

# **STRATEGIC PLACEMAKING SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY 21 MARCH 2019**

**6.00 PM**

**SUITE 1.05/06  
CIVIC, CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES**

## **Members of the Committee:**

Councillor: Bint (Chair)

Councillors: Two Conservative, two Labour and one Liberal Democrat representatives (to be advised)

If you have any enquires about this agenda please contact Shelagh Muir (Committee Manager) on 01908 254271 or e-mail: [shelagh.muir@milton-keynes.gov.uk](mailto:shelagh.muir@milton-keynes.gov.uk)

## **Health and Safety**

Please take a few moments to familiarise yourself with the nearest available fire exit, indicated by the fire evacuation signs. In the event of an alarm sounding during the meeting you must evacuate the building immediately and follow all instructions provided by the fire evacuation officer who will identify him/herself should the alarm sound. You will be assisted to the nearest designated assembly point until it is safe to return to the building.

## **Mobile Phones**

Please ensure that your mobile phone is switched to silent or is switched off completely during the meeting.

## **Agenda**

Agendas and reports for the majority of the Council's public meetings can be accessed via the Internet at: <http://milton-keynes.cmis.uk.com/milton-keynes/> Wi Fi access is available in all Council meeting rooms.

Users of Windows 7 and above can simply click the link to any documents you wish to see. Users of Windows XP will need to right click on the link and select 'open in browser'.

## **Recording of Meetings**

The proceedings at this meeting may be recorded for the purpose of preparing the minutes of the meeting.

In accordance with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, you can film, photograph, record or use social media at any Council meetings that are open to the public. If you are reporting the proceedings, please respect other members of the public at the meeting who do not want to be filmed. You should also not conduct the reporting so that it disrupts the good order and conduct of the meeting. While you do not need permission, you can contact the Council's staff in advance of the meeting to discuss facilities for reporting the proceedings and a contact is included on the front of the agenda, or you can liaise with staff at the meeting.

Guidance from the Department for Communities and Local Government can be viewed at the following link:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/343182/140812\\_Openness\\_Guide.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/343182/140812_Openness_Guide.pdf)

## **Comments, Complaints and Compliments**

Milton Keynes Council welcomes comments, complaints and compliments from members of the public in order to make its services as efficient and effective as possible. We would appreciate any suggestions regarding the usefulness of the paperwork for this meeting, or the conduct of the meeting you have attended. Please e-mail your comments to [meetings@milton-keynes.gov.uk](mailto:meetings@milton-keynes.gov.uk)

If you require a response please leave contact details, ideally including an e-mail address. A formal complaints / compliments form is available online at <http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/complaints/>

## AGENDA

### 1. **Welcome and Introductions**

The Chair to welcome councillors, officer colleagues and members of the public to the meeting and introduce those present.

### 2. **Apologies**

### 3. **Minutes**

To approve, and the Chair to sign as correct records, the Minutes of the meetings of the Strategic Placemaking Scrutiny Sub-Committee held on 20 September 2018 (Item 3(a)) (**Pages 8 to 10**) and 23 October 2018 (Item 3(b)) (**Pages 11 to 14**).

### 4. **Disclosure of Interests**

Councillors to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests, or personal interests (including other pecuniary interests), they may have in the business to be transacted, and officers to disclose any interests they may have in any contract to be considered:

### 5. **Call-In of Delegated Decision - 26 February 2019: Campbell Park Northside Development Brief**

The Chair to outline the procedure to be followed at the meeting.

At the Delegated Decision meeting held on 26 February 2019, the following decision in respect of the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief was made:

- “1. That the proposed changes to the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief arising from the public consultation be agreed.
2. That the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief be approved.”

A copy of the report considered by the Cabinet member is attached at Item 5(a) (**Pages 15 to 22**).

This decision has been called-in by Central Milton Keynes Town Council, the Town Council’s submission is detailed below:

#### **Submission from Central Milton Keynes Town Council**

“CMK Town Council requests the call-in of the delegated decision to approve the “Campbell Park Northside Development Brief” made on 26 February 2019 by the Cabinet-member for Customer Services.

#### **Background**

The Town Council’s key concerns are the safety of the highway and the high likelihood of adversely affecting public transport by changes that the Development Brief appears to allow or even encourage to the infrastructure along Silbury Boulevard, Overgate and Skeldon Gate.

CMK, including Campbell Park, is served by its Gates and Boulevards, with the CMK road hierarchy classifying ‘gates’ as district distributor roads and ‘boulevards’ as local distributor roads. Place-making principles in Plan:MK require that:

- new development proposals should aim to protect and enhance the existing redways in the Borough; and
- layouts must include direct, convenient and safe public transport routes and be free of obstructive parking.

Silbury Boulevard north of Campbell Park is a major public transport route. Over half of all bus routes in Milton Keynes (ie over 50 buses an hour) use it to access the city centre. In addition, it is the main route taken by regional shoppers driving from Junction 14 to the new John Lewis MSCP with 1400 parking spaces. Importantly, Silbury Boulevard along the length of Campbell Park and the development site is a single carriageway, not a dual carriageway, so the risk of congestion is high.

