

**APPEAL BY HB (SOUTH CALDECOTTE) LIMITED  
IN RELATION TO LAND AT SOUTH CALDECOTTE**

**OUTLINE APPLICATION INCLUDING ACCESS FOR  
THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE FOR EMPLOYMENT USES  
COMPRISING OF WAREHOUSING AND DISTRIBUTION,  
GENERAL INDUSTRY AND SMALL STANDALONE OFFICE**

**PROOF OF EVIDENCE OF NIGEL WEEKS  
ON HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION MATTERS  
ON BEHALF OF MILTON KEYNES COUNCIL**

**PINS. REFERENCE APP/Y0435/W/20/3251121  
LOCAL AUTHORITY REFERENCE 19/01818/OUT**

**July 2020**



**STIRLINGMAYNARD**  
Transportation Consultants

Woolstone Centre, 1-2 Mill Lane, Woolstone,  
Milton Keynes MK15 0AJ  
Tel: 01908 690463  
Email: [smt@smtrans.co.uk](mailto:smt@smtrans.co.uk) [www.stirlingmaynard.com](http://www.stirlingmaynard.com)

**Construction Consultants**

Stirling House, Rightwell, Bretton,  
Peterborough PE3 8DJ  
Tel: 01733 262319 Fax: 01733 331527  
Email: [enquiries@stirlingmaynard.com](mailto:enquiries@stirlingmaynard.com)  
[www.stirlingmaynard.com](http://www.stirlingmaynard.com)

## **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Personal Statement
- 2.0 Overview
- 3.0 Updated Position on Areas of Disagreement
- 4.0 Conclusion

## **1.0 PERSONAL STATEMENT**

- 1.1 My name is Nigel Weeks. I hold a BSc in Civil Engineering and I am a Fellow of the Association of Consulting Engineers. I have over 35 years experience in transport planning and have been employed in both the public and private sector.
- 1.2 I am currently a Consultant with Stirling Maynard Transportation, an independent transport consultancy. I have experience across the transport planning field and frequently advise on the transport impact of development proposals of all uses and sizes, from simple small scale developments to new towns. Our clients include major national organisations, Local Authorities and Government Bodies. We are based in Milton Keynes and regularly provide development control advice to Milton Keynes Council.
- 1.3 I have visited the appeal site at South Caldecotte and am familiar with the surrounding area and road network. I was involved in the consideration of the application, including reviewing the Transport Assessment that accompanied the application, and attended the Development Control Committee when the application was refused. The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal, reference APP/Y0435/W/20/3251121, is true and has been prepared and is given in accordance with the guidance of my professional association and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinions.

## **2.0 OVERVIEW**

2.1 I appear at this Inquiry on behalf of Milton Keynes Council (MKC) to present evidence on matters of highways and transport. As set out below there were several areas of concern within this subject area which lead to one of the reasons for refusal. However progress has been made in resolving these issues and I will therefore set out MKC's revised position on this subject area.

2.2 The Inquiry is into the refusal of a planning application for land at South Caldecotte in Milton Keynes. The application is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved except access. Details of the site and the application are already set out in documents before this appeal and will not therefore be repeated here.

2.3 The application was refused for three reasons as set out in the decision notice (C.D. D.1). Two of these refer to archaeology and ecology and so are not relevant to this Proof but Reason for Refusal 3 includes highway and transport matters and states:

“3. The proposal, by reason of failure to demonstrate provision of necessary infrastructure to mitigate the impact of the development, in particular in relation to transport, would have a harmful impact on the transport network, in terms of road, cycle and public transport provision, and would therefore fail to mitigate the impact of development, contrary to Plan:MK policies INF1, CT1, CT2, CT3, CT5 and SD14 (C.3) of Plan:MK.”

