

ITEM 3(a)



Minutes of the meeting of the SPECIAL CABINET MEETING held on TUESDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2017 at 6.30 pm

Present: Councillors Marland (Chair and Leader of the Council), Gifford, Gowans, Legg, Long, Nolan and O'Neill.

Present: C Mills (Chief Executive), M Bracey (Corporate Director People), N Jones (Corporate Director Resources), D Sharkey (Corporate Director Place), S Bridglingsingh (Service Director [Legal and Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer]), A Rose (Service Director [Growth, Economy and Culture]), P Gosal (Head of Corporate Economic Development & Inward Investment), J Cheston (Development Plans Team Leader), J Dewar (Interim Principal Planning Officer), M Moore (Senior Planning Officer), D Webber (Senior Planning Officer), J Wellstead (Senior Planning Officer), M Mackowiak, (Planning Officer), A Turner (Planning Officer) and S Muir (Committee Manager).

Also Present: Councillors Bint, Crooks, Ferrans, A Geary, Jenkins and McLean and circa 65 members of the public.

C124 APOLOGIES

Councillor Middleton (Cabinet member for Resources and Innovation)

C125 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

None Received

C126 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

(a) Question from Mr John Baker to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place).

Mr Burnett, with regard to Agenda Item 9 (Approval of the Draft Plan MK), asked Councillor Gifford to clarify the proposal included in the Draft Plan:MK Policy DS2 (page 29) for the South East Growth Area (i.e. between Bow Brickhill and Woburn Sands) and the Land East of the M1, as the Draft Plan stated this would not be brought forward until a route for the Expressway had been agreed. Conversely, the paragraph referring to the South East Growth Area did not include this condition, although Paragraph 5.24 on page 47 of

the Draft Policy confirmed the South East Growth Area was subject to the same condition and suggested that the summary on page 29 of the Draft Policy should be amended to include this condition.

The Service Director (Growth, Economy and Culture) indicated that it would be made clear in Policies DS2 (Housing Strategy [Land East of the M1]), SD13 (Land allocated at South East Milton Keynes) and SD14 (Land allocated at Milton Keynes East) of Plan:MK, that the delivery of both of the strategic sites was conditional upon there being clarity as to the route of the proposed Oxford –Cambridge Expressway.

- (b) Question from Mrs Pritchett to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place).

Mrs Pritchett, with regard to Agenda Item 9 (Approval of the Draft Plan;MK), asked Councillor Gifford to clarify if before Plan:MK was approved and implemented, and there was a planning application for a fast food outlet to open near a school, whether the Council's Development Control Committee could take the Draft Plan:MK into consideration when approving or declining such applications and if not, was there any current policy that the Development Control Committee could take into account.

The Development Plans Team Leader clarified that as the Plan:MK was currently at a draft stage, it would not be legitimate for the Council to use its policies for the determination of current planning applications until the Plan had progressed to a more advanced stage.

Councillor Marland, Leader of the Council, indicated that he was aware of the planning application that Mrs Pritchett was referring to and any technical issues would be for the Development Control Committee as the decision making body, to consider. However, he would ask officer colleagues to advise Mrs Pritchett in writing of any relevant policies.

- (c) Question from Mr John Burnett to Councillor Gifford (Cabinet member for Place).

Mr Burnett, with regard to Agenda Item 9 (Approval of the Draft Plan MK), asked Councillor Gifford how the Draft Plan:MK would impact on existing infrastructure.

Councillor Gifford indicated that existing built areas already had their infrastructure needs catered for. However, the consultation process would enable the Council to gather as much evidence as possible on the likely impact of growth that was already planned for or would be planned in the future, as a result of the Draft Plan:MK. This evidence would enable the Council to plan for the infrastructure elements needed to

alleviate the impacts of future developments and could also be used to inform funding applications to the Government for any required infrastructure. Therefore, the Council hoped to receive as much evidence as possible during the consultation period.

