

**Annex B, Stoke Road Draft Development Brief – Consultation Responses**

	Consultees	Consultees Comment	Officer response (with proposed changes in red)
<b>MKC Officers / Cllr's</b>			
1	John Bint (Cllr)	<p>1.1- Para 4.1.2: This (preference for flats) currently gives the appearance of a completely unsubstantiated and arbitrary officer opinion. Please either remove the entire sentence, or insert a clear rationale for why officers believe this site is particularly suited for apartments. I note the site seems less sustainable than most others, in terms of transport (only one bus-stop, in one direction, and no other amenities, within 200m.</p> <p>1.2- The second paragraph numbered 4.1.2 (presumably this should be 4.1.3, currently): this says Affordable Housing is required on developments of "over 10 dwellings". I can't find a policy basis for this phrase: the SPD seems to say "15 units or more" in multiple places. I think it's particularly important that we get this wording right for this site, because the site is right on the cusp of 10 units (no affordable units) or perhaps 11 units (which might require affordable units, depending on what our policy actually says).</p> <p>1.3- Para 5.2.1: The entire sentence and its advocacy for a block structure is incompatible with the Street Hierarchy in the Residential Design SPD. It is now Council policy to discourage road block</p>	<p>1.1-Agree will add / amend text- Page 25, Para 4.1.2 - New Text - <b>The context of the surrounding area suggests housing or apartments or a combination of both would be the best residential use of the site. Apartments would have the benefit of allow frontages to overlook Stoke Road, Phelps Road as well as the Grant Union Canal.</b></p> <p>1.2- Correct, will amend as follows – Page 25, Para 4.1.3 - New Text - If the proposal is over <b>15</b> dwellings It is expected that 30% of the total housing will be provided as affordable housing, <b>Please refer to the Council's Affordable Housing SPD, March 2013, (in particular paragraph 2.10).</b></p> <p>1.3 – The development is too narrow to achieve a perimeter block. It will likely be a cul-de-sac type development. This paragraph</p>

