

SPEAKING LIST

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 13 DECEMBER 2012

SPEAKING REQUESTS:

APPLICATION NO.	TITLE	REQUESTS TO SPEAK IN OBJECTION	TIME ALLOCATED	RIGHT OF REPLY OR SPEAKERS IN FAVOUR	TIME ALLOCATED
12/01704/REM Major	Blocks 14A And 14B Campbell Park, Avebury Boulevard, Central Milton Keynes	Ms L Stuart	Up to 3 Mins	Mr M Lambert (Applicants Agent)	Up to 3 Mins
12/02111/FUL Major	Local Centre, Selkirk Drive, Oakridge Park	Cllr A Francis New Bradwell Parish Council	Up to 3 Mins	D Keene (Applicants Agent) Cllr A Geary – Ward Member	Up to 3 mins
12/01769/FUL Minor	Land At, Fox Covert Lane, Castlethorpe	Cllr P Ayles Castlethorpe parish Council G Sweetland	Up to 3 Mins Up to 3 Mins	Mr J Paynter (Applicants Agent)	Up to 6 Mins

WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS:

APPLICATION NO.	TITLE	SUBMISSION BY	
12/01704/REM	Blocks 14A And 14B Campbell Park, Avebury Boulevard, Central Milton Keynes	Dr Oya Discombe	
12/02111/FUL	Local Centre, Selkirk Drive Oakridge Park	Mr P Davis	

COMMENTS BY DR OYA DISCOMBE OF 84 COLUMBIA PLACE, CAMPBELL PARK

Further to my comments made on 30th August 2012 regarding the application number 12/01704/REM, I submitted additional discussion points for the Development Control Committee meeting on 8th November. However, having read through the latest report on the Planning web site, I realise that my comments had not been taken into account, or even acknowledged. So I am re-submitting them for discussion for the meeting on 13th December.

Having read through the Application Committee Reports dated 29th October and 3rd December, I realise that all the objections I raised have been addressed, mainly in paragraphs 5.6 to 5.8, albeit in a very basic, undermining and unsatisfactory manner. The report gives the impression that this application is not being considered as a new application, as there is an outline approval for the previous submission by the developers, and for the fact that similar buildings exist from the phase 1 of the development. My question to the committee is then this: "Are you simply going through the motions for the sake of red tape rather than genuinely considering the impact of the Phase 2 of this development?" It seems to me that the decision to give full consent has already been made prior to all these discussions. If that is the case, it is completely unethical for the Council to make us go through this futile exercise in an attempt on lip service to called neighbourhood involvement and democracy.

As a local citizen and a neighbour, I demand that this application should be considered as a new application independent of any prior development or outline consent in the light of the following facts:

- 1) it has been more than 3 years that Phase 1 of the development was started and finished, making the current application a new one, not necessarily linked to the existing development,
- 2) The application for the provision of 169 dwellings represents a density of 135 du/ha. According to the Consultation Statement written by MK Council in September 2012 (available at both MK Council and CMK Alliance web sites), a relaxation of the current policy of minimum 100 du/ha is recommended for Campbell Park. It is also explained in the same report that Campbell Park is a "unique product" which represents "lower density, parkland living". It is specifically argued in that report that **"it will not be viable to build more than 50 dwelling per hectare in Campbell Park, although that might be possible in CMK"**.

The main problem with this application is the proposed density along with all the associated problems of high density developments, such as parking problems, noise, potential for increased crime and anti-social behaviour. The existence of the Phase 1 of the development should not justify doubling of the error originally made in approving a plan which totally goes against the recommendations for Campbell Park mentioned above. This application should be considered as a new application in the light of the vision to keep Campbell Park as **lower density, parkland living**.

COMMENTS BY MR P DAVIS

I refer to our recent telephone conversation. As discussed I believe that a significant part of the proposed development encroaches on open space as designated in the Proposals Map of the Local Plan. I have re-checked the Local Plan and the plans submitted by the applicant and can confirm this to be the case. I am very concerned that from looking at the Agenda for Thursday's night meeting that there is no reference to this. This was a fundamental point of my objection for which I can see no reference in the item on the Agenda. Please see below in italics part of my original objection.

"Part of the proposed development encroaches on Recreation and Open Space, falls within the boundary of The District and Linear Parks, is within the designated Linford Lakes Area and appears to encroach on a Wildlife Corridor. There are just too many policies to mention here but suffice it to say the proposal has little or no regard to these policies. The encroachment is an excuse to cram on more buildings including housing onto the designated Local Centre site."

From my recent discussion with you it would appear that you are not aware of this and that you will be investigating and getting back to me. As this involves a fundamental departure from the Local Plan this should form part of the report to the Committee so that they are aware that part of the development is proposed on land designated as recreation and open space. I would also like to know why this was not referred to under "letters of objection" in the agenda item as this was a major point in my objection.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Peter Davis