Any delivery vehicle, taxi or private car stopping at the kerb - even for “just a minute” to drop-off or pick-up - will cause delays on this major public transport route. Currently this does not happen in most of CMK and Campbell Park because the ‘parking areas’ (which the Development Corporation called the ‘slow streets’) are used, thereby keeping the Boulevards and Gates free-flowing. Underpasses and overbridges also remove delays normally caused by at-grade pedestrian crossings in more traditional cities.

#### **Reasons for call-in:**

The Development Brief allows, and even encourages, the developer to:

1. Create at-grade pedestrian crossings of Skeldon Gate and Overgate. The Brief needs to be amended to make it clear that at-grade crossings of the Gates are not acceptable.
2. Design developments that directly front the Gates and Boulevard, including pedestrian pavements next to the carriageway and new developments. The Brief needs to be amended to make clear that developments should NOT directly front the Gates or Boulevard.
3. Build over the ‘slow streets’ and the rows of parking along Silbury Boulevard. The Brief needs to be amended to retain the existing infrastructure that prevents delays and congestion forming on the Boulevard (by providing access to the slow streets away from public transport routes).

Requested amendments to the Development Brief are attached at Item 5(b) **(Pages 23 to 24).**”

The decision has also been called-In by twenty members of the public represented by MK Forum. The reasons given are:

#### **“Background**

Milton Keynes is still expanding and, if our ambitions to grow to a city of 500,000 residents are realised, we have to be in a position to attract high quality companies to come here and provide appropriate employment opportunities.

City building is a complex art that combines skill, endeavour and, to a certain extent, luck and the history of the development of Milton Keynes since its designation as a New Town in 1967 is not necessarily fully understood by those who did not have detailed involvement in the project, particularly during the life of the Development Corporation.

The growth of the city has been underpinned by a series of major corporate relocations and expansions - some by companies that are still here, and others by ones that have either moved away or subsequently ceased to exist, for whatever reason. These collectively include:

- Open University (Walton Hall): university.
- Hoechst (now MSD Animal Health) (Walton Manor): research centre.
- EDS - Scicon (initially Kiln Farm and then Wavendon Tower): computer centre and offices.
- Unisys (Fox Milne): European Training Centre and warehouse.
- Pharmacia (now Pfizer) (CMK and then Knowlhill): offices and warehouse.
- Abbey National (now Banco Santander) (CMK, Bletchley and Shenley Wood): offices and computer centres.
- Sentry Assurance (CMK – Sentry House): offices.
- Stone and Webster (CMK – Station Building): offices.
- Mobil (CMK – Witan Gate House): offices.
- Mercedes Benz (Tongwell): offices and warehouse.
- General Motors (Tongwell): offices and warehouse.
- Scania (Tongwell): offices and warehouse.
- Volkswagen (Blakelands and Wymbush): offices, warehouse and training centre.
- Network Rail (CMK): offices.
- Argos (CMK)- Central Business Exchange): offices.

Equally importantly the city has been able to cater for companies that established themselves here and built or acquired larger premises as they expanded e.g.:

- Red Bull Racing (Tilbrook) started in an advance factory unit in Blakelands.
- Domino's Pizza (West Ashland and Kingston) started in an advance factory unit in Tongwell.
- Nifty Lifts (Shenley Wood) initially built premises in Stonebridge.

Sometimes matters did not go according to plan:

- Olivetti's proposal for a major HQ at Mount Farm in the early 1970s fell through although they subsequently took a warehouse in Bradville.
- BT's proposed relocation to Campbell Park Northside in the mid 1980s did not proceed although they subsequently occupied Phoenix House office block on the north side of Station Square and built the seven building training centre in Kents Hill.
- JP Morgan chose to relocate from Chelmsford to Bournemouth rather than MK in the 1980s.

The availability of sites (or, in some cases, MKDC speculatively built buildings) has been key to all of these projects and all that proceeded have been of benefit to the city for the wealth that they brought, the high quality jobs and the associated spin-offs through occupying other buildings for spin-off needs eg the Argos catalogue photography studio is based at Bradwell Abbey.

We are conscious that Northside has been included with a development package that has already been offered to the market and that a developer has been identified. However, such a process (which is in breach of the Council's own procedure that marketing should not occur until after a brief has been approved) should not be allowed to determine a decision when the future of the city is at stake.

### **Reason for Call-In**

Corporate relocations and expansions such as those detailed above by their very nature are infrequent and, when they happen, will usually arise after the company involved has considered a range of competing sites in differing locations in the UK or, possibly, abroad.

If MK wishes to compete at this level (and, we think that it must) then we have to be able to offer high quality sites to attract potential occupiers for the economic benefit of the city. Campbell Park Northside is one such site, which is why it was identified as a Strategic Reserve in the CMK Alliance Business Neighbourhood Plan, and we believe that this status should be retained (all the more so because the other such Reserve site has now been allocated for MK:U). There are no other sites within CMK that could, for example, accommodate a development of the type and scale of Network Rail.

We note comments during the Plan:MK Examination about the Northside site having been marketed for ten years without success but would argue that this shows a lack of understanding about the nature of such sites – as the designation implies, they are held in reserve for strategic purposes, on a similar basis to the reserve sites throughout the city owned by MK Community Foundation – they are not intended for marketing on a day-to-day basis.