		<p>structures and to seek cul de sacs.</p> <p>1.4- Para 5.2.2: The text - and particularly the second paragraph - seems to be advocating a publicly maintained strip of land between the gardens and the canal. The implication is that the gardens and the public realm will be separated by fences. There are plenty of examples in MK where this has been done, and almost without exception the result is that the canal becomes irrelevant to the adjacent residents. By contrast, there are some areas where homes and gardens actually engage with the canal, and this seems to me to be very much more desirable. Therefore: please revise the entirety of that second paragraph, to encourage engagement between homes/gardens and the canal, instead of discouraging it.</p>	<p>promotes a style of development layout that is consistent with the existing development to the north of the site and the illustrative layout in the 'made' Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan. However I have adjusted the text below to remove any comments relating to perimeter blocks.</p> <p>Page 27, Para 5.1.2 - New Text - <b>The shape and size of the site will likely lead to a cul-de-sac type development. This does not however obviate the need for the layout to adhere to perimeter block principles, notably a clear public front and a secure private back.</b></p> <p>1.4- I agree that this area is problematic. I discussed this point with the Countryside Officer prior to the consultation, who had concerns in relation to the loss of the trees on the edge of the canal which form a key element of the wildlife corridor. If these trees were placed in private ownership they maybe removed. See email below</p> <p>-----</p> <p>I suspect that in landscape terms, it may be preferable for the houses to be facing towards the canal as rear gardens offer less amenity value for canal users. However, if a canalside landscape strip is kept in public management, that may be different and it would be far easier to ensure it maintains a degree of biodiversity value and the excessive disturbance and lighting often associated with private property could be reduced. Any area retained as public open space would obviously need to have access for management. Retention of</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>the trees would be beneficial to the wildlife corridor but there would still be an overall loss of biodiversity and a reduction in the operational width of the wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Any reduction in the wildlife corridor will have to be compensated by providing higher quality habitats in the remaining area. There are also local and national policies that require developments to provide net gains for biodiversity so other enhancements may be offered in addition to features at ground level and appropriate native planting, such as bat and bird boxes built into structures, green or brown roofs, etc. A preliminary ecological assessment of the site would provide a baseline against which to assess biodiversity enhancements offered.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Diane Evans Countryside Officer</p> <p>-----</p> <p>From an arboricultural point of view I would want the canal-side trees and the trees at the south end of the site, some of which border Stoke Road, protected and retained in accordance with BS 5837: 2012, as long as the trees are structurally sound. This means that the trees should have sufficient space around them to be able to co-exist with the new built form without problems arising, both direct problems in terms of nuisance caused and negative perceptions of residents, thus ensuring their long term retention. Account should be taken of tree shadow paths, dwelling aspects, garden locations and the locations of elevations with the principle windows.</p> <p>I think there is an opportunity to make an area of public open space adjacent to the canal side, including those existing trees which are structurally sound and place another link in the (discontinuous) chain of canal-side path. Certainly the retained trees should ultimately be within the public realm to further ensure their security.</p> <p>I hope this is useful, if you have any queries please do let me know.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>1.5- Para 5.3.3: The Lakes Estate does not front onto Stoke Road, and there is no assertion that the housing or Stoke Road suffers as a result. We are all currently struggling to cope with the consequences of housing fronting onto roads with through traffic. I don't accept it is necessary - or even desirable - for housing to front onto Stoke Road (although house frontages set back behind their own access roads, and facing across that access road towards Stoke Road would be desirable). Please therefore, revise this para accordingly to encourage properties to face towards Stoke Road but not front onto it (except in the case of apartment blocks having in effect multiple fronts).</p>	<p>Best regards, Stephen.</p> <hr/> <p>Page 27, Para 5.2.2 - New Text Any area retained for the purpose of visual amenity / biodiversity would need to have access for maintenance, but may also need to be reinforced with additional landscaping to ensure an attractive and secure rear boundary to the proposed dwellings.</p> <p>Page 28, 29, Fig 9 and 10. I've also amended the key in both Parameter Plans to Wildlife Corridor / Amenity Open Space as open space on its own suggests the area is publically accessible.</p> <p>1.5 - What is proposed in the Brief entirely accords with policies in the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan where for identified development sites adjacent to the west side of Stoke Road site, the principles make it clear that new development will positively address Stoke Road with active frontages facing it (access would however be from a new access road to the fronts of the properties). In the future therefore once these sites are developed, housing (opposite the site subject to this Brief) will front onto Stoke Road. This brief proposes a similar approach with housing to front onto Stoke Road but not taking access from it – rather housing will be setback behind an access road.</p> <p>1.5 - Page 27, Para 5.3.3 - New Text - In any development option in order to be consistent with the existing development to the north of the site as well as proposals for new development adjacent to the site in the Lakes Estate (as identified in the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>1.6- Figs 9 &amp; 10 will need changing substantially in the light of the changes requested above.</p> <p>1.7- Para 5.4.2: On a scheme of this size (ie quite small), I don't think it makes any sense to create a "statement entrance" to the site, especially as it's on a short side-road. Depending on the scheme put forwards, no particular "landmark feature" may be required, or something totally different (eg, something at the southern tip of the site, to signify the beginning of the entire MK conurbation). Therefore, please re-write the entire paragraph to be less proscriptive!</p>	<p>Plan) dwellings should front onto Stoke Road Development will not however take direct access off Stoke Road but rather be placed behind an access road which will both provide access to on plot parking as well as on street parking. If apartments are included they should address Stoke Road as well as the Grand Union Canal. In this regard care must be taken to avoid layouts and building footprints that result in blank elevations that front a public area.</p> <p>1.6- Both Figure 9 and Figure 10 do not illustrate direct access being taken off Stoke Road. Figure 9 has been design to reflect the indicative Plan in the 'made' 'Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan, 2015, with apartments that can be designed with a dual frontage. Figure 10 indicates house frontages set back behind their own access roads, and facing across that access road towards Stoke Road as suggested.</p> <p>1.7- Agreed, However the proposed dwellings should mirror the existing development on the opposite side of the street, therefore the amended text is</p> <p>Page 30, Para 5.4.2 - New Text <b>As stated in Section 2, the site occupies a slightly lower level than the surrounding area. The type of residential uses to be included will to an extent dictate building heights but the Neighbourhood Plan states that built form should not</b></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>1.8- Para 5.8.2: It would be better if the word "must" was used (as in, "must accord with..")</p> <p>1.9-Small print: It's a matter of record that I'm a longstanding member of DCC and currently a Board Member of MKDP. I don't believe either of these restrict my ability to engage with this consultation.</p>	<p>exceed 4 storey's in height.</p> <p>1.8- Agreed, will amend. Page 30, Para 5.8.2 - New Text The location of car parking <b>must</b> accord with the guidance in the Council's Residential Design Guide SPD and Parking Standards (SPD).</p> <p>1.9 Noted</p>
<b>Milton Keynes Council Officers</b>			
2	Elizabeth Woodhouse. Senior Landscape Officer	<p>2.1-Adjust text on Pg29 (para 5.9.2). Prior to development a tree survey plan and schedule, arboricultural impact assessment and arboricultural method statement should be undertaken all in accordance with BS 5837:2012 accurately surveying and plotting to a standard scale all trees affected by the development.</p> <p>Other minor adjustments were given as track changes within the document.</p>	<p>2.1- Agree will add / amend additional text on Page 29 as follows.</p> <p>Page 29, Para 5.9.2 - New Text - There are mature trees along the canal which are part of the Wildlife Corridor. <b>Prior to development a tree survey plan and schedule, arboricultural impact assessment and arboricultural method statement should be undertaken all in accordance with BS 5837:2012 accurately surveying and plotting to a standard scale all trees affected by the development..</b> Subject to the findings of this assessment, <b>the mature trees</b> along the canal should be retained as a back drop to the development.</p>
3	Mike Moore  Senior Planning Officer	<p><b><u>Stoke Road, Water Eaton Development Brief (Consultation Draft)</u></b></p> <p>Site Location: This site extends to approximately 0.32 ha (0.79 acres) and is located within the Water Eaton District of Bletchley. The site is</p>	

