

Minutes of the meeting of the PLANNING CABINET ADVISORY GROUP held on WEDNESDAY 9 DECEMBER 2020 at 6.00 pm

Present: Councillor Marland (Chair)
Councillors Bint, Ferrans, and Trendall

Officers: M Clarke (Principal Urban Designer), K Head (Monitoring and Information officer), S Kupczyk (Senior Planning Officer), J Palmer (Head of Planning), N Sainsbury (Head of Placemaking), and A Turner (Development Plans and Delivery Manager) and P Brown (Head of Democratic Services).

Also Present: Councillor J Baker (Central Bedfordshire Council), H Chipping (SEMLEP), K Fraser (Youth Cabinet), R Kurth (CMK Town Council), and R Mascarenhas (Youth Cabinet).

Apologies: Councillors D Hopkins and Legg, C Walton (Community Action Group) and D Hedge (Youth Cabinet).

CAG06 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None disclosed.

CAG07 MINUTES

The Chair received a query in relation to the minutes of the meeting of 13 July 2020 which included a correction to the minutes from 13 February 2020. Specifically, whether the suggestion of Youth Cabinet that the next Milton Keynes Local Plan should be named Innovate:MK, had been agreed.

In response, Councillor Marland advised that the Group was advisory in nature and therefore could not make a formal decision in relation to that matter. The executive would subsequently make such a decision, taking the suggestion into account.

RESOLVED -

That the Minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet Advisory Group held on 13 JULY 2020 and the Cabinet Advisory Group workshop held on 4 NOVEMBER 2020 be agreed as accurate records and the Chair to sign them as such.

CAG08 DRAFT SOUTH EAST MK DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK SPD

The Group received a presentation from the Head of Placemaking on the Draft South East Milton Keynes Development Framework Supplementary Planning Document.

Members of the Group made the following comments;

- The references to sites within Central Bedfordshire omitted to mention the Site to the West of Salford Road which was also available for Development.
- In respect of the Strategic Transport Network plans, there was a Redway extending out from Newport Road that could be further extended to the footpath from Old Farm Park to Newport Road utilising the existing footpath.
- There should be a requirement to provide grade separated crossings for the main roads in particular underpasses. Reference to this should be added to the Plan at Page 41 figure 3.1.
- At paragraph 4.2.29 of the Plan, reference to a 'Civic Space' was inappropriate terminology for an Urban Fringe Residential Suburb and Community Hub may be better.
- There should be a requirement on Developers to provide completed 'real' Grid Roads as part of their proposals rather than corridors or reserves.
- There should be a reference to real connectivity from H10 eastwards, not a reference to a potential link.
- There was no option within the Plan that took into account the possibility that Woburn Sands Railway Station was not relocated. This should be a fourth option.
- There had been representations from Woburn Sands to the effect that a by-pass was required, but there had been no modelling of that.
- The Local Plan stated that Redways should be on only one side of a road, rather than both and if appropriate crossings were to be provided; this was a principle that should be adhered to.
- Where staggered 'T' Junctions were required these should incorporate all safety measures at the outset rather than being applied piecemeal; there were several examples within the Town where this has happened.
- The Primary Road through the estate had houses with direct access to it and this should be avoided to ensure that the experiences of congestion elsewhere were not repeated.

- The options within the Plan assumed an East West rail link, but that there should be a 'fall back' option should that not be forthcoming. This should include consideration of the Transport Strategy in the event of a one bridge option and the provision of a level crossing on V10.
- The proposed siting of the transport hub was too far from the Woburn Sands Railway Station.
- Any connection between the estate and Woburn Sands should be via roads that would be for local use rather than develop any routes through to Junction 13 that would encourage the wider commuter groups to use them as a short way through to the motorway.
- The Road that is indicated as 'yellow' should be a grid road with grade separated crossings.
- The comparison of the primary residential road with others from other estates was misleading as this was primarily straight sections of roads rather than may estate roads which were not.
- The situation of a school adjacent to a main street was problematical for public transport as it would lead to congestion when residents drove children to school, especially when the weather was inclement. There would be a need for good highway planning in this respect

In response to a comment in respect of the status of the main street through the development area, Councillor Marland confirmed that the lessons learnt in respect of Countess Way and Fenn Street had been considered and the route was proposed to be a two carriageway road rather than four and was designed to ensure that it would not be attractive as a cut through route as it would have deviations around local centres and other similar areas.

In respect of the 'fall back' option, Councillor Marland stated that he had concerns about drawing this up as it would provide East West rail with a potentially cheaper option that would fail to deliver many of the benefits that the new rail link could provide for the Town.

In response to a question in respect of what criteria would be used to select the travellers site and how would the decision be justified to those living in close proximity to a chosen site, Councillor Marland stated that he believed that all 5 potential sites met the criteria for allocation as a traveller site but was unsure how an individual site would be selected. The Senior Planning Officer told the Group that the sites had been proposed based on best practice and that this had been researched on a National basis, however, there was no formal guidance.

There was a need to recognise that there was a difference between permanent and transient sites, which had different requirements, for example a permanent site would need to have a relationship with its surrounding community.

Councillor Marland stated that there would be a need to consider representations from Ward and Parish Councils, he did not however see why it would be necessary to consult on 5 sites, two of which were within the green buffer areas, which he suggested should be withdrawn from the consultation document as there had already been strong objections to the use of the Green Buffer zones for this purpose.

The Head of Urban Design confirmed that the Transport Officers had welcomed the locating of the school close to the main bus routes.

In response to a request, Councillor Marland stated that he would make a summary of feedback from consultations with Parish Councils available to members of the Group.

Councillor Marland stated that he was aware that there was a view that the Plan was premature and that there was a need to wait for consultation on the East West Rail development. He further recognised that there was a view that as the Council had a five-year housing land supply the development should not take place yet. However, Developers had indicated that as this was an allocated site and that there was not a sustainable reason to delay and doing so could result in speculative development that Council could not control. It was also necessary to maintain the five-year land supply going forward.

Councillor Marland further commented that should any members of the Group have any additional comments they should be forwarded by the 16th December 2020. It was anticipated that a Delegated Decision in respect of the Plan would be taken early in 2021.

THE CHAIR CLOSED THE MEETING AT 7.42 PM