2.4 The various policies are all taken from Plan:MK (C.D. E.1) and will not therefore be repeated here.

2.5 A Statement of Common Ground on Highways is before this appeal (C.D. K.8). This confirms that the outstanding areas of disagreement between the parties when the Statement was signed related to:

- i) Public Transport Strategy
- ii) Redway Infrastructure Provision
- iii) Safeguarded Land to enable an upgrade of Brickhill Street to Grid Road Standard.
- iv) Impact on the A5 Kelly's Kitchen Roundabout.

2.6 Since the Statement of Common Ground was signed ongoing constructive discussions have been going on between MKC and the Appellant to overcome these areas of disagreement and agreement has now been reached on those areas directly affecting MKC. This is briefly summarised in the next section of this Proof and means that MKC is no longer pursuing the Highway and Transport issues in Reason for Refusal 3 at the Appeal.

### **3.0 UPDATED POSITION ON AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT**

#### **Public Transport Strategy**

- 3.1 It has been agreed that a regular bus service from Central Milton Keynes to the site covering the main periods of operation needs to be provided without detriment to the existing service to the adjacent area. This will be done by funding from the Appellant of an additional bus and the details of the contribution are set out in the Section 106 (S106).

#### **Redway Infrastructure Provision**

- 3.2 The Milton Keynes Redway Network is a citywide network of car-free shared pedestrian/cycle paths. Within this extensive network (totalling approximately 290 kilometres) is a Super Routes Network of 13 continuous corridors of Redways which align closely to grid roads. Plan:MK in discussing walking and cycling (C.D. E1 - paragraph 8.21 onwards) highlights the fact that Milton Keynes is heavily dependent on the car and the need to make walking and cycling more attractive. This is reinforced in Policy CT3 with The Redway Super Route Network directly referenced in point 8, bullet point ii):

“8. The Council’s priority for improving access and conditions for pedestrians and cyclists are:

ii) The Redway Super Route Network”

- 3.3 It is agreed between the parties that the Appellant will fund upgrades and improvements to the surrounding redway network on those routes most directly serving the site. The details of the contribution are set out in the S106.

### **Grid Road Reserve**

3.4 Policy SD14 Section C states “The development must conform to the following principles” and point 2 states:

“2 Access to be taken from Brickhill Street which will be upgraded to grid road standard”.

3.5 The current proposals provide a dual carriageway only between the site access roundabout down to the A5 Kelly’s Kitchen Roundabout. North of the access there are no proposals to upgrade Brickhill Street.

3.6 Whilst Milton Keynes Council accepts that the traffic forecasts associated with the appeal site do not justify dualling at this stage, it does require the provision of a grid road reserve to safeguard the provision of a full dual carriageway grid road in the future if further development comes forward. The Appellants have submitted plan number TR-006 “Brickhill Street Grid Road Reserve” which shows a proposed reserve for a future grid road. This reserve is acceptable to the Council in this location and the issue is therefore addressed.

### **A5 Kelly’s Kitchen Roundabout**

3.7 This roundabout is at the southern end of the site forming the junction of the A5 trunk road, the A4146, Brickhill Street and Watling Street. It is currently a large signalised roundabout.

3.8 As it lies on the trunk road network it is the responsibility of Highways England (HE). As such during consideration of the application there were ongoing discussions between the Appellant and HE over the modelling of this junction and whether any mitigation was required. At the time the application was considered at the Development Control Committee these discussions were not concluded and a

holding objection from HE was in place. This was a material factor in the LPA refusing the application.

- 3.9 After much discussion between HE and the Appellant on the approach to resolving this issue, at the time of writing this Proof, a proposed scheme of mitigation has been put forward by the Appellant together with appropriate traffic modelling. HE are reviewing the proposals and will no doubt make their position clear shortly. However MKC take no issue with the proposals insofar as they impact on the non-trunk roads and will be content to leave HE to judge whether the mitigation is acceptable for the impact on the trunk road or not.



#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

- 4.1 In conclusion therefore the outstanding highway and transport issues relevant to Reason for Refusal 3 have been addressed subject to the contributions set out in the S106 and MKC therefore offers no further evidence on these matters.