	<p>strategically located off Stoke Road &amp; Phelps Road adjacent to the Grand Union Canal.</p> <p><b>Development Plan Team Comments</b></p> <p><i>3.1- Para 2.22 'The site is allocated in the Local Plan for the provision of a Housing (Policy H1, H1A, H2, H4, H5, H8, H9). The site is also allocated as part of the Wildlife Corridor (Policy NE1).'</i></p> <p>In or around the above paragraph you should also mention the following Local Plan policies are also shown on the Proposals Map as applying to this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LP policy C1 (Location of Community facilities) planning permission will be granted for residential community facilities within housing areas preferably in locations well related to local centres....</li> <li>• Policy L3 (Standards of provision) New housing development will be required to provide new or improved recreational facilities in accordance with the Council's adopted standards in Appendix L3.</li> </ul> <p>3.2- In terms of Local Plan Design policies, although policies D1,D2, D4 are mentioned as this site is located adjacent to the Grand Union Canal, you should also mention and highlight policy D3 (Canalside Development) as development alongside the canal should help meet the objectives of this policy.</p>	<p>3.1- Page 9, Para 2.2.2 - New Text The site is allocated in the Local Plan for the provision of a Housing (Policy H1,H1A,H2,H4,H5,H8,H9). <b>The site is also allocated as part of the Wildlife Corridor (Policy NE1).</b></p> <p>3.2- Page 10, Para 2.2.6 - New Text Policies D1 and D2 are general design policies that apply borough-wide. They look at the impact of development proposals on locality and the design of buildings. <b>Policy D3 (Canalside Development) is also relevant as development alongside the canal should help meet the objectives of this policy.</b></p>
--	---	---

