. Redway network to be developed to connect Wavendon residents with new facilities, sports fields and transport hub in SEMK. There should be redway access to Phoebe Lane and access or leisure route from recreational ground. Another redway access should be midway from Newport Road (i.e., where the H10 will terminate behind Frost's)	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport.
463	192, 193, 1250, 234-238, 1261, 1352	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Views towards Wavendon Woods and Greensand Ridge are suggested to be of enjoyment for new residents where medium density housing will be places. This would mean existing residents would be denied those views. Views for exiting residents should be maintained.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
464	192, 193, 1250	6. Next Steps	Respondent requests that appropriate mitigation and compensation is secured for potential loss of hedgerow habitats around Wavendon. Concerns over protection of rookery near Wavendon Fields apartments. Concerns raised over potential impact such as that took place in Stockwell Lane. Respondent would like appropriate fines etc for damaging hedges and trees.	SPD under 2.12.1 was amended to add that existing hedgerows (particularly those of higher quality) should be retained and strengthened to reinforce their importance as part of the local landscape for visual and biological diversity reasons. All hedgerows thus lost should be replaced by equivalent lengths of new hedgerows within the overall development area.

465	194	Para 4.2.28	<p>Sport England welcomes the acknowledgement of the need to provide on-site sports facilities to meet the needs of the development, Sport England notes that the SPD identifies that 3.8ha of land should be provided as playing field. Sport England does not however support a standards-based approach to identifying the level of provision required to meet the needs of a development of this size. Sport England instead supports the use of the PPS findings to identify the quantum and level of provision. The SPD refers to MK Playing Pitch Strategy which is from 2015. MK has been developing new strategy This represents a robust assessment of the council's area need for playing pitches. The emerging PPS is divided into sub areas with the southern one experiencing shortfall in pitch provision for football and 3G artificial grass pitch to meet current and future need for football. Other include need for access to suitable midweek floodlit training for rugby. Propose inclusion of artificial grass pitch as secondary school to be provided for both dual school and community use. Evidence from the emerging PPS suggests that in order to meet the existing community needs for facilities a third generation (3G) rubber crumb artificial surface to accommodate football and potentially rugby (requires installation of a shock pad) should be explored.</p>	Noted.
466	194	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	<p>Appropriate agreement should be in place to ensure that school facilities can be used by wider community to allow local clubs and groups to access the facilities during the peak period for community sport. Consideration should be given to indoor sports and how the site could help in delivering such needs. Sport England expects that any sport facilities and ancillary facilities are designed and constructed in accordance with Sport England and relevant national governing bodies for sport technical design guidance. It would be prudent to make direct reference to this expectation within the SPD. Note on Sport England's Facility was provided and calculations for SEMK site. It is recommended that reference is made in the SPD to Sport's England Active design guide.</p>	<p>An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.</p>
467	209	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	<p>Question: Earlier versions of the plan proposed a G&T site on the eastern boundary of the SEMK plan within an area suggested to become a Country Park with optional playing fields. Can you confirm if this is still being considered?</p>	<p>The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Other locations are no longer considered.</p>

468	209, 213, 1277	General comment	With the current COVID pandemic and its effect on mental health green spaces are more important and beneficial. Some said the boundary splits Woburn Sands, Central Beds and MKC who do not seem to communicate and continue to swallow up green spaces which have negatively impacted the area particularly since Covid with the increase in visitors.	open Space and Landscape Strategy was resided following consultation and additional areas included in the network.
469	204, 1295, 1265	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent welcomes proposed new redways in/around Woburn Sands with routes linking into MK. Current Redways in the area are limited, too narrow in places (Newport Road), and traffic along Newport Rd at 40mph can be intimidating. MKC Highways commented that Figure 3.1 should show redways on both sides of key roads so that developers are aware it is not a single side policy and that redways should extend into Bow Brickhill village to form connections to community facilities.	The SPD had been revised. Redway network can be seen on figure 4.3
470	197	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondent provided information in regards to Sctockgrove Homes ltd land that is located within SEMK site. Respondent is supportive of the development of the SEMK site and the draft SPD. The SPD provides guidance and direction for future development however is lacking in detail in respect of phasing, timing of delivery of infrastructure and clarity around who will be responsible to deliver key elements of wider infrastructure to ensure joined up approach to deliver the site. Delivery of specific parcels of land should not be prioritised over the delivery of the allocation. Stockgrove Homes wished to work collaboratively on the matter.	SPD phasing chapter was updated, An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
471	197	General comment	Respondent believes that the site can be delivered now and contribute to Council's 5-year housing land supply. Can be accessed from the existing road network and does not require extensive infrastructure.	Noted.

472	197	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent notes that the very western edge of the land off Paddocks Lane site is identified as part of the Linear Open Space Network and is largely supportive of allowing this important green space to be developed, so long as they are able to develop the rest of their land holding for residential purposes without hinderance from this designation. As the designation is limited to the very western edge, this would not affect Stockgrove Homes Ltd ability to develop their site but would seek to ensure that the designation does not affect the viability of developing the site. The site has direct access from Bow Brickhill, and the development would not be reliant on the wider infrastructure required for rest of the allocation to be able to commence development. This area should be included in first phase of development. The site does not rely on or is affected by EWR's proposal.	Noted. Details of the open spaces will be approved at planning application stage.
473	197, 113	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	There are inconsistencies between the Draft Framework SPD and the EWR Consultation documents in relation to the potential future crossings of the railway. This will inevitably have consequences on the timescales for delivery of the developments closest to the railway. Some respondents suggest that this SPD is re-drafted to make the document more in touch with EWR and more coherent to local residents.	SPD provides a primary option and a reserve option for the strategic movement network as uncertainty still exists over the East West Rail (EWR) Company's proposals for the existing railway-associated changes to level crossings and new bridge crossings. The primary option with a vehicular bridge at V10 (in addition the eastern bridge as part of the proposed Woodleys Road) features in the final SPD and is preferred from a placemaking perspective. A bridge crossing at V10 is currently favoured by EWR Co (based on the Summer 2021 non- statutory consultation) who are now considering various options for its actual alignment over the Marston Vale Line. Should any of these criteria for a bridge at V10 not be satisfied , the Council will withdraw its inclusion of the V10 bridge option from the SEMK SPD and use the V11 'reserve option' within the Development Framework to assess future planning applications . The reserve option is presented in Appendix C of the SPD. The main difference between the reserve and primary option is the re-location of a bridge at the V10 to the location where the V11 transport corridor reserve meets the Marston Vale Line. The reserve option assumes that the proposed V10/Brickhill Street Bridge can't be delivered to the Council's agreed specification (see SPD for details). Whilst the vast majority of the guidance contained within the SPD remains relevant, even if the reserve option becomes the preferred option, Appendix C of the SPD does outline what the differences are.

474	211	4.3 Movement Network	The future of Woburn Sands railway needs to be certain before developing.	MKC does not have control over the future of the stations/level crossings. EWR Co is considering the future of the stations and crossings as part of the DCO proposal.
475	211, 209	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	The proposed G&T site is too close to a children's day nurse and leisure facilities used by young adults and children.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location.
476	211	General Comment	Detrimental effect on house prices.	No changes required.
477	217	General comment	Respondent concerned about loss of community in existing settlements if SEMK built out. Concern also raised about 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' in NPPF and Government giving environmental groups perspectives low weight in decision making.	Noted. No changes required.
478	217	General comment	Respondent feels MKC needs to do more to deter second home ownership in new developments.	Not a matter for the SPD to consider.
479	1230, 1231	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Respondent stated that the site should not be near Wavendon, Woburn Sands or Bow Brickhill. The site should be away from playgrounds or wooded area.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.

480	1230, 1231, 1260	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent is against closure of Woburn Sands level crossing. The SPD should not be finalised until more is known about the future of the railway and the crossings (e.g., Woburn Sands, Bow Brickhill) and location of the station. Discussions should take place with EWR, MKC Parishes of Woburn Sands, Wavendon, Walton and Bow Brickhill and decisions/discussions not down to developers. Some noted that close easily accessible crossing available to the whole parish is vital.	SPD provides a primary option and a reserve option for the strategic movement network as uncertainty still exists over the East West Rail (EWR) Company's proposals for the existing railway-associated changes to level crossings and new bridge crossings. The primary option with a vehicular bridge at V10 (in addition the eastern bridge as part of the proposed Woodleys Road) features in the final SPD and is preferred from a placemaking perspective. The reserve option is presented in Appendix C of the SPD. The main difference between the reserve and primary option is the re-location of a bridge at the V10 to the location where the V11 transport corridor reserve meets the Marston Vale Line. The reserve option assumes that the proposed V10/Brickhill Street Bridge can't be delivered to the Council's agreed specification (see SPD for details). Whilst the vast majority of the guidance contained within the SPD remains relevant, even if the reserve option becomes the preferred option, Appendix C of the SPD does outline what the differences are.
481	1230, 1231	4.3 Movement Network/H10	There should be little or no access to Newport Road from SEMK. Newport Road should be a fixed boundary of MK. Any further development should be accessed from A421. Any extension of H10 should only serve SEMK and not connect to Newport Road. Developing it further would prevent creation of Wavendon Country Park and cause pollution, noise and affect air quality.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.
482	1232, 1305	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent is against closure of the Bow Brickhill level crossing since commercial traffic from industrial park (Tilbrook) uses the road to get to A5 and Bedfordshire. Concerns raised over potential increase in traffic around Walnut Tree if crossing is closed which has worsened since Red Bull closed an exit road leading to crossing.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.

483	1232, 1238	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondent is concerned that a lot of emphasis is given in regards to delivery of G&T site where less consideration is given to delivery of necessary infrastructure for high density site and residents affected by the site. Alternative prioned oposed location for G&T would be Brick Hill or area near motorway. Respondent questioned why Fenny Lock area for G&T has not been proceeded with.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Other locations are no longer considered.
484	1235	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	Respondent raised concerns over the delivery of social amenities and contributions being sought for any disturbance caused by site delivery.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
485	1236	Fig 2.9	The title to Fig 2.9 'Public Rights if Way'is misleading since the Redways do not have the same status as footpaths or bridleways that are statutory Public Rights of Way. Key states 'footpaths' but it does not distinguish PROW from paths that have other legal designations. E.g. 2 paths within Woburn Sands which are not shown on MyMK as PROW are one alongside Kiln Drive, one south of Kiln drive along west side of small lake. One s a footway alongside Kiln Drive. . Key is incorrect describing Redway as "cycle routes. They should be described as shared paths for pedestrian and cyclists. It would be helpful if the map showed leisure paths some of which run next or near Bridleway through Caldecotte Brook parklands through Brown's Wood and Old Farm Park (as shown on the official city atlas 2017). Proposed heading for Fig 2.9 'Paths for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders.	Text on top right hand of the Fig states: Paths for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse-Riders.

486	1236	Page 29	<p>No justification is provided for suggesting that this Bridleway (Bow Brickhill BW 014) is ‘the most significant’. All four of these routes are significant for their own purposes, so any evidence to the contrary should be added to the text or the phrase “The most significant of these is a north-south Bridleway” should be deleted. All four should be listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bow Brickhill FP 003 Footpath • Bow Brickhill FP 008 Footpath • Bow Brickhill BW 014 Bridleway • Woburn Sands FP 002 Footpath. Mention could also be made of the other Public Rights of Way, each of which has a useful purpose: • Wavendon FP 004 Footpath • Wavendon FP 005 Footpath • Wavendon FP 007 Footpath • Wavendon BW 006 Bridleway. 	Noted. Text added to add clarity. See Pedestrian and cycle routes.
487	1236	Fig 4.2 and Fig 4.4	<p>The Key needs to be made clearer and more accurate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) ‘Existing Footpath (PRoW) to be Retained’ rather than ‘Existing Public Footpath’. 2) ‘Diverted Footpath (PRoW) or New Footpath Proposed’ rather than ‘Proposed New / Diverted Footpath’. 3) ‘Proposed Bridleway’ rather than ‘Proposed Diverted Leisure / Bridleway’. <p>It is unclear what a ‘Leisure / Bridleway’ is.. The key to Fig 4.2 and Fig 4.4 to be brought into line with the proposed corrections.</p>	Noted. SPD amended to add clarity.
488	1237	6. Next Steps	<p>The Milton Keynes Cycling Forum and Cycling UK wish to be fully involved at every stage in the development process from initial planning to completion. Respondent expects that DfT LTN 1/20 to be fully implemented. General support to the proposal. Active Travel England is the new commissioning body and Inspectorate with the power to ensure that local authorities and developers follow the guidance.</p>	Noted.
489	1237	General Comment	<p>Respondent emphasise the need for land use planning and transport planning to be an integrated process to minimise travel distances to encourage cycling and walking and discourage car use. This helps to reduce air pollution, a major contributor to climate change. Together with this encouragement of physical exercise there are clear health benefits, not just for the individual, but also for the community.</p>	Noted.

490	1237	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Networks welcomed. Concerned that not all the grid roads have the Redway running alongside the whole route. It is not clear how a Redway not alongside a grid road can offer a more direct route (existing examples of redways where cyclists are forced to deviate from Redway alongside grid road into a local estate which can be confusing often due to lack of appropriate signage or state of the signs. Support 20 mph speed limits on residential streets and lower speed limits on grid roads and other roads. respondent states that the Woburn Sands – Bow Brickhill road should have grade separated Redway crossings. Note on recent accidents on the route. The proposed east-west linear open space alongside the south side of the railway should be a Redway, as part of an East-West cross city cycle route advocated in the Gilligan Report. Both railway stations need direct Redway access. The bridleway from Old Farm Park to Phoebe Lane in Wavendon is a green lane and should be protected, preferably as a Redway. This would provide two direct cycling routes - the first via Stockswell Lane to the Stables and the industrial estates beyond and the second via Walton Road to the Redway alongside Lower End Road and the new Redway alongside The A421 which will one day offer a vital cycling link to the countryside beyond Junction 13. Redway provides easy movement for not only cyclists, but for walkers, wheelchairs and other mobility vehicles, and E bikes and E scooters.</p>	The SPD had been revised. Redway network can be seen on figure 4.3
491	1237	6. Next Steps	<p>Safe and secure cycle parking, both short and long term, needs to be provided at all public destinations. MKC Parking Standards included cycle parking in the past. We seek confirmation of the current situation. At the same time all residential units should have secure indoor cycle parking. Likewise, larger employers should provide indoor cycle parking and shower/changing facilities.</p>	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
492	1238	General Comment	<p>The Q&A sessions were not well advertised and upon the request for more meetings those were not offered and one of the reasons was Purdah.</p>	Q&A sessions were advertised on the SEMK dedicated website.
493	219	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The provision of three movement scenarios introduces uncertainty for existing residents in/surrounding the site; this should be resolved as soon as possible.</p>	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport.
494	1238, 1351	4.3 Movement Network/V10	<p>Respondents support the need for crossing at V10 and underlines that it is essential transport link. A respondent stated that the level crossing at Bow</p>	Noted. EWR company will make a decision over the level crossings as part of the DCO proposal.

