

Representor ID: RP-158 & RCRP-020

UI Representor ID: 819

UI Representation ID: 883

Representor Name: Tom Taylor

Representor Organisation:

Policy:		
Legal Compliant:	Soundness Compliant:	Duty to Cooperate Compliant:
No	No	No
Paragraph		
Further to the south we are allocating two Strategic City Extensions: South of Bow Brickhill and Levante Gate. While these are smaller strategic sites, of 1,300 and 1,250 respectively, they still represent good opportunities for providing a significant nu		
Compliance Comment		
<p>I am objecting to the Milton Keynes City Plan 2050 because I do not believe it is legally compliant, sound, or properly prepared, and it does not meet the duty to co-operate. The specific impacts on Bow Brickhill have not been properly considered.</p> <p>1. The Plan Is Not Legally Compliant</p> <p>The Plan is based on very high levels of development, but it is not clear how this scale of growth can be supported in or around Bow Brickhill.</p> <p>Bow Brickhill already experiences congestion and safety issues on local roads, particularly around the A5 and Brickhill Road. The Plan assumes future transport improvements will address this, but there is no firm or credible evidence that these improvements will be delivered in time or at all.</p> <p>Other important issues such as drainage, pressure on local services, and protection of residential areas are either not fully assessed or rely on assumptions. At this stage, these matters should already be properly resolved.</p> <p>2. The Plan Is Unsound</p> <p>a) It Is Not Positively Prepared</p> <p>The level of development proposed appears to be driven by targets rather than by what villages like Bow Brickhill can realistically accommodate.</p> <p>Bow Brickhill is a small village valued for its quiet, rural setting. Significant development nearby would place pressure on the village and change its character without clear benefits for existing residents.</p> <p>Growth should improve living conditions, not reduce them.</p> <p>b) It Is Not Justified</p> <p>The Council has not clearly shown why development affecting Bow Brickhill is the best or most appropriate option.</p> <p>There is little evidence that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">brownfield sites have been prioritised,lower growth options were properly considered,or the cumulative impact on smaller communities has been fairly assessed.		

The permanent loss of countryside around Bow Brickhill and the reduction of separation from Milton Keynes have not been adequately justified.

c) It Is Not Deliverable

Traffic is already a concern for residents. Additional development would: increase congestion on the A5 and surrounding junctions, encourage rat-running through the village, and increase noise and safety risks.

Public transport options are limited, meaning increased car use is unavoidable. The Plan relies on future transport solutions that are unrealistic for a village location. Construction activity and long-term traffic increases will also raise noise levels and disturb residents' daily lives.

d) It Does Not Follow National Planning Policy

National planning policy aims to create healthy, safe and attractive places to live. For Bow Brickhill, the Plan would:

increase traffic, noise and air pollution, harm the village's rural setting and views, and reduce the overall quality of life for existing residents.

3. Erosion of Property Values and Quality of Life

Bow Brickhill is valued precisely because of its rural character, low traffic levels, and sense of separation from urban areas. These factors are reflected in local property values.

Large-scale development nearby risks:

increased noise and congestion, loss of open countryside and views, reduced privacy and tranquillity, all of which are well-known to negatively affect property values.

Residents have made long-term financial commitments based on the existing character of the village. A Plan that significantly changes this without clear mitigation is unfair and damaging to those who already live here.

The overall effect would be a clear reduction in quality of life for Bow Brickhill residents.

4. The Plan Fails the Duty to Co-operate

Bow Brickhill lies close to the Buckinghamshire boundary, and the impacts of this Plan will extend beyond Milton Keynes.

There is no clear evidence that neighbouring authorities have agreed how to manage: increased traffic on cross-boundary roads such as the A5, pressure on shared infrastructure, or the wider impacts on rural communities near the boundary.

Without clear, agreed solutions, the duty to co-operate has not been properly met.

In summary, the Milton Keynes City Plan 2050:

does not properly account for the limitations of Bow Brickhill, underestimates traffic, noise and safety impacts, threatens property values and residents' quality of life, and relies on uncertain future infrastructure.

For these reasons, the Plan should not proceed in its current form and must be significantly revised to properly protect Bow Brickhill and its residents.

Modification Comment

To make the Milton Keynes City Plan 2050 legally compliant and sound, the following changes are necessary:

Reduce and review the overall scale of development so it reflects what can realistically be supported by infrastructure, rather than relying on optimistic assumptions.

Protect Bow Brickhill from overdevelopment by maintaining a clear gap between the village and Milton Keynes and directing large-scale growth away from small villages. Require transport and infrastructure to be delivered before development, with firm funding, timescales and measures to prevent increased traffic, rat-running, noise and safety risks in Bow Brickhill.

Properly assess and mitigate impacts on quality of life and property values, with clear protections written into the Plan rather than left to future applications.

Prioritise brownfield land and reduce unnecessary greenfield development near villages.

Demonstrate genuine agreement with neighbouring authorities, particularly on cross-boundary traffic and infrastructure, to meet the duty to co-operate.

Without these modifications, the Plan remains unrealistic, harmful to Bow Brickhill, and not legally compliant or sound.

Appear at examination?	No
-------------------------------	----

Appear at examination reason?

--