		<p>3.3- In addition to the list of Core Strategy policies mentioned in paragraph 2.3.2 you should also mention policy CS1 (Milton Keynes Development Strategy) as this development is within the city of Milton Keynes and this is where the Council is focusing housing development and policy CS21 (Delivering Infrastructure)</p> <p>3.4- In section 2.4 you should mention the 'made' Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan, which covers this site is now part of the Development Plan. The Plan was 'made' by Milton Keynes Council at a meeting on Wednesday 21st October 2015. You should highlight relevant policies in that plan such as Policy SSP2 for this site and Policy GP7: Environmental Enhancements, improving Community and Recreation Facilities. Please also amend the illustration of the NP and change the date of plan at the bottom of page 11 from 2014 to 2015.</p> <p><i>3.5- Paragraph 4.1.2 'If the proposal is over <u>10</u> dwellings It is expected that 30% of the total housing will be provided as affordable housing, as outlined in the Council's Affordable Housing SPD adopted in 2013'.</i></p> <p>Comment: I think there is a typo here 10 should be 15. See Council's Affordable Housing SPD March 2013 paragraph 2.10.</p>	<p>3.3- Agreed will Amend. Page 10, Para 2.3.2 - New Text <b>CS1 (Milton Keynes Development Strategy) CS21 (Delivering Infrastructure)</b></p> <p>3.4- Agreed, Page 10, Para 2.5.1 - New Text The site forms part of The Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan. <b>The 'made' Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan, which covers this site is now part of the Development Plan. The Plan was 'made' by Milton Keynes Council at a meeting on Wednesday 21st October 2015.</b> Within this document the site is allocated for residential development, an illustrative layout has been provided below (figure 4)</p> <p><b>Relevant policies in The Neighbourhood Plan Include Policy SSP2 for this site and Policy GP7: Environmental Enhancements, improving Community and Recreation Facilities.</b></p> <p>3.5- Agreed Will Amend. Page 25, Para 4.1.3 - New Text If the proposal is over <b>15</b> dwellings It is expected that 30% of the total housing will be provided as affordable housing, <b>Please refer to the Council's Affordable Housing SPD, March 2013, (in particular paragraph 2.10.</b></p>
--	--	---	--

<b>Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council</b>			
4	<p>Delia Shephard Town Clerk Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council 74 / 76 Queensway, Bletchley</p> <p>Milton Keynes MK2 2SA</p>	<p>4.1- Stoke Road, Water Eaton Development Brief Matthew Clarke, Senior Urban Designer for MKC Council introduced the Stoke Road Development Brief prepared by Milton Keynes Council and sent out for public consultation in August 2016 explaining that the site had been purchased by MKDP from the Homes and Communities Agency and a development brief must be in place before marketing of the land could commence. The development brief had been based on relevant policies and local plans including the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan which incorporated the site. Both the Local Plan and the Lakes Estate NP allocated the Stoke Road site for residential development.</p> <p>The Chairman invited questions or comments from members of the</p>	4.1 Comments Noted.