			Brickhill station should be replaced by a bridge with bus lanes or other bus priority measures.	
495	1238	General Comment	Supports Wavendon Parish Council's response.	Noted.
496	1238	General Comment	Supports Bow Brickhill Parish Council's response	Noted.
497	213	General Comment	Does not object in principle to further development in the area but the development must be completed in a more thoughtful manner.	Noted.
498	213, 1311, 1341	4.5.2 Character and Density	Developers should build traditional homes/bungalows and not loads of apartment blocks as it causes problems for parking provision and access for emergency services when vehicles park on estate roads.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
499	213	General Comment	The original vision for MK has been lost - "city of tree".	No changes required.
501	215, 1288	4.5.2 Character and Density	Sensitive integration of existing towns/villages was crucial to the original 1970 plan and the same should be done with SEMK integrating with Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill.	Noted.
502	215	4.3 Movement Network	The extension of the MK grid road network is supported as a way of forming the structure for SEMK. However, I question the notion of Bow Brickhill Road becoming a major MK grid road. This would damage the roads existing rural character and adjoin Wavendon Woods AONB.	Bow Brickhill relief road will be a strategic route carrying through traffic, including potentially MRT. Woburn Sands/ Bow Brickhill Road will have potential measures to reduce the amount of through traffic to J13 and hence alleviate pressure on the Leys and Hardwick Road. See Table 4.2 for design details.
503	215	4.5.2 Character and Density	Housing should be located away from the road and at very low (rural) densities and behind a proposed landscape corridor	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for
504	215, 1331	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Support the inclusion of a green buffer along the western edge of Woburn Sands which will ensure the unique character of the village is retained. But questions the inclusion of land north of the railway line connecting to Newport Road (A5130) as it appears contrary to the vision of maintaining separation between the new and existing settlement. The 'green buffer' principle between Woburn Sands/Wavendon and the SEMK should be maintained and extended.	diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

505	216, 234-238, 1299, 1261, 1379	4.5.2 Character and Density	The character of Wavendon should be protected and maintained, particularly its access to footpaths and countryside walks. Wavendon should be given equal consideration. There should be protection for hedgerows and the ancient Phoebe Lane natural corridor.	Noted. Protection of hedgerows is underlined in the SPD.
506	216	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	Previous draft SEMK plan didn't include so many sites - why did this change? Respondent believes that G&T community want to live in reach of amenities but not directly next to existing settlements, but current plans don't provide this. If there is a need for 7 new pitches why aren't they distributed across existing sites in order to keep their community together? Respondent wants written explanation from MKC to explain why this is not an option. The respondent argues that of all proposed sites for G&T the most appropriate are those served by transport links - sites at junction of V10/Bow Brickhill relief road, or the one at the junction of the Bow Brickhill relief road/Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands road as both are far from housing and closer to facilities. Also concerned at the proximity of a site near Wavendon playing fields and Phoebe Lane. They believe the G&T community will use both these as short cuts to Wavendon rather than H10 as the site isn't positioned closer to the main road.	The draft SPD contained 3 locations for the G&T site which were selected considering the relevant best practice and available guidance. The final location was selected following a review of feedback from the consultation responses in addition to this best practice and guidance.
507	1240	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	By closing the level crossing and train station parents travelling to schools and then off to work will cause further traffic congestion at the top of the High Street and Weathercock Lane, which would be met by traffic from the new Bow Brickhill (BB) development traffic, and oncoming traffic from the M1 and A5 direction. Parents who choose to school their children in both Bucks and Beds systems will be forced to park on the Newport Road on both runs.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
508	1241	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent questions whether traffic survey been carried out and the estimated impact in rush hours to the access points of town been calculated before the only north access to the town is closed. The North (Newport Road) exit-access figures should be added to the figures for the calculated BB new development, and a simulation of impact times should be submitted, showing pinch points. Fig provided with areas of concern.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

509	1242	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent raised a number of questions in relation to environmental impacts of the rail and requested future train time. Respondent provided alternative level crossing proposal where the rail line would be dropped from the straight after Aspley Guise on a gradual gradient to go underneath station road	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
510	1243	Para 2.10	Concerns raised over classification of flood risk within the SPD. Section 2.10 (Environment) only utilises the Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) to define the risk as being low due to the lack of any identified floodplain. This is not an accurate representation of the fluvial risk to the site. The Flood Map for Planning (rivers and sea) is limited to watercourse whose catchment is greater the 3km2. In this particular case, the catchments of the ordinary watercourses running through the site are smaller than this threshold, so are therefore un-modelled. There may be fluvial risk associated with the watercourse that haven't been identified.	Detailed assessment will form part of the planning application process.
511	1243	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that all sources of flood risk are assessed during Local Plans. Currently this document only includes information on the fluvial (and tidal) flood risk. The Flood map for surface water identifies some flow paths that need to be clarified and avoided (or utilised to reduce risk downstream). Other considerations, such as combined events like what occurred in 20/21 should also be explored or planned for	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016) and all applicable local guidance documents.

512	1243	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent provided recommendation around artificial grass pitch. It is suggested that the pitch should be Gen2 multi-sport surface rather than a 3G surface. The Gen2 multisport surface will ensure that a wider range of sports (such as hockey, netball, tennis and football) can be delivered through the PE curriculum, and accessed by the community. In comparison, a 3G surface will only be suitable for football. The other benefit of Gen2 multisport over 3G is that Gen2 does not require the rubber crumb infill, so it is therefore less harmful to the environment. Respondent notes that there are 2 other 3G pitches close to SEMK ((Glebe Farm All Through School) and Fulbrook Middle School), and if another 3G is added to the mix, this would not make a very good business model as the operators would be competing for users to meet sinking fund requirement. LED lighting recommended for the floodlights. Gen2 multisport surface for both Glebe Farm All Through School and Watling Academy, and in both cases 3G has been provided.	The details of the design of the artificial grass pitches, if provided, will be agreed through planning application process.
513	1246	Para 3.3.	The site should feel like an extension to MK but also have its own character.	Noted.
514	1246	Para 4.3	Respondent supports transport hub idea and integration of public transport. Respondent supports relocation of Woburn Sands station.	Noted.

515	223, 1270, 1281, 1289, 1370	General Comment	<p>The area planned for development was originally designated as Green Belt land. Development and expansion onto these areas is very disappointing and, if similar to other sprawling areas its most likely to be nothing more than a money-making scheme for property developers e.g., Wavendon Golf course and Milddleton. More thought is needed on SEMK and how it will exist in 50+ years times. Developers shouldn't be allowed to make excessive profit, limit their profit to 5% and any excess after communal services are built should be returned to MKC.</p> <p>WCC similarly put, they share the concerns of neighbouring parishes regarding the 'low bar' set within the expectations for developers. Whilst broadly supportive of the need to continue to grow as a city, some of the newer developments have stepped away from the ethos of the founding parents of MK, leaving soulless and uninspiring spaces that are likely to become the 'regeneration estates' of tomorrow. To developers set expectations high, give clear aspirations for the city with innovation and sustainability at the heart. Be ambitious and bold. Don't be held to ransom by greedy developers who care only for the bottom line. Think about your residents, taxpayers, future citizens, and demand what is right for them. A respondent said MKC should join Robert Jenricks vision to build beautiful estates with conservation and greenery being key, and be a pilot and spearhead the new thinking, before it is too late.</p>	Noted. No changes required .
516	223, 1309	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	There should be wide open green areas with trees and feeling of openness	Noted.
517	223	4.5.2 Character and Density	<p>Infrastructure should follow original design principles of MK (grid roads), no buildings above 3 stories, all services underground (not under roads). Build houses on land not susceptible to heave and buildings should be aesthetically appealing. If land is susceptible to heave then measures should be taken to avoid potential problems caused by climate change predictions - developers should have to commit to addressing long term construction issues. Each property needs off road parking.</p>	<p>The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
518	225	4.4 Land Use	<p>The development should create significant opportunities for starter homes and hopefully priorities locals. However, this isn't always the case with high percentages of 4/5 bed homes, therefore the respondents request to know the split for this development.</p>	<p>Local Plan:MK policies (HN1, HN1 especially) will apply and matters of housing mix will be assessed through planning application stage.</p>

519	224	General Comment	Do not enable this housing and rail plan to sever Chantry Close in Woburn Sands from the main community hub and effect quality of life. Residents should be fully informed before any decisions are made	No changes required.
520	229, 230, 1271	General Comment	The respondent agrees with the points made by Wavendon , Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands Town/Parish Councils and believes that the consultation process has been inadequate for the severity of the proposal.	Noted.
521	231	4.3 Movement Network	In all three movement scenarios the roundabout at the end of the H10 is not shown. The current diagrams are misleading, and the roundabout should be included. The blue proposed grid road colouring should be extended up to the roundabout. Proposed bridges and underpasses should also be shown on the maps - where H10 crosses Byrd Crescent, where V11 crosses Morley Crescent etc, where the V11 crosses Holst Crescent.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
522	231	Para 4.3.6	The suggestion that Scenario 3 is the more expensive ' due to other amount of grid road infrastructure requires, e.g., underpasses' should be removed as it appears to contradict the diagram. Equally if the need to build two bridges if the real reason then this should be stated.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
523	231	4.3 Movement Network	The following redways are missing from the movement scenario diagrams: V11 redway super route underneath Fyfield Barrow overbridge, H10 Redway super route at entrance of Elgar Grove, redway from Wavendon Gate Pavillion to Gregories Drive, Wavendon Gate leading north from Passalewe Lane between Lester Court and Norton Leys, redway on west side of V11 north from H10 to the Fyfield Burrow overbridge and redway around Hindhead Knoll.	Pedestrian and Cycle Routes chapter had been revised following feedback received.
524	232	General Comment	Respondent questions the whole point of the consultation stating that the development will happen anyway so what is the point. Also states that the 3000 homes and the gypsy and traveller site are not needed.	Noted. The site and need for G7T site are specified in Policy SD1 of the Local Plan.

525	1252	Para 3.2	Respondent is concerned that the numerous crossings mentioned in para 3.2 will not materialise and the communities will be split to north and south of the railway line.	Noted. No changes required.
526	1255	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Question: Has the grade separated vehicular crossing at Woburn Sands been ruled out by the EWR consultation?	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
527	1255	4.3 Movement Network	The plan on page 20 designates Bow Brickhill/Woburn Sands Road as a major road. This is misleading and should be changed.	Fig 2.1 presents future development context.
528	1244	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	The flood risk from this site should consider all relevant sources e.g., fluvial, surface water, groundwater and sewer. The Flood Map for Planning (Rivers and Sea) does not reflect the existing flood risk at this site as the modelling extents normally relate to risk from main rivers. There is ordinary watercourse across this site. The Risk of Flooding from Surface Water Map may be able to provide some indication of flow routes through this area. Culverting of watercourses should be avoided and overall land drainage discharge should be maintained. Extensive site investigation will be required.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016), any recent flooding events and all applicable local guidance documents.
529	1244	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Respondent should contact the Bedford Group of IDBS, they may have more recent mapping of flood risk for the area and advise of any planned alleviation schemes. If the proposed development affects the IDBs access or operations it will be subject to obtaining its prior agreement and consent. It must also be made clear that the IDB intend to strictly enforce no development within the 9 m byelaw zone to ensure its future maintenance operations are not hindered. Allowable surface water discharge rates should be agreed with both the IDB and Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) if discharging into a watercourse within the IDB drainage district.	MKC contacted the IDB and reviewed the plans with them before finalising.
530	1244	6. Next Steps	To maximise the benefits of a development, surface water management and the incorporation of SuDS should be considered from the beginning of the development planning process and throughout. We would expect this to influence the site layout and design applying source control measures as standard. Developments should account for existing land use, natural contours of the land, flow paths, existing points of discharge and vegetation cover. If there are multiple catchments within the site, these should be identified and retained following development unless it can be demonstrated that the alteration of catchments will provide betterment. Milton Keynes Council has published specific guidance on the preparation of surface water drainage strategies, and it should be referred to.	Strategic SuDS features are presented in the SPD. Detail design will be reviewed through planning application process.

531	1244	6. Next Steps	Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands are both identified as Critical Drainage Catchments (CDC). All CDC sites as identified in Milton Keynes Surface Water Management Plan will be required to demonstrate that the development will not increase the flood risk to the CDC and provide an improvement to the existing situation where possible which is important due to recent flooding in the catchments (Great Ouse and Ouzel).	Noted.
532	1246	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Proposed locations for balancing ponds, should account for the adjacent infrastructure (e.g., railway line) and the event of exceedance or failure. Is balancing pond the correct wording here i.e., similar to the functions of Willen Lakes or is it to meant as attenuation for surface water runoff only?	SPD amended under Para 5.3.1 'balancing ponds' to state 'attenuation schemes'
533	1246	Page 35	Respondent believes that there is a typo on page 35 'All new development must be set back at a distance of at least 18 metres from any main rivers, at least 9 metres from all other ordinary watercourses, or at an appropriate width as agreed by the Environment Agency, Lead Local Flood Authority or Internal Drainage Board, in order to provide an adequate undeveloped buffer zone.' I refer you to FR3 of Plan:MK for correction.	Noted. Text amended.
534	1248	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Respondent stated that the proposed flood retention measures mentioned in the document are not sufficient. Consideration should be given to impact from neighbouring estates in addition to possibility of flooding from the site itself. Concerns raised over the lack of detail in geological assessment and comments made in regards to underlying geology and possibility of flooding. Comments made in relation to principles of building retention ponds and lakes on main watercourses and how this would not apply at SEMK site since there is no main river within 18m. Respondent believes that full hydrological survey is required for the site.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016), any recent flooding events and all applicable local guidance documents. The SPD highlights the strategic indicative SuDs and individual proposal will be assessed on their own merits.
535	1248	Para 2.5.4	Maintained of drainage ditches will be required to ensure they are not obstructed when flood occurs. Respondent suspect that low lying points either side of railway are not sufficient for surface water attenuation needed. Comments made in relation to extension of Caldecotte Brook Linear Park to ensure that sufficient unobstructed space either side is provided (concerns raised over min distance present in borwns Wood area - 9m). .	Noted. Matter falls outside of the remits of the SPD.

