

Representor ID: RP-137

UI Representor ID: 104

UI Representation ID: 848

Representor Name: Daniel Gooch

Representor Organisation:

Policy:		
Legal Compliant:	Soundness Compliant:	Duty to Cooperate Compliant:
No	No	No
Paragraph		
The largest of these is our Eastern Strategic City Extension. We estimate it can provide around 16,000 homes in total (7,750 by 2050) which would represent a major extension to the city, consisting of separate built areas within it. This site will expand		
Compliance Comment		
<p>I believe that the proposed Eastern Strategic City Extension will be a catastrophe, and is in conflict with a number of objectives within the plan, particularly</p> <p>Objective 1: Create inclusive and safe places that encourage greater physical activity, social interaction and healthier lifestyles.</p> <p>Objective 2: Create streets and neighbourhoods that prioritise walking, cycling and wheeling for access to shops, services, community facilities, and parks and open space.</p> <p>Objective 7: Create space for nature and deliver significant gains in biodiversity</p> <p>How can MK claim to be a walkable city when it is ever expanding outwards, requiring an increasing number of people to travel in to the centre, principally by car.</p> <p>While there are claims around the metro and redways, previous experience suggests that these will not be required prior to development. In the existing Eastern Expanse area, the homes are being built; but residents from Newport Pagnall, Olney, and other rural areas have faced years of traffic disruption, with no transport benefits placed in - no extension to the redway system, no additional crossing over the M1, and no dualling of the existing road network. When people start moving in, this will be a disaster - as residents raised prior to the development - and I can see nothing in this plan that will prevent this for the proposed Eastern Strategic City Extension.</p> <p>People live in the rural areas around MK because they want to; not because they expect the city to expand onto their doorsteps. There are a range of urban and suburban areas within MK, and ever expanding these at the cost of rural communities is distressing to those who live in the rural communities, as well as not being in line with "protecting our open countryside", a stated aim of the plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, placing so many - 31 - Gypsy and Traveller sites within the Eastern Strategic City Extension is bizarre; a large site which will have a significant impact on a community which is yet to be established. It would be much better for community cohesion to more fairly distribute these plots across the city.</p>		

As one final comment; if the council wants to promote net zero, why not specify that all homes built as part of the plan must have solar panels and heat-pumps? If there is such a demand for this housing, this shouldn't impact construction.

Modification Comment

Appear at examination?

No

Appear at examination reason?