We consider that the loss of Northside as a Strategic Reserve is prejudicial to the future beneficial development of Milton Keynes and further that it shows a worrying lack of ambition from the Council at a time when we need to be completely assured of our future direction.

Notwithstanding the discussions around Plan:MK we consider that the Reserve Site designation as identified in the CMK Alliance Business Neighbourhood Plan should be kept for the area south of the existing hedgerow through the site and that densities could be increased on the balance of land within Campbell Park to make good the shortfall in housing numbers.”

A mediation meeting was held on 12 March 2019 between the Cabinet member for Customer Services, representatives of Central Milton Keynes Town Council and representatives of MK Forum. As a result of the mediation meeting:

- (a) The Chair of MK Forum agreed to withdraw the Forum's Call-In request, on the understanding that:

- (i) the Cabinet member undertook to meet with representatives of the Forum to discuss issues about how the Council conducted consultations and office space issues in Central Milton Keynes; and
  - (ii) the issues would be considered as part of the Plan:MK Refresh which was currently underway.
- (b) In light of the comments from Central Milton Keynes Town Council the Cabinet member agreed to accept the amendments to the Development Brief suggested by the Town Council to Clauses 1, 2 and 7 (as shown at Item 5[b]), and to discuss with the Town Council its requested amendments at Clauses 3, 4 5 and 7.

Subject to the Cabinet member confirming his agreement in writing and the agreement being confirmed by the Town Council, the Chair may cancel the meeting in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16(d), which provides that:

“Where as a result of any mediation meeting the decision maker, or where the decision maker is the Cabinet, the responsible Cabinet member, gives an undertaking in writing that the decision will be reviewed and the person calling in the decision for review confirms their agreement in writing prior to the meeting of the scrutiny sub-committee, the Chair, in consultation with the Vice-Chair will cancel the meeting, with a report on the outcome of the call-in being reported to the next meeting of the committee.”

Also if agreement is reached a further Delegated Decision will be scheduled for the Cabinet member to review the earlier decision made on 26 February 2019.

If the agreement is not forthcoming the Call-In will be reviewed by the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee is requested to consider the reasons set out in the call-in request and, in accordance with the Council’s Constitution, either:

- (a) refer the item back to the Cabinet member, setting out the nature of the Committee’s concerns;
- (b) not refer the item back; or
- (c) refer its views to the Council.





Minutes of the meeting of the STRATEGIC PLACEMAKING SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on THURSDAY 20 SEPTEMBER 2018 at 6.30 pm

**Present:** Councillor Bint (Chair)  
Councillors Khan, McPake, Minns and Rankine

**Officers:** P Simpson (Corporate Director Resources), T Blackburne-Maze (Service Director [Public Realm]), P Cummins (Head of Legal Services and Deputy Monitoring Officer), D Taylor-Bond (Head of Highways), A Rulton (Strategic Finance Business Partner), R Trowse (Project Manager) and S Heap (Committee Services and Scrutiny Manager).

**Also Present:** Councillors Gowans (Cabinet member for Public Realm) and Walker (representing Councillors Brunning and Gilbert) and 3 members of the public

**SPSSC04 MINUTES**

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 23 August 2018 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**SPSSC05 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Councillor Bint advised the Sub-Committee that he was the Council's representative on MK Forum, which was referred to in a submission made by a member of the public.

**SPSSC06 CALL-IN OF 28 AUGUST 2018 DELEGATED DECISION WESTERN EXPANSION AREA PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS (JUNCTION 26 OF THE V4, JUNCTION 24 OF THE H4, JUNCTION 4 OF THE V4)**

The Sub Committee noted the following decision, made by Councillor Gowans on 28 August 2018, had been called-in for review by Councillors Brunning and Gilbert and by 20 members of the public:

- “1. That the fully funded developer approved design at Junction 26 of the V4 Watling Street be noted;
2. That all further matters, including the details of Junction 26 of the V4 (under the s278 agreement) be delegated to the Head of Highways for approval; and
3. That the update of the temporary crossings for junction 4 of the V4 and junction 24 of the H4 Dansteed Way be noted.”

The reasons for the call-in request from Councillors Brunning and Gilbert were as follows:

- “1. We do not believe adequate thought or consideration has been given to the possible funding options to construct an underpass at Junction 26;
2. As has been pointed out by a number of stakeholders at-grade crossings compromise the safety of both pedestrians and road users. It goes against the design of Milton Keynes’ roads and it is seemingly inconsistent with the decision to build an underpass at J25; and
3. Residents have significant concerns with the level of consultation that has gone on. Some have called it a ‘sham’.”

The reasons for the call-in request by the 20 members of the public were as follows:

- “1. At Grade crossings have been rejected by public consultation.
2. Milton Keynes Council’s planning for high throughput grid road schemes is being undermined by these proposed developments with at grade crossings.
3. Underpasses provide a safe means to separate motorists, cyclists and pedestrians. The Council should insist on their adoption for all developments.”

The Sub-Committee heard that mediation, held on 18 September 2018, had failed to identify any points of consensus.