535	1248	Para 2.8	Respondent believes that the SMEK is not intended to provide a library but to make use of existing one in Woburn Sands. The report should address the need to supplement or enlarge this facility or at least additional books should be provided. Respondent stated that Gyms and Libraries must be the new focus of communities not shopping.	Noted.
536	1248	General Comment	Comments made in relation to status and use of libraries within MK, comments in relation to need to provide cultural centers within MK.	Noted.
537	1248	General Comment	Comments in relation to pre-pandemic and post pandemic behaviours, use of shops and public transport.	Noted.
538	1248	4.5.2 Character and Density	Concerns raised over high densities which is believed to be incorporating smaller housing for people that cannot afford larger properties that they desire.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
539	1248	General Comment	Respondent stated the need for detailed geological assessment to ensure sustainable construction and drainage and assessment of impact.	Detail design will come at planning application stage.
540	1248	Section 2	Section 2 is missing a survey of current land use. Concerns raised over loss of arable land. Concerns over use of greenbelt land, open countryside of value for development.	Site allocated in Plan:MK to deliver approximately 3000 homes.
541	1250	4.3 Movement Network	Concerns raised over current and potential increase of traffic in Wavendon area roads (Newport, Walton, Lower End, Cranfield)	The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

542	1251, 1260	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent stated that MKC failed to undertake Strategic Transport review for the area since East West Rail Company will publish initial proposals (for both the track and stations) in respect of the railway in the next couple of months; there will then presumably be a period of consultation before final decisions are made. Some noted Proposals for the development of an O2C Expressway were paused in 2020 and have now been cancelled although discussions will continue on improving the road link between Oxford and Cambridge.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
543	1251	General Comment	Respondent is content with the Vision and supportive of need to become 'green' development linked to grid system but distinct from existing settlements. However, the phrase "feel like an extension to the grid squares of Milton Keynes" is not consistent with the idea of maintaining the character of the existing settlements. incorporate "A strategic movement network to accommodate through traffic" (para 3.4: Movement) – this is clearly incompatible with the Vision. SEMK should not adversely affect the welfare and wellbeing of the current residents of the area or its environmental and wildlife assets.	Vision was updated.
544	226	4.3 Movement Network	Supports comments by Aspley Heath Parish Council. Including mentions major issues that will be created if necessary, link roads aren't introduced.	Noted.

545	226, 1273	4.3 Movement Network	A largely Victorian road network cannot facilitate 21st century traffic needs without major change as they were not intended for this. Some stated that the approach for the strategic road network should be based on: Extension of H10 eastwards at single carriageway grid road standard to Newport Road, V10-V11 extensions and H10 to Bow Brickhill Rd link provided all with grade separation of EWR, Bow Brickhill relief road, Consideration of the EWR link from Bow Brickhill Rd to Hardwick Rd, Traffic calming measures in Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise to discourage through traffic and a comprehensive review of local signing, weight limits and speed limits.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
546	227	4.4 Land Use	Respondent is in favour of the proposed education plans. The location, range and size of education provision is appropriate for the number of dwellings planned. The proposed plans to have a secured site for an all through school (which if agreed would combine the 7FE and one of the 3FE primary schools) in the development plans at this stage is positive as this gives the Local Authority the flexibility in our education commissioning approach within the SEMK development to commission two separate educational establishments (a separate secondary and primary buildings) within this part of the development if it is deemed appropriate at the point of commissioning.	Noted.
547	1268	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent states there should be no left turns from new development onto Bow Brickhill Road as this will allow traffic to pass through Woburn Sands on their way to the M1.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
548	1272	4.4 Land Use	Respondents' states that primary school should not be placed behind Bellway and would be more suited to a site south of Frosts Garden Centre as this will have less noise impact on residents.	The SPD was amended to show the location of schools under primary and reserved options.
549	1278	General Comment	Gloucestershire CC have no comments to make on this SPD.	Noted.
550	1279	General Comment	Respondent questions the need for housing and asks why we can't finish sites that already have planning permission first.	Site allocated in Plan:MK to deliver approximately 3000 homes.

551	222, 1277	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The increase in traffic on Theydon Avenue causes great concern as it's already used as a cut-through and suffers with speeding despite the 20-mph limit and cars mount the pavement which makes crossing the main road is difficult. Whilst there are lights near the new Parklands development it is difficult to cross between there and the High street. Children have tried to cross the main road to access Fulbrook Middle School, through an alleyway, whilst there is heavy road traffic. There are significant parking issues on Station Road and Weathercock Lane when parents try to drop/collect children. This could end in a serious accident.</p>	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
552	1277, 1284	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The potential increase in the railway system will continue to cause major congestion backed up into Woburn Sands, making it difficult to access the High Street safely. The railway barriers often have mechanical failures and get stuck down which causes massive impact on the village, let alone an increase in the volume of traffic.</p>	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p>

553	1280	General Comment	Respondent provides background of their site, Bellowhill Veterinary Centre and Bellowhill Stud, located adjacent to SEMK. The landowner is open to discussion with MKC and is willing to make land available for developers. Location map is provided. Their site is proposed to possibly be adjacent to G&T site. The developer is generally supportive of the development and guidance set in the SPD but is concerned of potential conflict of land uses with the Veterinary Centre and G&T site. Suggests that suitable a landscape buffer and acoustic screening could be needed to prevent adverse noise and pollution affecting their site.	Additional buffer was provided in the SPD in the area of the select G&T site.
554	219	4.3 Movement Network	Scenario 2 is the least desirable movement option. Significant traffic levels could end up using the Bow Brickhill relief road. This could be mitigated however by routing through traffic via the A4146 and A5 rather than along the extended V11/Bow Brickhill relief road. Scenario 1 would result in least disruption to existing residents, with additional screening used to minimise impact further impacts. Scenario 3 would provide the best possible access to the site but is costly and would likely result in same disruption to residents of Old Farm Park as scenario 2, despite likely decreased traffic going through SEMK. Scenario 1 = preferred option, but mitigation for existing residents needed, including: planting and bunds to reduce noise impacts. grade separated crossing of V11 at Holst Close and Caldecote Brook Park (bridge or underpass), signage and traffic calming used to deter traffic from accessing A5/A4146 via SEMK.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
555	1280	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Fields adjacent to SEMK are used as paddocks and grazing fields for winning racehorses. The proximity of SEMK (including potential G&T site) to these fields creates potential for the horses to be disturbed or incidents to occur which may affect the horses' health and wellbeing. The Veterinary Centre deals with rescue cases where animals have been confiscated from their owners and may be in need of care/rehabilitation before being re-housed. This is a sensitive process which requires constant security and protection for the animals. This all would impact the ability of the breeder to continue their business and the landowner may then consider alternative land use options which may be more intrusive on local landscape and character. Considering other potential G&T locations, the site to the north of Station Road would have less potential for land use conflict: there are only 2 residential properties here, and they'd be complimentary in use, and would be entirely separated from the G&T site by a structural landscape buffer.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.

556	220	General comment	Respondent considers SEMK is representative of MK having lost its way in design terms and is placing desire for Government infrastructure funding ahead of quality of life. Criticism of token sustainability in new developments and adverse impact on traditional towns.	Noted. No changes required.
557	1281, 1260	4.3 Movement Network	Quotes Policy SD11. A preferred strategic movement network isn't provided. Uncertainty persists over the EWR alignment. MKC failed to undertake a Strategic Transport Review for the area so up to date data can't be use to inform transport decisions. They understand that Phase 1 modelling studies were undertaken to consider traffic flows, principally in Woburn Sands, and that Phase 2 of the study will consider the impact of traffic on local roads, which should include those in and around The Brickhills, has yet to be completed. The cumulative impact of EWR and surrounding developments on post Covid traffic must be assessed prior to any movement framework being finalised. Local roads, including but not exclusive to; 'McDonald's' Roundabout, V10 Brickhill Street, Brickhill Road, Station Road, Woburn Sands Road and Bow Brickhill Road are vital for access to amenities, including GP Surgeries, Dentists, Pharmacies, none of which are available in The Brickhills. With the number of existing and proposed developments in the area many extra vehicles will be pushed onto the 'McDonald's' roundabout junction with the A5, A4146 and Brickhill Street. The impact of the additional traffic must be mitigated.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
558	1282	General Comment	Respondent provides background on the Berks & Bucks FA.	Noted.
559	1282, 1259, 1381	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Berks & Bucks FA states where an identified need has been found for 7 full size 3G pitches, 0 currently serve the Eastern area of MK. The lack of training facilities combined with the growth of football will limit offering new opportunities for residents and affect quality of existing sessions as clubs are already introducing waiting lists which may deter engagement of young people in sport. Berks & Bucks are keen to support clubs identify, improve and develop local facilities. Respondents believe there is potentially a great opportunity to not only improve the current facilities at Wavendon Recreation Ground, but also develop and increase the facility footprint and number of pitches enabling this to develop into a hub site for the whole community and help reduce costs for LPAs.	An area of 5.4ha will be provided for playing pitches within the SEMK. MKC will work closely with internal and external partners during planning application process to ensure appropriate design is selected.

560	1282, 1259	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	<p>The 3G pitch facility in Walton High - Brooklands has resisted any community usage outside of school hours for 3+ years. This highlights the challenges to accessing educational facilities and the importance of developing future community use agreement that are also enforceable. In order to ensure that future educational facilities, such as Glebe Farm, are made available and that as much of the local community is able to benefit, we [Berks and Bucks FA] would welcome the opportunity to support pre-opening conversations between the educational establishment, linking them in with the suitable local groups and clubs. This not only enables a more accurate CUA to be developed but also enables both the school and the facility users to discuss mutual sport development outcomes.</p> <p>Bedfordshire FA adds that with an increased population from developments such as SEMK more access to facilities will be needed to provide community sport. 3G football pitches can be invaluable assets to the local community whilst also providing much-needed primary income generation through weekly hire fees. It would be a travesty if lessons are not learnt from previous community use agreements aforementioned that have not been enforced and so a legal document linked in with any planning condition and S106 legal agreement is essential.</p>	MKC will work closely with internal and external partners during planning application process to ensure appropriate design is selected.
561	1282, 1259	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	<p>The proposed layout of SEMK will prevent improving facilities at Wavendon Recreation Ground and its expansion (particularly the location of the G&T site), and even with the improvements to the site the Football Club are highlighting that this will not suffice their current needs or ambitions to grow. Bedfordshire FA agrees and adds detail on funding and investment in Wavendon Recreation Ground and the need to future proof the site.</p>	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
562	1283	Para 2.3.10	<p>Any linking SEMK with other developments between Newport Road and the M1 would be detrimental to the wider Woburn Sands area.</p>	Noted. No changes required. Buffers and layout of development will ensure that no coalescence occurs.

563	1284, 1379, 1366	4.3 Movement Network	We are yet to see the impact on the roads of the new homes being developed in Wavendon and the backup of traffic this may cause from the Kingston Roundabout up to and beyond Woburn Sands level crossing.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
564	1253	General comment	Comments made in regards to zero carbon developments with literature provided on that topic. Information on low traffic neighbourhoods, sustainability.	Noted. No changes required.
565	1253	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent stated that information provided on Page 13 ignores all the maps with a moved station and gives an impression of consideration of matters already decided around closing Woburn Sands station and level crossings.	The SPD was updated to show the possible zone within which the station may be relocated (Fig 4.2)
566	1253	4.3 Movement Network/H10	H10 crossing Newport Road is missing from all other maps than the one on page 21, it needs to go across Newport Road as part of future expansion especially Central Beds housing North of Aspley Guise.	The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.

567	1253	General comment	Bike redways could be along the easement corridors needed from utilities – gas, water and electricity. These would be direct and capable of being fast and so likely to be used if surfaces are kept smoother than current redway surfaces. MK emits more CO2 than London. Bike use is low in spite of Redways. The design, prioritisation and functionality need radically overhauling in SEMK and the rest of MK.	Noted. No changes required. Additional leisure routes provided.
568	1253	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	None of the scenarios has more than 4 crossings which is not numerous as cited in the document. Respondent suggests one more at least south of Tilbrook for non-vehicular travel.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport. The SPD acknowledges that the additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.
569	1253	4.3 Movement Network	Page 49 mentions proposed bridleway (going in a loop to nowhere) and existing bridleways are marked - it does not say they are going to be stopped. This is a risk of less through routes with functionality. This means active transported is not facilitated. Respondent seeks clarity over what is on page 49: "Highway intervention limiting wider through movement~ this is not in response 2 and 3. Also mentioned on page 54 point 4.3.9	The SPD notes that proposed on site network of redways, leisure routes and bridleways should connect into this existing network. Following comments received primary and reserved movement network were chosen. See Fig 2.9 For paths for Walkers, Cyclists and Horse Riders.

570	1253	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Drawings on page 53, 54, 55 looks nice but functionality of Active transport (non-vehicular use) is not emphasised enough. Dutch road design for bike usage does suggest 4 m bike track widths and separation of bike and pedestrians to allow efficient bike travel. All but grid roads need the priority for bike and walking with regard raised pavements at junctions to facilitate the walking and biking and forcing a reduction on motor vehicle speed. A tighter radius of junctions off grid roads will also lead to slow motor vehicle speed entering other roads and estates improving safety as well as noise and pollution. Dutch experience shows that concerted infrastructure for bike first travel needs to be in place before active transport will occur for commute, school, socialising and shopping.</p> <p>Concerns raised over general fractality of getting bikes out of house/bike stand and getting to shops etc.</p>	<p>Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application</p>
571	1253	Para 4.3.18	Redways do not provide segregated network of cycle paths since they are shared with pedestrians.	Noted. Text amended.
572	1253	Para 4.3.19	respondent disagrees with the statement that redways along grid roads provide the quickest routes. Routes across the diagonals of grid squares will shorten the journey.	Noted. No changes required. Additional leisure routes provided.
573	1253	General Comment	Concerns raised over the state of existing redways, need for wider, better surfaced routes, signage and need of repair.	Noted.
574	1253	Para 4.3.28	Paragraph wording suggests that Scenario 1 is decided.	The SPD was amended, and it includes primary and reserve movement option.
575	1253	6. Next Steps	respondent stated that features that are needed as per para 4.4.5 should be in 100% of homes with Passivhaus standards throughout, roof orientation, harvesting water and solar water heating. Need for CHP etc.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
576	1253	4.5.2 Character and Density	respondent stated that more dwellings need on plot garaging and parking and not rely on on-road parking and Infront of townhouse parking. Size of flats should be bigger than those build at present.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.

577	1253	4.3 Movement Network/V11	V11 across the railway is marked as possible in scenario 1 on page 63. It needs to be in place from the start and hopefully with MRT. The road could be 20mph.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
578	1253	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Comment made in relation to connecting H10 Eastwards to A421 as part of infrastructure before expansion. Respondent noted that there is outline planning application that seeks to access the North of railway part of their development from Newport Road – this has not been part of SEMK plan in this document and joined up approach is needed. Their plan does not have rail crossing road in place. It just says safeguarded area. A developer is also planning to access their development area south of the rail by vehicle access to Bow Brickhill which is not on their plan. Question raised over what is meant by some form of highway intervention. Concerns raised over EWR's impact on allotments on Edgewick farm	The SPD was updated to add clarity around phasing and delivery of infrastructure. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development. S.105 agreements are associated with the granting of planning permission.