**C129 CAMBRIDGE - MILTON KEYNES - OXFORD CORRIDOR:
INTERIM REPORT OF THE NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE
COMMISSION - REFERRAL FROM COUNCIL: 11 JANUARY
2017**

The Cabinet received the Interim Report of the National Infrastructure Commission, referred from the Council meeting of 11 January 2017 which was presented by Councillor Crooks.

Councillor Marland thanked Councillor Crooks and indicated that the response to the National Infrastructure Commission's report would be discussed as part of Item 9 on the Agenda (Approval of the Draft Plan MK).

C130 APPROVAL OF DRAFT PLAN:MK FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION

The Cabinet considered approving the Draft Plan:MK for a 12 week consultation, noting that feedback from the proposed consultation would be used to prepare the final version of Plan:MK.

It was reported that the Draft Plan:MK had been prepared using the outputs of previous rounds of consultation, a range of background evidence work and the input of a cross-party Councillor Consultation Working Group.

Councillor Gifford, the responsible Cabinet member for Place, in introducing the report, outlined that when the Draft Plan:MK was finally adopted it would set out how much new development was needed, in the Borough, where it should go and also provide the detailed policies that would be used when making decisions on planning applications. Plan:MK would inform a list of policy areas that included Community, Adult Social Care, Housing and Education needs. Also, if a site had already been granted planning permission, the site would be retained as part of Plan:MK.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the comments from the National Infrastructure Commission, referred to in the earlier item referred from Council would be included in the consultation process.

Councillor Gifford explained that the Council required feedback and views from residents and partners as to the preferred approach with regard what should be included in Plan:MK and what had been done well. For example, residents might wish to make constructive comments about existing features. A number of opportunities for residents, partners and parish and town councils to respond to the consultation were being organised and would include meetings, exhibitions and consultation events. Responses could also be

submitted at libraries, by letter or email and direct on the Council's consultation website.

The Cabinet received a presentation and a short film presented by the Service Director (Growth, Economy and Culture), that explained the vision and development strategy for the future of the Borough and the development management policies and site allocations for all sizes and types of development that were required to help deliver this vision.

The Service Director stated that Plan:MK would review and replace the existing Core Strategy (adopted in 2013) and the saved policies from the Local Plan (adopted in 2005). Plan:MK was required in order that the Council could demonstrate how it planned to meet the Government targets for 2016-2031 of 26,500 additional homes and the 5 Year Housing Land Supply target.

The Service Director also emphasised that National Planning Policy set clear expectations as to how a Local Plan must be developed in order for it to be justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared to deliver sustainable development that met local needs and national priorities. Local Authorities that did not produce a local Plan could be subject to Government special measures.

The Cabinet received a number of questions and comments from residents, Parish and Town Councils and Ward Councillors as follows:

Parish Councillor P Williams (Haversham cum Little Linford Parish Council)

Parish Councillor Williams stated that Haversham cum Little Linford Parish Council had been very concerned about the recent purchases of large areas of agricultural land in the Parish by developers, for housing. The parish council was relieved that the Draft Plan:MK was being approved for consultation without the inclusion of a large area of development in the northern part of the Borough and that the potential strategic growth options for Milton Keynes had focused on the existing urban area.

Parish Councillor Williams also indicated that Haversham cum Little Linford Parish Council was also developing a Parish Neighbourhood Plan that it was anticipated would provide details of small development areas within the parish and thanked the Development Plans team for its assistance with this.

Richard Pryor, Chair of the Protect Rural MK

Mr Pryor indicated that Protect Rural Milton Keynes had been very concerned about the suggested expansion in the rural northern area of the borough and was relieved that this option had been reconsidered and removed in the new version of the Draft Plan:MK .

As a result, the Protect Rural Milton Keynes Group was now able to broadly support the revised draft.

However, the Group requested that a statement be included in the proposed Plan:MK indicating that the Great Ouse River Valley be considered as a natural barrier to development between the urban part of Milton Keynes and the rural northern area so preventing urban expansion into the countryside.

Mr Pryor also indicated that Protect Rural Milton Keynes commended the proposals that areas to be developed across Milton Keynes should be identified by Parish Neighbourhood Plans.

