**Milton Keynes Council Development Review Forum**

**4 November, Civic, Room 1.05/06**

**Forum Meeting Notes**

**Attendees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME** | **ORGANISATION** | **E-MAIL** |
| Neil Sainsbury (Chair) | MKC – Head of Placemaking | neil.sainsbury@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Richard Edgington | MKC Development Management | Richard.edgington@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Katy Lycett | MKC Development Management | Katy.lycett@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Cllr Amanda Marlow | Milton Keynes Council | Amanda.Marlow@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Cllr Martin Petchey | Milton Keynes Council | Robin.bradburn@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Janie Burns | Milton Keynes Council  | Janie.burns@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Julia Banham | MKC Housing | Julia.banham@milton-keynes.gov.uk |
| Peter Molloy | MKDP | Peter.molloy@mkdp.org.uk |
| Tracy Molloy | N/A | n/a |
| Stuart Nightingale | Shenley Church End PC | Stuart.nightingale@ shenleychurchend-Pc.co.uk |
| Ken Brewis | Shenley Church End PC | Ken.Brewis@shenleychurchend-Pc.co.uk |
| Jane Nunn | Shenley Church End PC | Jane.Nunn@ shenleychurchend-Pc.co.uk |
|  |  |  |
| Tim Skelton | Milton Keynes Forum | colesbourne@btinternet.com |
| David Tooley | Local Democracy Reporter | David.tooley@jpimedia.co.uk |
| Mike LeRoy | MK Forum | mg@leroy.com |
| Aaron Regan | Taylor Wimpey | Aaron.regan@taylorwimpey.com |
| Emma Walton | Taylor Wimpey | Emma.walton@taylorwimpey.com |
| Ny Moughal | Taylor Wimpey | Ny.moughal@taylorwimpey.com |
|  |  |  |

1. The Chair welcomed everyone, did introductions 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

**Residential Development at Daubeney Gate, Shenley Church End**

1. The applicant outlined the context for their proposal which was the approved Development Brief for the site produced by the landowner, MKDP, and which provided strategic design guidance for the site.
2. The applicant explained that there is a gentle slope running from north to south with the high point along Vache Lane. The site is to be developed for 73 units (the allocation in Plan:mk is for up to 90 units) ranging from 2 bed to 5 bed houses at 37dph . Affordable housing will be at 36% with an equal split of affordable and market sale house types. Affordable housing schedule: 11 x 3 bed, 15 x 4 bed and 1 x 5 bed
3. **The design brief identified active frontages onto** Daubeney Gate and Vache Lane while houses could back onto the H5 Portway as well as existing housing in Duncan Grove.
4. The applicant then explained the proposed layout of the site as well as the elevations. Two main points of access are proposed. Red brick and buff / render and traditional detailing is proposed.

**Questions and Discussion**

1. It was pointed out that there is significant flooding at the northern end of the site and how was the applicant going to address this. It was also noted by a stakeholder that existing development to the south west of the site at Enders Court was built in a position that stops the normal flow of the stream (running along the sewer line) so this development must not worsen this existing situation.

The applicant responded that they are aware of the flooding and engineers are currently looking at this issue.

1. It was noted that Daubeney Gate is already a narrow street as well as being a bus route so there was a concern about cars from the development parking on it and it was questioned how this could be prevented.

The applicant responded that all parking needs will be me on site (the scheme will be self sufficient in terms of parking). In addition, housing is in places along Daubeney Gate setback behind a small private drive that includes on street parking spaces which will further prevent parking on Daubeney Gate.

1. Stakeholders questioned the width of the streets (they look very narrow) within the proposed layout and whether they were wide enough for refuse lorries and emergency service vehicles to pass through.

The applicant explained that detailed tracking will still take place and be submitted that will ensure refuse lorries can safely pass through the development.

1. It was questioned what the affordable mix was and whether a 5 bed home could be included in the affordable mix .

The applicant will review this as it is contrary to the advice given earlier.

1. A question was asked about landscape ownership – would the landscape be managed by a management company or the Council.

