

Zammit, John

From: Andrew Thomas [andrewthomas@homecall.co.uk]
Sent: 08 December 2009 12:54
To: Wilson, Bob; Galloway, Mike
Cc: Hopkins, David; White, Brian; Fenwick, Nick; Lane, Gavin; Zammit, John; Mike LeRoy
Subject: Re: LDF Core Strategy (Submission draft) - Observations from MK Forum to the LDFAG [1]

Bob

Thank you for your letter of 7th December in which you aimed to address MK Forum's concerns about CMK in the Core Strategy. We are keen to reach a resolution with you, but your letter does not convince us. If we cannot reach agreement before the meeting of the LDF Advisory Group, now to be held on 15 December, and if your letter is to be put before Members at that meeting, we would appreciate it being made clear that, regrettably, your explanation has not answered our concerns.

However we are pleased to hear that our suggestion that 'transport' be added to the list of key issues in the front of the Core Strategy, is being taken up.

Many of the statements in your letter concentrate on factors that are quite marginal in their overall effect on magnitude. The table you provide is out of context in that its origin predates the policies now adopted in the Local Plan. However, most puzzling of all, is your reference to the increasing need [over time] to reserve the majority of public parking for short stay uses not being the policy of the Council and only an assumption by the Forum. We obtained our information from Chapter 8 of the CMK Development Framework, principally the sections headed 'managing parking use' and 'short stay parking'.

We could continue to go point by point through your letter and explain what further concerns these raise, but we don't think this would prove a productive way forward for members, so we suggest an alternative approach.

We have expressed our concern that the Core Strategy does not show sufficient awareness of the sheer scale of the shift in transport that must take place if its vision for CMK is to be realised. The facts and figures that have been made available to us now and over the past couple of years simply have not provided a clear basis for knowing that the plan is achievable at the critical dates of 2026 and 2031. What would provide greater clarity would be the following kinds of information at each of three dates, a base year (say 2009), 2026 and 2031:

1. Number of employees in CMK;
2. Total number of parking spaces (both public and private) available for CMK workers;
3. Numbers of other publicly accessible parking spaces available for alternative purposes, such as: outward commuting; shopping; leisure and recreation, etc;
4. Number of CMK workers who would arrive without a car (car or public transport passengers, cyclists, walkers) over the morning peak;
5. Number of people arriving for work during the morning peak travelling by public transport;
6. Number of buses required to reach CMK during the morning peak to provide for all those requiring public transport (a range of bus numbers, allowing for different size

buses); and

7. Volumes of traffic over the morning peak (including: employees' cars; shoppers' cars; taxis and PHVs, outward commuters' cars; motorbikes; cyclists; service vehicles; buses/public transport and vehicles undertaking journeys to schools) in relation to the capacities of the roads and junctions forming the grid road boxes around and crossing through CMK.

In the absence of information along these lines, we do not see how you can have confidence that the scale of intensification of CMK development and employment proposed, can be achieved. A key issue is the scale of growth in public transport provision required, as so much depends on this.

Thank you for your continued good grace in responding to our concerns. We look forward to hearing from you prior to the next meeting of the advisory group.

Regards,

Andrew Thomas & Mike LeRoy
For the MK Forum Committee

----- Original Message -----

From: [Wilson, Bob](#)

To: [Andrew Thomas](#) ; [Galloway, Mike](#)

Cc: [Hopkins, David](#) ; [White, Brian](#) ; [Fenwick, Nick](#) ; [Lane, Gavin](#) ; [Zammit, John](#)

Sent: Monday, December 07, 2009 11:00 AM

Subject: RE: LDF Core Strategy (Submission draft) - Observations from MK Forum to the LDFAG

Dear Andrew,

Please see the reply to your letter submitted to Councillor M Galloway on behalf of the Forum. Councillor Galloway has agreed this letter and asked me to reply on his behalf. I will ask the Committee section to ensure this reply is available for the next meeting of the Local Development Framework Advisory Group. As explained in the letter, if you would like a meeting to discuss this please let me know as soon as possible.

R Wilson
Development Plans Manager

From: Andrew Thomas [<mailto:andrewthomas@homecall.co.uk>]

Sent: 23 November 2009 13:47

To: Galloway, Mike

Cc: Hopkins, David; White, Brian; Wilson, Bob; Fenwick, Nick; Lane, Gavin

Subject: LDF Core Strategy (Submission draft) - Observations from MK Forum to the LDFAG

Councillor Galloway

At that meeting of the LDF Advisory Group it was suggested that Mike LeRoy and I would arrange to meet with your officers so we could achieve a mutual understanding with them about the scale of the challenge for the development of Central Milton Keynes (CMK).

The matter has been further discussed at the Forum committee on 19 November. We had hoped that we could meet with your officers within days, so that they would be in a position to advise you prior to the intended Cabinet decision to approve the Core Strategy on 24th November. Unfortunately, officers are unable to meet us until after that date, so we are now sending them the attached note instead, requesting that your officers respond to us in writing.

We are concerned that the Core Strategy does not adequately address the scale of proposed future development for CMK and is therefore vulnerable to challenge as to its soundness on a fundamental issue. Our letter to you setting out those concerns is attached and copied to Councillors Hopkins and White and to officers.

Regards

Andrew Thomas
Secretary MK Forum