	<p>Tel: 01908 649469 Fax: 01908 649473</p>	<p>public and Mr Clarke was asked whether any planning gain from the site would be directed back into redevelopment of the Lakes Estate since this was what residents had been led to believe during consultation on the Lakes Estate NP. In particular funds were needed for the redevelopment of Serpentine Court. Mr Clarke advised that MKDP would need to pay back the loan used to buy the land from the HCA and it was not guaranteed that gains would go directly to the Lakes Estate. Members of the public expressed concerns that they had been misled about the benefits of the NP process.</p> <p>4.2 The Town Clerk offered to obtain a more detailed response to the questions about anticipated planning gains to be publicised after the meeting.</p> <p>4.3 It was <b>RESOLVED</b> unanimously to endorse the recommendation of the Regeneration, Planning and Environment Committee made on 11 October 2016 to propose no amendments to the Stoke Road Development Brief.</p> <p>-----</p>	<p>4.3 Noted</p> <p>4.2/ 4.4 Additional Text, Page 11, Para 2.5.2 - New Relevant policies in The Neighbourhood Plan Include Policy SSP2 for this site and Policy GP7: Environmental Enhancements, improving Community and Recreation Facilities.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plan policy GP7: Environmental Enhancements improving Community and Recreation Facilities</p> <p>All planning applications which result in the creation of new commercial premises or residential schemes that exceed 10 new housing units will be expected to demonstrate how that development will contribute towards the delivery of enhancements within the Plan</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>area, including improving community and recreational facilities.</p> <p>These enhancements will be sought through direct provision of on- or off-site improvements or subject to meeting the tests set out in paragraph 204 of the NPPF through financial contributions</p> <p>secured via a planning obligation and/ or payment of any Community Infrastructure Levy (if adopted) which would be made available to MKC and BFSTC and which will be capable of being spent on specific schemes to secure improvements to the physical environment and community and recreational facilities on the Lakes Estate as set out in this Plan.'</p> <p>2.5.3 Any contribution secured as a result of development within the Plan Area shall be prioritised towards the delivery of the following targeted community objectives wherever possible and consider</p> <p>2.5.4 Opportunities to co-locate services and facilities. If any such contribution is proposed to directly deliver any of the objectives set out below, Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council must be consulted on the acceptability of any scheme. Otherwise, it is intended that Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council will prioritise any general financial contribution to contribute towards the following:</p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a new community facility for the youth of the Plan area with associated parking and landscaping;</li> <li>• development and implementation of a community transport scheme designed to supplement existing bus services;</li> <li>• enhancement / replacement of street lighting throughout the Plan area;</li> <li>• rationalisation and improvement of existing car parking provision;</li> <li>• provision of formalised parking lay-bys in place of grass verges at relevant and acceptable locations, except in areas of Local Green Space designated through policy GP6;</li> <li>• improving and strengthening key landscape and footpath connections as identified in Figure 5.1;</li> <li>• improving the quality of play areas and variety of play equipment, including but not limited to, those listed below; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Warren;</li> <li>• Four Walls;</li> <li>• Bala Play Ground;</li> <li>• Skene Woodland;</li> <li>• Play area north of Gorman Place;</li> <li>• Play area south of Grasmere Way.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>2.5.5 The extent that new development can help deliver any of the objectives set out in the schedule above will be a key material consideration when determining any development proposals in the</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>4.4- Dear Matthew</p> <p>Would it be possible for MKC to provide a more detailed statement about any potential planning obligations eg S106 arising from development on the site? I am concerned that many residents do not understand the planning system despite a lot of engagement over the Lakes NP and I would rather obtain comment from an expert for them.</p> <p>Thank you again for attending. Kind regards, Delia</p>	<p>plan area.</p> <p>2.5.1 Paragraph 204 of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is mentioned in policy GP7 because this paragraph sets out three tests that have to meet if planning obligations are sought.</p> <p>Planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>• Directly related to the development; and</li> <li>• Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</li> </ul> <p>4.4 Planning response reflected in the additional text above</p>
--	--	--	--

**Local Residents**

5	Debbie Evans (Resident)	<p>Can you help with regards to the new proposal for the waste land that runs between Phelps Road, Stock Road and the can to the A4146 please.</p> <p>I understand that housing is going to be put onto this piece of land however I have some objections – the main one being the roads.</p> <p>5.1- I moved into this area in March last year and currently have to go the long way to work a getting onto the A4146 around 8 o clock in the morning is a no go. This is down the weight of traffic that are crossing the roundabout on the A4146. As they are going from two lanes to one there is no opportunity to pull out.</p> <p>If this additional housing gets built this will add to the weight of traffic.</p> <p>Thank you for your swift response – I had assumed it would be similar numbers to the Waterside development in which case it would be a lot more vehicles. We already struggle for parking but if it's such a minimal number I think it would be hard to push anything forward. The weight of traffic has been made worse by the Eaton Leys development and will again knock on with the new Bellway site in Stoke Hammond.</p> <p>5.2 Then obviously the proposed site with accesses that's already been submitted for the housing on the farm land next to the A4146. If</p>	<p>5.1-The site is allocated in the Local Plan for residential use. Given the location of the site near to local facilities a very low</p> <p>5.1- A traffic impact statement will need to be submitted with any planning application.</p> <p>5.1 Sites across the whole of Milton Keynes need to be brought forward in a timely manner in order to meet the Council's obligation to provide a 5 year residential land supply. This site has been allocated for residential development since 1995.</p>
---	----------------------------	---	---

