

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 December 2025 17:14  
**To:** NCP Engagement  
**Subject:** Fwd: CLASS REPRESENTATION AGAINST REGULATION 19 of MK50 Plan before deadline  
**Attachments:** IMG\_20251222\_163248\_073~2.jpg; IMG\_20251222\_163239\_405~2.jpg; IMG\_20251222\_163258\_149~2.jpg; IMG\_20251222\_163226\_849~2.jpg; IMG\_20251222\_163213\_734.jpg

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside of Milton Keynes City Council.  
Please be extra vigilant when opening attachments or clicking on links.  
Report spam or suspected malicious email via the REPORT MESSAGE icon above.

Subject: CLASS REPRESENTATION AGAINST REGULATION 19 of MK50 Plan before deadline  
To: [ncp.engagement@miltonkeynes.gov.uk](mailto:ncp.engagement@miltonkeynes.gov.uk) <[ncp.engagement@miltonkeynes.gov.uk](mailto:ncp.engagement@miltonkeynes.gov.uk)>

FAO : [REDACTED]

Dear Sir

RE: PRESENTATION WITH OBJECTIONS AGAINST REGULATION 19

CC : Attached petition against the motion signed by residents in nearby areas attached to the development areas falling under this plan; in particular, the areas of Wavendon, Woburn Sands, Cross End and Bow Brickhill

#### IMPORTANCE OF RURAL SETTING

As a very important first legal starter point about Milton Keynes, the original mandate for the town was that no villages were to be joined together except by a grid as a "City of Villages". There were also strongly worded mandates that no villages, especially those of heritage value and containing Grade 2 listed homes and old farm labourer cottages, like Cross End and Wavendon Village for instance were to have their "rural setting" destroyed nor be surrounded by new developments - but were to keep their original views and character. In fact, it was illegal for any council or body to suggest to do so.

I have recently headed a petition against NewTowns Task Force Plan, specifically for the above areas of the MK17 area. There has already been extensive development in the area of what used to be sleepy, scenic and historical villages, belonging first and foremost to the county of Buckinghamshire which came long before the concept of 'Milton Keynes'- which has gained an unstoppable outwards sprawl. These villages were NOT Milton Keynes....developers just started building there.

The persistence to develop more must come to an end for the reasons already outlined on the petition, but specifically on a non-compliant point of law.

Primarily, the wording of the submission states:

'Local authorities like MK City Council must set out plans to provide more homes and infrastructure to meet the growing needs of local people and businesses...we want MK to grow sustainably reducing the impact of climate change'

However, evidence has been gained, that, using the recent example of GLEBE FARM as a nearby, recently-built development that became occupied throughout most of 2025, most of the housing was discovered to have been occupied by non-local, and non-Buckinghamshire residents, with the majority of the housing being owned by non-local, mostly London, but some national, housing associations. Some associations include London & Quadrant, Peabody and Clarion and some from Coventry and West Midlands. This is NOT local residents, but over-spill merely adding to a population, whereby down the line more accommodation will be needed for their offspring on top of the accommodation needed for the offspring generated from the already existing MK population. This will necessitate more roads, cars, carbon emissions, infrastructure (including hospitals and schools etc) taking up every single piece of green land in an ever-increasing developers' spiral that will never stop. Adjacent to Glebe Farm is Eagle Farm, which contrary to the idea of local people, is now being filled with people of African and South African descent. There has also been the importation of London and Nigerian drug-dealers to that area as the recent articles in MK Citizen prove, which is reckless endangerment to the indigenous population at best.

Ignorance has been shown by those in surrounding areas who refused to sign the petition against this catastrophe in the mistaken belief that these developments were for local people. It is unethical that they have been misled and deceived by the wording to the extent that they are not able to make a rational, informed opinion on what is in their own families and friends' families best interests, and is very divisive.....in an area that was once, scenic, harmonious and peaceful.

Since the Plan was devised under the current Labour administration, there are also questions about gerrymandering to ensure a perpetual Labour Council vote. London itself is at breaking point, caused, unsurprisingly, by excessive legal and illegal immigration and the gentrification for rich non-doms in inner city areas. Some of the poorest and roughest people are being moved out to developer havens nationally, but in particular, Milton Keynes. And Milton Keynes itself has virtually nothing to offer this co-hort except burglary and drug dealing.

Milton Keynes is not a viable city to begin with in the true sense. It is an extremely small town centre limited to a few chain retail shops inside a privately owned mall. It is an M1 hub, but this has only been of use to those in logistics, lorry driving and engineering of different types. The Open University does provide jobs to academic personnel but it has no student body so no outside student money or service industry centres on that. There is also a lot of office space in the centre but it is largely disused. There is no sea, river or port, no true university and no real industry. There has been no idea put forward in the whole MK50 plan for instance on what the proposed 40 000 new residents will do in Milton Keynes....there are hardly any food banks and no soup kitchens... it is unlikely this meagre resource can be stretched further still amongst the poor... The proliferation of West African churches for instance, are hardly 'businesses' of any use to this cohort, or anybody else...just like in Paris, these churches more often than not are just fronts for international money laundering. Great for West African church persons but no wealth or opportunity being created for others.