Councillor Walker (representing Councillors Brunning and Gilbert) emphasised, with regard to the responses to the consultation undertaken, that 68% of respondents were in favour of an underpass, although the Committee was advised that the consultation had not been specific to just Junction 26.

The Sub-Committee heard from Councillor Gowans who outlined the history and reasoning behind his decision and addressed the individual points raised by the persons calling in the decision. Councillor Gowans emphasised that he had taken into account the outcome to the consultations when reaching his decision and that his primary concern was that a safe crossing was provided.

The Sub-Committee received a written submission from Councillors Marklew and C Wilson, Ward councillors who were unable to attend the meeting.

The Sub-Committee heard from three members of the public.

The Sub-Committee recognised that there had to be a balance between cost and safety and providing a safe crossing was the highest priority. However, the Sub-Committee did have concerns:

- (a) that funding options, particularly funding by the Developer, had not been fully explored

- (b) at the potential impact providing an at grade crossing would have in encouraging walking and cycling;
- (c) that a precedent would be created; and
- (d) the message allowing an at grade crossing would send to Developers who might see it as a way of saving money.

RESOLVED -

1. That the Sub-Committee notes the assurances of the Cabinet member that the Developer will be providing an at-grade crossing at Junction 26 of the V4 Watling Street.
2. That the Sub-Committee shares the concerns of the persons calling in the decision for review of the importance of having a grade separated crossing at Junction 26 of the V4 Watling Street for both pedestrians and cyclists.
3. That the Sub-Committee shares the concerns of the persons calling in the decision for review that the breath of funding options could be better explored for the provision of a grade separated crossing.
4. That the matter be referred back to the Cabinet member for consideration of the funding options.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 8.00 PM





Minutes of the meeting of the STRATEGIC PLACEMAKING SCRUTINY SUB-COMMITTEE held on TUESDAY 23 OCTOBER 2018 at 6.00 pm

**Present:** Councillors Brackenbury (Substitute for Councillor McPake), Marklew, Minns, Morla and Rankine.

**Officers:** S Gonsalves (Director of Policy, Insight and Communications), K Hullat (Acting Head of Legal Services) and S Muir (Committee Manager).

**Apologies:** Councillors Bint and McPake

**Also Present:** Councillors Marland, P Geary, Hosking, Miles, Morris and 18 members of the public.

**SPSSC07 ELECTION OF CHAIR**

Councillor Marklew proposed and Councillor Minns seconded that Councillor Brackenbury be elected as Chair of the Sub-Committee meeting.

RESOLVED -

That Councillor Brackenbury be elected as Chair of the Sub-Committee for this meeting.

**SPSSC08 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

None received.

**SPSSC09 HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND - FORWARD FUNDING BID FOR LAND EAST OF THE M1 (MK EAST)**

The Sub Committee noted the following decision made by the Cabinet on 2 October 2018 had been called-in by Councillors Bint, Morris, P Geary and Hosking

“That a business case for an application to forward fund necessary infrastructure be developed and submitted to meet the December 2018 funding window and that the Leader of the Council will approve the final submission.”

The Sub-Committee noted that the reasons for the Call-In by Councillors Bint and Morris were as follows:

- “1. that the officer submission of the original funding bid was contrary to the Council's policies at the time, including the emerging Submission draft of PlanMK, and therefore was improper in policy terms;
2. that the decision to submit the bid, without any consultation with residents living West of the M1, or their Ward Councillors, or their Parish Council, was contrary to the

Council's commitment to transparent decision making, contrary to the published commitment to transparency with Ward Councillors, contrary to the Parish Protocol, and therefore completely improper in process terms;

3. that officers and/or the Administration have used the unauthorised funding bid to influence the outcome of the PlanMK EIP, creating a policy context for MK East that might not have existed if officers had followed Council policy and proper process ahead of submitting the HIF bid;
4. that the Council Leader publicly stated at Cabinet that this cabinet decision and the business case will have no presumption of any new Bridge, and that this assurance was incorrect as the Business Case must support the application and the application includes the Bridge (as effectively the biggest single item to be funded). Therefore Cabinet was misled;
5. that the Cabinet has received no traffic modelling data to indicate that the Bridge will improve traffic flow in the area, and therefore the entire funding application is currently without justification and the Business case "to support the funding application" is completely pre-judging what the transport modelling data will show;
6. that the officer paper to Cabinet fails to address the significant understatements of risk identified by residents and Ward Councillors in the officer briefing paper circulated at the recent MK East Stakeholders Group; and
7. that, in the light of the officer remarks at the Stakeholder Group meeting that if the Council gets offered the money it will be too politically damaging to turn it down, any future "consultation" on the project as a whole will be a sham, and therefore, the entire project will have been steamrolled with no consultation of any kind so far and no meaningful consultation possible at any point in the future."

The Sub-Committee noted that the following reasons given by Councillors P Geary and Hosking for their Call-In:

- "1. the paper presented to Cabinet was scant on detail with little information on costs to the Council;
2. the paper and the decision to bid was taken with little or no understanding of the risks to the Council or the financial implications and that the risks highlighted were potentially misstated; and
3. the idea that the detail of such a large bid will receive no scrutiny or no future public decision making, despite the financial risks runs contrary to good democracy.

