

ITEM 6(a)

Application Number: 20/00133/OUTEIS

Description Outline planning application (all matters reserved except access) for the demolition of the existing farm buildings on site and the development of up to 930 dwellings (including affordable dwellings), primary school, local centre, open space, sports pitches, play areas, pavilion/wellbeing centre and other associated works.

At Tickford Fields Farm, North Crawley Road, Newport Pagnell, MK16 9HG

For Milton Keynes Council

Statutory Target: 20.04.2020

Extension of Time: Yes - 15.10.2020

Ward: Newport Pagnell South

Parish: Newport Pagnell

Report Author/Case Officer: David Buckley
Senior Planning Officer

Contact Details: 07775 110877
david.buckley@milton-keynes.gov.uk

Team Manager: Jon Palmer
Head of Planning
jonathan.palmer@milton-keynes.gov.uk

1.0 RECOMMENDATION

1.1 It is recommended that permission is granted subject to conditions set out in this report and signing of the Memorandum of Understanding.

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The Site

2.1 The application site is a plot of land 45.17 hectares in area, which lies approximately 1km to the east of the centre of Newport Pagnell. The site is allocated for development in the adopted Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan (NPNP) under policy NP2 and comprises most of the site allocation.

2.2 The remainder of this site allocation, formerly part of the North Crawley Industrial Estate to the south-west of the application site, is now the Tickford Mews residential estate, a Bellway homes development of 73 dwellings approved under planning reference 14/02799/FUL. Adjacent to this, to the southwest of the site lies a Council owned, public waste recycling facility.

- 2.3 The site is owned by Milton Keynes Council.
- 2.4 The development proposal was screened for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under MK planning reference 17/00340/EIASCR and this concluded that EIA was required to assess potential impacts on ecology and the local landscape, as well as considering impacts on noise, air quality and waste (construction waste). The application was thereafter subject to a Scoping Opinion to agree the amount of information required, and accompanied by an Environmental Statement.
- 2.5 The nearest schools are Tickford Park Primary (750m to the west) and Ousedale Secondary (1.75 km to the west). A new 2 form entry (2FE) primary school is proposed as part of the application.
- 2.6 The site is relatively flat with only minor changes in topographical levels. The northern edge of the site lies within flood zones 2 and 3. The site is located within a Milton Keynes Wetland Corridor follows the alignment of Chicheley Brook. There is a Milton Keynes Road Corridor, outside the site to the north associated with the A509. Both are a form or wildlife corridor. The closest listed buildings to the site are the Grade II listed Tickford Abbey to the northwest of the site and Grade II listed shop buildings on Tickford Street to the west of the site.
- 2.7 The site is currently accessible by road from North Crawley Road, which runs along the southern boundary of the site. There is a separate pedestrian access to the site from Chicheley Road on the western side of the site, with public footpaths FP10 and FP15 running through and adjacent to the site. There are areas of archaeological interest scattered across the site.

The Proposal

Summary

- 2.8 The proposal provides for a mixed, residential led development of up to 930 dwellings, including affordable housing together with ancillary commercial (local centre), 2 form entry primary school, community and recreation development and greenspace and ancillary access and infrastructure works.

Residential Development

- 2.9 The submitted Density Parameter Plan shows the residential element of the proposal (up to 930 units) will be developed with densities varying from 40-50 adjacent to industrial areas on North Crawley Road to the south, down to a density of 25-30 dwellings per hectare to the north and north west of the site, adjacent to the open countryside, recreation areas and existing settlements. An average density of circa 37.5 dwellings per hectare will be achieved, based on 930 dwellings on the net developable area of 24.74 hectares (submitted Land Use Budget Schedule). The housing mix and tenure has not been specified as this is an outline application, but it is stated in the Planning Statement that 31% affordable housing would be provided in line with Plan:MK policy.

Primary School

- 2.10 A 2.6-hectare site has been designated on the Indicative Masterplan for a 2-form entry primary school, expected to be for children aged to 2 to 11, adjacent to the main spine road and the local centre. Further details of the school have not been provided and this will be finalised with the Council and Education Authority, secured under condition and legal obligation.

Local Centre

- 2.11 A 1-hectare area of the site has been identified for the development of a local centre to accommodate a small supermarket up to 1000sqm and other small shops up to 1000sqm in total.

Landscape, Open Space, Play and Sports Facilities

- 2.12 The Indicative Masterplan shows that the proposal will incorporate landscape buffers along the site boundaries, extensive tree planting across the car parks and at key points within the public realm, and will create a natural area along the Chicheley Brook to provide opportunities to introduce native planting, including wildflower species. Also, pedestrian routes will be created through public realm to access the wider countryside.
- 2.13 The main open space for the site is located alongside the Chicheley Brook, which is proposed to form a linear park, in keeping with the existing linear park running through the Ouzel Valley nearby. The location of this linear park is largely within Flood Zones 2 and 3, with a section in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate surface water attenuation and the sports facility area, which will occupy a 2-hectare site.
- 2.14 As required by the Neighbourhood Plan, a Locally Equipped Play Area (LEAP) would be close to the local centre and school. An additional LEAP will combine with a Neighbourhood Equipped Play Area (NEAP) in the in the east of the site, forming a recreation cluster with the proposed sports facility.

Highways and Movement

- 2.15 Access is a matter for approval as part of this application. Three points of access into the application site are proposed. Two new principal access points have been provided from North Crawley Road, which will allow a public transport loop through the site. A third access point is via Morello Way, which links through via the recent Bellway development, which will include traffic calming measures.
- 2.16 As required by the Neighbourhood Plan a series of Redways are proposed throughout the site to provide access to the school, local centre and the sports/recreation facilities. These connect to the main spine road, along the North Crawley Road site frontage and also through the existing residential road of Chicheley Way. The scheme will secure offsite Redway provision that will connect to the existing network within Newport Pagnell town centre, Ousedale School, and Willen Road sports ground.

Flood Risk and Drainage

- 2.17 Most of the site and all of the residential development will lie within Flood Zone 1, with a smaller section of Flood Zone 2 and 3 adjacent to Chicheley Brook. The site has been submitted with a Flood Risk Assessment which was revised based on consultation with MKC and the Environment Agency.

Reason for referral to committee

- 2.18 The application has been referred to committee due its scale.

Scope of debate/decision

- 2.19 This application is for outline planning permission and access; therefore, the principle of development and the access are for consideration. Layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are reserved matters, to be submitted for later approval if outline permission is granted.

3.0 RELEVANT POLICIES

National Policy

- 3.1 National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) (NPPF)

Section 2 - Achieving sustainable development
Section 5 - Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Section 8 - Promoting healthy and safe communities
Section 9 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 - Making effective use of land
Section 12 - Achieving well-designed places

In addition, the Planning Practice Guidance is also a material consideration

The Development Plan

- 3.2 Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan (2016) (NPNP)

NP1: Preferred Sites for Housing Development
NP2: Tickford Fields Development Site Specific Policies
NP5: Affordable housing and tenure
NP6: Cycle and Pedestrian Routes

- 3.3 Plan:MK (March 2019)

Policy DS1 - Settlement Hierarchy
Policy DS2 - Housing Strategy
Policy ER14 - New Local Centres
Policy HN1 - Housing Mix and Density
Policy HN2 - Affordable Housing
Policy HN4 - Amenity, Accessibility and Adaptability of Homes

Policy CT1 - Sustainable Transport Network
 Policy CT2 - Movement and Access
 Policy CT3 - Walking and Cycling
 Policy CT6 - Low Emission Vehicles
 Policy CT8 - Grid Road Network
 Policy CT10 - Parking Provision
 Policy EH1 - Provision of New Schools – Planning Considerations
 Policy EH2 - Provision of New Schools – Site Size and Location
 Policy EH5 - Health Facilities
 Policy EH6 - Delivery of Health Facilities in New Development
 Policy INF1 - Delivering Infrastructure
 Policy FR1 - Managing Flood Risk
 Policy FR2 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) and Integrated Flood Risk Assessment
 Policy NE1 - Protection of Sites
 Policy NE2 - Protected Species and Priority Species and Habitats
 Policy NE3 - Biodiversity and Geological Enhancement
 Policy NE4 - Green Infrastructure
 Policy NE5 - Conserving and Enhancing Landscape Character
 Policy HE1 - Heritage and Development
 Policy L4 - Public Open Space Provision in New Estates
 Policy D1 - Designing a High-Quality Place
 Policy D2 - Creating a Positive Character
 Policy D3 - Design of Buildings
 Policy D5 - Amenity and Street Scene
 Policy CC1 - Public Art
 Policy CC2 - Location of Community Facilities
 Policy CC4 - New Community Facilities
 Policy SC1 - Sustainable Construction

3.4 Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance

Parking Standards SPD (January 2016)
 New Residential Development Design Guide (April 2012)
 Affordable Housing SPD (January 2020)
 Sustainable Construction Guide SPD (April 2007)
 Milton Keynes Drainage Strategy - Development and Flood Risk SPG (May 2004)

3.5 Human Rights Act 1998

There may be implications under Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol regarding the right of respect for a person's private and family life and home, and to the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. However, these potential issues are in this case amply covered by consideration of the environmental impact of the application under the policies of the development plan and other relevant policy guidance.

3.6 Equality Act 2010

Due regard, where relevant, has been had to the Milton Keynes Council's equality duty as contained within the Equality Act 2010.

4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 Application Site

17/00340/EIASC - Screening opinion request for approximately 1,100 homes, a two-form entry primary school and 1-hectare local centre, along with associated open space, sustainable urban drainage, landscaping and highways.

Decision: EIA Required

Date: 04/05/2017

4.2 Adjacent Site

14/02799/FUL - Redevelopment of site to provide 73 dwelling units with associated car parking and new access from North Crawley Road

Application Permitted: 25/08/2016

5.0 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 Publicity and Consultation Undertaken:

Site notices were displayed in the vicinity of the site

Newspaper advertisement was undertaken

673 neighbour letters were sent

5.2 Newport Pagnell Town Council

The Committee acknowledges that the Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group had held numerous meetings with the applicants and their agents over the past three and a half years, and therefore had no further comments to add.

5.3 Moulsoe Parish Council (adjacent parish)

No response received

5.4 Chicheley Parish Council (adjacent parish)

No response received

5.5 Lathbury Parish Council (adjacent parish)

Flooding

Concerns over flood risk at north/north west of the site, notes that Sherington Road floods significantly and flood areas have significantly increased in recent years. Concerns as to whether all surface run-off water from the new development would be directed to the Chicheley Brook, flowing into the River Great Ouse and the adjoining disused gravel pit lakes (which at places are only metres from the roadside verge). Also note Anglian water concerns on this issue.

Traffic

Concerns raised over increased level of traffic caused by the development from the B526 towards the A509 and A422 and thereon to Junction 14.

Raises questions as to whether the subject scheme and MK East should come forward with a joint highways infrastructure plan i.e. provision of a new junction on the A509 at the point the Crawley Road crosses the A509 (similar to the proposed Eastern Expansion Junction for the new road to Junction 14).

5.6 Cllr Alexander - Newport Pagnell South (DCC Member)

No comments received

5.7 Cllr McCall - Newport Pagnell South

No comments received

5.8 Cllr Carr - Newport Pagnell South

No comments received

5.9 MKC Highways Development Control

Initial comments (28 February 2020)

Concerns raised in relation to traffic impacts, pedestrian and cycle access.

Comments following re-consultation (6th August 2020)

Proposal is acceptable subject to planning conditions and legal agreement.

5.10 MKC Urban Design

No objection, subject to condition requiring the submission and approval of a site-wide design code prior to the submission of individual reserved matters applications.

Other comments/recommendations for detailed design/reserved matters stage:

- The school site, as currently configured, cuts through a key north-south open space, which has the potential to link the local centre and school with the linear park and sports field. The school site would be better configured with the school outside space located to the east of the proposed school building. This would have the benefit of retaining the whole of the linear landscape feature in the public realm; providing a north-south green open space link incorporating pedestrian/cycle routes, connecting the site's key community facilities; and providing higher density housing close to the local centre.
- The attenuation basin to the north of the school is too large. It is likely to result in an over-engineered feature, rather than something more naturalistic. A better solution would be to have two smaller linked basins, either side of the spine street.
- The small area of residential development in the north-west corner is poorly related to the rest of the development, and would result in an isolated group of housing accessed by a road over the floodplain with no development frontages. This area would be better used to accommodate flood attenuation.

5.11 MKC Flood and Water Management Officer (Lead Local Flood Authority)

Initial comments (18th February 2020)

An initial objection was raised by the MKC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) based on insufficient water drainage strategy.

Comments following re-consultation (30th July 2020)

Revised documentation was submitted comprising Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Report, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference 15552-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0001, issue P2, dated 16 July 2020 and SuDS Management & Maintenance Plan, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference TKF-HYD-XX-XX-RP-C-5000, revision P01. Based on these and subject to conditions, the Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection in principle to the proposed development.

5.12 MKC Landscape Architect

No objection to the proposal subject to conditions on the following areas:
Design Code; Landscape scheme; Levels; Boundary Treatment; Tree Protection

5.13 MKC Conservation

No objection to the proposal, draws attention to non-designated heritage interest of one of the farm buildings on site.

5.14 MKC Landscape Services Trees

No objection subject to conditions concerning tree protection, replacement planting, method statement, etc.

5.15 MKC Archaeology

Areas of significant medieval settlement activity, including some structural remains, in the north and west of the site, requires further mitigation, by preservation in situ (where feasible) and by a targeted programme of archaeological excavation, post-excavation assessment & analysis and publication. A broad approach to an acceptable scheme for mitigation has been discussed with the applicant's archaeological consultants and should be detailed in a written scheme of investigation secured with an appropriate condition.

5.16 MKC Development Plans

In this instance, it is considered that that the principle of development is in accordance with Plan:MK and the Neighbourhood Plan, but for a recommendation of approval to be made, consideration will need to be given to the detailed policies outlined in both Plan:MK and the neighbourhood plan and to the points outlined in this response.

5.17 MKC Countryside Officer (Great Crested Newt Officer)

There is a reasonable likelihood of great crested newts being present and therefore affected by the proposed development.

The following options are available:

1. An EPS site-based mitigation licence should be applied for in respect of GCN; or
2. The District Licence scheme (administered by the NatureSpace Partnership) should be applied for. Under MKC's district licence, development works that may cause impacts upon GCN can be authorised as part of the planning process.

5.18 MKC Countryside Officer (Ecology)

Original comment (4th March 2020)

Raised concerns in relation to impact of the proposal on protected species and biodiversity impact/uplift

Revised comment (14th July 2020)

The proposal is acceptable subject to conditions.

5.19 MKC Environmental Health- Contaminated Land/ Noise/ Air Quality

No objection subject to relevant conditions

5.20 MKC Footpath/Rights of Way Officer

No objection to the proposal, comments made in relation to:

1. Potential diversion of Newport Pagnell Footpath 10, so
2. Existing footpath infrastructure on the ground. The removal of the gates and stile would create a more open and accessible footpath which is advised.
3. The bridge on Newport Pagnell Footpath 15 is assessed and likely replaced with a structure more appropriate for scale of the development proposed and anticipated usage.
4. Clarification is required regarding the redway proposed at Newport Pagnell Footpath 15. It is recommended that the footpath is retained as a natural surface and the redway is provided parallel to it with a buffer strip in between. A minimum width of 1.5 metres is required for the footpath

5.21 MKC Housing Strategy

No objection to the proposal, subject to a condition to ensure that an acceptable housing mix is provided.

5.22 MKC Economic Development

No comment received.

5.23 MKC Waste Disposal

No objection, subject to financial contribution.

5.24 MKC Travel Planner

No objection subject to suitable condition to secure travel plan.

5.25 Health Safety Executive

No comment received

5.26 Central Bedfordshire Council

Response notes that the site is close to the Milton Keynes East site allocation and notes that the application documents do not consider the cumulative impact of the proposal development with the allocation.

Officer note: a response to these comments was provided by MKC Planning and Highways Officers and no further comment has been received from CBC.

5.27 Northamptonshire County Council

No response received

5.28 Bedford Borough Council

No response received

5.29 Anglian Water

No objection subject to conditions related to foul water drainage works and requirement to liaise with Anglian Water at appropriate stage.

5.30 Ramblers

No formal objection but drew attention to possible short diversion of footpath 10 and a redway by the route of footpath 15. A redway would change the usage and character of a footpath and may not be a suitable option.

5.31 Beds, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust

No response received.

5.32 Anglian Water

No objection subject to appropriate conditions and informatives.

5.33 Bedford Internal Drainage Board

The scheme is outside the boards area of interest, therefore no comments.

5.34 British Pipeline Agency

BPA Pipelines - Not Affected.

5.35 Buckingham and River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board

No response received

5.36 Canal and River Trust

No requirement to consult/no comment

5.37 Crime Prevention Design Advisor

No objection, requests condition to build schools, local centre, dwellings, play areas, public centres to the appropriate Secured by design standard. Further design guides and best practice, utilising the principles of CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design), can be found on the Secured By Design website. <https://www.securedbydesign.com/guidance/design-guides>

5.38 Environment Agency (13/02/2020)

Initial Response

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) we object to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Updated Response

To be provided as part of a later update paper

5.39 Highways England

No response received

5.40 Natural England

No objection- based on the plans, the development would not have significant adverse impacts on designated site.

5.41 RSPB

No response received

5.42 Cranfield Airport

No response received

5.43 Historic England

No objection/comment on the application

5.44 Third Party Representations and Petition

Comments have been received from 16 addresses/neighbours and a petition signed by 85 people, which relates specifically to the Morello Way access.

The material planning considerations raised are summarised below and will be addressed in the relevant section of the report:

Traffic and Parking

- Morello Way Access- the proposed development would have a significant number of cars and household and as the only access with a roundabout and first access point will become a priority access and a rat run. Residents are not convinced by proposed traffic calming measures mentioned by local Councillors.
- Tickford Mews loss of access- Tickford Mews consist of just over 70 dwellings and the only area of soft landscape will be lost through creation of the new access. This area is used by adults and children for recreation and provides visual amenity, location for wildlife, etc.
- Traffic Generation & Road Access - North Crawley Road, additional harmful impact
- School Safety/Parking - Lack of safety planning for crossing North Crawley Road to reach new school.
- Recycling Centre – traffic backs up leading to limited to Morello Way and the development will exacerbate this.
- Newport Pagnell Town Centre – extra provision is required to satisfy extra demand this will place on parking spaces.