579	1285	General Comment	<p>Note B accompanying item 1.3.8 states that a development framework will be made in conjunction with, and with the support of and in partnership with, the landowners, adjoining LPAs, other stakeholders etc. This is therefore a very powerful lobby with a huge financial interest. Consultation with the local community primarily of normal working or retired people who have little knowledge or experience of planning matters, supported only by their local councillors and having no financial backing. These are the people who will be most badly affected and it's unjust if their wishes are ignored in favour of those who wish to gain the maximum profit from the plans. The uncertainty about the design and funding of the very significant engineering works that will be needed for the EWR makes it difficult to give an objective opinion.</p> <p>Having attended 3 virtual meetings to discuss the SPD the presentations given by officers sounded very much like a declaration of intent rather than a proper consultation.</p>	No changes required.
580	1285, 1294, 1303, 1368, 1298	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Green buffer areas in some locations between new and existing developments is welcomed. However, the respondent is concerned with plans to place sports pitches within the green buffers, vastly reducing their size. Is it legitimate to class sports fields as green areas? There is not much flora or fauna or many birds' nests. Access to the sports fields is needed by both new and existing residents. Remaining green buffers will be very narrow and inevitably hedges and fences will be destroyed, undergrowth trodden and unofficial tracks formed, thereby making the areas unsuitable for wildlife or the keeping of domestic animals and subject to vandalism and littering. From an ecological standpoint this development will be nothing short of state sponsored destruction, so anything to mitigate this will be welcome.</p>	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended.
581	1256	5.2 Infrastructure delivery	<p>Respondent highlights the need for infrastructure to support SEMK and the developments that sit on the boundary i.e., Marston Vale at M1 J13, North of Aspley Guise village (area of future growths in CBC's pre-submission plan)</p>	Noted.
582	1256	General comment	<p>The process of preparation of the SPD was open and honest where numerous consultation meetings took place chaired by Cllr Marland, where parties have been given plenty of time to air their views.</p>	Noted

583	1256	4.3 Movement network/H10	H10 corridor towards the land north of Aspley Guise should be protected. By not doing so, landowners can submit planning applications and gain permission for housing that will vastly increase the cost of purchasing the land at a later date. The SEMK and hence SPD boundary does not extend to Newport Road at the point where an arrow points to a future reserve corridor. Whilst the land beyond SEMK (between the red line and Newport Road) is not within scope of the SPD, urgent action is required to preserve the corridor, by MKC purchasing the necessary land.	The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.
584	1256	4.3 Movement network	The SPD includes a new north/south “link road” adjacent to Woburn Sands, which includes crossings at grade. Respondent is concerned that the link road has some characteristics of Fen Street and Countess Way roads in Broughton which they believe are not satisfactory. Concerns raised over the amount of traffic on the road and the need for it to being a grid road standard.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application
585	1256	General comment	The development of the site should consider views of the stakeholders from adjoining areas and employment area of South Caldecotte.	We received responses from various stakeholders who took part in various stakeholder engagement throughout the preparation of the SPD.
586	1285	4.4 Land Use	The respondent is concerned about the increase of off-road bikers using Aspley Heath and Bow Brickhill Woods. Tracks have been designated for the bikers, but many form new tracks, cutting across public footpaths at high speeds. Families with young children, hikers and horse riders no longer use the woods as they feel unsafe or cannot find parking. There activities cause huge environmental damage and leave litter. There are no public toilets available so there are pollution and environmental health concerns. Parked cars make Church Rd in Bow Brickhill a single-track road, so vehicles regularly have to reverse up or down to allow others to pass. There are no footpaths, so the carriageway is shared by pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists. Bikers ride down the hill at high speed and it's highly dangerous. It cannot be denied that a further 3000 homes built within 1 mile will only make matters worse. How will you mitigate this?	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.

587	1287	4.3 Movement Network	Supports that grid roads should not go beyond the new development.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application
588	1294	4.3 Movement Network	Bow Brickhill Parish Council would like to make these suggestions for S106 funding in due course: 1) Funding to ensure that highway measures to restrict traffic through the village are effective and fit for purpose. A suitable scheme may include but is not limited to: Enhanced village gateway features to provide entrance narrowing and a visual high light at entrance points. Road narrowing along Station Road incorporating a cycleway scheme to enhance cycling safety and links between the village and the urban area of MK. Vehicle weight restrictions. Speed and ANPR cameras. Noise attenuation measures along the new road to protect existing properties. 2) Funding to enhance recreational facilities on Bow Brickhill recreation ground. A suitable scheme may include but is not limited to: The development of an All-weather pitch and grass football pitch drainage improvements such that the site can support more teams, and this reduce the need to provide pitches in the area identified as a green buffer. Enhancement of the existing Bow Brickhill pavilion and changing facility to support additional sports provision in the area. Development of alternative sports facilities including cricket, tennis etc. Play provision improvements including a MUGA.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development. S.105 agreements are associated with the granting of planning permission. Milton Keynes Council currently does not implement CIL regime.
589	1303, 1351	4.3 Movement Network	The building of a bypass for Bow Brickhill is welcomed but should be built before any other construction takes place. Potential highway intervention to limit wider through movements is also welcomed. Some noted that it should be B road.	The SPD had been updated to consider phasing of strategic infrastructure.
590	1305, 1369	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent requests that the trail that runs from Walton Road to Woburn Sands Road is maintained and left as peaceful as it is now. Play areas and sports pitches should not be located near to high pollution areas as they are in Glebe Farm.	It is considered that best location for the pitches is in the green buffer on the eastern edge of SEMK to protect the identity of Woburn Sands could take the form of a park, including playing pitches to benefit both the new and existing communities. Fig 4.12 Concept Plan also show indicative location of formal playing pitches (if the need arises) close to the village of Bow Brickhill.

591	1311	General Comment	Questions - How big is Mk going to get? When does all this building work end?	The SPD cannot address answer to this question. It is to address the growth in accordance with Policy S11
592	1314	General Comment	Respondent feels that the SPD fails to provide the full infrastructure required and that present and future residents will have to tolerate the penalties of under provision in the long term. Respondent feels that Council has a track record of failing to provide in the past.	The SPD addresses the requirements highlighted in Policy SD11 and other policies in Plan:MK that require strategic infrastructure to be provided.
593	1315, 1436, 1261, 1397	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent suggests that speed limits through the new development should be 30mph and 20mph in several parts. Speeds of 40-60mph should be discouraged as it will increase safety concerns and pollution. Some respondents suggested that these slower limits should also be extended to established roads such as Lower End Road and Cranfield Road.	The SPD contains a table with design requirements which includes design speeds. The SPD cannot address speeds outside of the allocation boundary. See Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network
594	1317	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	Why 7 pitches are required, respondent also feels that MKC are more concerned with making provision for travellers than providing the infrastructure required for a high-density development.	The SEMK site needs to provide for 7 pitches as required by Policy SD11 of Plan:MK. The SPD addresses all other criteria including delivery of strategic infrastructure.
595	1318	4.5.2 Character and Density	Respondent object to any high-rise flats in the development.	The SPD
596	1325	General Comment	Respondent states that these plans miss the opportunity to address a link with the future university and a link to EWR. Consideration for an incubator and set up hub beside the railway with an additional station between Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill could provide a transport system on the southern flank which could create a focal point for the SE corner of MK. This would also fit with the Ox-Camb arc of science and tech. Consideration of an education spur for development of PhD ideas with a network link could create jobs and opportunities for young people and a community that business would be keen to serve.	Noted. No changes required.
597	222	General comment	Respondent agrees with WSTC position on SPD and is concerned about lack of detail on how Infrastructure before Expansion would be delivered.	Noted.
598	1330	General Comment	Respondent states that the Council should not allow developers to erode the extensively drawn up policies in Plan:MK and Neighbourhood Plans. Policies are there for a reason and developers should follow them.	Noted. No changes required.

599	1288	4.3 Movement Network	All estate access must be onto the existing grid road system and the EWR link doesn't function on this present line, it needs to be moved. This transport scheme and unworkable rail route needs a thorough rethink.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. The SPD provides design guidance on how the development should be orientated.
600	1296	General Comment	Respondent opposes SEMK SPD and believes that its another instance of the south eastward's concentration of development, an area that has already undergone significant development. MKC has declined to develop in the north of the borough, particularly northeast of the M1 (claims tendered that there'd be limited transport routes across the M1). Now with SEMK, claims of transport limitations are quite clearly no longer viable. In the Draft 2017 Plan:MK Policy DS2 proposed 1,000 new homes in the SEMK area. The Plan:MK 2019 and the SEMK SDP propose 3,000 new homes in the same area. MKC are desperately looking for areas to enable them to meet housing targets and yet, while there is a substantial area to the north of the borough suitable for development the preoccupation with development in the southeast prevails.	Noted. No changes required.
601	1296	4.6 Sustainability	The Sustainability Appraisal applies only to the defined SEMK area. It doesn't account for effects that the development will have on areas outside MK in adjoining local authorities, despite it being situated on the edge of MK borough.	Noted. No changes required.

602	234-238, 1343, 1357, 1366	4.3 Movement Network	<p>The following measures should be applied in order to reduce the negative impact on the village: The H10 extension should be no more than a single carriageway feeder road with a maximum speed of 40mph. Road lighting should be carefully designed to reduce light pollution, for residents and wildlife. Substantial green buffers with area of dense trees should be provided to protect the village, including Phoebe Lane and Wavendon Fields apartments. It is also suggested this is contiguous with buffering of the H10 through the Church Farm Development. Great care must be taken for the landscaping of the grade crossing of Phoebe Lane to respect and retain the essential rural character of the lane and that part of the village. The H10 must not be extended over Newport Road and prejudice the potential for the land to be used for recreational purpose or create a de-facto MK South bypass to the M1.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions and landscaping will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
603	1296	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>The land covered by SEMK is high quality agricultural land which will be lost. There are agreeable views that will be lost, especially north-eastwards from Bow Brickhill and northwards from the Greensand Ridge. The relentless development of MK has diminished this. Respondent lists related key point from MKC Landscape Character Assessment 2016.</p>	<p>In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option). There are a number of policies within the Plan:MK that set principles for a new development and consider nature conservation are Policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5 and NE6. Future developments proposals will have to have regard to those policies. Future applicants should refer to Biodiversity:SPD for further guidance.</p>
604	1341	General Comment	<p>More play areas should be provided within the allocation.</p>	<p>Additional open space area with local play area was included in the SPD.</p>

605	234-238, 1343, 1357, 1260, 1366	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Measures to be implemented to reduce impacts on Wavendon residents is to complete the outstanding 2nd phase of the Local Transport Strategy to assess the impact of the SEMK proposals on Newport Road, Walton Road, Lower End Road and Cranfield Road. Implement the Low Traffic Neighbourhood pilot scheme on Walton Road to calm and reduce existing traffic and the expected traffic from the new development prior to scheme implementation. Introduced enforced speed limits of 30mph on Newport Road, Lower End Road and Cranfield Road. Maintain the railway crossing and access to the vital amenities of Woburn Sands. implement agreed closure of Cross End.</p>	<p>The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. Table 4.2 in the SPD contains design requirements for strategic highway network including the speed. The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p>
606	1320	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	<p>Flooding of the culvert behind Top Meadow, Cladecotte is a real problem and has got worse over the years. It is now at the point of intruding into people's gardens. This needs to be investigated and the water course changes to avoid further harm before more houses are built exasperating the issue</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016), any recent flooding events and all applicable local guidance documents.</p>

607	1286	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	North of Bow Brickhill there is a complex of hydrology laced historical underground streams. The new development will interact with this hydrology. Has this been explored when assessing the site? What is the land drainage plan to deal with this local feature?	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016), any recent flooding events and all applicable local guidance documents.
608	1286	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	Caldecotte Brook is completely inadequate to cope with hydrological impact of new estate, another means to link a new development with the balancing system need to be found. Considering this development, a pessimistic estimate needs to be made on flooding, this should take into account planning creep to make sure that inappropriate residents are not applied to this development. There needs to be from the start at robust defence in place against planning creep specifically resisting the appeals to planning precedents made under less extreme climatic conditions.	The SPD was updated to underline the requirement for new proposal to consider policies FR1-FR3. Furthermore, all new development proposals must take into consideration other relevant information such as the Milton Keynes SFRA, Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (2016), Surface Water Management Plan (2016), any recent flooding events and all applicable local guidance documents.
609	1296	4.5.2 Character and Density	Wildlife habitat and views will be lost, pressure on the green spaces on the Greensand Ridge will result from the widespread use by many of the residents of the 3,000 new homes who will be crammed into their new surroundings with little household space (increased density at expense of garden space), noise from the larger roads and inevitably increased traffic volumes will increase.	Noted. No changes required. Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
610	1299	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Best practice is to allocate G&T sites early in any development so that potential house buyers are fully aware of their future environs to facilitate social cohesion. It seems somewhat double standards to then propose a G&T site next to existing housing (Wavendon Fields) where current residents are not able to make informed choices. Notes that the G&T option west of Woburn Sands was removed from the list of options owing to it being too closely located to proposed leisure facilities. The proposed site next to Wavendon playing fields seems to me to be of a similar nature and should therefore be removed as an option.	The SPD phasing chapter was updated to reflect the need of early delivery of the G&T site.

611	1299, 1358	4.3 Movement Network	It is important that the Community Centre and St. Mary's Church are still easily accessible to those from Wavendon Gate. There are numerous elderly congregation members at the church that do not feel confident enough to drive on grid roads, so keeping car access to the Village from Wavendon Gate is critical for safe access but finding a traffic solution that prevents rat-running is essential. One respondent said the needs of elderly people wanting to remain active but who have safety concerns with speed & volume of traffic need to be considered.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. The SPD provides design guidance on how the development should be orientated.
612	1308	General Comment	Broughton and MK Parish Council welcome this consultation and acknowledge the status of this site within Plan:MK. They acknowledge the significant constraints on the site, with the railway forming (in part) a "hard boundary" to the site and (in part) a major obstacle to any conventional "placemaking" solution for this site as a whole; and with established settlement and/or attractive leisure woodlands forming much of the remaining site boundary.	Noted.
613	1259	4.3 Movement Network	The proposed road route to bypass Bow Brickhill must be aligned in close proximity to the railway line and not shown as bisecting the space between the railway and Bow Brickhill. This would additionally separate the proposed southern green landscape buffer and the proposed playing fields from the roadside, making them safer for families.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.
614	1259	4.4 Land Use	Respondent recommends that the south-west corner of SD11 consider the inclusion of a residential care facility for the aged and frail-care, as well as allotment space.	Housing mix will be reviewed at planning application stage. Allotment site is to be provided within the site.
615	1430	4.3 Movement Network	MKC Highways noted Scenario 3 states "Encourages vehicular movement towards Bow Brickhill Rd, exacerbating traffic through Woburn Sands (The Leys & Hardwick Rd)." This would seem a point common to all scenarios. Table 4.2- The width of a principal residential street to accommodate buses should be a minimum of 6.2m. Figure 4.7C -As above to accommodate buses width should be 6.2m. There needs to be a verge of at least 1m between the car parking spaces and redway.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.
616	1259	General Comment	The respondent provides background on Bedfordshire Football Association which includes Woburn and Wavendon FC.	Noted.