Parish Councillor Robert Jones Vice Chair, Bow Brickhill Parish Council

Parish Councillor Jones, on behalf of the residents of Bow Brickhill, asked for clarification of the late inclusion in the draft plan of employment land known as "Caldecotte South" identified as sites U22 and U27 which was allocated for the development of a mix of B2 and B8 employment floor space within the Plan period.

Parish Councillor Jones stated that these areas were in the Bow Brickhill Parish Council area and would be completely separated from Caldecotte by the proposed East West Rail link and were adjacent to one of the two areas of attractive natural landscape in Milton Keynes. Parish Councillor Jones requested that their inclusion should be reconsidered.

Mr Alan Francis

Mr Francis stated that the proposed housing target of 26,500 of additional homes during the period of 2016-2031 (1,765 p.a.) were too high and a more realistic target of 18,500 (1,250 p.a.) should be considered. He indicated that the lower figure would support the increase in the indigenous population and suggested future growth rates of newcomers to Milton Keynes. Mr Francis also stated that he did not believe that the indicated housing targets of 26,500 homes would have the required infrastructure.

Mr Francis further stated that it was his view that had the housing target in the existing Core Strategy been lower, then Milton Keynes would have met its Housing Land Supply targets and would have been able to refuse inappropriate planning applications from developers and he feared that this mistake was being repeated.

Mr John Baker

Mr Baker stated that he was now a resident of Aspley Guise, having previously lived in Milton Keynes, and indicated that Milton Keynes needed to improve its engagement about the impact of the Council's proposed plans on surrounding neighbouring local authorities such as Central Bedfordshire Council and Aspley Guise Parish Council

Mr Baker also indicated that the route for the proposed East/West Expressway needed to be agreed as quickly as possible to relieve the pressure of traffic on Woburn Sands, Wavendon and Aspley Guise.

Councillor A Geary

Councillor A Geary indicated his broad support for the Draft Plan:MK, but stated that he also supported the comments from Bow Brickhill Parish Council that the late inclusion in the draft plan of employment land known as "Caldecotte South" identified as sites U22 and U27, should be reconsidered as these could have a detrimental impact on Bow Brickhill.

Councillor A Geary also indicated that he supported the view that the Great Ouse River Valley was a natural barrier to growth and was pleased that the proposed strategic growth option to expand the existing urban area to the North, taking account of land between the M1 and the West Coast Mainline, north of the Ouse Valley and villages of Haversham and Little Linford had been withdrawn from the new version of the Draft Plan. Councillor A Geary thanked the Cabinet for listening to the views from the Parish Councils and over 1,000 householders in the rural northern area of the borough.

Councillor Bint

Councillor Bint echoed the views of Councillor A Geary and the previous speakers. He also stated his support for the process and welcomed what was a milestone in Planning Policy which would guide development in Milton Keynes for the next 15 years.

Councillor Bint indicated that housing targets were required and needed to be implemented to protect the Council from potential challenge from Developers.

Councillor Bint requested that the status and validity of existing Supplementary Planning Documents should be clarified in the Draft Plan:MK .

Councillor McLean

Councillor McLean stated his support for the comments by the previous speakers and for the proposed Draft Plan:MK.

Councillor MacLean suggested that clarification with regard to the future impacts on neighbouring local authorities such as Mulsoe Parish Council and Central Bedfordshire Council, of the development of Land East of the M1 motorway, south of Newport Pagnell, which it was envisaged would provide a sustainable urban extension after 2026.

Councillor McLean also indicated that with the other Ward members in Olney Ward, he would be organising public meetings in that Ward to discuss the consultation.

Councillor Ferrans

Councillor Ferrans indicated that she had been part of a Councillor Group working on the Plan:MK.

Councillor Ferrans also indicated that the population of Milton Keynes had been growing at the rate of 1100-1300 homes per year and that as companies were already successfully recruiting from outside the borough, these potential additional residents needed to be included in the forecast housing targets. Due to the anticipated pressure on the transport infrastructure resulting from the increasing levels of employment, it was essential that a realistic view of the future housing targets be included.