Other Considerations

- Drainage/Flooding
- Overlooking/light pollution
- Wildlife
- Overdevelopment
- Public Rights of Way
- Visual Impacts

6.0 MAIN ISSUES

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Access and Highway Matters
- c) Impact on Character of The Area /Design and Layout
- d) Heritage and Archaeology
- e) Residential Amenity
- f) Housing Mix/Affordable Housing

- g) Landscape and Trees/Footpaths
- h) Ecology/Biodiversity
- i) Drainage and Flood Risk
- j) Legal Agreement/Planning Obligations
- k) Other Matters

7.0 CONSIDERATIONS

a) Principle of Development

- 7.1 Plan:MK, which is more recent than the Neighbourhood Plan identifies the site as being capable of delivering 930 dwellings in Appendix A 'Housing Sites' of policy DS2.
- 7.2 The principle of development is established through the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP1 '*Preferred Sites for Housing Development*', which allocates inter alia, sites b) Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve Site and c) Tickford Fields Farm East Site, which together comprise the application site. These are identified as one development site covered under the site allocation policy NP2 '*Tickford Fields Development Site Specific Policy*'. This allocation also includes the North Crawley Road Industrial Estate (site a in policy NP1), which has already been developed for housing under planning reference 14/02799/FUL. Policy NP2 identifies required development principles under paragraphs a) to p) of the policy, which includes the non-residential uses proposed as well.
- 7.3 The final quantum and mix of development are secured by planning condition to be delivered at reserved matters stage. A condition is also included for inclusion of a design code. However, the submitted outline application is considered to meet or be capable of meeting the requirements of the site-specific policy. Therefore, subject to other planning considerations to be addressed in the remainder of the report, the proposal is acceptable in principle.
- 7.4 The key principles and requirements of the site allocation policy are amplified in the Development Brief attached to the Neighbourhood Plan as Appendix 2. Key elements of the policy and Development Brief will be highlighted as appropriate within the body of this report.

b) Access and Highways Matters

- 7.5 Plan: MK Policies CT1 and CT2 require the decision maker to have regard to any additional traffic generation a development may cause and the resulting impact on the surrounding road network/parking provision/access.
- 7.6 The Neighbourhood Plan site allocation policy NP2 has several access and highways requirements as follows:
- d) requires a Transport Assessment to assess and mitigate cumulative traffic measures;

- e) requires vehicular access to be taken solely from North Crawley Road through minimum of two junctions, one of which shall be through the North Crawley Road Industrial Land (now the Bellway Homes development Morello Way)
- f) requires the main distributor road to accommodate a bus route, shelters and proximity to housing with a financial contribution to secure a satisfactory service for a minimum of 5 years.
- g) requires Redways along North Crawley Road, through the development to link the school, play areas, Chicheley Street, Keynes Close and Tickford Street as a minimum.

7.7 Plan:MK policy CT3 Walking and Cycling and Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP6 Cycle and Pedestrian Routes state that major developments will be planned with integrated cycle and pedestrian routes, which where possible should integrate with and expand existing networks and forge new routes into the town centre. The proposal complies with the identified policies, which will be addressed in detail below.

Vehicle Access Arrangements

Main Access Points

- 7.8 Access is a detailed matter and so will be assessed as part of the planning application. The proposal includes three vehicle access points into the application site, with the two principal access points from North Crawley Road. Junction 1 is a simple junction with North Crawley Road and Junction 2, the primary access to the site, is a signalised (traffic lights) T junction with North Crawley Road. This will allow a public transport loop through the site.
- 7.9 The applicant has provided justification for the traffic signals at the primary access that it would not be possible to provide a roundabout junction with sufficient scale and capacity within land controlled by either the applicant or the highways authority. This design solution is supported by MKC Highways and is technically acceptable and has the advantage of offering priority to pedestrians, unlike a roundabout. The case officer has no reason to disagree with this advice. Both junctions will require a road safety assessment which will be undertaken as part of the s.278 Highways Agreement.

Tertiary Access at Morello Way

- 7.10 A third access point is via Morello Way, which links through the recent Bellway development. Several neighbour objections and a petition signed by over 80 people have been made in relation to this access, primarily over concerns that it would become a rat run (summary of comments provided in section 5.24 above).
- 7.11 This access will include traffic calming measures. Fig. 26 and paragraph 6.61 of the Transport Assessment explain in greater detail a range of measures that can be applied to the design of this area to prevent it being used as a rat-run. A condition has been included to ensure that design measures are provided to encourage only local traffic for the area immediately adjacent to the access use this point. MKC Highways Officers have advised that they would expect to see a robust set of measures provided via the approval of this condition to ensure that the impact on

existing occupiers are mitigated as far as possible. Therefore, while the level of traffic would increase and the impact on existing residents are acknowledged, the access would not result in an unacceptably harmful impact.

- 7.12 In addition, the Morello Way access is based on the Development Brief attached to the Neighbourhood Plan which requires an access at this point. This is slightly complicated by the fact that the Site Allocation and Development Brief had envisaged the application site and the Bellway development, which includes Tickford Mews and Morello Way, being delivered as a single scheme. The inclusion of this access is consequently based on the Neighbourhood Plan requirement and to increase permeability for future residents into Newport Pagnell. Therefore, it is considered that subject to the condition for traffic calming measures within the site the scheme is acceptable in this regard.
- 7.13 The objections also included concerns over the loss of existing trees where this access would be located. However, based on the Neighbourhood Plan policy requirement and the lack of protected status for these trees, this would not result in unacceptable harm. A further objection was raised by the Management Company of the Tickford Mews site that the proposal does not have land rights to access from this point. Land ownership is not a material planning consideration and is outside the scope of this assessment, furthermore Officers do not believe there is clear evidence to support the objection.
- 7.14 MKC Highways Officers have also advised that there is an awareness of traffic queuing on North Crawley Road to access the Household Waste site and that queuing does extend back over Renny Park roundabout in the busiest times. However, this would not have a detrimental effect on the signalised Primary access junction into the application site. The case officer has no reason to disagree with this advice.

Redway and Pedestrian Access Summary

- 7.15 The Access & Movement Parameter plan shows five points of cycle access into the development area, 3 from North Crawley Road, 1 from Chicheley Street and another from Keynes Close. With regard pedestrian access, the same plan shows 5 points of pedestrian access, as well as the availability of pedestrian access along the joint use redways. With sufficient permeability into the site capable of being provided, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy CT3 of Plan: MK.

Chicheley Street Public Right of Way

- 7.16 The access to the site from Chicheley Street links to an existing public right of way (FP15) which will be developed as a joint pedestrian/cycling route onwards from the eastern extent of Chicheley Street. Although Chicheley Street is acceptable as a cycling route it cannot be improved to allow segregated cycling due to its width and the level of on-street car parking. Redway access is also proposed via an existing leisure route which then becomes public highway at its interface with Keynes Close. A neighbour objection was made that there would be excessive use of this access, but no concerns were raised by MKC Highways Officers who consider this arrangement acceptable. The Council's Rights of Way Officers and Ramblers

Association have raised concerns over whether the redway would be a shared surface with the footpath through the site and that this may need a separate permission external to planning. This is an issue that relates to detailed internal layout and would be established at the reserved matters stage.

- 7.17 Detailed junction layout plans show the redway along North Crawley Road that will be built as part of the proposed development. Detailed plans/access arrangements have not been provided for the redway as it passes the existing household waste site. MKC Highway officers have inspected North Crawley Road and have confirmed that the northern verge of North Crawley Road can accommodate a 3-metre-wide redway and verge in front of the recycling centre, which will be secured via s.278 highways agreement. The redway annotated on the Access and Movement Parameter plan (dwg. 5078-PL05 Rev. B) will be built as part of the proposed development.

Offsite Redway Works

- 7.18 Plan 1(Offsite Redway Routes) is submitted as part of the planning application. Redway works will be undertaken on a phased basis with the redways on North Crawley Road and Tickford Street being completed prior to any occupation of dwellings. These improvements will be secured via a s.278 highways agreement, with a phasing plan and details to be secured via planning condition. I agreement and condition.

Traffic and Junctions

- 7.19 Junction J4 (B526/North Crawley Road) was assessed and found to operate overcapacity. Based on lack of space for a roundabout, traffic signal controls have been proposed to mitigate the impact on this junction. MKC Highway Officers have noted that some properties on the west of Tickford Street would access the highways within the operational area of the signal-controlled junction. However, this is considered acceptable by MKC Highways Officers and will be dealt with as part of a Road Safety Audit under the s.278 Highways Technical Assessment.
- 7.20 Junction J5 St Johns Street/High Street is a mini roundabout which does have capacity issues and the development will negatively impact this junction. However, mitigation would result in other negative impacts on existing footways due to limited space at this junction. Therefore, while acknowledging the impact from the development, MKC Highways Officers do not support undertaking an improvement scheme in this location and consider that the impacts of the development would not be unacceptably harmful.
- 7.21 Junction J7 Tickford Roundabout will operate over capacity by 2031 and the application has proposed part signalisation of this junction. While there would still be large queues on the A422, the works would sufficiently mitigate impact of the development to an acceptable degree, in accordance with policy CT2 of Plan:MK which request develop proposal to mitigate impacts on highways networks. Other junctions are considered to operate within capacity and so further comment on these within the MKC Highway Officer's consultation response was not included in this report.

Cumulative Impact with Milton Keynes East

- 7.22 A query was raised by Central Bedfordshire Council as to whether the traffic impacts should be addressed cumulatively with that of Milton Keynes East. MKC Highways Officers have responded that this would not be necessary as the current timeframes show the proposed application will be in advance of Milton Keynes East and so this would not be necessary. A response was sent to Central Bedfordshire Council to indicate this and no further correspondence has been received.

Vehicle Parking

- 7.23 As an outline application, onsite parking is not considered as part of this scheme and this will be required as part of reserved matters as a layout consideration. A financial contribution has been provided for parking in Newport Pagnell town centre to mitigate impacts of the development, in agreement with Newport Pagnell Town Council. Electric vehicle charging will be secured via a planning condition.

Highways Conclusion

- 7.24 In summary, MKC Highways Officers have no objection in principle to the proposals within the current planning application subject to the imposition of planning conditions and works secured via s.278 highways agreement. The case officer agrees, and the scheme is considered to meet the relevant Plan:MK policies CT1, CT2, CT3, CT6 and the Neighbourhood Plan and is considered acceptable.

c) Impact on Character of The Area /Design and Layout

- 7.25 Plan:MK policies D1, D2, D3, D5, and HN1, in conjunction with the Residential Design Guide, seek high quality design and appropriate density that relates well to the surrounding area, with a high level of residential amenity and design out opportunities for crime. In addition, section 12 of the NPPF, and paragraph 127, provides guidance in respect of design considerations for development. Policy NP2 of the Neighbourhood Plan identifies, as required design principles, that the development shall be developed with an average density of 37.5 dwellings per hectare within the developable area. This includes higher densities along main roads and at focal points, with lower densities adjacent to open spaces and countryside beyond, and that the development shall adequately screen or relocate the waste recycling facility, under paragraphs b and n. The policy also makes references to the Development Brief, which forms Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 7.26 The Development Brief linked to the Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of character, design and layout requirements in relation to landmarks and frontages. The Brief also includes requirements in relation to community facilities, landscaping, public open space, nature conservation, which are all included in the indicative masterplan. It specifies that the main access points should form gateways on North Crawley Road and suggest a green edge as the site moves towards open countryside in the east.

- 7.27 The Brief requires development to be undertaken in a cohesive and comprehensive manner, also that building should be of two to three storeys in height with high quality design and materials, with a density of 35 dwellings per hectare, while the development exceeds this slightly at 37.5 dwellings per hectare, this is considered acceptable on balance as it would allow a higher level of housing delivery for only a slightly higher level of density.
- 7.28 The Indicative Masterplan takes accounts of all of these requirements and the details will be secured through a Design Code which will be conditioned as part of this outline to inform the final appearance of the development.
- 7.29 The Council's Urban Design Officer has commented that the proposal is acceptable subject to a site-wide design code to be submitted and approved prior to the submission of individual reserved matter applications which will be secured via condition. The Urban Design Officer also provided more detailed comments on design which are recorded in the consultation section of the report.
- 7.30 As an outline application, detailed layout issues do not form part of the assessment, but these comments will need to be addressed at the Design Code and reserved matters stage to ensure an acceptable detailed layout. However, subject to these considerations the scheme is acceptable in accordance with Plan:MK policy D1 and Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2.

d) Heritage and Archaeology

- 7.31 Plan:MK Policy HE1 addresses heritage, while Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 requires applications to be accompanied by an Archaeological Assessment to demonstrate that the development is acceptable or to provide appropriate mitigation measures.
- 7.32 The site has been subject to a desk-based heritage assessment, a subsequent geophysical investigation and archaeological evaluation. The archaeological trial trench evaluation detailed in the submitted report has identified defined areas of significant medieval settlement activity, including some structural remains, in the north and west of the site. The heavily truncated probable remains of a post-medieval tomb were also located in the south-west of the site.
- 7.33 MKC's Archaeologist has advised that the archaeological remains in the above defined areas are of sufficient significance to require further mitigation, by preservation in situ (where feasible) and by a targeted programme of archaeological excavation, post-excavation assessment & analysis and publication. A broad approach to an acceptable scheme for mitigation has been discussed with the applicant's archaeological consultants and should be detailed in a written scheme of investigation. This has been secured through a planning condition.
- 7.34 The site is not within a conservation area and does not contain listed buildings. There is a stone-built storage shed within the farm located on the site. The Council's Conservation Officer has advised that this meets the definition of a non-designated heritage asset as set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF and that the removal of the building will result in harm being caused. Based on the Indicative Masterplan and

development description it does not appear that this building will be retained, although this would be confirmed through a reserved matters application. However, based on the designations and the site allocation it is not considered that the loss of this building would result in unacceptable harm in planning terms, based on the limited heritage value of this asset and the significant benefits of the proposal which are supported by the site allocation policy NP2 in the Neighbourhood Plan and the benefits that would result from the housing and other aspects of the scheme. On this basis, the benefits of the scheme clearly outweigh the harm, taking in to account the value of the assets and the scheme is in accordance with Plan:MK policy HE1 F.

e) Residential Amenity

- 7.35 Plan:MK policy D5 details that planning permission will be refused for development where it would adversely affect residential amenity of neighbouring properties. In addition, the New Residential Development Design Guide SPD (2012) provides guidance on achieving acceptable levels of amenities for future occupiers. Further, the National Planning Policy Framework details that planning decisions should seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Neighbouring Occupiers

- 7.36 Concerns have been raised by neighbours in the form of representations and a petition. These mainly related to highways and related impacts, which have been addressed in that section of the report.
- 7.37 In terms of issues of outlook, privacy, etc, the Indicative Masterplan shows the housing is set away from boundaries with existing residential occupiers. This will be subject to more detail at Design Code, which is secured by condition, and will be considered at the reserved matters stage. However, in principle the scheme can provide an acceptable impact for neighbouring occupiers in this regard. There is nothing to suggest that this cannot be achieved.

Future Occupier Amenity

- 7.38 As with the neighbouring occupier impacts, the details of layout, etc, will be determined at reserved matters stage. However, it would be possible to achieve a layout that can be designed to ensure an acceptable impact in relation to light, privacy, etc, and also to meeting national space standards which is a requirement of Plan:MK policy HN4 'Amenity, Accessibility And Adaptability Of Homes'.
- 7.39 A significant concern for future occupiers is in relation to noise, both from the recycling plant to the south-west of the site and also the A509 Road which runs along the south-eastern corner and eastern boundary of the site. Mitigation measures have been proposed, which comprise glazing and ventilation strategy and a 4m high acoustic barrier along part of the southern, south-west and eastern boundary, which will mitigate these impacts satisfactorily. subject to a condition to secure these noise mitigation measures, MKC Environmental Health Officers have no objection to the proposal in this regard. Regarding the proximity to the recycling centre, the Indicative

Masterplan does not show the housing near this and no objection has been made in this regard by MKC Environmental health officers.

f) Housing Mix and Density/Affordable Housing

- 7.40 Policy HN1 Housing Mix and Density requires major schemes to provide a mix of tenure, type and size of dwellings that reflect the Council's latest evidence of housing need and market demand and of different housing types. The policy also expects later proposal to provide a wider mix of tenure, type and size of dwelling and a range of net densities commensurate with the greater potential to created mixed communities. The policy requires densities to balance efficient use of land with the surrounding character and context. Policy HN2 Affordable Housing requires inter alia, that 31% of homes should be affordable and of the total number of units, 25% should be at affordable rent levels and 6% as shared ownership.
- 7.41 The Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 requires an average density of 35 dwellings per hectares, with higher levels at focal points, and lower densities adjacent to open spaces and countryside beyond, as set out in the Development Brief. Policy NP2 also states that the housing mix (in terms of size and tenure) should deliver a mixed and balanced community on this large site and address housing needs specific to Newport Pagnell and refers to policy NP5 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Plan:MK, which is more recent than the Neighbourhood Plan requires 31% affordable housing and this level will be secured via legal agreement. Policy NP5 requires 10% of all new affordable housing to be reserved for people with a strong local connection which will be secured via legal agreement. NP5 also requires the affordable housing split to be one-third shared ownership and two thirds affordable rent, which has been provided. This does deviate from Plan:MK requirements in policy HN2, which requires a slightly higher rate of affordable ownership and lower rate of shared ownership. However, the affordable housing split is supported by MKC Housing Officers and the Town Council and is not considered to result in harm to the wider policy aims.
- 7.42 The proposal would have a net density of 37.5 dwellings per hectare which is not significantly higher than the policy requirement and the Indicative Masterplan shows a layout in line with the principles laid out above. The housing mix itself has been secured under condition to be appropriate to the local context and take consideration of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, with details to be provided at reserved matters stage. As a larger site it should be able to provide an appropriate mix.
- 7.43 Requirements in terms of affordable housing have been secured via the legal agreement and are considered acceptable by MKC Housing Officers and Newport Pagnell Town Council. Based on the above subject to the legal agreement requirements on affordable housing and condition requiring appropriate housing mix, the scheme is considered acceptable in this regard.

g) Trees, Landscaping, Open Space and Play and Sports Areas

- 7.44 A primary aim of the NPPF is to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment and requires decision makers to not only conserve but enhance

biodiversity. Plan: MK policies D1, D2, D3, D5 and L4 seek to ensure high quality, well designed places which include planting on streets and in public open spaces.