617	1259	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	<p>3000 dwellings would equate to 4.26ha in meeting the requirement of delivering playing pitches and ancillary facilities including car park and changing. Therefore, it's important to highlight not only the discrepancy between page 44 playing fields space standard in MK's Policy L4 and page 46 4.2.28 [of SPD] but the need for clarity in relation to what is to be delivered and if this includes playing pitches alone or ancillary facilities so as not to under-supply for the development.</p> <p>Page 44 playing fields space standard in MK Policy L4 states 0.52ha / 1000 population is required, which only gives 1.56ha requirement for 3000 houses. Whereas page 46 4.2.28 states 3.8ha is required. Either way, both figures are significantly lower than what is typically expected for provision of a population of this nature (4.26 Hectares) and it could drastically worsen an already difficult situation. Ultimately the concern is in relation to expecting an increase in population growth but not providing adequate provision in an area that is already under-supplied with enough facilities at the current time.</p>	An area of 5.4ha will be provided for playing pitches within the SEMK.
618	1259	4.4 Land Use	<p>Bedfordshire FA provides info on the clubs operation across catchment areas.</p> <p>Despite extensive work by the club and support from CBC over several years, it has not been possible to secure a site for a 3G in this area for Woburn and Wavendon. A shortfall for 3G pitches already exists in Central Beds across the areas that Woburn and Wavendon are active which the CBC Playing Pitch Strategy 2014 identified and was recently confirmed by a Local Football Facility Plan (2019). A network of new 3Gs have been strategically provided, however these have not been in the general Woburn area that is also a priority as they don't currently meet the large and growing club's needs. New 3G pitches would be located near catchments consisting of surrounding villages in North Central Bedfordshire such as Salford, Hulcote, Lidlington, Ridgmont and Brogborough.</p>	Noted. Detail design of pitches will be reviewed at planning application stage.

619	1259	4.4 Land Use	<p>Existing provision of playing pitch facilities is already stretched and one of those current sites at Bow Brickhill has drainage issues that will require further investment to make good. Nonetheless there is a potential to invest in a 3G pitch on this site with housing development contributions (which the respondent would expect to see) and grant funding. This is designed solely in mind for the local organisations to be part of a steering group to enable access to the facilities on weekday evenings and weekends whilst allowing continual expansion to cater for the additional growth that is anticipated directly as a result of any new housing development.</p> <p>The new facilities proposed at Wavendon SLA Playing Field site are now looking at a reduction that results in the deficit of one full sized pitch in comparison to the original plans. This reduction in valuable pitch space now looks as though a shortage of pitches will continue to exist. Added to this pressure is the fact that Central Beds have referenced that a suitable site is required to develop more grass pitches and the justification of 3G provision in the area. The most alarming barrier the County FA fears most for the club is to be faced with a lack of community use/ access once the facilities are built in addition to under-provision or poor-quality constructed grass pitches that are left out of action before they are even played on.</p>	The site is to provide a site for playing pitches in accordance with the requirements in Plan:MK. Additionally the SPD shows areas where future playing pitches could be placed subject to demand.
620	1306	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	<p>The proposed South-East MK expansion will have a significant impact on health and care services. The expected level of growth is expected to place strain on existing healthcare services and it will be necessary to provide additional premises capacity to mitigate. Options still under consideration include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Extension to an existing healthcare facility, e.g. Brooklands Health Centre, to support the development of an integrated health and care hub •Relocation of an existing primary healthcare facility into new, larger premises, e.g. Asplands Medical Centre •Development of a new healthcare facility within the expansion area, in addition to existing facilities •Combination of multiple of the above options. <p>BLMK Clinical Commissioning Group describes who they are, what they want to do in terms of supporting the integration of health services and how they will get there. They also provide great detail on how contributions on developers are sought/calculated.</p>	Policy SD11 requirements for school are considered in the SPD. The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.

621	1307	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife welcome a section on green & blue infrastructure but find the text weak/ambiguous. Policies NE4 and NE3 state developments should provide a net gain in biodiversity measured by a biodiversity metric. The SPDs Biodiversity section uses the phrase 'encourage biodiversity gains' which is ambiguous and not in line with NE3/4. The site sits in the Milton Keynes City Local BOA and incorporates a MK Wildlife Corridor. There's lots of opportunity to enhance biodiversity in line with the aspirations of the BOA and create measurable biodiversity net gain given the site's size. They suggest rewording the SPD to say: "Biodiversity. New and Retained: Green infrastructure will provide a measurable biodiversity net gain within the site. Existing high value habitats will be protected and enhanced as assets of the GI network. Features to support wildlife species will be incorporated throughout the site and space for wildlife will be incorporated into the linear parks".</p>	<p>SPD Para 3.3.10 last bullet point was amended to state: <i>Biodiversity. New and retained: Green infrastructure within the site should be provided with the consideration of Policies NE1-NE6. In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option).</i></p> <p>Future applicants should refer to Biodiversity's for further guidance.</p>
622	1307	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	<p>Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife note section 4.2.12 states that there is potential to create wildlife corridors within the linear park extensions. However, in para 4.2.16 onwards both Caldecotte Brook and Brown Wood Linear Park are described as narrow, featuring leisure footpaths, play areas and being formal in nature which doesn't facilitate opportunity for biodiversity enhancements.</p> <p>The proposed GI needs to identify where the enhancements for biodiversity are best placed - they provide recommendations. The development framework makes no plans for where new biodiversity enhancements will go within the site or where accessible natural green space will be, other than the links to the offsite woodland. It appears that the offsite Wavendon and Browns wood is being expected to accommodate the increase in recreational use created by this development. There is no mention of whether the owners of the wood had been consulted or what mitigation would be needed to ensure that this increase in recreational pressure directed to the woodland won't damage the habitat. This development should contribute towards the management of the wood to help mitigate the increase in recreational pressure. The development framework should be amended to specify exactly how much of each type of habitat should be provided within each green space area. For example, along the watercourse it could specify that the brook is buffered by a minimum of 10m of semi-natural habitat, not designed for public access (e.g., rough grass and scrub) then the pedestrian and cycle paths, with play areas further away.</p>	<p>The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Individual planning applications will determine the detail of the proposals. MKC had recently adopted Biodiversity's to which developers should refer to for further guidance.</p>

623	1307	6. Next Steps	<p>Due to a lack of detail it's hard to identify if each development parcel has incorporated enough biodiversity features to result in an overall measurable net gain for the SUE and if enough contributions will be given for each development parcel towards green infrastructure and biodiversity provision. BBOW support the MK Parks Trust being offered the management of the green space and feed into the overall design of the GI. However, they would have hoped that more of this design would have been completed to inform the development framework, rather than be left to negotiation at a later date.</p>	Matters to be considered
(Hutton) 624	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1349, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1358, 1359, 1391, 1367, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432,	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	<p>Concerns regarding impact of SEMK & EWR on existing traffic safety & congestion issues in Wavendon/Woburn Sands area, impact of Woburn Sands railway crossing closure on traffic and associated separation of communities, links to facilities, shops, schools etc. Potential increased air and noise pollution from development, EWR and H10, particularly for Wavendon Fields & Phoebe Lane residents. Creation/exacerbation of drainage problems, worse conditions for pedestrians and cyclists (incl. school children) due to traffic, impact on character. Concern that H10 extension to Newport Road could become de facto MK southern bypass. The SPD should: complete outstanding 2nd phase of Local Transport Strategy and take appropriate steps to mitigate increased traffic and accounting for EWR impacts; include introducing LTN/traffic calming scheme on Walton Road/in area; enforce 30mph speed limit on Newport, Lower End and Cranfield Roads but ideally this should be 20mph; implement agreed closure of Cross End; maintain Woburn Sands crossing and the option to divert to new crossing; improve active travel links between existing and new communities. One respondent raised concerns about structural impact of more road traffic on property. One respondent proposed making Walton Road a no-through road to prevent rat-running, as well as making the bus route a dial-a-ride service.</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>

625	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1353, 1354, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Wavendon Site not appropriate due to: sloping topography, remoteness of Wavendon from facilities and services, difficult to see how it would be made accessible and avoid traffic impact on other residents, potential impact of noise from G&T site on nearby residents, relative remoteness from business/employment/retail/services centres, G&T may prefer a rural/semi-rural location which Wavendon will not be when SEMK is built out, drainage issues in winter months, potential privacy issues, technical challenges relating to HP gas pipeline, impact on landscape character/potential to install sufficient buffer/local views to Greensand Ridge/high prominence of site topography, proposed pony paddock would not meet British Horse Society size guidelines. Are there other more appropriate sites? Potentially next to A421 east of Cranfield Road or near Dobbies Garden Centre, Bletchley. What are the views of the local G&T community? Some respondents speculated that crime may increase in the area as a result of new G&T sites. One respondent asked what evidence there is to support the 2017 SHMA finding that 7 pitches are required? One respondent asked how will existing residents be offered the choice of whether to live near a G&T site, like prospective SEMK residents?	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.
626	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1225, 1226, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1353, 1354, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432	5 Delivery	Concerns about how realistic it is to expect developers to pay for large upfront costs of developing Wavendon G&T site prior to completing phase 1 of residential development.	No changes required.
627	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Bow Brickhill site is more suitable than Wavendon - better connectivity, close to employment sites, edge of housing area, flat terrain & relatively easy screening.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill.

628	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432	General comment	SEMK represents a major change to way of life in Wavendon - loss of open spaces and rural character central to identity/character/heritage of the area, as well as local ecosystems. The green buffers proposed would be insufficient as a means of protecting this way of life. The buffers need to be larger, do more to block noise, buffer the H10 extension, protect all sides of the village and houses/habitats at Wavendon Fields (new tree line required), provide new country walks and wildlife habitats. Instead of a traditional buffer, a linear park is more appropriate which would give open views for existing and new residents, dense tree planting/woodland and meadows, new hedgerows, link to Wavendon House parkland & Pheobe lane bridleway. New housing close to Wavendon should be low density. Existing site does not have 'limited ecological value' - it has diverse habitats. Views to Greensands Ridge from Wavendon as existing need protecting. One respondent uses the fields to the south of Wavendon for dog walking and does not want to see that amenity lost.	The buffers and open space network was revised. Additional leisure routes provided.
629	1202, 1203, 1204, 1207, 1206, 1210, 1211, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1432	4.3 Movement network	Contradiction between major grid road proposals and meeting the challenge of climate change. SPD should avoid proposals that would change character of old lanes, e.g., what has happened with Stockwell Lane.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications.
630	1202, 1203, 1211, 1322, 1370	4.3 Movement Network	From EWR's published consultation document it is clear there has been poor communication between themselves and MKC. EWR's options for the V10 Bow Brickhill crossing use land from Red Bull (built), Caldecotte C (Development Framework), South Caldecotte (Planning Permission), and SEMK (allocated). When questioned (7/4/21), EWR had little knowledge of the strategic nature of V10 or the scale of SEMK. When will detailed planning work be done with EWR that reflects the needs of this area? Some said both proposals devastate Woburn Sands and they are being consulted without there being a joint proposal between EWR and SEMK.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the

				EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
631	1322	Para 2.12	First bullet point ignores Walton Parish area which is on the northern edge of the site and will be connected via railway crossings. The density of this area must be respected as it is also at levels determined suitable for the previous edge of MK. Add Walton to this bullet point and reference density requirements.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
632	1322	General Comment	What means will be used to protect the adjacent areas against noise, dust, pollution, etc during the construction process? There is a risk that 100% of construction traffic uses H10 for Church Farm, O&H Properties and L&G developments. What is happening with Church Farm?	SPD cannot address matters related to church farm development. Cumulative effects will be reviewed at planning application stage.
633	1328	General Comment	It should be noted that whilst SEMK is not connected to Woughton Parish area, the principles of development and the impact of this expansion will likely be felt across the city, and certainly across the southern half of MK. It is with these two specific elements in mind that this feedback and contribution to this consultation is offered. WCC provides summary of points covered.	Noted.
634	1328	4.5.2 Character and Density	WCC would request that the previously stated rates (i.e. 30 dph) are included in any future agreement as they appear to have disappeared. Density levels have a direct impact on the quality of life, access to green open spaces, etc. and recent events have shown the value of this. Whilst they understand that cost plays a part, this should not prevent high quality, spacious development.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas.

635	1328	4.3 Movement Network	<p>This development being bordered by the rail line, potentially to become an important part of EWR brings opportunities and challenges. These should be fully explored and addressed now, as making changes later will be problematic and potentially prohibitively expensive, having massive impacts on current and future residents.</p> <p>The current levels of infrastructure are insufficient to enable access to and from MK and there appears to be language used with the documentation that almost expects lower standards than should be in place. Sufficient road crossings will be essential, and WCC encourage you to listen to and respond positively to colleagues in neighbouring parishes.</p> <p>There is a real danger that the railway will form a barrier/border between SEMK and MK city. This would be unhelpful, divisive and prevent any true 'urban extension', as opposed to a standalone, isolated community.</p> <p>Ensuring a comprehensive and collaborative transport infrastructure plan, listening to locals and considering not only the immediate, but longer terms impacts MUST be at the heart of this process. This should also consider the unique nature of surrounding villages that should be protected and enhanced. Again, good infrastructure where traffic is managed effectively will help protect these areas whilst allowing sustainable and agreed growth in commerce and visitor numbers.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications.</p>
636	1328	General Comment	<p>There is opportunity for something great here – the site can link the urban 'city' with rural villages and getting this right could provide a blueprint for future expansion of MK. Get it wrong and it could stifle future growth. WCC support Walton Community Council and villages south of SEMK in aiming to find creative and positive solutions. Stakeholders and the SPD should promote all that's great about MK, rather than the generic and disappointing developments of late.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>
637	1370	4.5.2 Character and Density	<p>MKC are already over their allocation of housing so it should be 2000-2500 not 3,500. It is not needed, especially when MKC have earmarked EMK for another 5,000 houses.</p>	<p>Site forms integral part of housing delivery for Plan:MK (Policy SD11).</p>
638	1376	General Comment	<p>Respondent had great difficulties in downloading your pages and only received the news 2 days before the consultation deadline.</p>	<p>No changes required.</p>
639	1380, 1387	General Comment	<p>We must return to the original ethos of Milton Keynes was that the grid system was built before development occurred. Some included underpasses in this too.</p>	<p>Phasing chapter of the SPD addresses infrastructure delivery.</p>
640	1384	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	<p>The provision of protected cycling and walking routes are essential</p>	<p>The cycle and pedestrian network was amended following consultation.</p>

641	1276	4.3 Movement Network	<p>Aspley Heath Parish Council would like to see the land needed for the H10 extension safeguarded from development, and the H10 extension built before SEMK development is occupied. Traffic from the 3000 homes is likely to take the direct route to J13 through the villages unless a viable alternative route is provided for the through an H10 extension. The omission of an H10/Newport Road connection from these SEMK infrastructure plans show a lack of foresight and a lack of consideration for both the existing residents in the villages, and for the new residents moving into the SEMK development</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications. The SPD cannot safeguard a land outside the red line boundary.</p>
642	1276	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	<p>SEMK in collaboration with EWR need to commission some accurate traffic modelling of the situation on the Leys and Hardwick Road to identify the potential impact of additional traffic on Hardwick Road and the Leys, and Theydon Avenue of closing the Woburn Sands level crossing. It also needs to identify the potential impact on Hardwick Road and the Leys of the additional traffic movements from the 3000-home development, both with and without the closure of the level crossing, and with and without the connection of the H10 to Newport Road.</p>	<p>The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.</p>

643	1276, 1275	General Comment	The significant increase in residents will increase the visitor numbers to the Browns Wood and Wavendon Wood. S106 contributions from SEMK developers should be set aside to mitigate the impact of this development. Mitigation could include additional parking and other facilities needed to support the increasing visitor numbers, and these should be identified in consultation with the Bedford Estates, the Greensands Trust and CBC who currently own and/or manage these popular woodlands. Concerns raised over negative impacts of the development on habitats of Browns Wood and Wavendon Wood. The will likely see substantial increases in recreational use, negatively impacting their biodiversity value.	No changes required.
644	1273	4.3 Movement Network	There are errors in the document regarding the status of Newport Road. Fig 2.1 and Fig 2.8 refer to Newport Road as the A5130 and an 'A' road - although it is neither. There is also no reference to the road sections covered by a 7.5T weight limit. On Fig 2.1 Newport Road ought therefore to be shown as a local road and coloured green rather than red.	Noted. Fig 2.1 shows Future development Context. Fig 2.8 Refers to Newport Road.
645	1273	4.3 Movement Network	Although Bow Brickhill will benefit from the proposed by-pass, Wavendon, Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise will be adversely affected. The absence of measures to protect existing development from increased traffic is a serious omission.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications. The SPD cannot safeguard a land outside the red line boundary.
646	1273	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Clarification is needed on who is responsible for the delivery of an improved or relocated rail station at Woburn Sands. It is vital that the accessibility of the rail station is considered, with convenient access to both platforms from both sides of the rail line. The draft SPD is not sufficiently clear on this point.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
647	1273	4.3 Movement Network/MRT	MRT Route 4 should not terminate at Woburn Sands Station but continue to Woburn Sands itself.	Noted. The routes for MRT form part of a separate MK2050 Strategy which was recently adopted by the Council.