The Sub Committee heard that at the mediation meeting held between Councillor Marland and Councillors Morris and P Geary and Hosking to try and reach compromise was unsuccessful.

The Sub-Committee received representations from Councillors Morris, P Geary and Hosking who summarised their reasons for Calling In the item.

The Sub Committee received a response from Councillor Marland (the responsible Cabinet Member) who indicated that:

- he was aware of residents' anxieties that supporting infrastructure for development east of the M1 might affect residents west of the M1 and further consultation and engagement with councillors, parishes and town councils, stakeholders and residents from both East and West of the M1, including face-to-face meetings, workshops and the opportunity to comment online, would be carried out;
- a public note to respond to feedback from consultation would be published;
- that the Risk Assessment Register would be made available as appropriate;
- that the work undertaken that demonstrated the need for the required infrastructure, including traffic modelling, would be shared more widely;
- that an independent review of costings to ensure robustness would be undertaken and shared; and
- he would also consider delaying submission of the business case, if it did not harm the prospects of success, to ensure additional consultation and feedback could be taken into account.

The Sub-Committee challenged and questioned Councillor Marland and his witness about the Housing Infrastructure Bid process, the consultations that had been carried out, the timeframe for submission of the bid, the availability of transport modelling data, the financial implications and risks to the Council and the proposed option to not submit the bid by the councillors who had called-in the item.

Councillor Marland also indicated that should the submission to the Highways Infrastructure Fund be successful, the resulting project would be monitored by several Government departments including the Department for Transport, Highways England and the National Infrastructure Commission and scrutiny invited by the relevant Council scrutiny committees.

Councillor Brackenbury indicated he believed that more consultation should be carried out. He understood that residents and councillors were nervous about the proposal but funding from Government of

£75m for infrastructure was very rare and the opportunity should not be turned down.

The Sub Committee received a written submission from Councillor Crooks and also heard from Councillors Marklew, Minns, Morla and Rankine and 2 members of the public, during consideration of the item.

Councillor Brackenbury proposed and Councillor Marklew seconded that the matter be not referred back to the Cabinet and that the assurances from Councillor Marland be noted.

The motion was declared carried with 3 Councillors voting in favour and 2 Councillors voting against.

RESOLVED -

1. That the decision be not referred back to the Cabinet,
2. That the following undertaking given by Councillor Marland be noted:
  - that a public note to respond to feedback from consultation would be published;
  - that the Risk Assessment Register would be made available as appropriate;
  - that further consultation and engagement with Councillors, Parishes and Town Councils and residents from both East and West of the M1, including face-to-face meetings, workshops and the opportunity to comment online would be carried out;
  - that the work undertaken that demonstrates the need for required infrastructure, including modelling, would be shared more widely;
  - that an independent review of costings to ensure robustness would be undertaken and shared; and
  - to consider delaying submission of the business case, if it does not harm the prospects of success, to ensure additional consultation and feedback can be taken into account.

The Sub-Committee noted that the Cabinet Decision of 2 October 2018 would be effective immediately.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7.45 PM



**CAMPBELL PARK NORTHSIDE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF**

Responsible Cabinet Member: Councillor Legg, Cabinet member for Customer Services

Report Sponsor: Tracy Darke, Director - Growth, Economy and Culture

Author and contact: Neil Sainsbury, Head of Placemaking, Tel: 01908 252708

**Executive Summary:**

This Development Brief provides planning and design guidance to inform the future development of the land at Campbell Park Northside. It has been the subject of public consultation, and changes are proposed to the Brief as a result.

This report seeks approval of the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief.

**1. Recommendation(s)**

1.1 That the proposed changes to the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief arising from the public consultation be agreed.

1.2 That the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief be approved.

**2. Issues**

Background

2.1 Campbell Park Northside is one of the sites that transferred from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to the Milton Keynes Development Partnership (MKDP). The Council has adopted a protocol for the preparation of development briefs. This requires Cabinet to approve a Development Brief before MKDP can market/sell any of the sites under its control.

2.2 Development Briefs are the key documents which will influence what a site is eventually used for and therefore engagement with key stakeholders to establish their issues, views and aspirations is essential to the process of preparing and adopting Development Briefs.

2.3 The primary purpose of the draft Development Brief is to provide prospective developers with planning and design guidance to enable them to submit informed and high quality proposals for the development of this site. The draft Development Brief reflects best practice guidance as well as local stakeholder aspirations for the site. A key aim of the draft Development Brief is therefore

to streamline and speed up the process of submitting and determining planning applications.

- 2.4 The draft Brief has been informed by a desk top analysis of the site and a resulting understanding of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats as well as an understanding of the existing policy position.
- 2.5 The development brief has been commissioned, not by the planning authority, but rather by the landowner and it has not been subject to the all the statutory requirements that a planning document would have to undergo. The Brief has however been prepared to accord with current national and local Planning Policy and has been subject to public consultation. In addition it will be submitted for approval by MKC Cabinet and if approved will therefore be a material consideration in helping determine planning applications albeit with limited planning weight.