- 7.45 The Indicative Masterplan shows that the proposal will incorporate landscape buffers along the site boundaries, extensive tree planting across the car parks and at key points within the public realm. This will create a natural area along the Chicheley Brook providing opportunities to introduce native planting, including wildflower species. Also, pedestrian routes will be created through public realm to access wider countryside.
- 7.46 The main open space for the site is located alongside the Chicheley Brook, which is proposed to form a linear park, in keeping with the existing linear parks through the town. The location of this linear park is largely within Flood Zone 2 and 3, with a section in Flood Zone 1 to accommodate surface water and the sports facility area, which will occupy a 2-hectare site.
- 7.47 As required by the Neighbourhood Plan a Locally Equipped Play Area (LEAP) would be close to the local centre and school, with additional LEAP combined with a Neighbourhood Equipped Play Area (NEAP) in the in the east of the site, forming a recreation cluster with the proposed sports facility.
- 7.48 As an outline application, the scheme will be required to provide details in this regard at the reserved matters stage. MKC Landscaping and Tree Officers and the Town Council have been consulted and the scheme is considered acceptable in these considerations subject to details of layout, landscaping etc at reserved matters stage.

h) Ecology/Biodiversity

- 7.49 Plan:MK polices NE1, NE2, NE3 and NE5 seek to protect and provide a net enhancement to biodiversity through sustainable development.
- 7.50 Initial concerns were raised by MKC Ecology Officers both regarding net biodiversity gain and protection of species within the site. However, an acceptable Biodiversity Impact Assessment Matrix was submitted that showed the site could provide a net gain in biodiversity within the site. This will be subject to detailed layout and a condition has been included to ensure that this will be undertaken at reserved matters stage.
- 7.51 Also, concerns were raised regarding lack of up to date species surveys and data on protection of species within the site, including bats, owls and otters. Based on a revised submission of details, it is considered by MKC Officers that the scheme can be acceptable in relation to protected species subject to conditions for updated surveys and mitigation measures for the construction and operational phases. While it is recognised that a large development will have an impact on wildlife, the requirements secured via condition are considered appropriate and acceptable in planning terms to mitigate the impact to an acceptable degree.
- 7.52 It is considered that on this basis, the scheme is still acceptable in terms of ecology and biodiversity in accordance with the NPPF and policies NE1-NE3 and NE5 of Plan: MK.

i) Drainage and Flood Risk

- 7.53 Plan:MK policies FR1 and FR2 addresses issues related to managing flood risk and sustainable drainage systems. Policies FR1(D) of Plan:MK and NP2: (p) of the Neighbourhood Plan state that any application shall be accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment, to demonstrate that the development is acceptable or to provide appropriate mitigation measures.
- 7.54 The application site falls largely within Flood Zone 1, but part of the application site is partly within Flood Zones 2 and 3- all buildings would be entirely within Flood Zone 1.
- 7.55 An initial objection was raised by the MKC Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) based on insufficient water drainage strategy.
- 7.56 Revised documentation was submitted comprising Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Report, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference 15552-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0001, issue P2, dated 16 July 2020 and SuDS Management & Maintenance Plan, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference TKF-HYD-XX-XX-RP-C-5000, revision P01. Based on these and subject to conditions, the Lead Local Flood Authority have no objection in principle to the proposed development.
- 7.57 The LLFA also commented that the applicant proposes that surface water run-off from the development will be managed through attenuation basins and swales with an outfall to the Chicheley Brook and associated watercourses, which will be restricted to what Driange Offices considered to be an acceptable extent and will provide storage for up to the 1% AEP event (a once in 100 year flood event) plus an appropriate allowance for climate change. Whilst not demonstrated at the outline stage, the applicant states that the site will use infiltration techniques where testing confirms feasibility and future phase developments must take into consideration the use of further SuDS features such as permeable paving and swales for source control. The report also confirms that no building or structures will be located within the fluvial floodplain.
- 7.58 The Environment Agency also raised an objection initially due to concerns that the development may include some development within the Flood Zone 3. The Environment Agency were re-consulted on the updated documentation which confirmed, as per the LLFA comment that none of the more vulnerable uses, including dwelling houses, would take place within the Flood Zone 3. Formal removal of objection is still pending from the EA, but is expected prior to September's Development Control Committee meeting.
- 7.59 The Drainage Board have raised no objections. A response from Anglian Water stated that the scheme is acceptable subject to drainage conditions.
- 7.60 Objections and concerns have been raised by neighbours in relation to flooding issues and by a neighbouring Parish Council. However, while the proximity to the Flood Zone 3 is noted, based on the assessment above and the proposed condition,

the scheme is concerned acceptable in accordance with Plan:MK Polices FR1 and FR2 and neighbourhood plan requirements.

j) Legal Agreement/Planning Obligations

- 7.61 Plan:MK Policy INF1 Delivering Infrastructure requires that the necessary on and off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of that development is either already in place or that there is a reliable mechanism in place to ensure that it is delivered. Policy CC1 requires contributions towards public art. Policy SC1 requires Sustainability and carbon offsetting to be addressed, this has been secured through a planning condition and the proposed legal agreement details.
- 7.62 In this instance, the Council is the current landowner of the application site and therefore it is unable to enter into the s.106 agreement with itself in the usual way. However, is agreed that the Council the Landowner will sign a Memorandum of Understanding (to be entered into by the Council under the enabling powers under Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 or Section 1 Localism Act 2011) to agree that any transfer of the land will not be completed until there is in place a section 106 agreement containing the heads of terms set out below to ensure that any outstanding planning obligations continue to bind the land and successive owners and the obligations are complied with.
- 7.63 Contributions are sought to mitigate the impact of this development on local infrastructure including primary education, leisure, recreation and sports, social infrastructure and carbon neutrality. These contributions meet the tests for obligations as outlined at paragraph 204 of the NPPF and are in accordance with CIL Regulations 122 and 123, and are considered reasonable, acceptable and appropriate to offset the impact from the development.
- 7.64 Affordable housing requirements have been set out in section f above. A highways s.278 agreement will be secured to ensure provision of the agreed offsite redways works and highways mitigation works.

Education	Contribution
Total Early Years and Primary Pupils	£7,750,000
Secondary pupils	£3,503,939
Post 16 pupils	£760,018

Leisure, Recreation & Sports	Maintenance Cost	
Offsite Playing Fields	£2,000,000	£0
Onsite Playing Fields	£907,796	£0
Local Play	£732,375	£520,800
Neighbourhood Play	£697,500	£892,800
Community Hall	£215,927	£0
Local Parks	£93,000	£134,850
District Parks	£186,000	£269,700
Allotments	£87,188	£0
Sports Hall	£108,404	£0
Swimming Pool	£294,794	£0
Social Infrastructure:	Contribution	
Crematorium/Burial Grounds	£85,188	

Museums and Archives	£149,079
Health Facilities 1	£255,000
Health Facilities 2	£1,203,845
Waste Management	£240,656
Waste Receptacles	£93,000
Emergency Services/Thames Valley Police	£47,430
Public Art - 1% (Estimated)	£465,000
Town Centre Improvements	£492,100

Public Transport:	Contribution
Public Transport	£2,000,000

Carbon Offsetting:	Contribution
Carbon Neutrality (<i>Estimatee</i>)	£200/tonne of carbon where policy compliant offsetting cannot be provided

Other Contributions	Contribution
Pedestrian and Cycling	s.278 works

Total Contribution:	£25,479,690 (excl of carbon offsetting)
<i>Per Unit:</i>	<i>£27.4k per house</i>

k) Other Considerations

- 7.65 The Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 requires a local centre, health and wellbeing facility, sports facility and a site for a primary school. These have all been shown on the Indicative Masterplan that they can be provided on site while achieving an acceptable density level and these requirements will also be secured through the legal agreement in agreement with the Town Council, with further details to be provided at reserved matters or another appropriate stage as specified in the draft legal agreement.

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 On this basis, in accordance with the policy context, in particular Plan:MK policies and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policies, the scheme is considered to comply with policy and is considered acceptable, subject to the attached conditions and proposed legal agreement.

9.0 CONDITIONS

1. Reserved Matters

Approval of the details of the appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") shall be obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced on the relevant phase or part hereby approved.

Reason: This is outline permission only and these matters have been reserved for the subsequent approval, (in three relevant phases) of the Local Planning Authority.

2. Time

Application/s for approval of all the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission. The development hereby permitted shall be begun no later than the latest of the following dates:-

- i. The expiration of three years from the date of this permission; or
- ii. The expiration of two years from the date of the approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved

Reason: To prevent the accumulation of planning permissions; to enable the Local Planning Authority to review the suitability of the development in the light of altered circumstances; and to comply with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3. Number of Dwellings

The development hereby permitted shall not exceed 930 dwellings (Use Class C3). The use classes are those set out in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 2010 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modification.

Reason: To ensure development conforms to the outline planning permission and what has been assessed as part of this permission.

4. Overall Phasing

Prior to the commencement of development of any phase or part of the development, a phasing plan for the whole site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. For the avoidance of doubt the phasing plan shall include the timing and delivery of:

- Housing
- NHS/wellness centre
- Local centre
- All roads, footways and Redway
- Recreational and Play Facilities/Areas
- Open Space
- School

The development shall take place in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of this planning permission and ensure that the development proceeds in a planned and phased manner, in accordance with Plan:MK policies DS2 and SD1 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2.

5. School Phasing

At a date no later than six months from the date of this permission, a phasing plan for delivery of the school site within the application boundary, shall be submitted in writing for approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Local Education Authority and delivered in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with the Local Education Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the school on site can be delivered within an acceptable phasing plan, in accordance with Plan:MK policies SD1, EH1 and EH2 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2.

6. Affordable Housing

Any housing reserved matters application shall include details of the location and type of affordable housing pursuant to the development parcel for which approval is sought. Each phase or part of the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure that the development and location of the affordable housing is appropriate

7. Housing Mix

Any relevant reserved matters application containing residential units shall include details of:

- a. development density, and
 - b. the mix of type and size of market dwellings to be provided in that phase, informed by the Council's most up to date Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) evidence and Policy HN1 of Plan:MK
- to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the proposed development provides an adequate variety of housing mix to reflect need within the District, and to comply with Policy HN1 of Plan: MK.

8. Secure by Design

Prior to the occupation of 95% of the dwellings hereby approved evidence confirming the achievement of Secured by Design as shown on the approved plans shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these agreed details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.

Reason: In the interests of reducing crime and disorder in accordance with Policies D1, D2, D3, D5 and SD1 of Plan: MK

9. CEMP

No development, including any works of demolition, shall take place until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CEMP shall include site procedures to be adopted during the course of construction including:

- routes for construction traffic
- Method of prevention of mud being carried onto the highway
- location of site compound
- loading and unloading of plant and materials
- the erection and maintenance of security fencing/hoardings and lighting
- proposed temporary traffic restrictions
- parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved CEMP.

Reason: To ensure there are adequate mitigation measures in place, in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and in order to protect the amenities of existing and future residents in accordance with policy NE6 of Plan: MK.

10. Noise

As part of any reserved matters application, full details of a noise mitigation scheme, produced with reference to the measures described in the submitted Appendix 7.1 Noise Assessment (March 2018), to protect the residential amenity of the residential occupiers and the school within the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to the first occupation of the use hereby permitted and shall thereafter be maintained and retained as approved.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of existing and future residents in accordance with Policies D5 and NE6 of Plan:MK (2019).

11. Ecology/Biodiversity

Any reserved matters application shall be accompanied by an updated:

- Biodiversity Impact Assessment Matrix,
- Ecological Baseline & Ecological Impact Assessment, and
- Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme and Management Plan including lighting levels.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of the relevant phase or part of the development.

Reason: To maintain and enhance local biodiversity and ecology in accordance with Policy NE3 of Plan: MK (2019).

12. Species Surveys- Bats

As part of any relevant reserved matters application, a bat survey, produced within 12 months prior to the submission- together with details of proposed bat commuting and foraging proposals on site, and any necessary mitigation proposals shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure an acceptable impact on the protected species, in accordance with Plan:MK policy NE2.

13. Species Surveys -Otters and Barn Owl

As part of any relevant reserved matters application, a survey of:

- a) Otters
- b) Barn Owls

and any necessary mitigation proposals, produced within 12 months prior to the submission shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority and carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable impact on protected and priority species, in accordance with Plan:MK policy NE2.

14. Wildlife Buffer

Any relevant reserved matters application shall indicate a land buffer area adjacent to Chicheley Brook, to be kept free of activity detrimental to the use of the brook by otter during the construction and operational phase and shall include a maintenance plan. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained and maintained in that form unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure an acceptable impact on Otters, a protected and priority species, in accordance with Plan:MK policy NE2.

15. Sustainability

Reserved matters applications for each phase or part of the development hereby permitted shall be accompanied by a Sustainability Statement for that phase or part including, as a minimum, details required by Policy SC1 of Plan: MK. The approved details shall be implemented for each dwelling prior to the first occupation of that dwelling.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with the sustainable aims and objectives of the Plan: MK policy SC1 and the NPPF.

16. Levels

Any reserved matters application shall be accompanied by details of the existing and proposed finished floor levels of all buildings and the finished ground levels of the

site, in relation to existing site levels of surrounding property, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: To ensure that construction is carried out at suitable levels having regard to drainage, access, the appearance of the development and the amenities of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policies D3 and D5 of Milton Keynes adopted Plan: MK (2019).

17. Archaeology

Prior to the commencement of each phase/parcel of the development a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological mitigation in respect of any identified areas of significant buried archaeological remains shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include a statement of significance and research objectives; and:

- a) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- b) The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: To ensure the appropriate recording of any archaeological remains affected by the development in accordance with: Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy HE1 of Plan: MK.

18. Contamination

No development shall take place until an assessment of ground conditions to determine the likelihood of any ground, groundwater or gas contamination of the site has been carried out in accordance with the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination'. The results of this survey detailing the nature and extent of any contamination, together with a strategy for any remedial action deemed necessary to bring the site to a condition suitable for its intended use, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before construction works commence.

Any remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy and validated by submission of an appropriate verification report prior to first occupation of the development.

Should any unforeseen contamination be encountered the Local Planning Authority shall be informed immediately. Any additional site investigation and remedial work that is required as a result of unforeseen contamination will also be carried out to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the site is fit for its proposed purpose and any potential risks to human health, property, and the natural and historical environment, are appropriately investigated and minimised in accordance with Part B of Policy NE6 of Plan:MK (2019).

19. Design Code

Prior to the submission of the first reserved matters application (excluding the primary infrastructure - attenuation ponds, primary roads and associated landscaping) for approval of Reserved Matters, a Site Wide Design Code shall have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The design code will cover the entire site. Reserved matters applications shall accord with the principles set out in the Design Codes.

Reason: In order to clarify the terms of this planning permission and ensure that the development accords with the principles submitted in support of the outline planning application

20. Drainage

Prior to commencement of development of each phase or parcel of the development, in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Report, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference 15552-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0001, issue P2, dated 16 July 2020 detailed designs for the surface water drainage scheme for that phase or parcel shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The detailed designs will include elements of source control and a programme for the incremental implementation of the surface water drainage design for the phase or parcel. This must ensure sufficient surface water drainage infrastructure is in place for the amount of development which has taken place in that phase or parcel of the development at any point in time unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once implemented the surface water drainage infrastructure shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding to third parties in accordance with Plan:MK policies FR1 and FR2.

21. Drainage

Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any building. The submitted details should identify run-off sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Plan:MK policies FR1 and FR2.

22. Highways Layout

Prior to the commencement of the development details of all accesses shown on Parameter Plan 5078-PL05 (Revision B) shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The accesses shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development in accordance with policy CT1 of Plan: MK.

23. Traffic Calming Measures North Crawley Road

No part of the development hereby permitted shall commence until such time as details of traffic calming proposals for North Crawley Road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the traffic calming proposals have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with policy CT1 of Plan: MK.

24. Offsite Redways 1

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until details of the proposed redways on North Crawley Road and Tickford Street (identified as sections 1 to 5 on the Proposed Offsite Redways Plan) have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the required works completed.

Reason: In order to provide sustainable modal links between the development and Newport Pagnell town centre in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT3 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 (g).

25. Offsite Redways 2

No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until a phasing plan including timings for the submission of detailed drawings and completion of works for the offsite redways west of Tickford Street (identified as sections 6 to 12 on the Proposed Offsite Redways Plan) have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The redways shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details and phasing plan.

Reason: In order that residents have sustainable modal choice as a means of transport to and from the proposed development, in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT3 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 (g).

26. Offsite Junction Works

No part of the development shall commence until plans for the improvement of off-site junctions have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until such time as the works to improve the off-site junctions have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development, in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT1.

27. Morello Way Calming Measures

As part of future reserved matters, details of traffic calming measure works to discourage use of the Morello Way access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to first occupation of the development hereby permitted, the traffic calming works shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To limit use of the Morello Way access by residents and visitors to the proposed development, in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT1 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan.

28. Travel Plan

No part of the development shall be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted and approved. Within three months of occupation of the development a Travel Plan Coordinator shall be nominated to manage the Travel Plan. The plan shall be produced utilising the Stars for online platform. The approved full travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained within and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied with a minimum of annual reporting for the first five years, every two years thereafter.

