**Milton Keynes Council Development Review Forum**

**1 July, Civic Room 0.06/07**

**Meeting Notes**

**Attendees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME** | **ORGANISATION** | **E-MAIL** |
| Neil Sainsbury (Chair) | MKC – Head of Placemaking | neil.sainsbury@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Lakeisha Peacock | MKC Development Management | Lakeisha.peacock@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Elizabeth Verdegem | MKC Development Management | Elizabeth.verdegem@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Cllr Emily Darlington | Milton Keynes Council | Emily.darlington@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Cllr Jenni Ferrans | Milton Keynes Council | Jenni.ferrans@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Cllr Carole Baume | Milton Keynes Council – Chair of Regen Executive Scrutiny Committee | Carole.baume@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Julia Banham | MKC Housing | Julia.banham@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Robert Denby | MKC Housing | Robert.denby@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Natalya Palit | HTA Design | Natalya.palit@hta.co.uk |
| Sylvia Cantmill | HTA Design | Sylvia.cantmill@hta.co.uk |
| Jon Rees | HTA Design | Jonathan.rees@hta.co.uk |
| Rebecca Kurth | RoRE Chair of Residents for Regeneration Estates | Rebecca.kurth@lovecmk.com |
| Tim Skelton | Milton Keynes Forum | colesbourne@btinternet.com |
| David Tooley | Local Democracy Reporter | David.tooley@jpmedia.co.uk |
| Mike LeRoy | MK Forum | mg@leroy.com |
| Kevin Twigger | KRT Associates | admin@krtassociates.co.uk |
| Mike Bodkin | TOWN | mike@wearetown.co.uk |
| Neil Murphy | TOWN | neil@wearetown.co.uk |
| Sid Hadjioannou  | Turley | sid.hadjioannou@turley.co.uk |
| Delia Shepherd | Clerk: Bletchley and Fenny Stratford TC | clerk@bletchleyfennystratford-tc.gov.uk |
| Jeanette Marling | Lakes Residents Association | jeanettemarling@talktalk.net |
| Mandy Shipp | Wolverton and Greenleys TC | mandyshipp@wgtc.org.uk |
| Hilary Saunders | Wolverton and Greenleys TC | h.saunders@wgtc.org.uk |
| Shannon McCaul | SCSG Vice Chair |  |
| Danielle Slaymaker | SCSG Chair | Danielle.slaymaker27@gmail.com |
| Andy Forbes | Kings Church | andyforbes@kingschurchmk.org.uk |

1. The Chair welcomed everyone and explained the purpose of the Forum, ie allowing stakeholders an input into the emerging design and layout of schemes as well as raising the quality and profile of design in Milton Keynes

**Serpentine Court and infill sites on Lakes Estate**

1. HTA Design on behalf of Milton Keynes Council (the landowner) explained the policy background to the proposals – mainly that they are building on the proposals in the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan
	1. Across all sites 602 new homes are proposed with 31% houses and 69% being apartments, with the latter mainly being located on the infill sites across the Lakes Estate.
	2. Key aims of the proposal include connecting the new development into the wide area – safer crossings to Blue Lagoon, Waterhall Park and Grand Union Canal. The intention is to build on the existing good bus links and create a new mixed local centre with better links to Warren Park. There was also potential for some commercial units to go onto Stoke Road.
	3. Further key aims were stated as being to improve the character of the 4 ‘neighbourhoods’ of the Lakes Estate as well as the green diagonal links that join/separate them and finally to provide better connections between Fern Grove and Windermere Drive.

Q+A

* 1. It was queried what the speed limit on Drayton Road would be – it was indicated that it should be slowed from 40mph to 30mph as has been done for Stoke Road.
	2. It was questioned what commercial development would be included as part of the redevelopment of Serpentine Court and what the associated floorspace would be. It was explained that the existing units would be replaced together with new community space and a café and would be built in the first phase to enable decant from existing premises. Commercial units it was explained could be further subdivided providing further flexibility. The exact floorspace figures were not to hand at the Forum.
	3. Space for local businesses was also seen as important - for example, for local businesses to start their own business. It was explained that this could/would be part of Phase 2.
	4. The comment was made that if MKC was serious about regeneration it needed to cater for existing residents
	5. There were question about the provision of community space as this was seen as particularly important with the increase in housing. It was explained that community facilities would be provided on Warren Park.
	6. It was questioned what the plans were doing about elderly care home and GP surgery especially given the latter is closing down in the nearby area. It was explained that no GP facility is proposed as part of this development.
	7. There was support for the proposal for some commercial floorspace to go to Stoke Road which would have the benefit of ‘pulling’ people through the estate (“dumb-bell” principle)
	8. It was also asked whether Warren Park would still have the flexibility to accommodate events –it needs to be flexible
	9. It was questioned what was being proposed in the form of SUDS and that they shouldn’t be too steep and create ‘bomb craters’. The plans show a SUDS attenuation area within Warren Park, however, this will not be a pond. Large attenuation tanks in this location will be required, however, a natural wet/dry area above that can accommodate water in the event of flooding is also being considered. This location within Warren Park has been identified to enhance biodiversity so a natural feature such as this will help to meet this objective. Engineers and landscape architects are still developing the design for this space, however, the intention is not to provide a purpose built pond.
	10. Electric car charging points were seen as important and it was asked to check if here were any planning standards that stated how many would be provided.