#### Consultation

- 2.6 Following a Delegated Decision on 31 July 2018, the Draft Development Brief was published and circulated to key stakeholders for an 8 week public consultation held from the 22 August to 17 October 2018. Formal consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, as well as the adopted protocol for preparing Development Briefs.
- 2.7 The consultation involved:
- (a) a copy of the Development Brief displayed in the Central Library;
  - (b) document published on the Council's website and in the Members Weekly News;
  - (c) copies/web links of Draft Development Brief sent to Cabinet Members, Cross Party Planning Spokespersons, CMK Ward Councillors and CMK and Campbell Park Parish Council's and the NHS Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group;
  - (d) residents immediately abutting the site on Adelphi Street were also provided with letters informing them of the consultation; and
  - (e) all relevant Council officers were formally consulted.
- 2.8 Comments were received from 11 respondents. A schedule of the comments received with officer response and proposed changes is contained at **Annex A**. The most significant representations concerned the following subjects:
- (a) Principle of Proposed Development  
All respondents supported the principle of development on the site.
  - (b) Proposed Land Uses  
Four respondents objected to the draft Brief proposing residential led mixed use development and wanted the Brief to respect the CMK

Alliance Plan which firstly, reserves Block F1.2 – Block F1.4 for a major development such as a significant educational institute or Business Headquarters, and secondly, indicatively highlights a fairly significant amount of office use for Campbell Park Northside.

#### Response

These matters on appropriate land uses have been considered in detail through the Plan:MK examination and this brief is consistent with the proposed modification MM14 which states that ‘the northern side of Campbell Park will be developed for largely residential purposes.’

#### (c) Potential Changes to Classic Infrastructure

Four respondents objected to the draft Brief including wording allowing for the potential of classic infrastructure to be changed. It was also requested that the original intentions / benefits of the classic infrastructure get included within the Brief so that developers can make a more objective assessment of whether to alter it in any way.

#### Response

In order to deliver the vision for the new neighbourhood as described within the Vision Statement on Page 5 of the draft Brief, the brief states that potential exists for the existing classic infrastructure comprising of the space for two rows of parking along Silbury Boulevard as well as the lower or southern halves of Skeldon Gate and/or Overgate to be ‘re-imagined’. The Brief also states that consideration could be given to an alternate surface treatment and design to the lower halves of both Skeldon Gate and Overgate to enable at-grade crossings, thereby respecting potential pedestrian desire lines and facilitating the delivery of an integrated neighbourhood.

The Brief will make it clear that if developers do re-imagine the use of the classic infrastructure, they will need to meet policy requirements.

The brief will state that the functionality of the classic infrastructure with Silbury Boulevard should be considered as part of any redevelopment proposal.

#### (d) Housing Types on the Site

Three respondents asked that the Brief be clearer about what type of housing was envisaged on the site.

#### Response

The brief has been amended to say that housing types will likely be informed by the demographic expected to live on site, including young adults / young professionals, key workers (singles and couples) who want to live in proximity to the buzz of CMK as well as retirees and empty nesters. This suggests a higher proportion of apartments and townhouses which would also support the higher densities of between 100-200dph required on the site.

(e) Relationship of New Development to Existing Housing on Adelphi Street

Five respondents stated that the brief should say more about the relationship of new development to the existing housing on Adelphi Street.

Response

The Brief has been amended to explain the existing character of development on Adelphi Street as well as explain that building heights in particular should appropriately respond to it. The brief has also been amended to state the existing trees along both sides of Adelphi Street should be retained.

3. **Options**

3.1 Not to approve the Development Brief

This would be contrary to the MKDP agreement which require development briefs to be prepared and approved prior to the marketing and sale of the site. This option is not therefore recommended.

3.2 The preferred option is to approve the amended Development Brief at **Annex B**. This will not only provide key planning and design guidance for the development of the sites but would allow MKDP to market and dispose of the sites. This will help meet Corporate Aims and deliver Core Strategy targets.

4. **Implications**

4.1 Policy

The Development Brief is not a Key Council Document, nor is it a Development Plan Document.

4.2 Resources and Risk

There are no known risks or financial implications associated with approving this development brief

N	Capital	N	Revenue	N	Accommodation
N	IT	N	Medium Term Plan	N	Asset Management

4.3 Carbon and Energy Management

There are no known carbon and energy management implications associated with the approval of this Brief.

4.4 Legal

Development Briefs prepared and adopted by the local planning authority are a legitimate tool to inform developers and other interested parties of the opportunities and restrictions of a site in planning terms. While it is possible to adopt a development brief as a supplementary planning document (“SPD”), it

is not proposed that the Development Brief is adopted as an SPD in this instance. As such, it is not necessary to examine whether or not the document meets the legal requirements for SPDs.

Once approved the Development Brief, while not part of the Council's Local Plan, is capable of being a material consideration in determining any forthcoming planning applications related to the site.

In the light of this advice, there is no real identifiable risk to the Council should it take the recommended action

#### 4.5 Other Implications

(a) E-Government

The Development Brief will be made available on the Council website.

(b) Stakeholders

Consultation with a wide range of stakeholders was undertaken in accordance with statutory requirements and the MKC Statement of Community Involvement.

(c) Equalities

This decision is not relevant in regard to equality issues.