Reason: To support sustainable transport objectives including a reduction in single occupancy car journeys and the increased use of public transport, walking and cycling in accordance with Plan: MK Policies CT2 and CT3.

29. Amenity, Accessibility and Adaptability of Homes

Any relevant reserved matters applications containing residential units shall be informed by the Nationally Described Space Standard and the requirements of Plan:MK policy HN4 in regard to accessibility and adaptability of homes.

Reason: To ensure and acceptable level of future occupier amenity, in accordance with Plan:MK policy HN4.

30. Electric Vehicle Charging Points

Any relevant reserved matters applications shall contain details of electric charging points, to be informed by the requirements of Plan:MK Policy CT6.

Reason: To maximise the use of sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT6.

A1.0 FULL CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS

A1.1 Newport Pagnell Town Council

The Committee acknowledged that the Town Council's Neighbourhood Plan Implementation Group had held numerous meetings with the applicants and their agents over the past three and a half years, and therefore had no further comments to add.

A1.2 Moulsoe Parish Council (adjacent parish)

No response received

A1.3 Chicheley Parish Council (adjacent parish)

No response received

A1.4 Lathbury Parish Council (adjacent parish)

Lathbury Parish Meeting has the following concerns regarding the above-mentioned Planning Application/Notification.

Flooding

We question what measures will be enacted to mitigate against flooding caused by the development - in particular the risk of flooding to the north/north west of the site towards the River Great Ouse between North Bridge (Newport Pagnell) and the Sherington Bridge.

Currently, during times of flood, the Sherington Road (from the B526 to the Sherington Bridge) becomes impassable causing traffic disturbance both to and from Newport Pagnell. This also affects the properties on the Sherington Road.

Over the past 10 years we have seen incidents of flooding in the area increase dramatically. We can only see these occurrences of flooding increasing if all the surface run-off water, from the new development, is directed to the Chicheley Brook and therefore flowing into the River Great Ouse and the adjoining disused gravel pit lakes (which at places are only metres from the roadside verge).

We note Anglian Water have raised questions on this point too.

Traffic

We have concerns over the increased level of traffic caused by the development in particular congestion from the B526 towards the A509 and A422 and thereon to Junction 14.

What consideration has been taken regarding the impact of this development on the proposed highways works as part of the eastern expansion area? would it not make more sense to combine the two proposals with a joint highways infrastructure plan i.e. provision of a new junction on the A509 at the point the Crawley Road crosses

the A509 (similar to the proposed Eastern Expansion Junction for the new road to Junction 14).

A1.5 Cllr Alexander - Newport Pagnell South (DCC Member)

No comment received

A1.6 Cllr McCall - Newport Pagnell South

No comment received

A1.7 Cllr Carr - Newport Pagnell South

No comment received

A1.8 MKC Highways Officer

Initial comments (28 February 2020)

Application needs amending and/or further information required

Introduction

This planning application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved other than for access, for the development of up to 930 dwellings, a primary school, local centre, open space, sports pitches, play areas, pavilion/wellbeing centre and other associated works.

Summary

Highways have been involved in pre-application discussions with the applicant and their planning team for several years and as a result, much of what is now contained within the Transport Assessment (TA) has been the subject of detailed discussions.

Highways have no objection in principle to the proposals within the current planning application. However, the following comments raise issues for which the applicant's response is required.

The comments are largely in response to the TA submitted in support of the application but also provide some comment on the plans,

The TA is split into sections and to avoid lengthy repetition of what is said in that document, comment is only given where there is an issue that isn't agreed or that requires clarification.

Transport Assessment (TA)

1. Introduction

No comment

2. Transport Policy Context

Para 2.2 - Given that the TA is dated 14 October 2019 there is an expectation that reference would have been made to NPPF 2019, published in February of that year and not NPPF 2018.

Para 2.3.15 – This refers to the New Residential Design Guide SPD (2012) providing highway design guidance. The applicant should use the council document ‘A Highway Guide for Milton Keynes’ dated September 2018 for all highway design guidance in preference to the stated document.

3. Site Description & Existing Conditions

Table 3.1 – there are two PRow crossings of the A422 west of the application site.

Para 3.7.8 – the paragraph states that accident statistics have been reviewed for the most recent time period. Is no data available for 2019? No concern with the conclusion that the data shows no prevalence of significant road safety issues across the local highway network.

4. Accessibility to The Site by Non-car Modes of Travel

The details of existing accessibility to the site are agreed and are discussed further on in these comments.

5. Development Proposals

Para 5.2.3 – the applicant is requested to provide justification regarding his choice of traffic signal control at the primary site access junction rather than the Milton Keynes Council preference of roundabouts.

5.3 – The council has its own set of design criteria for residential and other roads and these are contained in the council document ‘A Highway Guide for Milton Keynes’ dated September 2018. The applicant should use this document and not Manual for Streets.

Para 5.4.2 – parking will be conditioned as part of any planning consent for this application.

Para 5.5.1 – the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is acknowledged and it is presumed that this will be a separate document to any Construction Environmental Plan (CEMP)?

6. Trip Generation

Traffic surveys have been carried out at the following junctions: -

- i. Jenna Way/North Crawley Road (priority)
- ii. Howard Way/North Crawley Road (priority)
- iii. North Crawley Road/Renny Park Road (roundabout)
- iv. B526/North Crawley Road (mini-roundabout)
- v. Renny Park Road/A509 (Renny Lodge roundabout)
- vi. A422/A509/B526 (Tickford roundabout)
- vii. A422/Willen Road/Marsh End Road (Marsh End roundabout)
- viii. Brickhill Street/A422 (Blakelands roundabout)
- ix. St John’s Street/High Street (mini-roundabout) - 2015
- x. B526/Chicheley Street (priority) – 2015

The 2015/2016 count data has been converted to 2018 base and future year 2031 using the TEMPRO program. The rates shown in Table 6.1 are acceptable.

Two committed development sites (Site A in local plan – 73 houses, Aston Martin site – 86 houses) have been included before analysing the impact of the proposed development in 2031.

The 2011 Census Travel to Work Area (TTWA) data has been used for MK 004 MSOA area to calculate the distribution. This is acceptable.

Primary school trips have been assumed to be internal and have no effect on the junctions

The residential trip rates obtained using TRICS for morning & evening peak hour are acceptable.

7 Traffic Impact

For Traffic impact analysis the following junctions were agreed for assessment with MKC Highways: -

J1 – Eastern Site Access/North Crawley Road priority (proposed)

J2 – Western Site Access/North Crawley Road/Howard Way Signalised (proposed)

J3 – North Crawley Road/Renny Park Road/Morello Way

J4 – B526/North Crawley Road

J5 – St Johns Street/High Street

J6 – Renny Lodge Roundabout

J7 – Tickford Roundabout

Roundabout and priority junctions have been analysed using ARCADY and PICADY respectively. LINSIG has been used for signalised junctions. Comments for each junction are as follows: -

J1 Eastern Site Access/North Crawley Road (proposed), this operates within capacity as to be expected.

J2 Western Site Access/North Crawley Road/Howard Way (proposed), the LINSIG input is acceptable and the junction operates within capacity.

J3 North Crawley Road/Renny Park Road/Morello Way, the roundabout junction operates within capacity.

J4 (B526/North Crawley Road) was tested in its current mini-roundabout form but was found to operate over capacity. There is insufficient road space to enable a larger, conventional roundabout to be used and therefore the applicant had no choice but to analyse the junction under traffic signal control. Whilst the junction is shown to operate well in the evening peak hour with the additional development and committed development traffic, modelling for the morning peak hour shows the junction to be operating close to capacity. Further to this it was agreed with MKC Highways that MOVA (Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation) would be fitted to the traffic signal controller. This is identical to some other junctions in MK where capacity issues have been overcome using the same equipment. TRL Research Report 279 identifies that MOVA has the potential to offer an average of 13% delay reduction at signalised junctions and it is reasonable to assume that it would offer this level of benefit at this junction. MOVA will therefore be fitted as part of the junction improvement.

The layout for the signal controlled junction shows that some properties on the west side of Tickford Street will have accesses to the highway within the operational area of the signal controlled junction. The applicant is requested to respond on what difficulties, if any, he sees for vehicles emerging from these individual house accesses.

J5 St Johns Street/High Street, as a mini-roundabout, excessive queues are shown even in the 2018 morning peak hour base analysis. The TA comments that impact from the development at the junction is 2.9% and 4.3% for the morning and evening peak hours respectively. For the High Street approach, impact is 2.2% and 6.3%

for the morning and evening peaks respectively. Further analysis is required together with mitigation measures.

J6 Renny Lodge Roundabout, the junction operates within capacity.

Tickford roundabout (J7) was found to operate over capacity in 2031 and as a result the applicant proposes a partial signalisation of the junction. The LINSIG output is acceptable but large queues still remain on the A422. However, the applicant confirms the partial signalisation represents an improvement over the existing junction performance as observed prior to the introduction of the proposed development.

The proposed arrangements of approach lanes on the London Road approach to Tickford roundabout are acceptable and any change to these as a result of partial signalisation is unnecessary.

Access

Access to the site is proposed from two new junctions. The eastern most junction (junction 1) is a simple priority junction with north Crawley Road and junction 2, the primary access to the site, is shown in the form of a signalised 'T' junction with North Crawley Road. Access is also proposed from Morello Way. This is a tertiary access and is discussed in more detail below.

The applicant has chosen to use traffic signals to control traffic flows at the primary access into the site from North Crawley Road. The applicant is required to explain why this option has been chosen in preference to a simple priority junction or a roundabout. The access junction further east on North Crawley Road has been designed as a simple priority junction. Both junctions will require a road safety assessment.

The Design and Access statement explains that an access into the site via the existing Morello Way could be tertiary in nature and will be designed to ensure that it is a less preferable route for traffic, compared to the primary access. However, at paragraph 6.48 the D&A statement refers to *'along the south western edge of the site' the Tickford Mews development'* and at paragraph 6.50 states *'The area provides the Primary access to the site....'*. This is misleading and may lead to those reading this section, that Tickford Mews will form the primary access to the site when in reality this isn't the intention. The applicant is requested to revisit this section of the D&A to clarify further what is meant.

Fig,26 and paragraph 6.61 explain in greater detail a range of measures that can be applied to the design of this area to prevent it being used as a rat-run and at reserved matters stage, MK Highways will expect to see a robust menu of measures to ensure this doesn't become the case.

There is an awareness of traffic queuing on North Crawley Road to access the Household Waste site. The queuing does extend back over Renny Park roundabout in the busiest times. However, this is not seen as having a detrimental affect on the signalised Primary access junction into the application site.

The access to the site from Chicheley Street links to an existing public right of way (FP15) which will be developed as a joint pedestrian/cycling route onwards from the eastern extent of Chicheley Street. Although Chicheley Street is acceptable as a cycling route it cannot be improved to allow segregated cycling due to its width and the level of on-street car parking. Redway access is also proposed via an existing leisure route which then becomes public highway at its interface with Keynes Close. This is acceptable.

Whilst detailed junction layout plans show the redway along North Crawley Road that will be built as part of the proposed development, there are no plans to show the redway as it passes the existing household waste site and what the arrangements will be at the access to that site. In order to provide an assurance that cycle access to the site from North Crawley Road is entirely feasible the applicant is requested to submit details of the 3 metre wide redway along the whole site frontage with North Crawley Road as part of this application. Plan 1 (Offsite Redway Routes) is submitted as part of the planning application. There is an expectation that the works to deliver the redway network shown on the plan will form part of this planning application. The applicant's confirmation of this is required.

Conclusion

The above comments raise issues that require a response from the applicant. Please consult highways again when responses have been provided.

Highways Comments following re-consultation (6th August 2020)

No objection subject to condition(s)



The following comments are provided following extensive correspondence and online (virtual) meetings with the applicant.

Prior to this activity there were a number of issues that MKC Highways were not entirely happy with. These weren't issues where an objection was likely but more of an issue around areas where the applicant needed to carry out further work in order to provide greater clarification.

Introduction

This planning application seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved other than for access, for the development of up to 930 dwellings, a primary school, local centre, open space, sports pitches, play areas, pavilion/wellbeing centre and other associated works.

Summary

Highways were fully involved in pre-application discussions with the applicant and their planning team for several years and as a result, much of what is now contained within the Transport Assessment (TA) has been the subject of detailed discussions.

Highways have no objection in principle to the proposals within the current planning application subject to the imposition of planning conditions.

The comments are largely in response to the TA submitted in support of the application but also provide some comment on the plans, together with a Technical note provided by the applicant's transport consultant and the productive discussion through virtual, online meetings.

The TA is split into sections and to avoid lengthy repetition of what is said in that document, comment is only given where there is an issue that isn't agreed or that requires clarification.

Transport Assessment (TA)

1. Introduction

No comment

2. Transport Policy Context

No comment

3. Site Description & Existing Conditions

Table 3.1 – there are two PRow crossings of the A422 west of the application site. These are picked up on the Access and Movement Parameter Plan (dwg. 5078-PL05 Rev. B)

4. Accessibility to The Site by Non-car Modes of Travel

The details of existing accessibility to the site are agreed and are discussed further on in these comments.

5. Development Proposals

Para 5.4.2 – parking will be conditioned as part of any reserved matters planning consent for this application.

Para 5.5.1 – the production of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is acknowledged and it is presumed that this will be a separate document to any Construction Environmental Plan (CEMP)?

6. Trip Generation

Traffic surveys have been carried out at the following junctions: -

- i. Jenna Way/North Crawley Road (priority)
- ii. Howard Way/North Crawley Road (priority)
- iii. North Crawley Road/Renny Park Road (roundabout)
- iv. B526/North Crawley Road (mini-roundabout)
- v. Renny Park Road/A509 (Renny Lodge roundabout)
- vi. A422/A509/B526 (Tickford roundabout)
- vii. A422/Willen Road/Marsh End Road (Marsh End roundabout)
- viii. Brickhill Street/A422 (Blakelands roundabout)
- ix. St John's Street/High Street (mini-roundabout) - 2015
- x. B526/Chicheley Street (priority) – 2015

The 2015/2016 count data has been converted to 2018 base and future year 2031 using the TEMPRO program. The rates shown in Table 6.1 are acceptable.

Two committed development sites (Site A in local plan – 73 houses, Aston Martin site – 86 houses) have been included before analysing the impact of the proposed development in 2031.

The 2011 Census Travel to Work Area (TTWA) data has been used for MK 004 MSOA area to calculate the distribution. This is acceptable.

Primary school trips have been assumed to be internal and have no effect on the junctions

The residential trip rates obtained using TRICS for morning & evening peak hour are acceptable.

7 Traffic Impact

For Traffic impact analysis the following junctions were agreed for assessment with MKC Highways: -

J1 – Eastern Site Access/North Crawley Road priority (proposed)

J2 – Western Site Access/North Crawley Road/Howard Way Signalised (proposed)

J3 – North Crawley Road/Renny Park Road/Morello Way

J4 – B526/North Crawley Road

J5 – St Johns Street/High Street

J6 – Renny Lodge Roundabout

J7 – Tickford Roundabout

Roundabout and priority junctions have been analysed using ARCADY and PICADY respectively. LINSIG has been used for signalised junctions. Comments for each junction are as follows: -

J1 Eastern Site Access/North Crawley Road (proposed), this operates within capacity as to be expected.

J2 Western Site Access/North Crawley Road/Howard Way (proposed), the LINSIG input is acceptable and the junction operates within capacity.

J3 North Crawley Road/Renny Park Road/Morello Way, the roundabout junction operates within capacity.

J4 (B526/North Crawley Road) was tested in its current mini-roundabout form but was found to operate over capacity. There is insufficient road space to enable a larger, conventional roundabout to be used and therefore the applicant had no choice but to analyse the junction under traffic signal control. Whilst the junction is shown to operate well in the evening peak hour with the additional development and committed development traffic, modelling for the morning peak hour shows the junction to be operating close to capacity. Further to this it was agreed with MKC Highways that MOVA (Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation) would be fitted to the traffic signal controller. This is identical to some other junctions in MK where capacity issues have been overcome using the same equipment. TRL Research Report 279 identifies that MOVA has the potential to offer an average of 13% delay reduction at signalised junctions and it is reasonable to assume that it would offer this level of benefit at this junction. MOVA will therefore be fitted as part of the junction improvement.

The layout for the signal controlled junction shows that some properties on the west side of Tickford Street will have accesses to the highway within the operational area of the signal controlled junction. This matter will be dealt with as part of the Road Safety Audit carried out as part of the Highway Technical Assessment for the S278 submission. That said, it is not unusual for this scenario to occur and movements from individual properties within the zone of traffic signal controlled junctions become habitual and motorists well versed in the timings of the signals themselves.

J5 St Johns Street/High Street.

As a mini-roundabout, excessive queues are shown even in the 2018 morning peak hour base analysis. The TA comments that impact from the development at the junction is 2.9% and 4.3% for the morning and evening peak hours respectively. For the High Street approach, impact is 2.2% and 6.3% for the morning and evening peaks respectively. Highways required further analysis for this junction and this became the subject of lengthy debate. The development does have a

negative impact on the capacity of the junction which already operates at over capacity. MKC Highways requested the applicant develop a scheme of mitigation for the peak hour impacts on queuing (an additional 70 vehicles in the PM peak and 58 vehicles in the AM peak). The applicant has designed a scheme of mitigation for this junction which, when modelled offers betterment in the 2031 future scenario. However, the scheme itself is relatively minor and will result in some negative impacts on the width of existing footways around the periphery of the junction. As such, although providing a theoretically acceptable scheme, it is recommended that these works or a financial contribution are not progressed.

J6 Renny Lodge Roundabout, the junction operates within capacity.

Tickford roundabout (J7) was found to operate over capacity in 2031 and as a result the applicant proposes a partial signalisation of the junction. The LINSIG output is acceptable but large queues still remain on the A422. However, the applicant confirms the partial signalisation represents an improvement over the existing junction performance as observed prior to the introduction of the proposed development.

The proposed arrangements of approach lanes on the London Road approach to Tickford roundabout are acceptable and any change to these as a result of partial signalisation is unnecessary.