Councillor Ferrans further indicated her frustration with the sluggish rate of house building once planning permissions were granted and indicated that it was hoped that the 7 February 2017 Government White Paper which sought to speed up the building of homes, would resolve this.

Councillor Jenkins

Councillor Jenkins stated her support for the comments from the previous speakers and for the proposed Draft Plan:MK.

Councillor Jenkins indicated that it was essential that a 5 year housing land supply was in place and also expressed her concerns about the late inclusion in the draft plan of employment land known as "Caldecotte South" identified as sites U22 and U27, as this was not in the December 2016 version of the Draft Plan:MK.

Councillor Jenkins also indicated that she hoped that the affected communities, including those from the rural areas would be listened to.

Councillor D Hopkins

Councillor Marland read out an email from Councillor D Hopkins, Ward member for Danesborough and Walton, which advised of his disappointment about the late inclusion in the draft Plan of employment land known as "Caldecotte South" identified as sites U22 and U27, as this was not in the December 2016 version of the Draft Plan:MK and also indicated that the route of the proposed East/West Expressway needed to be formalised as quickly as possible

Councillor Gifford, the responsible Cabinet member, explained that the proposed housing numbers in the Draft Plan:MK were based on Government forecasts of house that would be needed to meet current and future population growth. Councillor Gifford stated that she shared the frustrations with the sluggish building rates once planning permissions had been granted.

Councillor Gifford indicated that the Housing Allocation Plan was about housing use and this would need to be examined more

carefully during the consultation period with input from residents and parish councils.

Councillor Gifford acquiesced that the late inclusion in the draft plan of employment land known as "Caldecotte South" identified as sites U22 and U27 at Bow Brickhill might have been a shock for residents in that area, but including these sites would enable meaningful discussion with residents, Parish Councils and Ward members and provide the opportunity to re-examine the impact of the proposals.

Councillor Gifford explained that during the process so far, neighbouring authorities had been consulted and consideration had also been given to the impact of their Local Plans on Milton Keynes.

Councillor Gifford also indicated her support for the draft Plan:MK and summarised that the current draft Plan:MK was not final but represented the Council's preferred approach based on the evidence currently available and the results of the consultations in 2014 and 2016. The Draft Plan had been prepared with input from a cross-party Councillor Working group. The preparation had now reached a stage where the views and feedback from residents and parish and town councils on what the Plan ought to contain, and where a preferred approach had been identified, whether that approach was appropriate. The responses to this consultation document would, together with the findings from ongoing evidence studies, shape the final version of the Plan which was expected to be published for a final round of consultation at the end of 2017.

Councillor Gifford reiterated that it was essential that comments were submitted both on issues that worked well as well as those that didn't; the more comments and detailed responses as possible that were able to be considered would strengthen the final version of the Plan:MK and would be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate .

Councillor Marland, Leader of the Council, clarified that it was one of the most important documents that the Cabinet had considered and it built on previous policies to take the development of Milton Keynes forward. Councillor Marland thanked all those involved in producing it for their work and input.

Councillor Marland indicated his support for the draft Plan:MK and also indicated that the issue of accurate forecasts of housing numbers would be for the Planning Inspector to confirm, but the numbers submitted should be robust .

Councillor Marland also stated that the East /West Expressway and Rail link was central to the Plan. He had also met with surrounding local authorities to take the draft Plan:MK and the issues arising from it, forward on a consensual, not an adversarial basis.

Councillor Marland further stated that the Plan:MK was a plan for the people of Milton Keynes and not for the Council, and would continue the borough's history of an excellent built environment and a high quality green space development that fitted with the MK50 vision.

Councillor Marland also indicated that issues such as the River Ouse Valley natural barrier to development that had been raised during the meeting would need to be consulted on prior to inclusion.

RESOLVED -

1. That the Draft Plan:MK be published for a 12-week period of public consultation and engagement.
2. That the Service Director (Growth, Economy and Culture), in consultation with the Cabinet member for Place, be authorised to make any minor necessary amendments to the Draft Plan:MK when producing the consultation version of the Draft Plan:MK.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 19:46 PM

DRAFT