648	1434	General comment	Objects to development as it will have further impact on roads in the area. Currently there are plans for warehousing in the nearby area between Hunter's roundabout and Bow Brickhill which will impact the roads, the level crossing, and the environment.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
649	1434, 1398	4.5.2 Character and Density	There is a large housing estate being built at the other end of Woburn Sands and all down the slip road at junction 13. Is it necessary for more in this area?	The site is allocated site of Plan:MK Policy SD11.
650	1273	General Comment	It is inappropriate for the SEMK SPD to reject proposals as being beyond the financial viability of the development proposals or not justified on the basis of the development impacts alone.	No changes required.
651	1436	4.3 Movement Network	The traffic passing through the V11/H10 roundabout is already high. The potential increase in traffic flow is likely to result in tailbacks across the Wavendon Gate, Old Farm Park and Browns Wood estates.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications. The SPD cannot safeguard a land outside the red line boundary.
652	1436	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent is aware that Walton Community Council are actively supporting the V11 grid road extension, however this is not necessarily representative of the views of residents, and certainly not mine as a resident who will be directly impacted.	
653	1373	General Comment	Thank you for consulting Historic England. We do not wish to comment at this time.	

654	1261, 1356, 1379	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Provide a more acceptable buffer for Wavendon by extending the existing natural hedgerows to create hedgerows and woodland alongside a linear park. Wavendon Fields should be protected as much as possible with a wide, dense buffer that includes trees with foliage all year round. Using woodland as a buffer will be in keeping with the character and identity of Wavendon as a rural village. One respondent thought the Wavendon buffers should connect into Wavendon Park - creating a linear park.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas have been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. The Wavendon buffer had been widened to around 100m. The planned width would allow in principle to provide additional playing pitch if needed.
655	1399	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Provision for an Arts Centre, maybe through conversion of an existing building on this site, at this end of MK would complement those in Great Linford and Westbury. Also, the plan gives no estimate or projection of the expected demographic of SEMK. Ethnic and cultural diversity together with community integration and common understanding would be promoted/enhanced through provision for a multi faith centre in discussion with Faith communities within MK.	The SPD is required to cover the requirements under Policy SD11. Suggested uses can come forward as applications and be considered in accordance with Plan:MK policies.
656	1368, 1298	4.3 Movement Network	More thought needs to be put into pedestrian and cycle routes that do join existing footpaths and bridleways. There is a cul-de-sac footpath that runs across private land starting at Station Road and finishing at the railway- it is a dead end. It is totally unreasonable to consider this a major route from the development. It should not be considered with this plan. The well-used footpath that runs along the Bow Brickhill playing fields and crosses no private land or livestock and is much more appropriate.	The updated SPD contains revised linkages and additional leisure routes through development.
657	1368, 1298	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	The existing residents of Bow Brickhill should be afforded the same privilege as the new residents in terms of knowledge of traveller's site. It should be situated away from the village and closer to new properties. a G&T site near Bow Brickhill should not be considered.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.

658	1258	4.3 Movement network/V11	Access road extension of V11 violates Plan:MK recreation and open space between Browns wood and Old Farm Park. Without this road access to the entire development south of the railway is impractical due to overload of traffic on the remaining railway crossings. Eastern border of Old Farm Park has insufficient green space boundary if an access road is to be placed from Wavendon Gate through to South of the railway.	The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. The Open space network for the site was amended following comments received.
659	1258	6. Next Steps	Respondent noted existing drainage problems in Bow Brickhill despite the proximity of large swathes of absorbent farmland and believes that development of SD11 south of the railway will certainly exacerbate this by the removal of a massive area of soak away as well as increased demand resulting from urban municipal water (garden watering, home car wash etc).	Noted. The SPD plans for strategic SuDS
658	1258	General comment	respondent stated that there is a need for a police station in the area and suggested that it should be located in the central G7T location proposed within the SPD.	Policy SD11 does not require a provision of a police station and we are not aware of TVP's requirements to provide one.
659	1258	General comment	South-West corner of SD11 consider the inclusion of a residential care facility for the aged with frail-care, as well as allotment space. This is because of the growing need for facilities for the aged throughout the country and particularly in the existing villages, as well as its compatibility with the neighbouring village of Bow Brickhill (required in support of policies HN4 and HN5).	Need for residential care facilities to be established through planning application stage. Allotment area provided in the SPD.
660	1258	General comment	Comments were provided on SEA HRA 2020 document which formed the evidence for this consultation	Noted.
661	1291	4.3 Movement Network	EWR provided information about their non-statutory consultation which will feed into the next stage to inform the DCO for the design and construction and operation rail links for communities between Oxford, Milton Keynes, Bedford and Cambridge. EWR will be seeking to engage with MKC to ensure that coordinated approach is undertaken on these infrastructure works.	Noted.

662	1369	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent welcomes the idea of a country park around the fishing lake, however, would like an entrance off Bow Brickhill Road to avoid additional traffic on Parklands. Respondent would also like to see parking permits and parking warden to deter visitors parking on the estate.	The SPD provides links to the fishing lake and provides the option of the lake being made accessible to the public. It will form part of the wider green buffer. Detail design will be determined through planning application stage.
663	1275	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent welcomes a Green Infrastructure (GI) network-led approach, with connectivity and buffering being supported, but consider the proposed open space provision to be inadequate for the likely population 3000 new homes will bring; a lack of a truly focal greenspace which could form a community focus, meet many recreational needs and help create an identity and sense of place for new communities. The areas identified for residential development include a substantial block with no greenspace provided within a suitable catchment for many residents and many being more than 300m from an accessible natural greenspace (as advocated through Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standards). We welcome the principle of linking into the existing Linear Park to the north.	Concept Plan Fig 3.1 had been amended. The SPD had been revised and buffer areas had been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. Proposed linear network had been amended. Potential neighbourhood Play Area was identified with connecting proposed cycle/ pedestrian routes. Open space should be provided in accordance with guidance set out in Plan:MK (Policy L4 and Appendix C)
664	1275	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	The proposed linear park type features are largely very narrow, often less than 100m wide. Compared to the existing linear park to the north, this is much narrower and would not function effectively as a park. While respondent supports the inclusion of SUDS features within a wider, multi-functional GI network, such features would sterilize significant areas of this already narrow feature, and therefore we recommend broader corridors enabling the proposed multi-functional use. Wider recreational sites will also be impacted by the influx of new residents in the area wishing to visit local sites, with Rushmere Country Park and Aspley Woods nearby and already receiving significant numbers of visitors from Milton Keynes. It will be important to ensure this wider network of sites is able to cope with additional demand. Specific biodiversity strategy should be created to ensure it is properly taken into account, especially in the context of the Greensand Ridge NIA and future Local Nature Recovery Strategies	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas have been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. The details of the proposals will be provided at planning application stage.

665	1275	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent welcomes the incorporation of principles and prescriptions from the Bucks Landscape Character Assessment, but this should also incorporate relevant information and prescriptions from the Bedfordshire Landscape Character Assessment (relating to the area immediately to the east) and the Greensand Country Landscape Character Assessment (relating to the area immediately to the east) and the Greensand Country Landscape Character Assessment, helping to ensure wider considerations, including reciprocal views, are taken into account. Welcome reference to open views to the Brickhill Greensand Ridge (2.5.4) and specifically to the need to retain these. It is currently difficult to see how this will be achieved with the proposed layout of the SUE and we would welcome specific detail on this; It is noted that the majority of existing boundaries are identified as in 'good' condition, this therefore needs protection and enhancement and paragraph 2.5.5 suggests that the majority of landscape issues can be resolved 'within the allocation'. Again, it is difficult to see how this will be possible and further detail is required	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas have been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity. The details of the proposals will be provided at planning application stage.
666	1275	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent stated that it should be identified how existing and potential 'Natural Capital/ assets can be protected and enhanced and new ones created to deliver range of ecosystem services. the Bedfordshire Local Nature Partnership and the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership have produced assessments of NC and ESS in the area, and these need to be utilised to better inform the SPD and the development, helping ensure that opportunities are maximised and areas with the potential to deliver a high level ESS are not compromised.	Individual planning applications will have to have regard to policies in Plan:MK and consider the existing assists and possible requirement for their protection. MKC had recently adopted Biodiversity:SPD which is designed to provide further guidance for developers.
667	1381, 1260	4.2.28 Sports Provision	Respondents' states that once all housing is complete there will be a significant shortfall in playing field provision. It was noted that SEMK needs to take into account COVID 19 and the importance of outdoor exercise and should be more ambitious and allocate extensive recreational facilities and playing fields. SEMK is required to only provide playing fields to meet the needs of residents within the allocation acknowledging that provision could serve a deficit in, for example, Woburn Sands. As addressed above Wavendon Parish Council considers that this deficit is very significant and under played in the SPD. The location for G&T within Wavendon should be used for playing fields provision.	The SEMK site is required to provide playing fields in accordance with the provision required for the site. The SPD was amended to show possible locations for future provision if such need arises. The Wavendon location is shown within the SPD as a potential location for pitches.

668	1381	4.2.28 Sports Provision	SEMK represents an ideal time to extend the existing Wavendon Recreation Ground to help satisfy demand. This would have a number of additional benefits: It would deliver far more participation value taking advantage of existing facilities, It would benefit from being on an already free draining site, It would provide improved access and parking to both the existing facility as well as the new extended recreation area, It would protect the outstanding views across Wavendon, Brickhill and Woburn woods, It would reinforce the buffer zone around the existing Church End/Wavendon settlement, It would enjoy current FA Enhanced Grass Pitch Fund investment enabling maximisation of participation.	The SEMK site is required to provide playing fields in accordance with the provision required for the site. The SPD was amended to show possible locations for future provision if such need arises. The Wavendon location is shown within the SPD as a potential location for pitches. The buffer zones were reviewed and additional buffer provided near Wavendon.
669	1381	4.2.28 Sports Provision	WWFC would like to see enlargement of Wavendon Recreation Ground as a means to maximise usage of the existing facility at the same time as providing much needed additional recreational space. This should be in addition to playing field space already planned for SEMK.	The SEMK site is required to provide playing fields in accordance with the provision required for the site. The SPD was amended to show possible locations for future provision if such need arises. The Wavendon location is shown within the SPD as a potential location for pitches.
670	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1211, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432,	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	In areas close to Wavendon, low rather than medium density housing should be used. Protect all existing hedgerows. Note the high-water table which has led to increased flooding recently. Buffers will need to extend beyond red line site boundary. Wavendon recreation ground not a sufficient buffer in itself.	Table 4.5 provides information on character typologies and design components and it classifies the area as General residential with lower densities of 25-35dph.
671	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondents stated that the agricultural fields and other habitats around Wavendon contain a wider variety of wildlife than the draft SPD suggests and it should not be built on. Hedgerows and existing habitats should be protected where possible and compensation sought for limited losses. questions raised over developers or highways contributions where habitats are lost. Request to protect Pheobe Lane bridleway, which is a wildlife corridor, Buffer areas should be multi-function: noise, air and light pollution prevention, wildlife corridor, leisure space/routes. One respondent would like builders/developers etc. to need permission from Parish Council before uprooting any tree/hedge. One respondent thought the number of trees being planted should be quadrupled - Woodland Trust recommendation.	In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option). Future applicants should refer to Biodiversity:SPD for further guidance. The SPD notes that some trees and hedges are part of the historic environment in Para 2.6. Protection of hedges and woodlands is underlined in Para 2.12.1 'Habitat and vegetation'. Plan:MK policy NE3 requires protection and enhancement of biodiversity in new development. Fig 4.1 shows existing hedge (to be retained where possible) and principal hedge with ecological value (should be retained where possible).

672	1202, 1203, 1204, 1206, 1207, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213, 1214, 1215, 1216, 1217, 1218, 1219, 1220, 1221, 1223, 1224, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1345, 1346, 1347, 1348, 1349, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1358, 1359, 1361, 1362, 1363, 1421, 1422, 1423, 1424, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428, 1431, 1432	4.3 Movement Network/H10	H10 must be only single carriageway & 40mph limit. H10 extension will reduce access to Wavendon Vale countryside for existing residents by severing Pheobe Lane; a visually sensitive (perhaps with green walls) at-grade (bridge/underpass) crossing is therefore required. Future vehicular connection to Pheobe Lane/Walton Road from SEMK should be prohibited. H10 corridor should include adequate visual green buffering with wildlife provisions, redways alongside road, leisure routes, dog walking areas, bridleways and viewpoints. More redway connectivity is required: along/to Newport Road/existing commercial/retail sites & from Wavendon recreation ground to Woburn Sands through SEMK. More leisure routes for walkers and horse riders needed. H10 extension should not connect to Newport Road - only allow a redway connection. Design lighting along H10 extension, new roads and redways to reduce light pollution to people and wildlife. One respondent thought: existing redways in the area should be widened, and the cycle Route along Walton Road needs to be demarcated clearly/separated. One respondent thought a 30mph limit on the H10 extension was more appropriate. One respondent questioned the safety of having a bridleway next to a high-speed railway due to horse reactions, suggested Walton Road should be a no-through route to prevent it becoming a rat run & changing village character, questioned if bus route along Walton Road is actually used.	Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
673	1260	General Comment	respondent noted that Wavendon PC have consistently objected to the principle of developing SEMK site, history of the village is noted by the respondent and recent developments in the area.	Noted.
674	1397	General Comment	Nature conservation, green spaces, trees, AONB along with highway safety and traffic generation must be included and need proper consultation. Crime is already rising in WS and surrounding areas, it's also a key consideration with a new major grid road system being proposed and can only see it getting worse.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
675	1260	Para 2.12	para 2.12 of the SPD document identifies the southern boundary of the Wavendon recreation ground as having a "sensitive edge" and as such built development towards this edge should respect the character of Wavendon and "views south toward Greensand Ridge should be exploited through the layout of the site". The views towards Wavendon, and in particular the 13th Century church, are noted as being of importance in the SPD and should not be screened by development.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.