Access

Access to the site is proposed from two new junctions. The eastern most junction (junction 1) is a simple priority junction with North Crawley Road and junction 2, the primary access to the site, is shown in the form of a signalised 'T' junction with North Crawley Road. Access is also proposed from Morello Way. This is a tertiary access and is discussed in more detail below.

The applicant has chosen to use traffic signals to control traffic flows at the primary access into the site from North Crawley Road. The applicant has since stated that *'at the outset of the project, all junction types were considered including different forms of roundabout. The decision to proceed with a signal controlled junction was as a result of the iterative design process. Preliminary modelling exercises demonstrated that it was not ultimately possible to provide a roundabout junction with sufficient scale and capacity within land either controlled by the applicant or the highway authority'*. This approach and the solution to design the most appropriate form of junction with North Crawley Road is supported by MKC Highways and is technically acceptable. It is often the case that where both vehicle and pedestrian movements need control, the best form of junction is traffic signals as roundabouts offer no priority to pedestrians.

The access junction further east on North Crawley Road has been designed as a simple priority junction. Both junctions will require a road safety assessment.

The Design and Access statement explains that an access into the site via the existing Morello Way could be tertiary in nature and will be designed to ensure that it is a less preferable route for traffic, compared to the primary access.

This access will be conditioned but it is more appropriate that this is done at the time of any reserved matters planning application. The design of measures to deter anything but local traffic to the relatively small area that the access is intended to serve needs to be formed from a combination of both highway and built form design. These are not available at this stage.

Fig. 26 and paragraph 6.61 explain in greater detail a range of measures that can be applied to the design of this area to prevent it being used as a rat-run and at

reserved matters stage, MK Highways will expect to see a robust menu of measures to ensure this doesn't become the case.

There is an awareness of traffic queuing on North Crawley Road to access the Household Waste site. The queuing does extend back over Renny Park roundabout in the busiest times. However, this is not seen as having a detrimental effect on the signalised Primary access junction into the application site.

The access to the site from Chicheley Street links to an existing public right of way (FP15) which will be developed as a joint pedestrian/cycling route onwards from the eastern extent of Chicheley Street. Although Chicheley Street is acceptable as a cycling route it cannot be improved to allow segregated cycling due to its width and the level of on-street car parking. Redway access is also proposed via an existing leisure route which then becomes public highway at its interface with Keynes Close. This is acceptable.

Whilst detailed junction layout plans show the redway along North Crawley Road that will be built as part of the proposed development, there are no plans to show the redway as it passes the existing household waste site and what the arrangements will be at the access to that site. The applicant was requested to provide additional detail on this matter. MKC Highway officers have inspected North Crawley Road and have confirmed that the northern verge of North Crawley Road can accommodate a 3 metre wide redway and verge in front of the recycling centre. The redway annotated on the Access and Movement Parameter plan (dwg. 5078-PL05 Rev. B) will be built as part of the proposed development.

The existing set speed limits on North Crawley Road will require revision with the existing 30mph zone being extended eastwards to a point yet to be defined (part of S278 Agreement and a revised Traffic Regulation (Speed Limits) Order) but as a minimum to cover the site frontage on this length of highway. To ensure that traffic proceeds in compliance with the revised speed limits Order a range of speed management measures will be required in advance of the new 30mph signs.

These works will form part of the development proposals and will be conditioned as part of any planning consent for this application. This has been discussed with Thames Valley Police and they will be consulted on the proposed speed limit measures.

Plan 1(Offsite Redway Routes) is submitted as part of the planning application.

The offsite redway improvements are the subject of a separate legal agreement associated with the proposed development. The redway works will be undertake on a phased basis with the redways on North Crawley Road and Tickford Street being completed prior to any occupation of dwellings. This will also be conditioned. The network of redway improvements will provide a network of routes to the town centre and Ousedale School and beyond thereby ensuring the development site is sustainable from the highway perspective.

The Access & Movement Parameter plan shows five points of cycle access into the development area, 3 from North Crawley Road, 1 from Chicheley Street and another from Keynes Close. With regard pedestrian access, the same plan shows 5 points of pedestrian access as well as the availability of pedestrian access along the joint use redways.

Conclusion

Milton Keynes Highways have no objection to the granting of planning permission subject to the following conditions: -

1. Prior to the commencement of the development details of all accesses shown on Parameter Plan 5078-PL05 (Revision B) shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The accesses shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development in accordance with policy CT1 of Plan: MK.

2. No part of the development shall commence until such time as details of traffic calming proposals for North Crawley Road have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be brought into use until the traffic calming proposals have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway in accordance with policy CT1 of Plan: MK.

3. Prior to the commencement of the development details of all offsite redways shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to first occupation, the redways on North Crawley Road and Tickford Street (identified as sections 1 to 5 on the Proposed Offsite Redways Plan) shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to provide sustainable modal links between the development and Newport Pagnell town centre in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT3 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 (g).

4. Prior to first occupation of the development, a phasing plan for the offsite redways west of Tickford Street (identified as sections 6 to 12 on the Proposed Offsite Redways Plan) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The redways west of Tickford Street shall be developed in accordance with the approved phasing plan.

Reason: In order that residents have sustainable modal choice as a means of transport to and from the proposed development, in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT3 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan policy NP2 (g).

5. Prior to commencement of the development details of plans for the improvement of off-site junctions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwellings shall be occupied until such time as the works to improve the off-site junctions have been laid out and constructed in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: In order to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the highway and of the development, in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT1

6. As part of future reserved matters details of traffic calming measure works to discourage use of the Morello Way access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Prior to first occupation, the traffic calming works shall be laid out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To limit use of the Morello Way access by residents and visitors to the proposed development, in accordance with Plan:MK policy CT1 and Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan.

A1.9 MKC Urban Design Response

No objection, subject to condition requiring the submission and approval of a site-wide design code prior to the submission of individual reserved matters applications.

Other comments/recommendations for detailed design/reserved matters stage:

- The school site, as currently configured, cuts through a key north-south open space, which has the potential to link the local centre and school with the linear park and sports field. The school site would be better configured with the school outside space located to the east of the proposed school building. This would have the benefit of retaining the whole of the linear landscape feature in the public realm; providing a north-south green open space link incorporating pedestrian/cycle routes, connecting the site's key community facilities; and providing higher density housing close to the local centre.
- The attenuation basin to the north of the school is too large. It is likely to result in an over-engineered feature, rather than something more naturalistic. A better solution would be to have two smaller linked basins, either side of the spine street.
- The small area of residential development in the north-west corner is poorly related to the rest of the development, and would result in an isolated group of housing accessed by a road over the floodplain with no development frontages. This area would be better used to accommodate flood attenuation

A1.10 MKC Flood and Water Management Officer (Lead Local Flood Authority)

Initial Response

We have reviewed the following documents:

- Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Report, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference R/C-04632-C/FRA001, dated October 2018;
- Preliminary Drainage Strategy Plan, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, drawing number TKF-HYD-XX-XX-DR-C-2100, Rev. P04, drawn date 21/03/2017;
- Ground Conditions Desk Study Report prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference R/C-04632-C/001, dated January 2017.

At present, as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), we are unable to support this application for the following reasons:

1. Insufficient surface water drainage strategy

Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires planning applications to be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment. Such an assessment should include a surface water strategy and must demonstrate that the proposed development incorporates sustainable drainage systems (SuDS), unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate. The SuDS should:

- a) Take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority;
- b) Have appropriate minimum operational standards;
- c) Have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and
- d) Where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.

A flood risk assessment and preliminary surface water strategy plan has been submitted as part of this application. However there is insufficient information in order for us to determine the impacts of the proposal.

Please note that flood risk information and government guidance on flood risk and drainage is being continually updated and we would not normally accept any application using any FRA/drainage strategy older than 12 months without an addendum or update. An addendum or update – even if this only confirms the data used is still current – should be provided.

For an outline application the following should be included within the surface water strategy, where applicable:

- i. Existing and proposed impermeable area (including an allowance for urban creep)
- ii. A description of site topography
- iii. A description of ground conditions (using site investigation where possible)
- iv. Identification of any surface water flood risk
- v. Existing site drainage arrangements
- vi. Proposed method of surface water disposal
- vii. Existing and proposed runoff rates (if discharging off-site)
- viii. Existing and proposed runoff volumes (if discharging off-site)
- ix. Required volume of attenuation (m³ per m² of impermeable area)
- x. Preliminary SuDS proposals
- xi. Infiltration test results in accordance with BRE365 (or second viable option for surface water disposal if testing hasn't yet been undertaken)
- xii. Evidence of in principle agreement from third party if discharging into their system
- xiii. Management/maintenance plan and on-going maintenance responsibilities
- xiv. Details of proposed phasing

In particular, the following items should be addressed:

- As outlined in the MK Surface Water Management Plan, Newport Pagnell is a Critical Drainage Catchment that acts as a confluence for a number of watercourses (including Chicheley Brook) and consequently there are a number of historical fluvial flood records. These watercourses may combine with pluvial sources and exacerbate flooding. There are no drainage calculations or infiltration testing submitted with the Preliminary Drainage Strategy Plan and the greenfield run-off rate appears to be quite high for this site. An acceptable discharge rate should be agreed with the LLFA.
- In line with Policy FR3 of Plan:MK, all new development must be set back at a distance of at least 8 metres from any main rivers, at least 9 metres from all other ordinary watercourses, or at an appropriate width as agreed by the appropriate authority, in order to provide an adequate undeveloped buffer zone. It is currently unclear if the smaller watercourses undeveloped distances will account for this.

Informatives

Impact in relation to fluvial risk

Milton Keynes prohibits development within the floodplain and seeks flood management/drainage infrastructure to be provided strategically and as part of a multi-functional blue-green infrastructure. It is recognised that the flood risk assessment included fluvial modelling of the site, which was submitted to the Environment Agency. Evidence that the modelling is acceptable should also be included as part of an application.

As described in the CIRIA SuDS Manual - 'All storage volume should normally be provided within the development footprint, outside of the floodplain.'

Furthermore, the LLFA 'will resist proposals that would adversely affect the natural functioning of main rivers, ordinary watercourses and wet or dry balancing lakes, this includes through the culverting of open channels, unless for access purposes'.

Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS)

A position statement by Milton Keynes Council that outlined the physical and natural environment core policy vision for how Milton Keynes can aspire to become the 'Greenest City in the World' was approved by Cabinet in November 2019. In this, it underlined the following:

Create:

In order to address surface water flooding, urban growth and regeneration will adopt a comprehensive approach to designing sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) with surface water being attenuated and treated on site using methods that blend infrastructure nature, landscape and trees. Milton Keynes will create a more diverse portfolio of water landscapes that support greater biodiversity.

Engage:

...Sustainable drainage systems will be seen as a positive tool for providing local amenity benefit as well as managing flood risk.

Sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) mimic natural drainage processes by reducing the effect on the quality and quantity of runoff from developments whilst also providing amenity and biodiversity benefits. The variety of SuDS techniques available means that virtually any development should be able to include a scheme based around these principles. As such, SuDS such as permeable paving, swales, green roofs, attenuation basins and wetlands should be preferred on all development sites ahead of conventional piped drainage measures. We will seek evidence that permeable surfaces and surface based conveyance and storage systems are to be used wherever practical.

Considerations should be made for the location of attenuation basins whilst upholding a blue/green corridor.

Adoption and maintenance of SuDS

The management and maintenance of SuDS should appropriately account for the construction, operation and maintenance requirements of all components of the drainage system (surface and sub-surface). For applications we expect due consideration to have been given to potential organisations who may adopt / maintain the proposed surface water system and this should be outlined within the surface water drainage strategy.

Ordinary watercourse consents

Constructions or alterations within an ordinary watercourse (temporary or permanent) require consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Ordinary watercourses include every river, drain, stream, ditch, dyke, sewer (other than public sewer) and passage through which water flows that do not form part of Main Rivers (Main Rivers are regulated by the Environment Agency).

Pollution control

Surface water and groundwater bodies are highly vulnerable to pollution and the impact of construction activities. It is essential that the risk of pollution (particularly during the construction phase) is considered and mitigated appropriately. It is important to remember that flow within the watercourse is likely to vary by season and it could be dry at certain times throughout the year. Dry watercourses should not be overlooked as these watercourses may flow or even flood following heavy rainfall.

Comments following re-consultation (30th July 2020)

_We have reviewed the following additional information:

- Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Report, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference 15552-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0001, issue P2, dated 16 July 2020;
- SuDS Management & Maintenance Plan, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference TKF-HYD-XX-XX-RP-C-5000, revision P01, dated 14 July 2020.

Based on these, as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) we have no objection in principle to the proposed development.

The applicant proposes that surface water run-off from the development will be managed through attenuation basins and swales with an outfall to the Chicheley Brook and associated watercourses, which will be restricted to QBAR to provide storage for up to the 1% AEP event plus an appropriate allowance for climate change. Whilst not demonstrated at the outline stage, the applicant states that the site will use infiltration techniques where testing confirms feasibility and future phase developments must take into consideration the use of further SuDS features such as permeable paving and swales for source control. The report also confirms that no building or structures will be located within the fluvial floodplain.

We request the following conditions are imposed:

Condition 1

Prior to commencement of development of each phase or parcel of the development, in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Hydraulic Modelling Report, prepared by Hydrock Consultants Limited, reference 15552-HYD-XX-XX-RP-FR-0001, issue P2, dated 16 July 2020 detailed designs for the surface water drainage scheme for that phase or parcel shall be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The detailed designs will include elements of source control and a programme for the incremental implementation of the surface water drainage design for the phase or parcel. This must ensure sufficient surface water drainage infrastructure is in place for the amount of development which has taken place in that phase or parcel of the development at any point in time unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Once implemented the surface water drainage infrastructure shall be retained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason

To ensure a satisfactory method of surface water drainage, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding to third parties

Condition 2

Details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage system (including all SuDS features) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first occupation of any building. The submitted details should identify run-off sub-catchments, SuDS components, control structures, flow routes and outfalls. In addition, the plan must clarify the access that is required to each surface water management component for maintenance purposes. The maintenance plan shall be carried out in full thereafter.

Reason

To ensure the satisfactory maintenance of drainage systems that are not publicly adopted, in accordance with the requirements of paragraphs 163 and 165 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

No objection in principle to the development of the site which is designated as a mixed residential and employment strategic urban extension site in Plan:MK and on the policies map.

Suitably worded conditions are necessary first and foremost being a requirement to submit for approval a design code for the site which I suggest is subject to a pre-application process involving all not selective consultees to reach a holistic and comprehensive design code. The condition should specify the content and scope of the Design Code and should include the points listed in suggested wording below (points f. and g. should be discussed with our urban design colleagues). Other content and scope would be necessary as part of the design code.

No objection in principle to the development of the site which is designated as a mixed residential and employment strategic urban extension site in Plan:MK and policies map.

Conditions are necessary using the wording below suitable for this scheme as opposed to using standard condition wording. Conditions to include:

- Biodiversity enhancement scheme based on a BIAmetric calculation and demonstrable net gain
- Lighting (bat friendly)
- Public open space provision for Leisure, Recreation and Sports Facilities to meet policy standards

1. (Design Code) Prior to the submission of the first of the reserved matters applications for the development, a site wide Design Code shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Design Code shall cover the entire site and the content and scope of the Design Code shall address the following:

- a. The conceptual design and approach to the public realm, including play areas, formal sports provision, enclosure, natural surveillance, public art, materials, street furniture and signage, the incorporation of utilities and landscaping;
- b. Approach to incorporation of ancillary infrastructure/buildings such as substations, pumping stations, pipes, fibres, wires and cables required by statutory undertakers;
- c. The hard and soft landscape design principles for the Strategic Landscaping Elements, including approach to the character and treatment of each of the elements, landscape typologies, a palette of materials for hard and soft landscaping and furnishings;
- d. Boundary treatments;
- e. Measures to demonstrate how the design can maximise resource efficiency and climate change adaptation through external, passive means, such as landscaping, orientation, massing, and external building features;

Also discuss with our urban design colleagues including the following:

- f. The establishment of development parcel boundaries incorporating streets wholly within development parcels and boundaries drawn along the rear of property boundaries and establishing the approach to addressing consistency of design on either side of primary streets;
- g. The design of the transport network hierarchy, streets, cycle routes, footpaths and public spaces, providing typical street cross-sections, which should include

details of tree planting and tree species, underground utility/service trench routes type and specification, and on street parking, including construction design details; The Design Code shall explain its purpose, structure and status and set out the mandatory and discretionary elements where the Design Code will apply, who should use the Design code, and how to use the Design Code. All subsequent reserved matter applications shall accord with the details of the approved design code, and be accompanied by a statement which demonstrates compliance with the code. Reason: To ensure a high standard of design and coordinated development in accordance with Plan:MK Policies

2. (Landscape scheme) No development shall take place above slab level until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Soft landscape works shall include planting plans at a minimum scale of 1:300 with schedules of plants noting species, supply sizes and proposed densities; and a tree planting details drawing. The planting plans shall include existing trees and/or hedgerows to be retained and/or removed accurately shown with root protection areas; existing and proposed finished levels and contours; visibility splays; proximity between street lights and tree planting; proposed and existing functional services above and below ground. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and prior to the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner, or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. If within a period of two years from the date of the planting of any tree or shrub, that tree or shrub, or any tree and shrub planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies, becomes severely damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees and shrubs of equivalent size, species and quantity. Thereafter the hard and soft landscape works shall be maintained and retained in situ. Reason: To protect the appearance and character of the area and to minimise the effect of development on the area in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of Plan:MK (2019).

3. (Levels) Prior to the commencement of development including site clearance, details of the proposed finished floor levels of all buildings, ground retaining measures, embankment gradients and the finished ground levels in relation to existing ground levels and root protection areas of trees and planting to be retained shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels. Reason: To ensure that development proposals respond appropriately to the site and is carried out at suitable levels in accordance with Policies D1 of Plan:MK (2019).

