

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON DRAFT DAUBENEY GATE, SHENLEY CHURCH END DEVELOPMENT BRIEF

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
Milton Keynes Development Partnership		
1.1 Matt Green, MKDP	Amend para 1.2.4 to read: 'The Development Brief has been commissioned, not by the Planning Authority, but rather by the landowner and it has not been subject to 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.'	Accepted. Amend para 1.2.4 to read: '<u>The Development Brief has been commissioned, not by the Planning Authority, but rather by the landowner and it has not been subject to 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.</u>'
MKC Councillors		
2.1 MKC Development Control Committee	How should setting of SAM be protected? It was commented that the Brief should be more specific in respect of arrangements to protect the entrance to and the setting of the scheduled ancient monument and any developer would be best advised to contact Historic England to seek to realign the boundary of the monument	See response to rep no 11.2 (Historic England).

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
2.2	to allow development to take place. Don't allow site boundary and boundary of SAM to overlap.	A buffer zone has been included to ensure that development won't encroach on the SAM or its setting (see response to rep no 11.2).
2.3	Add in that MKC own MKDP.	Accepted. Amend first sentence of footnote on page 6 to read: "MKDP is a limited liability partnership set up and owned by Milton Keynes Council to facilitate Milton Keynes's continued growth....."
2.4	No active frontage or access onto Daubeney Gate.	Not accepted. It is a key urban design principle that development should front the street. Access onto Daubeney Gate will be limited.
2.5	No 3 storeys.	Accepted. Amend para 5.4.1 to delete sentence: "3 storeys may be appropriate to mark key buildings."
2.6	Need tracked changes document. The Committee asked that when the revised brief was presented to the Committee it contain 'tracked changes'.	Noted.
3.1	Councillor Zoe Nolan I know the site was originally allocated for an independent school but there has been nothing coming forward for the school. We looked at it for a special school but the schools forum voted against this. Part of the site was also looked at for a primary school but there is not a need in the immediate area and all that would do is draw people in	Noted. The Site is allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
	<p>from other areas.. The parish and neighbours were against having a school there as well because of the traffic when people are either driven to school or they drive themselves in the case of older young people.</p> <p>I understand that some people think sixth form college might be appropriate but I would not support this view. There is already sixth form provision at Denbigh and at Hazeley in the area. In my view the best solution would be housing. It is not too far from the station which offers good opportunities for work either locally or in London. It is not very far from the local shops. I would like to see starter homes or other sorts of homes which are more affordable or council housing, for example bungalows similar to those on Engaine Drive, on the site.</p>	
4.1	<p>Councillor Andy Dransfield</p> <p>As well as being a Milton Keynes councillor representing the Loughton and Shenley ward, I am also a trustee of the Denbigh Multi Academy Trust which has recently been awarded the new school at Whitehouse.</p> <p>The Whitehouse school is proposed with an 11-16 age range with no post 16 provision. Even though the Council's Education Department has confirmed that the site is no longer required for education use – I am advised that means Primary – there is no clear plan for post 16 education on the Western Flank to accommodate the pupils who will reach 16 in about 2025. The Denbigh MAT should have written to you to express similar concerns.</p> <p>Therefore, I think that it is premature to market or dispose</p>	<p>Not accepted. The Site Allocations Plan allocates the site for housing.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
	of this area which is currently designated for Education use. I will expand on this issue if you insist on proceeding to the Development Control Committee, and formally 'call in' a similar Delegated Decision.	
5.1	<p>I know that many residents have responded to the consultation, and I would urge all those involved in decision-making to review the submissions in detail, as I am sure you always would.</p> <p>Among the concerns are issues relating to traffic management, building design, privacy, drainage, impact on wildlife, impact on historic sites and noise and disruption generally. I wanted to highlight a few of those points in particular.</p>	<p>Where it can, the brief addresses the concerns raised (see responses below, 5.2-5.4).</p> <p>However, many of the issues will only be fully resolved through the planning application process when a detailed scheme is submitted.</p>
5.2	Traffic flow and entry/exits to the site need to be considered carefully, especially given the width of Daubeney Gate itself. I can well imagine the impact locally of lots of additional cars trying to drive through and park along the road.	<p>Any planning application for housing would require the developer to submit a Transport Statement/Assessment. This would assess the impact of development on existing roads and propose measures to mitigate those impacts, where necessary. <u>Include new para after 5.7.2 to read: "Planning applications for proposals must include a Transport Statement/Assessment. A Transport Statement/Assessment"</u></p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
		<p><u>identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport.</u></p>
5.3	<p>Those adjacent to the site will want reassurance about their privacy and also the height and design of any planned buildings.</p>	<p>See response to rep no 2.5 with regard to building heights. With regard to privacy, any development will be expected to accord with the guidance in the Residential Design Guide SPD.</p>
5.4	<p>With regards to wildlife, residents have mentioned great crested newts and foxes. There should be active plans to assess and manage impacts. Drainage should also be considered to prevent flooding.</p>	<p>Para 5.10.2 of the brief requires that proposals for development should be accompanied by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, which will identify and mitigate impacts on wildlife. Para 5.10.1 requires that surface water drainage is taken into account in the design of new development.</p>
5.5	<p>I am aware that various of these issues have been addressed in the draft brief, but residents will want clarity that all concerns have been heard and reflected in the brief, and that safeguards are in place.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
6.1	<p>(Former) Councillor Matt Clifton</p> <p>There is no meaningful local demand or need for either an</p>	<p>Noted. The site is allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined>
	<p>independent, primary or special school at this site.</p> <p>A school would increase peak time traffic in a residential area where people are crying out for better traffic calming measures.</p> <p>Similarly a sixth form college would not be appropriate, not least because there is already sixth form provision at Denbigh and at Hazeley.</p> <p>However, from so many conversations with so many people, I can say there is a huge demand and need for housing and affordable housing.</p> <p>The site offers good opportunities for work either locally or in London and is close to local amenities.</p> <p>Therefore I would like to see more affordable housing and/or council housing at Daubeney Gate.</p>	
Parish Council		
7.1 Shenley Church End Parish Council	<p>Following the PC meeting the Parish Council would like to put forward the following comments:</p> <p>The area should be retained as a Reserve Site for future schooling needs.</p>	<p>The site is allocated for housing in the Site Allocations Plan.</p>
7.2	<p>If this is not a feasible option: Rear parking should be avoided. It has been proven time</p>	<p>Direct access to properties cannot be taken off Daubeney Gate. Rear parking would be</p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
	and again that this does not work and residents will simply park in the road outside their properties clogging them up and leaving the parking areas empty. Parking should be on plot or to the front of the properties	only considered for these properties. The brief does suggest that an alternative arrangement could be short private drives parallel to Daubeney Gate and Vache Lane serving a number of properties. The majority of the site would have front or side parking.
7.3	3 storey properties will not be in keeping with the area and would look out of place	Amend para 5.4.1 to delete sentence: “3 storeys may be appropriate to mark key buildings.”
7.4	Serious consideration should be given to the suggestion of contemporary designs as these may not be in keeping with the existing properties in the area.	The brief makes it clear that the appearance of new housing should be informed by the site’s context. Existing development along Daubeney Gate has a more contemporary feel and therefore it would be appropriate to reflect this character.
7.5	Consideration to schooling and medical provision for the increase in residents must be given. The additional houses on the 3 sites within the parish that have development potential will increase the strain particularly on health services which are already stretched within the parish.	Noted.
Other Stakeholders		
8.1	Ken Brewis, Daubeney Gate	First and foremost I welcome the use of this land, whether it be for housing or school. Noted.
8.2	Copy of your letter, on page 2, I have identified an area which is prone to flooding from October to March every year, this is obviously the lowest part of the field adjacent to Daubeney Gate and directly opposite the cul-de-sac for	Noted. Any development proposal will be required to ensure that existing surface water drainage issues are addressed. Para 5.10.1 of the Brief emphasises the need to