676	1260	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Notwithstanding the value of the existing recreation ground and any potential extension, as an important component of a potential new linear park, Wavendon Parish Council does not wish to see it included as part of an enlarged buffer zone.	The SPD had been revised and buffer areas have been increased with additional green access links added to provide even better connectivity.
677	1260	Para 4.2.29	Dual use of schools is supported by the respondent however respondent stated that additional text should be included at para 4.4.29 to state that Community Access Agreements should be a key part of delivering future education sites and put in place at least 12 months before a school site opens. Such agreements should include an indication of how community access to the site will work and expectations for the use of equipment and its storage.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
678	1260	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Respondent has reservations relating to H10 extension proposal particularly in relation to connectivity with Newport Road and beyond and wishes to reserve its position until Strategic Transport Assessment has been undertaken and its brief agreed with parish council and other stakeholders by independent consultant assessing the impact of H10 extension on local area. There should be not there to be no opportunity for a major road, beyond Newport Road to the east, without significant land take, demolition and associated disruption particularly now that the indicative route of the H10 extension is prejudiced by the recent grant of planning permission for housing on the Frost's northern landscaping site.	The transport strategy reflected in the development framework for SEMK is informed by various scenarios modelled in the council's strategic transport model. This is an evidence base appropriate for the allocation of the site in Plan:MK. The SEMK Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in accordance with the relevant statutory requirements and is based on an appropriate transport strategy. This includes evidence that informed the allocation of the site in Plan:MK and, as I outlined at the start, will be supplemented by the developer's own transport assessment. Further modelling of the planned growth in the area can only be undertaken when EWR Co have clarified their preferred level crossing closure options. This would also need to reflect changes in travel demand associated with the EWR/Marston Vale line rail stations. Plan:MK and the SEMK development framework do not require this as part of its evidence base, as the East West Rail project in planning terms is not currently certain to proceed. The highways network impacts resulting from EWR would be considered through a Transport Assessment, which will accompany their Development Consent Order application.
679	1354, 1431	General comment	Objection in principle to SEMK allocation. Question's integrity of 2020 stakeholder meetings, working group and the draft as the only member of Wavendon PC present was Cllr Hopkins who was absent for some meetings. The results of this consultation should be published and any revised SPD published for second consultation to make up for lack of prior engagement with locals. Delivery of SEMK SPD should be delayed until EWR proposals finalised.	Emergency regulations were imposed by the government allowing us to consult during pandemic. Online workshop events were hosted. necessary to progress the SEMK SPD toward adoption in 2021.

680	1260	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	supports the creation of a centrally located Hub but would wish to see the uses proposed as part of the Hub support only the needs of the local community so as not to compete with other nearby facilities. supports paragraph 4.4.4 of the draft SPD which highlights the criteria in Plan:MK Policy HN3, and the expectation that the development will be expected to provide an element of supported or specialist housing to help contribute towards meeting the needs of older persons and households with specific needs. In terms of detailed design Wavendon Parish Council considers that there is an opportunity to provide more bungalows for the elderly population, especially in areas where building heights and associated views are a potential development constraint; for example, on the high ground next to Wavendon village.	The Council considered the possibility of delaying progress on the SEMK SPD in order to align it with the East West Rail Company's statutory consultation on their proposals for the railway line (see Question 5 for further details). However, on balance, it was felt that this was not appropriate given previous delays to the East West Rail Company's consultation which had originally been expected to occur in autumn/winter 2020.
681	1260, 1385	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery/community facilities	The creation of two Local Centres (4.4.17 – 4.4.18) is generally supported given the scale of SEMK. However, in relation to the Local Centre closest to Woburn Sands consideration should be given to the scale of retail provision in that location and the potential impact on the vitality and viability of the established Woburn Sands High Street. This can be done by controlling use classes in the SEMK Local Centres Furthermore, the design of the uses proposed should be of the highest quality given the close relationship of buildings in the Local Centre. There is a danger, if not properly planned, that the area will accommodate too many uses in a relatively compact area which will impact adversely on the overall design creating a cramped, over developed environment.	Detail design to be approved at planning application stage.
682	1260	4.6 Sustainability	The detail contained in Local Plan policy and the finalised SPD, relating to sustainability, is supported by Wavendon Parish Council but will need to be reflected and applied in the assessment of detailed planning applications relating to SEMK as they are submitted. all new development, at SEMK, should have access to high speed, future proofed broadband and that this connectivity be extended to the existing areas of the Parish.	Noted.

683	1266	General comment	respondent is generally supportive of the framework and as a landowner within the site would like to take part in further discussions around equalisation since their landforms part of school site. matter absent from the SPD is any form of discussion concerning phasing or timing of the expansion area. To provide certainty, the landowner requests that a phasing plan is included in the draft SPD prior to publication, to set timescales for bringing forward infrastructure within the land allocation. The landowner runs a business from the site and must find an alternative site to relocate to. Without a phasing plan or any certainty over timing, there is significant uncertainty for the landowner in respect of their future business plans. While the site is currently identified for the location of the school, if the draft SPD is amended, and an alternative location for the school is sought, the landowner would seek residential development on this site instead of an alternative community use.	Phasing chapter amended to consider strategic infrastructure deliver.
684	1388	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	The site proposed next to Bow Brickhill should be used to provide the local community of Caldecotte a small supermarket. There is nowhere for local residents to shop without using a car to get there. The site next to the railway could potentially be dangerous to traveller children and animals and is therefore not appropriate. A small supermarket would be better placed on this site.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.
685	1395	General Comment	The plan is ill thought through and lacks sensitivity in acknowledging the nature of surrounding historic settlements and doesn't consider the part they've already played in providing more housing.	Noted. No changes made.
686	1389	4.3 Movement Network	The proposed bridge over the level crossing at Bow Brickhill is too close to residential property and businesses. Extending the V11 over the railway would be far more useful as it would give access to the heart of the development.	The detailed design of bridges will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications. The SPD cannot safeguard a land outside the red line boundary. The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.

687	1385	General Comment	Respondent would like the railway line to be the county boundary as they believe MKC is not acting in their best interest with regards SEMK.	Noted. No changes made to the SPD. Not a matter for the SPD.
688	1360	4.3 Movement Network	Respondent states time should be taken to coordinate with EWR on delivery to lessen uncertainty over 2 projects. If not, concerns an SPD will be produced with one vision supported by locals that will be then be contradicted/overridden by later changes to EWR proposals.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.
689	1360	General comment	Design guidance should seek unique house designs which respond to existing red brick & white/cream rendered buildings in local area. Use Great Denham in Bedford and Middleton/Monkston Park in MK for idea of level of innovation. Avoid designs like those in Broughton. Buildings of 6 storeys in the hub would be out of character with the local area. The maximum should be 6 storeys. Land to NE of Newport Road should not be built on in future; instead build on brownfield land within MK. Prevent H10 extending into Wavendon House Park area, to protect wildlife, safety of residents, and prevent traffic bottlenecks. Supports main access via V10, V11, H10, subsidiary access to WS, BB and Wavendon and Bow Brickhill bypass. No woodland areas should be lost.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
690	1383	4.2 Landscape and Open space	Near watercourses, Master plans should seek opportunity to enhance appearance and flood alleviation potential. For example, creating meanders and other in channel features to attenuate flows, also bank re-profiling to benefit riparian mammals such as water vole. This will also improve the public value of the features.	Noted. Planning applications will review future proposals with the consideration of local Plan policies on managing and reducing flood risks: FR1-FR3
691	1383	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Ensuring loss of landscape character and views towards surroundings must not be allowed to slip with each phase of Master Planning. A watching brief must be maintained to ensure there is no impact on the visual landscape.	Noted. This matter will be considered at planning application stage.

692	1383	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	For each Master Plan submission, it is important road and house layout is informed by and works with existing features - not against. Particularly with reference to hedges which are too frequently treated as dispensable. As stated for woodland, and hedge removal should be a justifiable last resort. The Mitigation Hierarchy and Net Gain should serve to reduce risk of loss but requires diligence to ensure this does not slip.	In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option). Future applicants should refer to Biodiversity:SPD for further guidance. The SPD notes that some trees and hedges are part of the historic environment in Para 2.6. Protection of hedges and woodlands is underlined in Para 2.12.1 'Habitat and vegetation'. Plan:MK policy NE3 requires protection and enhancement of biodiversity in new development. Fig 4.1 shows existing hedge (to be retained where possible) and principal hedge with ecological value (0should be retained where possible).
693	1383	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent acknowledges the proposals to utilise the linear park for surface water attenuation. However, to maximise their amenity and wildlife value, water reaching them must be treated initially at source. Respondent urges all subsequent master plans at the outset with SuDs source control that avoid piping run-off from roads directly entering the created wetland habitats and to create a network of sub-catchments hat enhance the amenity and wildlife benefit within the development parcel.	Open space should be provided in accordance with guidance set out in Plan:MK (Policy L4 and Appendix C). Future proposal will have to be in accordance with Policy FR2 where Pat B4 states: SuDs will be designed as multi-purpose green infrastructure and open space, to maximise additional environment, biodiversity, social and amenity value, where possible. The use of land to provide flood storage capacity should not conflict with required amenity and recreation provision- floodplains and floodplain habitats should be safeguarded.
694	1360, 1292	4.3 Movement network	Support for scenario 1 but grid road status should not be given to southward V11 extension. some respondents suggest that it could be further refined to accommodate safeguarding of the most likely EWR improvements.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.
695	1383	4.6.8 Surface Water, Drainage and Flooding	SuDs - there is no reference to improved water quality. This will only be achieved by implementing proper source control and to avoid 'business as usual' direct pipe-run off into the proposed network of detention basin, balancing pond wetlands. Detention basins and balancing ponds are not efficient at dealing with oils and heavy metals generated by run-off.	Details of the SuDs features will be provided at planning application stage. The SPD highlights indicative location of the strategic SuDs.

696	1383	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent supports the importance of incorporating the existing landscape into the development but the wording 'where possible' provided master planners their default to the path of least resistance and innovative though process. Advanced structural landscaping should be ecologically informed and based on Net Gain. Linear features are a priority therefore road and house layout must be informed by existing habitat features. Ecology needs to inform the landscape mater plans to ensure Net Gain is met.	In accordance with Plan:MK and mitigation hierarchy, biodiversity losses resulting from a development should be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for (on site and off site as an alternative where on-site is Council's preferred option. There are a number of policies within the Plan:MK that set principles for a new development and consider nature conservation are Policies NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5 and NE6 which will be used to review future applications.
697	1383	Para 4.2.6	Street Trees require integration with bioretention areas/rain gardens as part of the streetscape. Graphics 4.5 t 4.7 show no indication of biorientation area being considered. Edge treatments should be ecologically informed by Net Gain to maximise the opportunity of providing habitat benefit.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
698	1383	6. Next steps	Respondent cannot see any reference to how 'enhancement of biodiversity' will also extend into the built element of the new development. To meet the policy, aim of NE3 master planners need to move away from dated landscape palettes of poor species and structural diversity, and limited nectar resource to avoid the biological desert typical of developments. In addition, design codes and master plans for each phase need to include integrated nest and roost bricks for swifts and bats, along with network of hedgehog highways.	Matters to be considered at planning application stage.
699	1302	Para 1.4.4	Suggested change to paragraph: Alternative proposals and land use arrangements can only come forward as part of the planning application process if accompanied by a clear justification which will be assessed on its own merits with sites that are deliverable in accordance with Annex 2 of the NPPF being afforded significant weight.	Noted. No change made.
700	1302	2.11 Utilities	Suggested change to paragraph: There are also overhead lines crossing the area, these will require an easement of 3m from built form, but these are not considered to be a major constraint.	Noted. Overhead line is mapped on Fig 2.13 Utilities where the 3m easement corridor is noted.
701	1302	General Comment	Respondent would like to add a small parcel of land to the SEMK area.	SEMK is allocated site in Plan:MK and no additional rea can be added to it. Matter to be considered through future revision of Plan:MK
702	1302	Para 4.7.1	Suggested changes to paragraph: The indicative Development Framework Plan (Fig 4.10) shows the proposed land uses and illustrates how individual framework layers can be brought together to achieve the vision for the SUE and be consistent with the guidance in the National Design Guide and/or the National Model Design Code.	Change not considered necessary.

703	1302	4.5.2 Character and Density	Respondent would like to propose a minimum density of 35dph as it is consistent with the guidance in paragraph 122 of the NPPF. Suggested changes to paragraph: Indicative average residential density: A minimum of 35dph.	Indicative average residential densities are provided in the Character Table 4.5. SEMK should accommodate a mix of residential densities to provide for diversity and varying character across the site with lower densities towards the edges of existing development notably Bow Brickhill Road, to complement the character of the neighbouring areas. Open Space network was amended.
704	1302	Para 5.2.2	Suggested changed to paragraph: An overarching Section 106 Agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established with the payment instalments of the necessary contribution to be agreed through the associated planning application.	Change not considered necessary. SPD explains what tariff will cover further in the text.
705	1392	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	Site should be away from allotments.it may lower house prices.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.
706	1300	Figure 2.1	Responded would like the whole of their land holding marked as possible future development. Land is outside of SEMK area.	Matter not for the SPD but for future revisions of local Plan and any associated call for sites.
707	1393	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Respondent noted one good thing being the provision of sports grounds near to Woburn Sands as it is something which it has been lacking for years.	Noted.
708	1300	Table 4.2	Evidence should be provided to support the design requirement of 60-80m for grid road corridors. If this cannot be supplied then numerical width range should be omitted and written comments upon grid road relationship to the development should be provided.	Detail design will come at planning application stage. Strategic routes hierarch provided in Table 4.2
709	1393	General Comment	Respondent said it seems that no thought has been given to the effects on Woburn Sands. An area which has gained very little despite paying us Council tax. Lack of community facilities, poor roads/pavements and now no bus service. The only money spent is S106 from developers.	Noted. No changes made.
710	1300	4.3 Movement network	WPL would like to further understand how the MRT route could support future growth aspirations.	It is a matter that falls outside of the remits of the SPD.