4. (Boundary Treatment) No development shall take place above slab level until details of the proposed boundary treatments have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include a boundary treatment plan (at a minimum scale of 1:500) detailing the position of all proposed boundary treatment and including a schedule specifying the type, height, composition, elevation appearance of boundary treatment throughout the site. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of each dwelling to which the boundary treatment relates, and shall thereafter be retained in that form. Reason: To provide adequate privacy, to protect the external character and appearance of the area and to minimise the effect of development on the area in accordance with policy D1 of Plan:MK (2019).

5. (Tree Protection) Prior to the commencement of any phase of the development, a tree protection scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing

by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include an arboricultural impact assessment based on the approved layout; method statement; and a scaled Tree Protection Plan detailing: the location of all retained trees within the site; tree root protection areas (RPA) including the line of tree protection fencing; the type of tree protection fencing shall be of the same specification as that depicted in figure 2, page 20, in BS 5837: 2012; any areas to be covered in BS 5837: 2012 ground protection; location details of storage areas including what substances will be stored and where, locations of construction site car parking, welfare facilities, cement plant, fuel storage and where discharge, filling and mixing of substances will take place. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of any construction works and maintained in full until the construction process is completed.

All existing trees to be retained are to be protected according to the provisions of BS 5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations'. All tree protection measures must be put in place first, prior to any other work commencing on site (this includes clearance, ground-works, vehicle movements, machinery / materials delivery etc.). Once erected the local authority tree officer shall be notified so the fencing can be inspected and approved. The Root Protection Area (RPA) fencing will be amended as the arboriculture officer feels appropriate after taking account of the details submitted. Signs informing of the purpose of the fencing and warning of the penalties against destruction or damage to the trees and their root zones shall be installed at minimum intervals of 10 metres and a minimum of two signs per separate stretch of fencing. The RPA within the protective fencing must be kept free of all construction, construction plant, machinery, personnel, digging and scraping, service runs, water-logging, changes in level, building materials and all other operations, personnel, structures, tools, storage and materials, for the duration of the construction phase. No fire shall be lit such that it is closer than 20 metres to any tree or that flames would come within 5 metres of any part of any tree.

Reason: To protect the appearance and character of the area and to minimise the effect of development on the area in accordance with Policies D1 and D2 of Plan:MK (2019).

A1.12 MKC Conservation Response

An update on the heritage statement by Cotswold Archaeology:

The main body of text records that 'the stone built storage shed is of 19th century in date, and is of local heritage significance' (para 5.5). However, in assessing the physical effects of the development and reaching a conclusion, the report fails to mention the building and thus take account of any impact arising, which is unusual.

Annex C includes photographs of the building (attached below) and describes it as 'limestone with slate roof', that it 'likely pre-dates 1881' (we know this from OS maps) and that 'it is in a state of disrepair; but it is of local heritage significance'.

It is clear that the building meets the definition of a heritage asset as set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF and that the removal of the building will result in harm being caused. My initial conclusion is that the building has been accurately described in general

terms but that it has been left out of the assessment of impact on heritage significance.

As discussed, this itself is not a threat to the acceptability of the overall development from a heritage point of view since the retained building could easily be accommodated within the redevelopment of such a vast site. A reserved matters layout integrating it properly would be acceptable.

A1.13 MKC Landscape Services Trees

There is potential for confusion between the solid blue line for the Category B trees / groups and the solid blue line for the tree protection fencing, the colour and/or style of the Tree Protection Fencing line should be changed to aid clarity particularly for the fencing contractor.

Between the two access roads onto to North Crawley road is a 55m length of hedgerow identified to be removed 'to accommodate access', the indicative masterplan does not shown any access at this point. Can the reason for removal of this section of hedgerow be clarified please?

Trees 30 – 42 and G24 are at increased risk due to proximity of demolition of existing buildings– the tree protection fencing and signs must be in place before any demolition works start including site access.

The full application should be accompanied by; a full arboricultural method statement including a more detailed tree protection plan; details of soft landscaping proposals, levels, services, boundary fencing etc. in relation to root protection areas; phasing in relation to any need to move tree protection fencing while maintaining tree and root protection measures; auditing of the tree protection fencing to ensure it performs its function without undue interference until project completion when all contractors have left the site; and a schedule of the proposed tree works.

All works relating to retained trees should be carried out in accordance with the conditions and the submitted arboricultural impact assessment by Aspect Arboriculture.

Requested conditions;

1. All existing trees, woodlands and hedges to be retained are to be protected according to the provisions of BS 5837: 2012 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations' All protective measures especially the fencing and ground protection must be put in place first, prior to any other work commencing on site (this includes vegetation clearance, ground-works, vehicle movements, machinery / materials delivery etc.) and shall thereafter be maintained in place in good functional condition until the project is entirely complete and until, with the exception of soft landscaping works, all contractors, equipment and materials have left site. The fencing shall be on the RPA margin and of the same specification as that depicted in figure 2, page 20 and ground protection as specified in 6.2.3.1 - 6.2.3.5 pages 21/22 in BS 5837: 2012.

Signs informing of the purpose of the fencing and warning of the penalties against destruction or damage to the trees and their root zones shall be installed at minimum intervals of 10 metres and a minimum of two signs per separate stretch of fencing. Once erected the local authority tree officer shall be notified so the fencing can be inspected and approved.

The Root Protection Area (RPA) within the protective fencing must be kept free of all construction, construction plant, machinery, personnel, digging and scraping, service runs, water-logging, changes in level, building materials and all other operations, personnel, structures, tools, storage and materials, for the duration of the construction phase.

The developer shall submit details of the proposed layout and general arrangements of the site in relation to the trees to be retained. In particular details of storage areas including what substances will be stored and where, locations of car parking, welfare facilities, cement plant, fuel storage and where discharge, filling and mixing of substances will take place. The details should include site levels to enable risks posed to trees to be quantified. The RPA will be amended as the arboriculture officer feels appropriate after taking account of the details submitted.

No fire shall be lit such that it is closer than 20 metres to any tree or that flames would come within 5 metres of any part of any tree.

Earthworks, level changes, service runs, foundations and all other works involving excavation should not be located within the root protection areas.

2. A detail tree protection plan and an arboricultural method statement all in accordance with BS 5837:2012 should be submitted. It should include a scale plan accurately marking the position of all the retained trees and hedges, the extent of the root protection areas, the BS 5837: 2012 tree protection fencing along the root protection area margin, any areas to be covered in BS 5837: 2012 ground protection, construction details for the BS 5837: 2012 fencing and ground protection and sufficient detail of hard & soft landscaping works, service and drainage runs and proposed & existing spot levels in sufficient numbers and at appropriate spacing's to enable the impact of the development on the tree root zones to be assessed.

3. A method statement for the execution of soft landscaping works within the root protection areas shall be submitted for approval. Before any soft landscaping operations within root protection areas are carried out, the local authority tree officer shall be notified so a site meeting can be arranged with the landscape contractor to confirm the agreed landscape working methods that will avoid root damage; this involves the use of hand tools only – machines and motorised tools will not be permitted.

4. Where appropriate construction details for areas of raised construction, nil-excavation hard surfacing, foundations etc., specifically tailored to this site context, shall be submitted for approval.

5. If construction-facilitation pruning of the trees is required, this should be carried out by a competent, qualified and experienced tree surgeon according to the provisions of BS 3998: 2010 and current arboriculture industry best practice. The Local Authority arboriculture officer shall be given a week's notice before the works are carried out so they have the opportunity to attend on site and agree the exact extent of the works with the tree surgery contractor.

6. Full details of replacement tree planting in accordance with BS 8545: 2014 to be submitted for approval as part of a general landscaping scheme where appropriate, and which should include full details of tree sizes, species, planting locations, planting spacing's, pre-planting ground preparations, planting method and long term maintenance. Also where appropriate details of root deflection barriers and permanent protective measures against soil compaction, vehicle impact, de-icing salt etc. Particular attention should be paid to ensuring the trees are planted in a sufficient quantity of high quality growing medium, to ensure their quick establishment and the early provision of maximum benefit to the locality. Tree species must be chosen to maximise biodiversity, climate change resilience and human interest. Any trees failing to thrive within five years of planting to be replaced in accordance with the original planting specification.

A1.14 MKC Archaeology Response

The archaeological trial trench evaluation detailed in the submitted report has identified defined areas of significant medieval settlement activity, including some structural remains, in the north and west of the site. The heavily truncated probable remains of the post-medieval tomb of Mark Slingsby were also located in the south-west of the site.

The archaeological remains in the above defined areas are of sufficient significance to require further mitigation, by preservation in situ (where feasible) and by a targeted programme of archaeological excavation, post-excavation assessment & analysis and publication. A broad approach to an acceptable scheme for mitigation has been discussed with the applicants archaeological consultants and should be detailed in a written scheme of investigation secured by the following recommended condition:

" Prior to the commencement of each phase/parcel of the development a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for a programme of archaeological mitigation in respect of any identified areas of significant buried archaeological remains shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. For land that is included within the WSI, no development shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed WSI, which shall include a statement of significance and research objectives; and:

- a) The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording and the nomination of a competent person(s) or organisation to undertake the agreed works;
- b) The programme for post-investigation assessment and subsequent analysis, publication & dissemination and deposition of resulting material. This part of the condition shall not be discharged until these elements have been fulfilled in accordance with the programme set out in the WSI.

Reason: To ensure the appropriate recording of any archaeological remains affected by the development in accordance with: Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy HE1 of Plan:MK. "

A1.15 MKC Development Plans

Proposal

This application is an outline application with all matters reserved except access for the demolition of the existing farm buildings on site and the development of up to 930 dwellings, including affordable housing. The proposal will also provide a 2FE primary school, local centre and open space, including 2x LEAPs and a NEAP, a sports pitch and pavilion/well-being centre. The site is located at Tickford Fields on the south eastern edge of Newport Pagnell and is allocated within the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan, as well as being a designated site for housing within Plan:MK, as shown on the Plan:MK Policies Map.

Relevant Site History

This site has no relevant planning history

Policy Context

Plan:MK 2016-2031

Principle Issues

In principle the development of this site is supported by the Development Strategy, as well as the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan. Policy DS1, The Settlement Hierarchy breaks down where development should be located, with any development in Newport Pagnell falling into the second tier, which is 'Key Settlements'. The aim of the Development Strategy is outlined in paragraph 4.29 which states that the provision of new homes and jobs from 2016-2031 will be focussed on, and adjacent to the three key settlements which are considered sustainable rural settlements. The proposal in this instance also accords with the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP1 (Preferred sites for housing developments) which to meet housing requirements allocates Tickford Fields as a suitable site for development

Regarding the housing strategy, Policy DS2 further supports the proposals. Tickford fields is identified and supported by Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP1 and Policy NP2 (Tickford Fields Development Site Specific Policy). Such developments where appropriate to the size, function and role of each settlement will be delivered through allocations in neighbourhood plans (DS2, Criterion A.6 and A.8). Policy DS2 aims to deliver a minimum of 26,500 net dwellings across the borough of Milton Keynes over the plan period of 2016-2031. The site is referenced in Appendix A as 'HS104'.

Identified below are the key criteria, pertinent to this proposal:

- '3. The completion of existing commitments as outlined in Appendix A;
6. The delivery of sites already identified in made neighbourhood plans, both within the urban and rural area of the Borough;

8. Small to medium scale development within rural and key settlements, appropriate to the size, function and role of each settlement to be delivered through allocations in neighbourhood plans currently being prepared;

13. Permitting development proposals within the defined settlement boundaries where they comply with all other relevant policies of Plan:MK and neighbourhood plans.'

Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan

The aims of Policy NP1 and NP2 are to meet the now superseded Core Strategy targets. The Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan allocates the site at Tickford Fields for housing development and thus supports the proposal.

'Policy NP1: Preferred sites for housing development – This policy states that in order to meet the needs of the Core Strategy Housing requirements and achieve a sustainable form of development, the Neighbourhood Plan Policy allocates the following sites for Housing Development:

- b. Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve Site
- c. Tickford Fields Farm East Site'

Policy NP2: Tickford Fields Development Site Specific Policy states that 'The sites of North Crawley Road Industrial Estate, Tickford Fields Farm Strategic Reserve Site and Tickford Fields Farm East shall be developed for a residential led extension to the town, with a capacity of around 1280 homes.'

'l. The development shall provide a local centre, comprising a small supermarket and other stores (with a maximum of 200sqm per store), together with parking provision prior to the occupation of the 600th dwelling or as agreed in the Masterplan. Parking provision shall be in line with Milton Keynes Council adopted parking standards.'

Paragraph 8.3.1 states that the objectives of this policy are:

'Provision of new housing to meet Core Strategy targets, together with the necessary infrastructure, housing sited in the most suitable location and developed in a sustainable manner, mix of housing, affordable housing, housing to meet resident's needs, provision of medical facilities, adequate provision of school places, improving movement into and around the town, promoting cycling, walking and ease of access for the disabled, encouraging development that strengthens sport, recreation, play and culture, and ensuring development enhances the town and maintains the heritage aspects of the town.'

Policy NP2 allocates the site for the uses proposed by the application. The policy states that there will be a capacity of 1280 homes, as well as a local centre and therefore the proposals adhere to the demands of the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan. However, there remain further detailed elements of the policy which the officer will need to assess the proposals against.

Housing

The purpose of Policy HN1 according to paragraph 7.1 in Plan:MK is to plan for a mix of housing based on demographic trends, market trends and the needs within the community, including older people and those with specific needs. The aim of doing so is to ensure there is a wide choice of high quality homes, opportunities for home ownership and to help create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Policy HN1 – Housing Mix and Density states:

‘A. Proposals for 11 or more new dwellings will be expected to provide a mix of tenure, type and size of dwellings that:

1. Reflects the Council's latest evidence of housing need and market demand;
2. Reflects the needs of different household types;
3. Avoids the over-concentration of certain types of residential development in an area’

Policy HN2 – Affordable Housing states:

‘A. Proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing. Proposals that provide greater than 31% of homes as affordable housing will be strongly supported. However, proposals consisting of 50% or more affordable housing will only be supported provided that they would maintain (or help create) a mix of housing tenures and therefore a mixed and sustainable community within the wider neighbourhood the proposal is situated in.

B. The tenure mix of affordable housing to be provided will consist of:

1. 25% of units for rent at a range of rental levels up to 80% of market rents (but at no more than Local Housing Allowance rates), under the Affordable Rent model, including approximately 5% of the total affordable provision at a level broadly equivalent to Social Rent (at the time an application is considered).
2. 6% Shared Ownership (based on a range of 25%-40% equity share).’

Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan Policy NP5 – Affordable Housing and Tenure requires at least 30% of all new housing developments on all sites of 15 dwellings or more to be affordable. This is superseded by Plan:MK which requires 11 or more.

Policy HN4 – Amenity, Accessibility and Adaptability of Homes, ensures that homes will be adaptable, accessible and flexible to meet changing needs over time. The proposed scheme will need to therefore meet the following policy requirements:

‘A. All proposals for Class C3 dwellings will be required to:

1. As a minimum, meet the Nationally Described Space Standard, unless it can be robustly demonstrated that this would not be feasible or viable.

2. Demonstrate good internal and external design that can accommodate different lifestyles and needs, and be capable of adaptation and extension to accommodate the changing needs of households over time.

B. Proposals for 11 or more new dwellings will be required, subject to viability, to provide:

1. At least 60% of all new dwellings across market and affordable tenures that are built to Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards for accessible and adaptable dwellings; the delivery of which should be distributed across market and affordable tenures.

2. At least 5% of all new market dwellings that are capable of being readily adapted to the Building Regulations part M4(3) wheelchair accessible standard.

3. At least 10% of all new affordable dwellings that are built to Building Regulations part M4(3) wheelchair accessible standard. These dwellings should include automatic fire suppression measures consistent with Building Regulations Part B.'

Retail

Policy ER14 – New Local Centres

B. 'New local centres will also be required in new residential developments of 500 dwellings or more. They should be located so that the majority of all new dwellings are within 500 metres walking distance of a Local Centre'

This is further supported by paragraph 6.57 which states:

'The original city was planned so that most residents would be within a short walking distance (500 metres) of a Local Centre; this maximises the opportunities for people to walk or cycle to facilities, particularly those without access to a car. The Council would expect that the majority of all new dwellings should be within 500 metres of a local centre, but it acknowledges this may depend on factors such as the size and detailed design of the residential area. One of the principles for new strategic urban extensions (policy SD9) is the provision of local shops and community facilities.'

The reasoning behind this policy is to ensure that in new areas, adequate facilities are provided that are accessible to as many residents as possible. Policy SD9, Criterion 2 (General Principles for Strategic Urban Extensions) states that in principle a development should provide the necessary social infrastructure, at the appropriate stage, rate and scale to support the proposed development, in accordance with an approved Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Furthermore, when considering the size of the development, and because the distance from other local centres, as well as the Newport Pagnell High Street are over a distance of 500 metres, a new local centre is therefore in line with policy, so long as it satisfies the demands of Criterion B.

Other Policies for Consideration

The purpose of Policy EH8 (Hot Food Takeaways) is to limit the easy access of fast food to school children through only allowing development of hot food takeaways at a 400m distance from the main school entrance by the most logical walking route. Milton Keynes has a rate of 32.4% overweight, or obese children aged 10-11 according to Public Health England (2014). Policy EH8 states:

‘A. Hot food takeaways (Class A5) which are proposed within close proximity to a primary or secondary school will only be permitted if the takeaway is located more than 400m from the main school entrance.

1. The 400m distance will be assessed on the most logical walking distance from the main school entrance.

B. The Council may impose conditions restricting opening hours of hot food takeaways.’

Assessment

The site at Tickford Fields falls within the development strategy and providing that it complies with the policies of the Development Plan it should be approved.

As stated above, the site complies with the settlement hierarchy, as it is identified as being a key settlement, and therefore, the site is listed in Appendix A of Plan:MK as an existing commitment. Furthermore, as this site is an existing commitment that will help to provide 930 of the required 26,500 homes, is within the defined settlement boundaries and which is already identified in a made neighbourhood plan (as this site is in Policies NP1 and NP2 of Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan) it complies with the development strategy.