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
	houses 1 to 4. Drainage for this area is a priority and must be taken into account, as it would be totally unacceptable for it to impact on the relevant cul-de-sac.	ensure that surface water management is fully integrated into the development.
8.3	<p>I have attached a photograph taken within the last few days which also shows the flooded area.</p> <p>A number of houses along Daubeney Gate face directly onto the proposed development area and therefore careful consideration should be taken into account regarding design and structure, so as not to detract from the existing properties; e.g. all residents would oppose the construction of 3 story dwellings along Daubeney gate.</p>	<p>Para 5.1.2 of the Brief states that development proposals should be based on a thorough appraisal of the site's context.</p> <p>Para 5.5.1 states that the architectural approach to development should be informed by the contextual analysis.</p> <p>Amend para 5.4.1 to delete sentence: "3 storeys may be appropriate to mark key buildings."</p>
8.4	Daubeney Gate is quite a narrow and well inclined road, as well as being on a busy bus route; therefore it would not be in the best interest for all concerned to have additional entries/exits along its route. Ideally there should be a single entrance/exit to the new development along Vache Lane, which is NOT on the bus route.	<p>Not accepted. It is considered that the access points proposed would provide the best solution to development of the site.</p> <p>Access off both Vache Lane and Daubeney Gate is required to enable houses to front the street and for parking to be provided to the front or side of the property.</p>
8.5	To avoid parking along the main length of Daubeney Gate it would also be advantageous for there to be double yellow lines both sides, as this would provide safety for all users concerned.	<p>Noted. This not a matter for the Development Brief.</p>
9.1 Ashley & Joan Mirfin, Vache Lane	As local residents we are particularly concerned that the proposed development will have a material effect on the quiet enjoyment of our property. During the construction period access to the site and the parking for contractors' vehicles must be properly controlled and enforced. We	<p>Accepted. Site traffic can be controlled through a Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>Include text to state "A planning condition will be imposed on any consent for housing requiring a</p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
	believe that it should be mandatory for all such parking to be provided on site by the developer.	Construction Management Plan to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of development. ”
9.2	Daubeney Gate is a bus route and is not suitable for long term parking. Vache Lane is not of sufficient width to facilitate parking on either side. We witness the daily school runs where a single parked vehicle is enough to disrupt the free flow of traffic between V3, the schools and local centre. In our view the site should be planned and designed for there to be sufficient usable and accessible parking within the confines of the site for all the vehicles of future residents.	Development must provide parking on site in accordance with the Council’s adopted parking standards.
9.3	The opportunity in the Brief for up to three access points to the site contributes to the potential parking issues. We believe a single access road would best serve the site. This access road should be at the western end of Daubeney Gate as close to H5 as possible. This would reduce site traffic using Daubeney Gate and Vache Lane. It should be noted that the adjoining development on Duncan Grove has a single access point from Vache Lane close to V3.	Not accepted. It is considered that the access points proposed would provide the best solution to development of the site. Access off both Vache Lane and Daubeney Gate is required to enable houses to front the street and for parking to be provided to the front or side of the property.
9.4	Houses in the development fronting Daubeney Gate and Vache Lane should each complement the existing houses in terms of colour, construction and size.	Noted. The existing context should inform the design of new housing. Para 5.1.2 of the Brief states that development proposals should be based on a thorough appraisal of the site’s context. Para 5.5.1 states that the architectural approach to development should be informed by the contextual analysis.
10.1	We write regarding the future of the land at Daubeney	Not accepted. Site is allocated for housing