		<p>this highway could be sorted it would be better for all of us.</p>	<p>5.2- Comment noted – However This is beyond the remit of the Development Brief</p>
6	<p>Ann Seymour. 5 Phelps Road Bletchley MK 2 3FD</p>	<p>My comments are as follows.</p> <p>6.1-I feel this site is too small to accommodate 14 or more residences 2 storey let alone any 3 storey Site is on very low lying ground alongside the canal with mature trees which should be retained. Whilst not very likely to flood from canal there is considerable run off from the hilly areas across Stoke Road.</p> <p>6.2Access is proposed from Phelps Road which is already becoming dangerously busy at times and parking from this development could well encroach onto Phelps Road. We already suffer from some trade business vans and lorries parking here. There have been a number of accidents in spite of traffic lights at the junction Phelps Windermere and Stoke Road. Stoke Road already dangerous with amount of traffic especially at rush hours.</p> <p>6.3-Is the proposed development to include any social housing .</p> <p>I note it should be in keeping with existing estate all well and good but any property facing Phelps Road would overlook and intrude into the privacy of flats and house right opposite the access to the new development.</p> <p>Finally I would have thought the original developers of this Waterside estate Lovell would have continued along this piece of land if they had considered it viable.</p>	<p>6.1-Comment noted – leaving this site in its current state is contrary to the existing Local Plan and the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>6.2-A traffic impact statement will need to be submitted with any planning application.</p> <p>6.3-Social housing will be included if the number of dwellings exceeds 15 units.</p>

	<p>Although I am not completely against building here but feel very strongly that there are better sites and it is social housing that is badly needed and it looks as if it would be all expensive private residences</p> <p>6.4-Let's tidy this piece of land and let it become part of the linear park which is accessed from the adjacent bridge over the canal</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	<p>6.4- Leaving this site as amenity land is contrary to the existing Local Plan and the Lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
--	---	---

**Other Interested Parties**

7	<p>Richard Drew Development Director   Apollo Capital Projects Development</p>	<p>7.1- I am making an inquiry about this site which I discussed with Kevin Monkton back in March this year.</p> <p>My company Apollo Capital Projects is working with the main GP surgery in Bletchley called the Red House Surgery who have a requirement for new healthcare premises to service their growing patient list of over 12,000. Together with the support of the local CCG ( Clinical Commissioning Group) we are endeavouring to undertake a development for the surgery over the next 12/18 months and this site on Stoke Road was identified as potentially being suitable.</p> <p>Apollo is a specialist Primary Care developer with over 25 years' experience of developing GP surgery premises - please refer to our web site for more information <a href="http://www.apollomedical.co.uk">www.apollomedical.co.uk</a>.</p> <p>The new surgery building would be in the region of 1400sqm over 2 levels, so with a footprint of 700sqm. Ideally it would be served by around 50 car parking spaces; this site being 0.8 acre should be capable of supporting this scale of development.</p>	<p>7.1- The site is allocated in the Local Plan &amp; the 'made' lakes Estate Neighbourhood Plan for residential development.</p> <p>Currently the Council does not currently have a 5 year housing land supply.</p> <p>The CCG have confirmed that they are no longer interested in the site.</p> <p>Any community facilities / GP Surgery will need to be assessed against all Planning Policies and determined on its individual merits.</p>
---	--	--	---

		<p>I've read the consultation Development Brief which has identified the site for housing . Would you be able to consider it being developed for D1 health/surgery use please?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing from you,</p>	
--	--	---	--