



Milton Keynes Council  
Civic Offices  
1 Saxon Gate East  
Milton Keynes  
MK9 3EJ

By Email: [ncp.engagement@milton-keynes.gov.uk](mailto:ncp.engagement@milton-keynes.gov.uk)

18<sup>th</sup> December 2025

Dear Sirs,

**Plan: MK Plan Consultation (2050)** Regulation 19 consultation

Ridgmont Parish Council wish to make the following representation on the Development Plan for Milton Keynes specifically Regulation 19 consultation. We consider the plan to be unsound for the following reason:

- During this consultation process there has been an utter absence of local engagement outside of the Milton Keynes authority areas. This is a significant disregard given that the proposed future expansion of Milton Keynes is heavily weighted towards the east of the city and especially through Policy GS14, Eastern Strategic City Extension and Policy GS15, East of Wavendon Strategic City Extension. We understand a commitment to properly inform and consult neighbouring communities was given by MK officers to Cllr Sue Clark, Cranfield Ward Councillor. This has not happened.  
Given there has been no consultation with communities outside the Milton Keynes Local Authority Area, we therefore consider the plan **unsound**.
- Ridgmont Parish Council is particularly concerned about the impact of expansion to the east of the city on the villages of Cranfield and Salford and particularly M1 Junction 13 . We consider the Regulation 19 proposed submission is **unsound** because traffic impacts on the neighbouring roads and communities in Central Bedfordshire have been modelled but not considered and no mitigation is proposed.
- Given the weighting of major development to the east of MK with both the Eastern SCE and the Wavendon SCE directly abutting the Central Bedfordshire boundary there will be significant cross boundary traffic impacts. These seem to have been modelled, but the impacts are not clear in the consultation documents, and no mitigation is proposed.
- The Highways flow difference maps do not cover the whole of the simulation area but focus on the city area. Significant increases in traffic volumes are shown on roads in Central Bedfordshire which are illustrated in the figures, but the information is incomplete.
- Figure 4.4 shows a significant increase in highways volumes on the local roads in Central Bedfordshire. For example Crawley Road and the Salford Road staggered cross road shows 150 – 350 extra vehicles at the AM peak.

- At the PM peak (figure 4.6) the A421 at Salford shows an increase of more than 500 vehicles. Where is the cumulative impact of this additional traffic assessed with the National Highways studies of J13 and the A421 which already show severe congestion?
- What are the predicted highways impacts across the wider villages, such as at Ridgmont, Husbourne Crawley and Brogborough, which are adjacent to Junction 13, which are used as rat runs.
- The impact on Junction 13, M1 is critical. We are dumbfounded that this has not been considered. Given the heavy weighting of development to the East of Milton Keynes, the impact on the wider arterial road network must also be fully considered. Ridgmont remains deeply concerned at the cumulative development proposals across the area, including Universal Theme Park, development in Beds Borough, Central Beds and MK and the impact these will have on the major highways network, especially at Junction 13, where there seem to be absolutely no proposals coming forward to improve capacity, with the consequent impact on all the local communities.
- Having read the Plan a number of references suggest a desire to expand into Central Bedfordshire. We do not support this.
- We note MK City Plan 2050 makes an overprovision for housing growth by about 10,000 houses. Given that so much growth is proposed to be to the east of the city, we are deeply concerned as to how this might impact the neighbouring communities of Cranfield and Salford in the immediately adjacent to these expansion sites in Central Bedfordshire with the resulting pressure on our infrastructure and road network and loss of open countryside.
- **Policy GS11** refers to sites which are '*wholly or partly within the administrative boundary of a neighbouring authority*'. We do agree with this statement, nor do we support any growth within Central Bedfordshire that is an extension to an urban development in Milton Keynes.
- It is for Central Bedfordshire to determine where and how housing growth is delivered within its administrative area. As a rural area we would not expect to see urban extensions but a style of development reflective of our rural landscape character.
- It is of extreme concern that **Policy GS14** is a very large extension site, which extends right up to the boundary with Cranfield Parish.
- As a Parish Council we strongly expect to be fully consulted and involved in all stakeholder groups and future discussions regarding this site to ensure any impact on local communities is appropriately and robustly considered and mitigated.
- Similarly, **Policy GS15** is also a significant proposal which extends right up to the boundary with Central Bedfordshire and directly impacts Hulcote and Salford Parish. The policy states that this site will allow MK to explore opportunities for cross boundary growth with Central Bedfordshire. We do not support any proposal for the extension of Milton Keynes into Central Bedfordshire.

We would respectfully request, going forward Ridgmont Parish Council is fully and robustly consulted. The commitment for cross boundary consultation with Local Parish Councils and local communities should be honoured.

We request to be able to address the Inspector on these matters at the public inquiry.

I look forward to hearing from you

Yours faithfully,

Maria Spearing  
Chairperson Ridgmont Parish Council