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined>
Squires, Denbigh School	<p>Gate, Shenley Church End. Historically this plot has been set aside for educational purposes but this is now apparently under scrutiny, and at risk of being disposed of. It is my understanding that this is largely due to the four new primary schools being built on Whitehouse and Fairfield, however whilst there may no longer be a need for primary provision, there most certainly is a growing need for Post-16 provision.</p> <p>The Regional Schools Commissioner and the Local Authority recently informed us that, The Denbigh Alliance Multi Academy Trust has been awarded the running of the Secondary School, soon to be built on the new Whitehouse Development. This new school which is 1.4 miles from Denbigh School will provide an additional 1800 places for students aged 11-16. The entry will be for 360 students in each year group.</p> <p>The new school is due to open in September 2020. Therefore, by 2025 there will be a significant group (approximately 500) of Post-16 students for whom there is no current or future provision. The Sixth Form at Denbigh School has an excellent retention and recruitment rate and could not currently support this increased capacity in its existing buildings. There is not enough provision on the Western Flank to accommodate these additional students.</p> <p>The development at Whitehouse has not been allocated any space for a purpose built Sixth Form Centre. It would seem prudent therefore, to retain the land at Daubeney Gate, which lies, between the new School and Denbigh</p>	<p>in the Site Allocations Plan.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
11.1	<p>School for potential future Sixth Form provision.</p> <p>We would strongly urge that the council reconsider any plans to dispose of or change the usage of this plot, as there is a definite future need for Post-16 educational provision in this area.</p> <p>I have consulted my colleague, David Wilkinson, Assistant Inspector of Ancient Monuments. David has confirmed that he is satisfied that the previous archaeological evaluation has shown that the area of the site close to the scheduled monument does not contain archaeological remains of national importance - indeed, the evaluation suggests, from the sample that was investigated, that archaeological remains are very sparse. We are satisfied that the remainder of the site can be investigated by a pre-determination archaeological evaluation.</p>	Noted.
11.2	<p>With regard to the setting of the Scheduled Monument, the impact of a housing development on the significance of the monument is likely to be different to that of a single-storey school set in its own grounds. However, we are aware that Policy SAP9 includes the requirement for proposals to incorporate a buffer to the adjacent Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>We consider that if this buffer zone is adequate in terms of nature and extent, then harm to the significance of the Scheduled Monument would be avoided or reduced to an acceptable level.</p> <p>We therefore advise that the development brief being prepared by the Council's Urban Design and Landscape Architecture Team for the site covered by Policy SAP9,</p>	<p>Accepted. Amend para 5.10.5 to read: “<u>A buffer zone, measured at 15 metres from the southern boundary of the site, has been defined around the Scheduled Ancient Monument, in order to protect its setting. This area should be kept free of development and should be maintained as public open space. Housing adjacent to the buffer zone should be a maximum of 2 storeys to ensure that built development does not adversely affect the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument.</u>” Amend Parameters Plan to show buffer zone around SAM and area to be</p>

Consultee	Comment	Officer Response (proposed change in bold, with new text underlined)
	<p>with advice from the Council's Senior Archaeological Officer, should include a requirement for a buffer zone for the scheduled monument of appropriate size (minimum to be specified) and nature (rather than requiring any future development merely to 'have regard to the setting of the scheduled monument').</p> <p>With this safeguard in the development brief, Historic England would be satisfied that the development of the site covered by Policy SAP9 would be acceptable in terms of impact on the significance of the Scheduled Monument. We therefore withdraw our objection to Policy SAP9 and to the Proposed Modification MM16 in anticipation of this requirement being included in the development brief.</p>	<p>maintained as public open space.</p>