Virtually all boroughs in London are Labour-led councils and shipping thousands of London and West Midlands inhabitants with multi-diverse labour sensibilities will ensure a perpetual Labour administration which will ensure the eternal Developers' dream.

Again, great for politicians and Developers..what about everyone, every creature and everything else?

If you read the grounds against the petition you will find the stated concerns of those that actually ARE local, and have, for the most part, descended from these Buckinghamshire areas for many decades, and even centuries in time. Many I have spoken to are not only angry, but sad and bewildered by the sudden demise and are selling up, moving to remote parts of the UK and even

leaving the country altogether. Those at Cross End have stated and objected legally that it is illegal to surround Grade 2 listed buildings, and that even at this stage, driving to the bottom of their road has become congested and even dangerous. Retirees were looking forward to, and had even moved close to, the old golf course there to enjoy in their retirement which Redarrow has now insisted on building on. That is not fair to the LOCAL working community. The insistence that a small "park" is going to be built in the vicinity to offset that loss is neither here nor there. The current developers' business model with all residual costs borne by the taxpayer, environment, flora and fauna will eventually lead to a balkanisation of the country, a shortage of land for farming ( Bow Brickhill/Woburn View) and therefore food shortages nationally. I have been told by a Mr Chubb who lives on Newport Rd and has spent his life in Sewage engineering that in no way can the system handle more development in the Newport Rd/Woburn Sands, Glebe Farm and other areas. It is unsustainable as it is and will ultimately lead to land and water pollution. The council's solution to every problem by just increasing Council Tax can only go so far. They may even end up bankrupt, like most councils in London.

## PETITION TO STOP MK CITY PLAN 2050 DEVELOPMENT

In Particulars: Land Sales Surrounding:

Woburn Sands: Prohibit further expansion- this is destroying the scenic and 'desirable' character of the area and inducing gridlock

Woburn View : BLOCK FURTHER EXTENSION- DO NOT ALLOW REPURPOSE OF FORMER AGRICULTURAL FIELDS

Wavendon/ Walton Road; BLOCK CHURCH FARM EXTENSION\_ - DO NOT ALLOW REPURPOSING OF AGRICULTURAL FIELDS

Bow Brickhill Rd: DENY PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE REPURPOSING OF HECTARES OF ARABLE/PASTORAL LAND

Cross End/Newport Rd: DENY PLANNING PERMISSION FOR A 'GLEBE FARM SOUTH' which is not utility-sustainable

We the undersigned object on the following grounds:

1. Excessive Housing Expansion [without mandate] for private and political gain - private Developers' profits; Immigration industry profits; Electoral gains/ gerrymandering; excessive nonviable strain on local amenities { i.e. nearby supermarkets and lack of car parking space/local transport for mobility}
2. Infrastructure strain: sewerage, water and utilities/amenities
3. Traffic Volume – congestion; endangering pedestrians {esp. children}, carbon emissions affecting health and climate
4. Damage to flora and fauna { with some indigenous species critically endangered/excessive roadkill and decimation of deer} – disregard for feeding/breeding and general welfare/ destruction of known beauty spots and ancient hedgerow
5. Council Budget Strains - Maintenance of roads/Increase in pot holes, need for expensive traffic-calming measures, new signage/lights/crossings with all costs borne by the council tax payer and none to the developers
6. Destruction of farmland and historical legacy – Destruction of pastoral and arable land for future national food security (livestock fodder and human); Attempts to build on listed Roman Forts, areas of historical interest { Wavendon/Domesday Book} forsaking the birthright of local village communities who have lived here for centuries and wish not to be priced out or lose their cultural identity
7. The throwing over of the indigenous community for a displacing cohort { consisting mostly from London and economic migrants} from assorted housing associations and other agencies with no affection, nostalgic or protective sensitivities for the local area, its wildlife and its history
8. Increase in Crime: Importation of drug-dealers { from London and foreign-born cohorts} promoting drug addiction; culture disidentification/sexual harassment, robberies and welfare dependency.

I am a local resident requesting that my petition counts as a stakeholder objection to the above to inform the Regulation 19 Consultation paper before 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2025.

Please see attached petition at 5 pages long .

It is merely a snapshot of the population in those areas because of time permitting, but as a rule 90% were against the developments in the earmarked developments close to their residences.

Most said they had attempted to use online petitions proffered by the Council that DID NOT work.

Please take into account this small sample as representative of the majority on a wider population.

These objections and attached petition were written and generated by myself with all statements able to be verified with evidence and fact-checked if needed. It is in the hope to form a public protest and legal objection and I would be interested to be kept informed of any further results/developments. Please request permission to reproduce any of the results or above report.

Yours sincerely

Ms Rebekah Stonehouse  
[REDACTED]