**Agora and adjacent Council owned car park**

1. TOWN began by explaining the policy context for their proposal of around 105 new homes within a mixed use scheme that builds on much of Wolverton’s historic character, through a series of blocks that would;
	* Re-instate a new development frontage to Church Street
	* Reconnecting Radcliffe Street with The Square
	* Re-introduce back lanes that would allow excellent views of St Georges Church
	* Include features which reflect ‘paired doors’, the inclusion of two car-free ‘little streets’
	* A combination of on street parking and a parking basement under the westernmost block,
	* Workshop type units that provide surveillance over the back lanes would also be provided.
	1. The scheme would include ‘little streets’ that would be pedestrian only while houses would have small private space but also communal shared space (such as garden squares). A small pocket park would be created on Buckingham Road where some valuable trees are located.
	2. TOWN explained that the residential units would provide the ideal opportunity for downsizing but in an urban location, something not offered elsewhere in MK.
	3. It was explained that commercial units would be located on key corners and a new gateway building would be located at the bottom of the Square. An independent commercial offer is proposed to attract people to the area.
	4. An important principle was seen as capturing the local spend
	5. Three proper bus stands would also be provided on Church Road.
	6. In terms of the design of the development the following was explained:
		1. Modern Methods of Construction would be used
		2. Contemporary architecture and detailing was sought (rather than a pastiche), so for example, instead of stone, concrete could be included
		3. Some 4 storey buildings would be included
		4. Contemporary versions of dormers to break up the terraces
		5. Porches and doors could help introduce colour to the scheme.

Q+A

* 1. A view was expressed that the complete erasing of the memory of the Agora was not good -the Agora did introduce leisure and retail into Wolverton so brought something interesting and this shouldn’t be lost. It was suggested that the scheme should pick something from the Agora as a chain of memory. It shouldn’t however just be totenistic. It was suggested that something about the brick detailing eg its stack bonding could be introduced into the scheme.
	2. There was discussion about the proposed architecture and TOWN said that a balance should be struck between cleanliness and fuss.
	3. A comment was made that flat roofs were not a feature of the Wolverton Conservation Area. There was discussion about the corners and parapets and why the latter were raised. TOWN explained that this was done to hide all the modern ‘kit’ on the roof. TOWN explained that they will look at other ways of hiding the ‘kit’. TOWN also explained that that visual appearance / architecture for the entire scheme is being developed and will be influenced by these comments and those made in the Public Review. Stakeholders were happy to hear this.
	4. There was some discussion about parking. It was noted by one attendee that the Agora car park experiences an ebb and flow of parking and it isn’t just linked to Fridays when the Mosque is open, rather there is a wide variety of businesses and charities who are dependent on the parking. TOWN responded to the loss of public car parking by saying the following:
		1. There would be additional on street parking,
		2. There would be a new flexible parking scheme with permits
		3. A lease back scheme whereby residents who don’t use their allocated permit could lease it back to the Management Company annually.
		4. TOWN also pointed out that additional parking is being explored around St Georges Way on land that MKC own. A ‘key decision’ is to be made in July to take forward this initiative and allocate MKC funding.
		5. TOWN also stated that Wolverton is about catering for local residents, not to attract visitors coming from afar who would require parking.
		6. TOWN finally made the point that the scheme would not be commercially viable with a reduced number of units (that would allow for some retention of the existing public car park)
	5. There was a call for public toilets to be included. TOWN responded that while it wouldn’t be possible to provide a public toilet ‘unit’ as part of the scheme, there could as part of the contract with individual retail/commercial units be a condition allowing the public access to toilets. Alternatively a standalone toilet pod could be included possibly within the Square.
	6. There was a question about small business space and whether this was being provided as part of the scheme. For example, could a local entrepreneur rent a table with wifi? TOWN responded that it is looking to facilitate this type of entrepreneurial activity / flexible use of space but it is early days in terms of identifying specific space and occupier / tenants.