To accord with the mix and typology of units on site, a condition should be imposed to ensure that the proposals meet the requirements of Policy HN1, and HN2 in terms of tenure mix. Regarding affordable housing Policy HN2 requires that 31% of the houses comprise of affordable tenures, which should form part of the heads of terms for the Section 106 agreement. The dwellings provided on site would also be expected to meet the Nationally Described Space Standard as well as meeting the targets of Policy HN4 in terms of accessibility.

The development itself needs to be planned appropriately to ensure that the main entrance of the proposed school is located at a distance greater than 400m of the most logical walking distance from any proposed hot food takeaways, if there is the potential for hot food takeaways in the local centre, otherwise policy EH8 would be contravened. The Local Centre itself needs to be located in such a place that would allow the majority of the proposed dwellings to be within 500m walking distance of it as per the set standards of ER14 to facilitate alternative means of transport such as walking and cycling.

Lastly the Newport Pagnell Neighbourhood Plan, Policy NP2 demands that all units except the supermarket, located within the Local Centre, will need to be no more than 200m².

Conclusion

In this instance, it is considered that that the principle of development is in accordance with Plan:MK and the Neighbourhood Plan, but for a recommendation of approval to be made, consideration will need to be given to the detailed policies outlined in both Plan:MK and the neighbourhood plan and to the points outlined in this response.

A1.16 MKC Countryside Officer (Great Crested Newt Officer)

Further information in relation to great crested newts and/or licensing required. The proposals involve development within 250m of ponds and cause damage/loss of terrestrial and/or aquatic habitats where great crested newts (GCN) may be present and potential harm to individual GCN.

There is a reasonable likelihood of great crested newts being present and therefore affected by the proposed development.

- The proposed development site is classified as an amber impact area for GCN under district licence mapping tools. This indicates that the development has suitable habitat for newts on site;
- Natural England Interim Guidance on District Level Licensing (January 2020) stipulates that development projects falling in the Red or Amber risk zones must demonstrate proposals do not pose a risk to GCN, or, provide detail on the methods that will be used to safeguard against such risks, which may include licensing.
- There are 3 ponds within 500m of the site boundary.
- There are 7 ponds within the site boundary as indicated by the location plan, mapping software and ecological report;
- The submitted ecological report (Aspect Ecology, April 2019) indicates that GCN are present on site, the site has terrestrial habitat suitable for GCN and a number of GCN breeding ponds;
- Connectivity of suitable habitat in the local area may provide dispersal of GCN from the surrounding area to the development site;
- The Natural England Rapid Risk Assessment Tool (GCN Method Statement WML-A14-2, November 2017) indicates that potential for an offence to GCN is highly likely at this development due to the loss of a pond and loss/damage of terrestrial habitat.

GCN and their habitats are fully protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). Therefore it is illegal to deliberately capture, injure, kill, disturb or take GCN or to damage or destroy breeding sites or resting places. Under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) it is illegal to intentionally or recklessly disturb any GCN occupying a place of shelter or protection, or to obstruct access to any place of shelter or protection (see the legislation or seek legal advice for full details). Milton Keynes Council have a statutory duty in exercising of all their functions to 'have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity', as stated under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC). As a result GCN and their habitats are a material consideration in the planning process.

Policy:

MKC could refuse permission if adequate information on protected species is not provided by an applicant, as it will be unable to assess the impacts on the species and thus meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), ODPM Circular 06/2005 or the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended). MKC has the power to request information under Article 4 of the Town and Country (Planning Applications) Regulations 1988 (SI1988.1812)(S3) which covers general information for full applications. CLG 2007 'The validation of planning applications' states that applications should not be registered if there is a requirement for an assessment of the impacts of a development on biodiversity interests.

Recommended Actions:

The following options are available:

1. An EPS site-based mitigation licence should be applied for in respect of GCN; or
3. The District Licence scheme (administered by the NatureSpace Partnership) should be applied for. Under MKC's district licence, development works that may cause impacts upon GCN can be authorised as part of the planning process.

A1.17 MKC Countryside Officer (Ecology)

Initial Consultation Response 3rd March 2020

Ecological Baseline

The ecological baseline report that was submitted as part of the ES has significant limitations. All the surveys were carried out in 2017 or 2016, these are now out-of-date and need to be repeated. The mobile nature of any protected species and potential changes on site since these were carried out mean that there could have been significant changes on site in the presence and distribution of species on site. In line with CIEEM advice (Advice Note on the Lifespan of Ecological Reports & Surveys, April 2019), any data more than three years old is unlikely to be valid and the surveys will need to be updated.

The ecological baseline provides only a baseline, the report does not include an assessment of the potential effects of the proposals on this baseline and no recommendations or mitigation for the loss of the habitat of protected species. There are confirmed bat roosts on site, which must be considered prior to determination, and the proposals will affect the habitat of otter along Chicheley Brook. Otter are also a European Protected Species and their presence and an assessment of any effects on them must be provided prior to determination. Similarly, the report does not contain any recommendations for further survey, or an indication of the lifespan of the data.

The baseline report identifies that there are seven trees with moderate potential to support roosting bats, given the time elapsed this may have changed. However, any trees with more than low potential to support roosting bats must be subject to additional survey prior to determination of the application. On this occasion, at least one emergence and a separate re-entry survey are required prior to determination, the timing of these surveys is restricted to between May and September. Additional endoscopic/climbing surveys may help in identifying if the features identified are suitable for use by bats. These surveys can be carried out at any time.

The applicant must also consider the potential effects on great crested newt, which are present on site, and I believe Andrew Irving has advised on already.

I would have expected a full Ecological Impact Assessment (following CIEEM Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK & Ireland, September 2018) to accompany this application and include an assessment of the effects on the designations (for example, the location of the sports facility immediately adjacent to Chicheley Brook Wetland Corridor, which is protected under policy NE1 and provides important habitat for bats and otter), habitats and species identified in the baseline report. This would be required prior to determination.

BIA Calculator

The Technical Briefing Note provided (Aspect 2020), includes sections of the BIA calculator. I would expect the complete calculator to be submitted in the form of a spreadsheet.

We are in agreement that the net gains that are proposed are, in principle, deliverable on-site. However, there are some issues with the information submitted that should be addressed prior to determination or through reserved matters applications in the future.

1. The BIA should be recalculated based on the outcomes of the updated ecological surveys;
2. Connectivity of habitats should be taken into account, the sports facility cuts a swathe through the “ecological opportunity area” and has the potential to affect the ecological functioning of this area, as well as affecting protected species and the wildlife corridor. I would like to see appropriate buffering of the brook and better connectivity around the sports facility;
3. The BIA will need to be updated when detailed designs and reserved matter applications are submitted, to ensure that the net gain is still achievable. The BIA calculator should also be used to inform the detailed design of any future proposals;
4. Any management plans for the site must consider the BIA calculator and proposals for biodiversity net gain and any enhancements should remain in public open space to ensure appropriate management; and
5. The proposals for net gain appear to include multi-use areas (or layering of benefits), for example creation of neutral grassland within the ecology opportunity area that will be used for leisure activities, such as kick about areas. The management of these areas for leisure activities may be incompatible with net gain and management for biodiversity. The primary purpose of areas created for biodiversity net gain is just that, the danger of multi-use areas where leisure activities

are likely to taking place is movement towards the creation and management of amenity grassland with little biodiversity value.

Second Consultation Response 3rd July 2020

Following our discussions, my advice on the best way forward is as follows:

1. Ecological Survey Validity

Whilst the ecological consultant states that the surveys are still valid, I do not accept that. The ecological baseline of a site can change in a relatively short time frame and some of the surveys are now at least three years old. Ordinarily I would expect a fully updated suite of surveys to be submitted by the applicant, however, I acknowledge that updated surveys will be required at the REM stage.

2. Ecological Baseline & Ecological Impact Assessment

I accept that the ES contains an assessment of the potential effects of the proposals on ecology. This will need to be updated at the detailed design stage.

3. Bats

There are confirmed bat roosts on site and therefore at the detailed REM stage a full up-to-date suite of bat surveys will be required. Ordinarily, these surveys should not be conditioned, but I appreciate the limitations of the current situation.

Therefore, a condition should be attached to the outline permission requiring new surveys that are dated within the 12 months prior to the application being submitted and validated. These surveys should include an assessment of the use of any trees by bats. This condition will need to be carefully worded and the surveys would be required prior to the commencement of any works on site. I would also expect the applicant to submit a copy of the EPS mitigation licence for bats when it obtained, this demonstrates that we, as LPA, have fulfilled our duties under the Conservation of Habitats & Species Regulations 2017. The applicant should also provide the details of how the use of the site by commuting and foraging bats will be protected.

4. Otter

Otter are using the Chicheley Brook on site, no evidence of holts was recorded during the surveys. These surveys must be updated at the REM stage. To prevent disturbance to otters and maintain the use of the brook by them, a buffer between the brook and any development will have to be secured by condition. This should prevent any use of the buffer during construction and once the scheme is occupied in any way that would be detrimental to the use of the brook by otter. It should be noted that I would not support the current layout in the Indicative Masterplan as the inclusion of sports pitches within the buffer zone is not acceptable.

5. Great Crested Newts

GCN are present on site and the applicant will need to decide on the approach they will take in relation to licensing at the REM stage.

6. Barn Owl

I note that evidence of barn owls has been submitted and the updated surveys should include barn owl surveys.

7. Biodiversity Impact Assessment

The complete BIA will need to be updated and submitted at the REM stage, as well as a detailed Biodiversity Enhancement Scheme including detailed management prescriptions to ensure that any net gain is maintained in perpetuity. This can be secured by a suitably worded planning condition.

Final Consultation Response 14th July 2020

Thanks for sending the draft conditions through to me. I've had a look and I am happy that they cover all the issues I raised in my advice, the only point I have to make is whether the conditions for protected species should include reference to them accompanying any REM application. It may not be an issue, and I might just be being overly picky.

A1.18 MKC Environmental Health

Contaminated Land

Ground Contamination

CONSULTEE ASSESSMENT (Detailed Consultee assessment)

I have read the Ground Conditions Desk Study report (Hydrock, Jan 2017) and I consider it to be a thorough assessment of the site. I agree with the conclusions of the report that the risk to the proposed development is low to moderate but this would need to be confirmed by an appropriate intrusive investigation, testing and assessment of the results as outlined in section 5.1. No plausible pollutant linkages that would prohibit the development or its design. However, In accordance with NPPF as the proposed use is particularly vulnerable to the presence of contamination I recommend that the following condition be applied to any grant of planning permission for this site.

RECOMMENDATION (Please draft any suggested reasons for refusal or suggested conditions including reference to relevant Planning Policy. If amendments or additional information is required please make your requirements clear)

1) Prior to any development taking place, the developer shall carry out an assessment of ground conditions to determine the likelihood of any ground, groundwater or gas contamination of the site.

The results of this survey detailing the nature and extent of any contamination, together with a strategy for any remedial action deemed necessary to bring the site to a condition suitable for its intended use, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before construction works commence.

2) Any remedial works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved strategy and validated by submission of an appropriate verification report prior to first occupation of the development.

3) Should any unforeseen contamination be encountered the Local Planning Authority shall be informed immediately. Any additional site investigation and remedial work that is required as a result of unforeseen contamination will also be carried out to the written satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the site is fit for its proposed purpose and any potential risks to human health, property, and the natural and historical environment, are appropriately investigated and minimised.

Noise

No formal written comment received, but advised condition to secure mitigation measures in the Noise Assessment.

Air Quality

have re-read the updated air quality assessment in the ES and there are no significant air quality impacts predicted for the development.

The assessment of emissions during construction (mainly dust) assumes mitigation measures will be used. The measures listed in 8.7 p167-169 of the ES can be found in the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance "Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction" published in 2014. As construction mitigation measures are site-specific it would be better to require that a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) incorporating a Dust Management Plan should be submitted prior to works commencing.

A1.19 MKC Footpath/Rights of Way Officer

KEY CONSIDERATIONS (These should relate solely to your specialist area of advice and be in bullet point form as a summary)

1. The application outlines a diversion of Newport Pagnell Footpath 10 as part of the proposal. This will require a formal legal process to be undertaken through the Rights of Way team.
2. The nature and setting of Newport Pagnell Footpath 15 will be changed with implications for the current footpath infrastructure in place.
3. A narrow bridge is at the development boundary. An assessment of the structure is required.
4. A redway is proposed either alongside or on top of the route of Newport Pagnell Footpath 15. The specific details of how a redway and the public footpath can co-exist need to be clarified.

CONSULTEE ASSESSMENT (Detailed Consultee assessment)

1. The Design and Access Statement set out that a section of Newport Pagnell Footpath 10 is proposed to be diverted. This would require a Public Path Order. A diversion can be applied for either under s119 Highways Act 1980, or under s257 Town and Country Planning Act 1990. An application can only be made under the Town and Country Planning Act "to allow development to take place". However, the applicant has not made it clear whether this diversion is required because development will take place along the existing line. The plans indicate that the existing route will remain unbuilt on. In the Design and Access Statement the applicant has suggested that Newport Pagnell Footpath 10 could be diverted into the area of green space and also the local centre, "Diverted footpath - there is a potential

for diverting a short section of the existing footpath FP10, so it is re-routed away from the recycling centre and towards the more attractive setting of green open spaces, a play area and the local centre". Whilst I would be supportive of a Public Footpath travelling through open green space, it is not clear whether it is necessary to divert the existing Public Footpath to achieve this, or whether the proposed new route could be a leisure route with no formal designation, or alternatively an additional Public Footpath being designated.

The applicant needs to be aware that diversion applications are subject to public consultation.

2. Newport Pagnell Footpath 15 is currently a public footpath with several features along its route including kissing gates and a stile. Gates and stiles should only be in place for stock-proofing purposes, so are unlikely to be required in the new development.

3. There is a bridge structure at grid reference 489046 243954 on Newport Pagnell Footpath 15, on the edge of the sports facility area of the proposal, at the development boundary. This structure has a narrow width of approximately 70cm with a parapet constructed of key clamp. Whilst the bridge may currently be fit for its purpose of linking two rural fields, with limited usage, the scale of the development means that it would unlikely be inappropriate to accommodate the increased usage it will receive following development. An assessment is required.

4. The Design and Access Statement show that a redway is proposed in the vicinity of Newport Pagnell Footpath 15. It is not clear whether it is intended that the redway runs adjacent to the Public Footpath, or directly on top of it.

The Public Footpath has a minimum width of 1.5m.

It is illegal to cycle on a Public Footpath, and any Public Right of Way has much stronger legal protection than a redway, which has no legal status. Changing a natural surface to a hard surface path, shared with cyclists would change the character of the Public Footpath. Therefore, if widths allow it is advised that the Public Footpath remains as a natural surface and that the redway is provided adjacent to it with a buffer strip in between.

RECOMMENDATION (Please draft any suggested reasons for refusal or suggested conditions including reference to relevant Planning Policy. If amendments or additional information is required please make your requirements clear)

1. The applicant should contact the MKC Rights of Way team to discuss the potential diversion of Newport Pagnell Footpath 10, so an understanding of timeframes and processes can be discussed.

2. Discussion is required between the applicant and the Rights of Way team regarding the existing footpath infrastructure on the ground. The removal of the gates and stile would create a more open and accessible footpath which is advised.

3. The bridge on Newport Pagnell Footpath 15 is assessed and likely replaced with a structure more appropriate for scale of the development proposed and anticipated usage.

4. Clarification is required regarding the redway proposed at Newport Pagnell Footpath 15. It is recommended that the footpath is retained as a natural surface and the redway is provided parallel to it with a buffer strip in between. A minimum width of 1.5 metres is required for the footpath.

A1.20 MKC Housing Strategy

Milton Keynes Council Local Plan Priority Housing Policy H2, Affordable Housing Policies H3-H5, Housing Mix Policy H9

Milton Keynes Core Strategy adopted July 2013 Policy CS10 Housing Plan:MK, Approved April 2019, Policy HN1 Housing Mix and Density & Policy HN2 Affordable Housing (<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/plan-mk>)

MKC Affordable Housing SPD January 2020

The Council's Plan 2016-20 approved at Council 8 June 2016

KEY CONSIDERATIONS (These should relate solely to your specialist area of advice and be in bullet point form as a summary)

- Development should provide 31% Affordable Housing in line with Plan:MK unless an MKDP site which requires more
- At least 10% of affordable housing must be built to Building Regulations Part M4(3) wheelchair accessible standard.

CONSULTEE ASSESSMENT (Detailed Consultee assessment)

The Council's Plan 2016-20 approved at Council 8 June 2016 has the Key Priority: "Growth and Affordable Housing – securing the future of Milton Keynes by continuing to support Plan:MK and supporting the aspiration that MK should grow to a population of 500,000 and beyond by 2050". As per Policy HN2 (Affordable Housing) of Plan:MK any development that proposes for 11 or more homes should provide at least 31% affordable housing.

The policy states a tenure mix of affordable housing will consist of approximately:

- 20% of units under the Affordable Rent model (up to 80% of market rents) or Local Housing Allowance (whichever is lower);
- 5% of units at a level broadly equivalent to Social Rent; and
- 6% Shared Ownership (based on a range of 25% - 40% equity share in order to be classed as Affordable Housing).

However, we do note that there was agreement to revise the tenure mix to:

- 16% of units under the Affordable Rent model (up to 80% of market rents) or Local Housing Allowance (whichever is lower);
- 5% of units at a level broadly equivalent to Social Rent; and

- 10% Shared Ownership (based on a range of 25% - 40% equity share in order to be classed as Affordable Housing).

For this development the affordable housing we would expect to see is 289 units to be compliant. These should be:

- 149 as affordable rent
- 47 as social rent
- 93 shared ownership

Any proposed Affordable Housing house size mix should be in line with current affordable housing need and policy; predominantly 3 bed and 2 bed, then 1 bed and 4 bed properties, as appropriate for the site and development.