N	Equalities/Diversity	Y	Sustainability	N	Human Rights
Y	E-Government	Y	Stakeholders	N	Crime and Disorder

Background Papers: [29 January 2019 - Delegated Decisions report and Decision Sheet](#)

#### Annexes

**Annex A:** Comments Table and Officer Response

A copy of the comments and officer response is available at the following link:

[Comments and Officer Response](#)

**Annex B:** Campbell Park Northside Development Brief

A copy of the Development Brief is available at the following link:

[Campbell Park Northside Development Brief](#)

**Annex C:** Update Briefing Note



## **Campbell Park Northside Development Brief: Delegated Decision to Approve Development Brief - 26 February 2019**

### **Update Paper**

#### **Introduction**

The decision to adopt the Campbell Park Northside Development Brief held on the 29 January was deferred for the following reasons:

1. To further consider education provision on site raised by Cllr Bint
2. To consider comments raised by CMKTC regarding the prematurity of adoption of the Brief before the inspectors report on Plan:MK had been received (in relation to Main Modification 14 and the land use allocation of Block F1.2 – F1.4
3. To consider comments raised by CMKTC relating to classic infrastructure with particular concern that the brief falls to appreciate the importance of Silbury Boulevard and Skeldon Gate to public transport serving CMK.
4. To consider comments raised by CMKTC requesting that the Brief emphasise the importance of an overbridge at Skeldon Gate
5. To consider revisions to para 5.9.5 regarding play provision on site as requested by Cllr Ferrans
6. To update section 5.10 on Broadband provision to reflect policy in Plan:MK
7. To clarify in para 5.7.5 that lower and southern halves of Skeldon Gate and Overgate mean the same thing.

#### **Proposed Amendments**

This update paper represents the responses (and proposed amendments to the Brief - underlined) to reflect these above comments made (they are listed in the same order as above):

1. Add in a new para 2.2.2 as follows “Main Modification 6 (MM6) to Policy DS2 sets out clearly that Campbell Park Northside is expected to deliver 1500 dwellings.”

In addition new wording is included in para 4.1.7 as follows, “While the nature of the future demographics indicates that on-site education provision will not be required (based on a development proposal of c1600 dwellings), contributions to off site provision will be sought.

Although not to be included within the Brief itself the following should be acknowledged, "It is noted that the projected pupil yield, at primary school ages, may exceed the future availability of places within nearby schools. Therefore by the time the development is complete, the Council must determine whether sufficient places can be found or whether additional school capacity needs to be built somewhere nearby."

2. The Inspectors Report on Plan:MK has been received with his indication that the inclusion of the Proposed Main Modifications (including Main Modification 14) would make the Plan sound.
3. Amend para as follows, “Campbell Park Northside is well served by public transport with buses using Overgate, Skeldon Gate and Silbury Boulevard with two sets of bus stops being located on the latter.”  
Add new wording to the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet para 5.7.5 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet as follows, “Silbury Boulevard, Overgate and Skeldon Gate are public transport routes so any alternative treatment should not compromise that function.”
4. No proposed change – the Brief states that the inclusion of a grade separated crossing across the northern end of Skeldon Gate should be explored. This is felt to give sufficient clarity as to its importance.
5. Para 5.9.5 proposed to be amended as follows, “Play provision will be required to be provided as per current policy requirements. This could be located as part of the landscape corridor along Common Lane.”
6. Section 5.11 redrafted as follows, “Superfast / Ultrafast Broadband (as identified in Policy CT9 of Plan:MK):  
The council wishes to see all premises on all new developments served by digital communication services that provide at least superfast broadband speeds, but will give preference to future proofed services providing Ultrafast speeds for all residents and businesses, for example using full fibre “fibre to the premises” (FTTP) technology.  
Developers must make sure that broadband services that meet the ambitions of the Digital Communications Infrastructure Strategy and the Digital Agenda for Europe are available, wherever practicable, to all residents of the development at market prices and are not restricted to one particular service provider.  
Developers are required to work with a recognised network carrier to design appropriate duct infrastructures, wherever practicable, for the development.  
Other forms of infrastructure, such as facilities supporting mobile phones, broadband and WiFi, should be included, wherever viable and possible”.
7. Para 5.7.5 has been redrafted to only make mention of the southern halves of Skeldon Gate and Overgate (removing reference to lower halves)



8. The Inspector in his report also made the following observation regarding classic infrastructure:

The CMKAP places significant emphasis on the contribution of “classic CMK infrastructure” to the character and heritage of CMK (including Campbell Park) and seeks to only contemplate the alteration of this infrastructure in exceptional circumstances. Given Plan:MK is setting a new strategic framework for CMK to 2031 in the context of higher growth requirements, there will inevitably need to be some flexibility to make efficient use of sustainably located urban land (as per the recent Intu:MK decision [MK/RET/004]). Accordingly, I am not persuaded that Plan:MK should strategically identify “classic CMK infrastructure” and an appropriate balance needs to be struck particularly if moribund areas within the city centre are to be developed and rejuvenated. I find Plan:MK sets the right strategic tone in terms of seeking improvements to the quality of the environment and public realm in CMK (Policies DS4 and SD2) and accommodating significant new levels of growth and change (Policy SD3).