711	1300	Figure 2.4	WPL request that the other watercourse identified in figure 2.4 is removed as it is not considered to be an accurate reflection of onsite conditions.	following feedback from EA drainage drawings were amended.
712	1292	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent suggests amendment: Some degree of clarification may assist in explaining that the progress of EWR is not incompatible with SEMK, moreover the SPD recognises EWR and accommodates its more realistic options for this part of the EWR route.	Noted. Additional Paragraph provided under the 4.7 Development Framework around EWR proposals and how they can affect the Framework Plan.
713	1292	Para 1.7.9	This section of the document can now be updated to confirm that the expressway has now been cancelled as a policy by Government.	Noted and actioned.
714	1292	General Comment	The SPD needs to take a positive approach to future proofing as the proposals can still be brought forward whilst maintaining opportunities for the most likely and deliverable future infrastructure improvements.	Noted.
715	1292	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers site	The G&T site should be located on a site north of Bow Brickhill Road and West of Woburn Sands - which was not one of the options within this SPD. The G&T site next to Bow Brickhill station is not supported.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.
716	1292	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	Some additional recognition of a phased delivery of the development would be helpful in the SPD. It is important that the set Tariff is viable and infrastructure is equitably delivered across ownerships. The basic principle of equitable basis. In the simplest terms each party should end up with their % of net acres/income commensurate with their share of the overall gross acreage.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development. Phasing chapter of the SPD was amended

717	1292	5.2 Infrastructure Delivery	There needs to be a reference to equalising both primary infrastructure costs and Planning Infrastructure costs. Where land is lost to either of these then the opportunity cost of what that land could have been used for needs to be taken into account in the equalisation calculation.	An overarching Section 106 agreement, known as the Tariff Framework Agreement, will be established. The planning obligations regime for Milton Keynes will continue as it currently stands. In the case of this development, this will be a number of individual S106 Agreements entered into in compliance with an overarching MK Tariff Framework Agreement whereby a contribution is made to infrastructure costs through Tariff payments for each unit of development.
718	1290	4.2 Landscape and Open Space	Respondent welcomes the inclusion of Green and Blue Infrastructure in Section 3.1.10 of the Development Framework and pleased to see the reference to linking to wider GI and the creation of new habitat corridors.	Noted. No changes to SPD required.
719	1290	6. Next steps	Respondent noted that Biodiversity Metric 2.0 can be used to measure gains and losses to biodiversity resulting from development. We advise you to use this metric to implement development plan policies on biodiversity net gain. Any action, as a result of development, that creates or enhances habitat features can be measured using the metric and as a result count towards biodiversity net gain. welcome reference to of biodiversity gains in section 3.1.10 of the Development Framework. However, we suggest that Biodiversity Net Gain is separated from Green and Blue infrastructure section in the report and further detail is provided on the provision of Biodiversity Net Gain. We would recommend that a minimum of 10% net gain is provided on site where possible. Natural England would like to draw your attention to Annex A which contains useful resources as well as advice related to biodiversity net gain. Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitat Regulations Assessment Natural England provided a response on the 5th March 2021 agreeing with the conclusions reached in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report.	Noted. MKC has adopted Biodiversity SPD.

720	1274	4.3 Movement Network	Hayfield Consortium will continue to promote the Aspley Guise Triangle as the most sustainable area for development and continue to support its connections with the SEMK urban extension. There is a significant opportunity to ensure that the SEMK Development Framework provides sufficient fixes on a wider movement network that takes into account the ambitions for sustainable transportation to serve the area as identified in the Milton Keynes Local Transport Plan 3 and 4 and identified in MK:Futures 2050.	Noted.
721	1274	4.3 Movement Network/H10	Figure 1.4 (p15) identifies the opportunity to provide Mass Rapid Transit through the SEMK site via an extension to H10, and thereafter through the Aspley Guise Triangle, this opportunity is missing from the Development Brief (which necessarily deals with the SD11 site rather than wider implications). Further consideration is needed in relation to this issue to address the current lack of cross-boundary strategic transport planning. The Consortium therefore submits that the H10 route to Newport Road (currently shown on Fig 4.2 as 'potential future mass rapid transit'), should be continued, safeguarding the connection of the H10 Grid route across the Newport Road, and ultimately further eastwards to the Aspley Guise Triangle and the proposed relocated Ridgmont railway station / junction 13 P&R.	The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.
722	1301	5.2 Infrastructure delivery/health	respondent highlights the need for new health facility providing various background information in relation to the existing facility and future needs. Asplands Partnership are willing, able and best placed to provide the service but need support from planners and grant funding to identify and build a new accessible multipurpose health hub. Data on expected influx of patients due to developments in surrounding area were provided. The proposed number of dwellings on the SEMK site makes it a site of strategic importance that warrants healthcare provision and the consideration of a SEMK healthcare Hub. As a population bordering more than one local authority the impact of the development of the Aspley Triangle and the East West Rail changes should also be considered to ensure that the ongoing needs of the current population and planned growth result in futureproof provision. respondent proposes that A purpose-built healthcare hub on the Woburn Sands edge of the development would allow both the existing Woburn Sands population and SEMK development population to access the facility both by foot and by cycle. This is a particularly important consideration in and above average elderly population many of whom do not have access to cars	The local centre to the south of the site will include 0.6ha community reserve site that could be used for a satellite health facility.

723	1342	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	Respondent's views do not change following a review of the EWR's consultation and those submitted previously (respondent 1260) remain	Noted.
724	1342	4.3 Movement Network	It is anticipated that the final version of the SEMK SPD will contain one spatial framework plan for movement. The draft SPD states that if the strategic movement issues around the future of the railway line have not been resolved the final version of the SPD will contain a preferred movement framework alongside a fallback position. Respondent believes that this approach is contrary to the advice contained in both national and local planning policy.	The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD.
725	1324	4.3 Movement Network/EWR	respondent provided comments submitted to EWR consultation and their preference over concepts proposed. Wavendon Parish Council considers that the principle of development outlined in Concept 2 is a more sustainable option in planning terms and is therefore supported.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
726	1351	6. Next Steps	Concerns raised over potential impact of grid roads on wildlife in the Neighbouring Greensand Escarpment woods to the south. Noise pollution, impact on bird breeding was noted. It was noted that the impact would be contrary to the 'Green Infrastructure' concept from Para 3.1.10.	Matters will be reviewed at planning application stage.

726	1351	4.3 Movement network	<p>respondent prefers scenario 1 or 3 and does not support scenario 3. Respondent noted that traffic on V10 from OU should not divert via H10, V11 bridge and new E-W spine road from V11 back to V10 and then A5 roundabout. There should be a link between Woodleys Rd and Newport Road near the proposed relocated WS station. This could be through a proposed Swanhill housing development and/or an extension of H10 to Newport Road (or the reservation of such an extension) to enable a public transport route through this connection in future. There could be a public transport 'gate' to ensure the connection is only used by public transport. We support Redway and bus link between Woodleys Rd and Newport Rd north side of MV line as in Fig 4.2 et al. Bus routes and infrastructure should be designed so that the existing settlements of Woburn Sands and Bow Brickhill can be served as well as the new developments in SEMK. Ends of MRT routes along V10 and V12 should be linked together along the E-W spine road through SEMK so MRT can loop CMK-V10-SEMK-V12-CMK and vv. Browns Wood crossing: If only 2 bridges can be afforded then it is the V11 bridge that should be dropped in favour of V10 and Woodleys. If no road bridge there then there should be a cycle/pedestrian bridge or underpass there to replace Browns Wood crossing.</p>	<p>The SPD was updated to provide one primary option in terms of strategic movement with the reserve option in Appendix C of the SPD. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application. EIA process will apply to those future applications.</p>
727	1351	4.3 Movement network/V11	<p>V11 crossing should not be a priority but V10 since it will be the MRT route. If it can be afforded there should be redway bridge or underpass at that location. If V11 is main vehicle access SEMK will be difficult to serve by public transport and so will become a car-oriented development. If V10 and Woodleys Rd are main vehicle access points it will be easier to serve by public transport and so can be a more public transport-oriented development.</p>	<p>The SPD provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.</p>
728	1351	4.3 Movement Network/H10	<p>Respondent stated that a public transport-only link is provided via the H10 extension to Newport Road.</p>	<p>The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.</p>

729	1351	4.3 Movement network/EWR	If SEMK goes ahead then relocating Woburn Sands station to near the proposed bridge at the proposed north-south Woodleys Road crossing is acceptable as long as there is good quality and direct access to the new station from Parkland's estate for pedestrians and cyclists and a link for buses or other form of public transport on the north side of the line between Woodleys Rd, near the station, and Newport Rd. The new Woodleys Road should be a bridge open to all traffic with bus/MRT lanes, or other bus priority measures and a Redway. The Woodleys Road will be a main route for buses, and in future for a planned Mass Rapid Transit system, to the SEMK development.	Noted. Comments relate to EWR matters. It is EWR Co who is reviewing stations and level crossings not MKC.
730	1372	General Comment	Having reviewed the information provided, the BPA pipeline(s) are not affected by these works, and consequently no site visit or supervision will be required and the works are free to continue as planned. Please get in touch if the proposed location changes.	Noted.
731	1366	Para 2.3	Wavendon is not mentioned as an adjacent settlement unlike other surrounding villages. It is a village with big history and recently been subject to development of SLA.	Wavendon is mentioned in the SPD.
732	1366	4.3 Movement network/H10	Planning application 20/02682/FUL for an additional 12 houses on the Frosts Landscaping site, immediately adjacent to SEMK. This site is close to, and may even overlap, the area reserved for the grid road corridor shown in the Framework document and contained in draft MK 2050 plans for the longer term H10 extension to M1 J13. If this route ever gets closed off the only realistic alternative route to Newport Road would be across the fields between SEMK and Simon's Paddock, close to Wavendon Fields. Indeed, a variation on this last route running across the field containing the possible GRT site location is included as an option in the EWR Consultation document. This would be alarmingly close to the established centre of Wavendon for a major grid road, again placing at risk the character of our village.	The Wider concept plan of the SPD shows green arrow which relates to future proofing on site H10 extension and potential future extension of H10 corridor. The Plan was prepared to spatially interpret the vision and development principles. The Movement Strategy Plan shows future proofed on-site extension of H10 corridor only.
733	1374	4.4.6 Gypsy and Travellers Site	Respondent raises concerns with the G&T sites located near Bow Brickhill and believes they don't meet the requirements of the "planning proposal for travelling site" requirements, specifically section . Respondent lists points A to H of section 13 which states how LPAs should plan G&T sites. Respondent believes none of the points are possible given the proposal and states it would be to extreme detriment to both current residents of Bow Brickhill and future residents of the G&T site if either of these sites was agreed.	The SPD was updated with a final location for the G&T site in the south west corner of the site near Bow Brickhill. Additional buffer areas are included in the location. A number of best practice criteria were used to review possible locations within SEMK. This included, amongst others, the availability of a range of transport links. Further detail on the assessment criteria used has been published on the council's webpage for the South East Milton Keynes Strategic Urban Extension.

734	1404-1406	4.3 Movement network/V10	Concerns raised over lack of grid road extensions and closure of Bow Brickhill level crossing, lack of underpass, lack of adequate flood defences	The SPD provides location for Strategic SuDs. Design requirements for roads can be found in Table 4.2 Street Hierarchy of Strategic Movement Network. The detailed design of highways interventions will be reviewed at the planning application stage. The developer will produce a Transport Assessment which will identify any mitigation measures required in response to the traffic generated by the site. These measures could vary depending on the detailed design and layout of the development proposals, which would come through the submission of a planning application.
735	1402	4.3 Movement Network	It has been our understanding from previous discussions and at initial concept stage of the SPD that access to and from the wider SUE from the Swan Hill Homes site would be limited to bus and redway access at the landscape buffer on the western boundary of the Swan Hill Homes site with the 'Redway & Bus Link' notation straddling the boundary on the Concept Plan at Figure 3.1 in the Vision Section of the draft SPD. The notation on the Development Framework Plan at Figure 4.10 in the Development Framework Section refers to 'Redway & Bus Link Only' along this section.	Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.

Respondent notes that this is reflected in their application allowing for a future Redway and Bus Link through the Swan Hill site to Newport Road with private vehicles to be restricted at the green buffer to the west of the site and with the proposed residential development on the Swan Hill site accessed from Newport Road, residential development on the Swan Hill Homes site will require vehicular access for residents and respondent notes points around urban design and highway principles for access to be from Newport Road such as: the site fronts onto Newport Road and has a clear relationship to Woburn Sands, which has been reflected in the Illustrative Site Layout submitted with the application. On the basis that satisfactory access can be provided to serve the development from Newport Road, it would seem illogical as an alternative to route private vehicles through the wider SUE to the Swan Hill Homes site only then to restrict private vehicular access onto Newport Road at or close to the point of the junction with Newport Road. It would involve provision of a turn head in this location, give the impression of the development 'turning its back' to Newport Road and Woburn Sands and may lead to confusion associated with drivers thinking they can access onto Newport Road at this location but having to turn around. Furthermore, access to the site from Newport Road will allow for early delivery of this part of the SUE for housing and would put in place Redway and Bus Link to the wider SUE to be used as and when required, rather than having to wait for later phases of the SUE to be completed. We acknowledge the objective of the draft SPD to restrict vehicular access into the wider SUE from Newport Road and this can be achieved by restricting private vehicular access at the landscape buffer on the western boundary of the Swan Hill site as confirmed by the Urban Design Officer. However, having regard to other representations submitted in respect of our client's outline planning application, it is apparent that the draft SPD is somewhat open to interpretation as to how this is to be achieved. To avoid any potential confusion, we would therefore recommend that specific reference is made in the text at sub section 4.3 Movement Framework as appropriate to Redway & Bus Link access only being allowed between the Swan Hill Site and the wider SEMK SUE and to the Swan Hill Homes site being served by vehicular access onto Newport Road to include the Redway and Bus Link.

Following the consultation, the SPD had been revised and provides primary and reserved movement network with details on highway access and Public Transport. Primary access into SEMK will be provided by means of an extension to the H10 (Bletcham way) and via relief road to by-pass Bow Brickhill village (access at both ends of the relief road. Additional vehicular access into SEMK will be delivered at the eastern end of Bow Brickhill via a new Woodleys Road which will pass over the railway and connect via a new roundabout to the H10 extensions. Additional access will enter SEMK off the southern end of Newport Road just north of the Woburn Sands level crossing (vehicular access to a limited number of dwellings). Access across the green buffer to the rest of SEMK will be for cyclists, pedestrians and potentially public transport.

737

1224

6. Next steps

Provision of fibre-ready broadband services to new development is welcomed; fibre should also be delivered to existing surrounding settlements as part of mitigation measures - noise, disruption and changes to lives.

Noted. Those matters will be reviewed at planning application stage or are matters outside of the production of the SPD.