The applicant stated that this would still be looked at. It is TWSM policy to avoid / restrict the use of management companies on its developments where ever possible.

1. It was questioned what height the buildings would be.

The applicant confirmed all buildings will be 2 storeys in height

1. A concern was expressed about the angle of the key L-shaped unit at the corner of Daubeney Gate and Vache Lane. It didn’t respond the street layout or adjacent buildings and looked odd.

The applicant accepted this and said they would look at this again but the reason for the ‘odd’ angle was to avoid blank gables being seen from Daubeney Gate and Vache Lane.

It was mentioned that a hipped roof could be included to reduce the extent of blank gable wall which the applicant acknowledged.

1. A stakeholder also thought he thought the architecture looked quite dated and didn’t respond well for example, to the interesting architecture directly to the north of the site and challenged the applicant to do better. He said it didn’t have to be anything radical but could mean, for example, replacing cottage style windows with casement style. Another stakeholder however said that he liked the designs proposed.

The applicant explained that while they do have more contemporary housetypes, for this site they felt the house elevations proposed were contextually appropriate. The applicant also explained that the style proposed is desired and more marketable.

1. It was questioned why the development was not laid out to have allow more views of the existing ancient hedgerow which is an asset for the site.

The applicant explained that to the east of the hedgerow proposed housing did look over it but to the north it was difficult because of the dimensions of the developable land and the desire to back onto the H5.

1. It was questioned whether there was any play provision on site and whether a footpath connection could be made directly into the existing access road most west within Duncan Grove and onto the existing play area further to the west.

The applicant explained this would not be possible as this existing road was a private drive.

1. Concern was expressed about how much of the ancient hedgerow had been removed. This seemed in part due to the angle across the hedgerow that an internal street was taking to connect parcels to the east and rest of the hedgerow. It was suggested that instead of making the access point at an angle across the northern end of the hedgerow it could rather be taken further south where the existing street could be extended through the hedgerow to connect to the parcel west of the hedgerow but at right angles (to the hedgerow) which would reduce the amount of hedgerow removed.

The applicant explained that the hedgerow does not in fact extend all the way to Portway to start with and even if a vehicular access across it was taken where suggested (at right angles to the hedgerow) given sightlines that will need to be maintained from a highway safety perspective it is unlikely the lost hedgerow would be reduced.

The applicant has looked at this and the result would not result in a net reduction of hedgerow los. This alternative would also reduce the number of dwellings on the site.

1. It was pointed out that Swift colonies exist in the area (within 50m) and the applicant could get some ‘easy’ biodiversity points by including nesting boxes and nest bricks on the buildings.

The applicant confirmed that they would consider this.

1. It was noted that MK wants to be the greenest city in the world so the question was asked what the applicant policy on this matter was. It was questioned, for example, what the applicant was doing about orientation of homes, locations of rooms (do living rooms face south it was asked?) and windows to capture solar gain etc.

The applicant explained there approach to sustainability, green credentials and energy efficiency was to do with construction rather than layout. Taylor Wimpey build specification incorporates a fabric first approach to deliver energy efficient homes with intelligent and efficient internal building services. Typically our sites achieve 10% betterments in energy efficiency when measured against the Building Regulations Target Fabric Energy Efficiency standard.

As standard we only source and use ethically sourced timber products both in the build process and within the structure and furniture fixings of every home. Our build specification achieves A+-C ratings when assessed against the BRE Green Guide

Further queries made by Cllr Dan Gilbert (local ward councillor) via e-mail as he unfortunately couldn’t make the meeting:

* What is the ratio of parking spaces to houses? I am worried about dangerous overflow parking.

The applicant explained that the allocated parking provided is 2 per dwelling (73 X 3 = 146 spaces), plus 56 unallocated spaces as per policy.

* Concern about fast cars coming off the grid road onto Daubeney Gate. Is there an entry to the new site onto Daubeney Gate? What about signage and traffic calming measures?

The applicant explained that while there are no proposals to Daubeney Gate (it is outside the applicant site boundary) they are providing traffic calming on the proposed new estate road.