The 2017 SHMA indicates that only 9.8% & 8.5% respectively of the 8,200 affordable housing needed between 2016 and 2031 should be one-bed and two-bed flats. Instead, the need is predominantly for 3 and 2 bed houses as the table below shows:

Table 1: Expected Market Sale and Affordable Housing tenure

Type	Size	Affordable housing Expected	Aff Hsg Expected	Market housing	Mrkt Hsg
Flat	1 bed	9.8% 28	0.5% 3		
	2+ bed	8.5% 25	1.1% 7		
House	2 bed	32.9% 95	10.9% 70		
	3 bed	37.8% 109	57.4% 368		
	4 bed	8.5% 25	24.6% 158		
	5 bed	2.4% 7	5.5% 35		
	100%	289	100%	641	

We would like to see the affordable units dispersed throughout the site and integrated with the market housing to promote community cohesion & tenure blindness. We do not want clusters of more than 12 affordable units.

We expect the affordable housing to be let in accordance with the Council's allocation scheme and enforced through an agreed nominations agreement with the Council.

Any variance to the mix as required and detailed in the SHMA may need to be assessed through a viability assessment and against all other material planning considerations.

Accessibility & Adaptability of Homes

As per policy HN4 of Plan:MK, further to requirements for 60% of all new dwellings to be built to Building Regulations Part M4(2) standards for accessible and adaptable dwellings, at least 10% of all new affordable homes must be built to Building regulations part M4(3) wheelchair accessible standard.

RECOMMENDATION (Please draft any suggested reasons for refusal or suggested conditions including reference to relevant Planning Policy. If amendments or additional information is required please make your requirements clear)

The Development needs to comply with Plan:MK (2019) and further that a condition be added to ensure the housing mix is provided at outline stage and/or secure it by condition if it has been provided and agreed.

Strategic Housing welcome early discussion of the tenure mix with the Developer.

We are hopeful that as we encourage more Affordable Housing from our own property, we would hope that we would be the first to be approached in regards to any excess properties for Affordable Housing over and above the 31%.

A1.21 MKC Economic Development

No response received

A1.22 MKC Waste Disposal

when will we receive the waste management sum?

Can this be at commencement of the works so that we can get on with putting in the queuing system as soon as the development commences ?

A1.23 MKC Travel Planner

The Framework Travel Plan for the proposed Tickford Farm Fields development covers most of the elements for a framework travel plan. There are some positive plans in place, however, there are a number of comments and queries listed below which the developer is requested to consider and subsequently include in their Travel Plan.

Development Proposals

There is mention that there will be a new primary school and a local centre on the site. New school builds will require a separate travel plan producing for the school site. The local centre on the site will help residents reduce the need to travel. It is difficult to comment on the need for a travel plan without knowing the full details of what facilities will be located on the proposed site. However a travel plan will be required if the class of business meets the required thresholds.

Policy and Planning framework

There is background provided on transport policy, however, there is no mention of Plan MK or the Milton Keynes Core Strategy. Neither is there mention of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Access to Services

It is positive that the travel plan has included information about the length of time it takes to walk to local services, however the plan states that an acceptable walking distance is 2 miles, whereas in reality acceptable walking distances are much lower,

the desirable distance being 400m, acceptable 800m and preferred maximum 1200m.

Travel Plan Management

It is positive to see a target to reduce single occupancy vehicle journeys. Survey results must be sent to Milton Keynes Council and targets must be agreed. The measures included in the Travel Plan must be robust enough to ensure the targets can be met.

Action plan

In the final travel plan a detailed action plan must be included providing details of actions, costs, persons responsible, dates for actions should be given to ensure they are undertaken at specified times and not overlooked. All measures in the travel plan should be carried through and be included in the action plan.

Travel Plan Co-Ordinator

It is positive to see that there is a commitment for Travel Plan Co-Ordinator to be in place to manage the process of promoting and monitoring the Travel Plan. Information should be included about how much time will be allocated to the role, this must be enough to be able to carry out all travel plan activities and monitoring tasks. The details of the Travel Plan Co-Ordinator must be shared with Milton Keynes Council. To ensure consistency the Travel Plan Co-Ordinator should remain in place for a minimum of 5 years post occupation of the final stage of the development in order to manage the monitoring of the travel plan.

In addition Milton Keynes Council asks for monitoring of developments annually for the first five years of occupation and then biennially thereafter, meaning contact will need to be maintained on a long term basis. Milton Keynes Council's preferred method of monitoring travel plans is through the Modeshift Starsfor online platform www.starsfor.org

Parking Standards

The Travel Plan mentions that the MKC parking standards will be considered, the plan later does mention that cycle parking will be dependent on the property style, however cycle parking will also need to adhere to MKC parking standards.

Travel Plan Measures

Residents welcome pack – it is good to see a Welcome Pack will be provided to each household. A journey planner is mentioned, it is worth noting here that the council supports its own website for travel in and around MK, including a journey planner www.getsmartertravelmk.org The welcome pack will need to be submitted to MKC for approval before being delivered to households.

Personalised Travel Planning – it is encouraging to see included within the Travel Plan. It would be useful to explain how the travel plan coordinator will be trained in order to know how to provide the travel advice residents will need.

Electric Vehicle charge points – It is difficult to comment without knowing the types of local services, however, consideration for EV charge points at local services should be given. The full travel plan should give more details about this.

Bike share – Again, it is difficult to comment without understanding what local services will be provided but consideration should be given as to whether this is an appropriate location for any bike hire/share options. An action to investigate this should be included in the Travel Plan.

Conclusion

The recommendations suggested above should be included in the travel plan. A condition is suggested to be placed on the application as detailed below;

No part of the development shall be occupied until a Travel Plan has been submitted and approved. Within three months of occupation of the development a Travel Plan Coordinator shall be nominated to manage the Travel Plan. The plan shall be produced utilising the Starsfor online platform. The approved full travel plan shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable and targets contained within and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied with a minimum of annual reporting for the first five years, biennially thereafter.

A1.24 Health Safety Executive

No comments received

A1.25 Central Bedfordshire Council

Firstly thank you for consulting us; Central Bedfordshire Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the application. We recognise the need for both Councils to work together on cross boundary issues raised by growth within Milton Keynes and Central Bedfordshire moving forward, including matters of infrastructure and Section 106 contributions.

We note that the site is in very close proximity to the Milton Keynes East allocation, yet the application documents do not appear to adequately consider the cumulative impact of the proposed development with the allocation. In particular, we are concerned that the Transport Assessment only considers localised consented development and a growth factor and does not appear to consider the allocation.

We feel that it is crucial that Highways England and CBC's highways officers are fully engaged in conversations about the cumulative impacts of the development and the Milton Keynes East allocation on both the strategic highway network and the highway network within Central Bedfordshire, with identified negative impacts being suitably mitigated.

We note that the Transport Assessment is showing a very small proportion of trips utilising the route east towards the CBC area, however, it is unclear whether the work makes any assumptions on rerouting of traffic on rural routes to avoid the M1 for east bound journeys to Bedford or Cambridge for example. We would appreciate clarification on this point.

We also request that control is placed on HGV/ construction traffic to ensure that only strategic routes are used for. For example, we wish to ensure that North Crawley Road East towards Cranfield is not used as an alternative route to the A421

A1.26 Northamptonshire County Council

No comments received

A1.27 Bedford Borough Council

No comments received

A1.28 Anglian Water

ASSETS

Section 1 - Assets Affected

There are assets owned by Anglian Water or those subject to an adoption agreement within or close to the development boundary that may affect the layout of the site. Anglian Water would ask that the following text be included within your Notice should permission be granted.

Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement.

Therefore the site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then the sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.

WASTEWATER SERVICES

Section 2 - Wastewater Treatment

The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Cotton Valley Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows

Planning Report

Section 3 - Used Water Network

Development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding downstream. Anglian Water will need to plan effectively for the proposed development, if permission is granted. We will need to work with the applicant to ensure any infrastructure improvements are delivered in line with the development. A full assessment cannot be made due to lack of information, the applicant has not identified a connection point to the Anglian Water network. We therefore request a condition requiring an on-site drainage strategy. (1) INFORMATIVE - Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act Approval and consent will be required by Anglian Water, under the Water Industry Act 1991. Contact Development Services Team 0345 606 6087. (2) INFORMATIVE -

Protection of existing assets - A public sewer is shown on record plans within the land identified for the proposed development. It appears that development proposals will affect existing public sewers. It is recommended that the applicant contacts Anglian Water Development Services Team for further advice on this matter. Building over existing public sewers will not be permitted (without agreement) from Anglian Water.

(3) INFORMATIVE - Building

near to a public sewer - No building will be permitted within the statutory easement width of 3 metres from the pipeline without agreement from Anglian Water. Please contact Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087. (4)

INFORMATIVE: The developer should note that the site drainage details submitted have not been approved for the purposes of adoption. If the developer wishes to have the sewers included in a sewer adoption agreement with Anglian Water (under Sections 104 of the Water Industry Act 1991), they should contact our Development Services Team on 0345 606 6087 at the earliest opportunity. Sewers intended for adoption should be designed and constructed in accordance with Sewers for Adoption guide for developers, as supplemented by Anglian Water's requirements.

Section 4 - Surface Water Disposal

The preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to sewer seen as the last option. Building Regulations (part H) on Drainage and Waste Disposal for England includes a surface water drainage hierarchy, with infiltration on site as the preferred disposal option, followed by discharge to watercourse and then connection to a sewer.

This response has been based on the following submitted documents: Flood Risk Assessment From the details submitted to support the planning application the proposed method of surface water management does not relate to Anglian Water operated assets. As such, we are unable to provide comments on the suitability of the surface water management. The Local Planning Authority should seek the advice of the Lead Local Flood Authority or the Internal Drainage Board. The Environment Agency should be consulted if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse. Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an effective surface water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.

Section 5 - Suggested Planning Conditions

Anglian Water would therefore recommend the following planning condition if the Local Planning Authority is mindful to grant planning approval.

Used Water Sewerage Network (Section 3)

Condition Prior to the construction above damp proof course, a scheme for on-site foul water drainage works, including connection point and discharge rate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning

Authority. Prior to the occupation of any phase, the foul water drainage works relating to that phase must have

been carried out in complete accordance with the approved scheme. Reason To prevent environmental and

amenity problems arising from flooding

Planning Report

FOR THE ATTENTION OF THE APPLICANT - if Section 3 or Section 4 condition has

been recommended above, please see below information:

Next steps

Desktop analysis has suggested that the proposed development will lead to an unacceptable risk of flooding

downstream. We therefore highly recommend that you engage with Anglian Water at your earliest convenience to

develop in consultation with us a feasible drainage strategy.

If you have not done so already, we recommend that you submit a Pre-planning enquiry with our Pre-Development

team. This can be completed online at our website <http://www.anglianwater.co.uk/developers/pre-development.aspx>

Once submitted, we will work with you in developing a feasible mitigation solution.

If a foul or surface water condition is applied by the Local Planning Authority to the Decision Notice, we will require a

copy of the following information prior to recommending discharging the condition:

Foul water:

Feasible drainage strategy agreed with Anglian Water detailing the discharge solution including:

Development size

Proposed discharge rate (Should you require a pumped connection, please note that our minimum pumped

discharge rate is 3.8l/s)

Connecting manhole discharge location (No connections can be made into a public rising main)

Notification of intention to connect to the public sewer under S106 of the Water Industry Act (More information

can be found on our website)

Feasible mitigation strategy in agreement with Anglian Water (if required)

A1.29 Ramblers

have quickly looked through some of the documents and have the following comment at this stage.

The application form states that there will be no diversions to public rights of way. Footpath 10 runs along south-west boundary and footpath 15 runs through proposed site. The access and design statement mentions a possible short diversion of

footpath 10 and a redway by the route of footpath 15. A redway would change the usage and character of a footpath and may not be a suitable option.

A1.30 Beds, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust

No comments received

A1.31 Anglian Water

No objection subject to appropriate conditions and informatives.

A1.32 Bedford Internal Drainage Board

You are advised that this site is outside the Board's district, in this instance the Board has no comment to make.

A1.33 British Pipeline Agency

Thank you for your correspondence enclosing details of your proposals as listed above. We are not aware that any of BPA Pipelines apparatus, falls within the vicinity of the above noted location.

A1.34 Buckingham and River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board

No comments received

A1.35 Canal and River Trust

The Canal & River Trust is a statutory consultee under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The current notified area applicable to consultations with us, in our capacity as a Statutory Consultee was issued to Local Planning Authorities in 2011 under the organisations former name, British Waterways. The 2011 issue introduced a notified area for household and minor scale development and a notified area for EIA and major scale development.

This application falls outside the notified area for its application scale. We are therefore returning this application to you as there is no requirement for you to consult us in our capacity as a Statutory Consultee.

A1.36 Crime Prevention Design Advisor

Whilst I do not wish to object to the outline application, I make the following comments in the interest of creating safe and accessible environments with minimal crime and disorder.

I am disappointed to see that there is little to no mention of crime prevention in the DAS. I would hope the applicant intends to meet with Secured by Design standards. The following has been noted "DAS Layout 6.20 The indicative configuration of streets and structure of parcels take into consideration the principles of passive surveillance and overlooking, with plots fronting the public realm, enhancing the

sense of security.” I would hope to see in any indicative layout plan the use of back to back gardens, and where possible all side elevations of dwellings including a ground floor active room window to allow surveillance over carparking as well as over the site as a whole.

I would ask that the applicant is conditioned to build schools, local centre, dwellings, play areas, public centres to the appropriate Secured by design standard. Further design guides and best practice, utilising the principles of CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design), can be found on the Secured By Design website. <https://www.securedbydesign.com/guidance/design-guides>

Please find below Input from the Thames Valley Police Traffic Management Officer With reference to the proposal of 930 dwellings being primarily accessed from two connecting roads leading onto the North Crawley Road, Newport Pagnell the collision history has been checked for the five year period 1/8/2014 – 31/7/19 which show no slight, serious or fatal collisions along this length to the junction with London road in Newport Pagnell to the west and to the overbridge over the A509 towards the village of North Crawley to the east.

The accesses are currently being shown within a 40mph speed limit and would need to be reduced to 30mph bearing in mind the size of the development and number of vehicle movements in these locations. In order to reduce speeds at there would be a requirement for some form of physical measures to be provided along the affected length of carriageway to gain the required degree of compliance for this reduced speed limit.

The existing 30mph limit commences just prior to the exit point to the refuse disposal site along the North Crawley Road where the road environment changes to a more urban environment which will need to be extended together with the reduction in the speed limit.

The comments above are made on behalf of Thames Valley Police. I hope that you find my comments of assistance in determining the application and if you or the applicants have any queries relating to crime prevention design in the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact me.

A1.37 Environment Agency

Initial Consultation Response (13/02/2020)

Environment Agency position

In the absence of an acceptable Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) we object to this application and recommend that planning permission is refused.

Reason(s)

The submitted FRA does not comply with the requirements for site-specific flood risk assessments, as set out in paragraphs 30 to 32 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the planning practice guidance. The FRA does not provided sufficient evidence to support its conclusions. In particular, the FRA fails to provide:

The model files so that the model quality can be confirmed

Details of how the development has sought to reduce overall flood risk

Advice to LPA / Applicant

The proposed development has utilised a bespoke flood model to determine the areas at risk of flooding onsite. The majority of the built development is being proposed outside of the 0.1% Annual Exceedance Probability (the chance of an event occurring in any one year) floodplain. However, some sections indicate that development parcels will be placed directly adjacent to the floodplain. This requires the modelling to contain very small level of uncertainty. To help us determine whether the current layout is supported by an accurate evidence base, we will need to review the model.

We are concerned, that given the scale of the development, no options for reducing overall flood risk have been discussed and enacted within the proposals. Part B of the Exception Test (paragraph 160 of the NPPF) states the development should, where possible, reduce flood risk overall. Given the scale of surface water drainage network and the presence of watercourses within the site, there should be options to achieve flood risk reductions post development.

The FRA identifies (section 4.3.7) that the area of Flood Zone 2 that surrounds the smaller ordinary watercourse is likely the result of a blockage. This residual risk has not been investigated further within the FRA. Although a sequential approach has been taken to avoid this area, it may impact the drainage of the site if another blockage occurs.

Overcoming our objection

To overcome our objection, the applicant should submit a revised FRA which addresses the points highlighted above.

If this cannot be achieved, we are likely to maintain our objection. Please consult us on any revised FRA and we will respond within 21 days of receiving it.

A1.38 Highways England

No comments received

A1.39 Natural England

Based on the plans submitted, Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designated sites and has no objection.

A1.40 RSPB

No comments received

A1.41 Cranfield Airport

No comments received

A1.42 Historic England

On the basis of the information provided, we do not consider that it is necessary for this application to be notified to Historic England under the relevant statutory provisions, details of which are attached.

If you consider that this application does fall within one of the relevant categories, or you have other reasons for seeking our advice, please contact us to discuss your request. If we do not hear from you within five working days we will assume this application should not have been sent to us.

A1.43 Third Party Representations and Petition

Comments have been received from 16 addresses/neighbours and a petition signed by 85 people, which relates specifically to the Morello Way access.

The material planning considerations raised are summarised below and will be addressed in the relevant section of the report:

Traffic and Parking

- Morello Way Access- the proposed development would have a significant number of cars and household and as the only access with a roundabout and first access point will become a priority access and a rat run. Residents are not convinced by proposed traffic calming measures mentioned by local Councillors.
- Tickford Mews loss of access- Tickford Mews consist of just over 70 dwellings and the only area of soft landscape will be lost through creation of the new access. This area is used by adults and children for recreation and provides visual amenity, location for wildlife, etc.
- Traffic Generation & Road Access - North Crawley Road, additional harmful impact
- School Safety/Parking - Lack of safety planning for crossing North Crawley Road to reach new school.
- Recycling Centre – traffic backs up leading to limited to Morello Way and the development will exacerbate this.
- Newport Pagnell Town Centre – extra provision is required to satisfy extra demand this will place on parking spaces.

Other Considerations

- Drainage/Flooding
- Overlooking/light pollution
- Wildlife
- Overdevelopment
- Public Rights of Way
- Visual Impacts