**CMK TOWN COUNCIL REQUESTED AMENDMENTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF:**

Requested Amendments (in blue)	Reason
<p>1. <u>Page 25, Para 3.5 last bullet point</u> Existing parking areas alongside Silbury Boulevard are there to serve the new Neighbourhood and <b>visitors to Campbell Park</b></p>	<p>These parking areas support activities in the new neighbourhood as well as visitors to Campbell Park. Just as in the rest of the city centre, these parking areas support a range of economic and cultural activities and their flexible use for different activities at different times of the day and different days of the week is important to support vibrancy and growth of the city centre.</p>
<p>2. <u>Page 33, Para 5.2.2, last two sentences</u> Delivery of the vision which would see a close integration between the park and the development may also however consequently have implications for some of the existing parking areas alongside Silbury Boulevard which in its current design/layout may hinder this vision but this brief is not discouraging the inclusion of <b>the space for</b> this existing parking into <b>new public realm for</b> the new neighbourhood, <b>for example as part of a new public square/piazza. However</b>, if any of the parking areas (classic infrastructure) are to be <del>re-</del>imagined' <b>built-over, altered or sold into private ownership</b>, so as to help the vision, the development of those areas would need to be meet the relevant policy requirements.</p>	<p>The CMK Alliance Plan (CMKAP) seeks to retain the <del>space</del> for the 'slow streets' which currently provide rows of parking next to the Boulevards and Gates, but says "the use of this public space for public purposes may change over time" (para 8.6, CMKAP). The additional wording proposed in blue clarifies this point.</p>
<p>3. <u>Page 36, Para 5.3.4, last sentence</u> The southern half of Skeldon Gate however is more level with the adjacent development parcels and will be highly visible from passers-by and should therefore be an attractive frontage that faces onto Skeldon Gate. <b>However, pedestrian accessibility to/from Skeldon Gate should be physically prevented eg. through earth bunds or SUDs, to prevent pedestrians crossings the Gate at grade and to avoid vehicles stopping to pick-up/drop-off directly from the Gate.</b></p>	<p>At-grade crossings are dangerous in this location - Gates are not sleepy streets in the middle of a residential estate, but district distributor roads which serve as major gateways into the city centre with significant car, bus and lorry traffic. Furthermore, as documented at the Hub, development which directly fronts Gates and Boulevards leads to unsafe and inappropriate stopping to drop-off and pick-up by delivery vans, taxis, etc to the detriment of public transport.</p>

<p>4. <u>Page 40, Para 5.7.5, first bullet point</u>  <del>If a bridge is proven to be a viable grade separated crossing then it could be explored whether the design aesthetic created by other overbridges connecting CMK with adjacent estates can be extended to this bridge.</del>  <b>If the developer seeks to integrate development on the three blocks across the entire northern half, then grade separated crossings such as overbridges is encouraged, but at-grade crossings over the Gates are not acceptable.</b></p>	<p>Change text to make the point more clearly that overbridges are welcome but not at-grade crossings, which are dangerous for such busy roads and will delay public transport. The three blocks are large with about 500 potential dwellings each – more than most development sites elsewhere. So integration is not necessary to create neighbourhoods on each block. (Please note that an overbridge does not exist between CMK and Block F1 at the northern end, so all pedestrians and cyclists will have to travel to the southern end of these blocks to access CMK along Silbury Boulevard anyway.</p>
<p>5. <u>Page 40, Para 5.7.5, second bullet point</u>  <del>Consideration could be given to an alternate surface treatment and design to the southern halves of both Skeldon Gate and Overgate to enable at-grade crossings, thereby respecting potential pedestrian desire lines and facilitating the delivery of an integrated neighbourhood.</del></p>	<p>Delete text. At-grade crossings of the Gate are not acceptable. There are existing underpasses at the southern end of both Skeldon Gate and Overgate to meet pedestrian and cycling desire lines. These Gates are not sleepy streets in the middle of a residential estate, but major gateways (technically “distributor roads”) into the city centre with significant car, bus and lorry traffic.</p>
<p>6. <u>Page 40, Para 5.7.5, third bullet point</u>  <del>This will include exploring whether any footways should run along the southern halves of these streets. If the southern halves of these streets does have an alternative treatment this will need to continue around into Silbury Boulevard for a short stretch.</del></p>	<p>Delete text. As above, these are not streets within a residential estate but Gates, which are major Gateways to CMK. There should be no pavements along the Gates, which would encourage dangerous at-grade crossing of the Gates. Furthermore, as documented at the Hub, pavements next to Gates and Boulevards with development fronting them causes inappropriate drop-off and pick-up by delivery vans, taxis, etc to the detriment of public transport and safety on the public highway.</p>
<p>7. <u>Page 41, para 5.8.2</u>  Unallocated parking is required at a ratio of 1 space per 3 dwellings. These should be preferably provided on street <b>and preferably within the existing rows of parking along Silbury Boulevard which provides the added flexibility of serving both visitors to the development and visitors to Campbell Park.</b></p>	<p>Unallocated parking within allocated private parking areas ties-up any under-used spaces and is inefficient. Unallocated spaces need to be accessible by all residents for the occasional big family gathering or party. Locating unallocated spaces in the existing parking areas along Silbury Boulevard would provide more activity along the pedestrian/cycling redway, as well as sharing these spaces with visitors to the Park.</p>