

Notes and Actions from the Planning CAG workshop Location: Virtual Meeting
Date: 25th August 2020, 18:30-20:30

1. Welcome
2. Purpose of the workshop
3. Timeline of events
4. Draft vision discussion
5. Presentation and discussion on 4 key structuring elements
6. Next steps

Apologise: [Apology from Hilary Chipping \(SEMLEP\)](#), [Clare Walton \(Community Action Group\)](#), [Disha Hedge \(Youth Cabinet\)](#)

Present:

Cllr Peter Marland (PM)

Cllr John Bint (JB)

Cllr David Hopkins (DH)

Cllr Jenni Ferrans (JF)

Cllr Paul Trendall (PT)

Cllr Rebecca Kurth (RK)

Youth Cabinet: Kathryn Fraser (KF) (supported by Roy Mazcarenhas for questions)

Cllr John Baker (JB2)

Officers: Neil Sainsbury (NS), Matthew Clarke, Sabina Kupczyk

Notes:

Agenda Item	Notes	Actions, points agreed and updates
1	Welcome and introductions were given by Cllr Marland Opening speech was made by Cllr Marland reminding CAG members of terms of reference of the group, the need for work to progress of the SPD. Officer abuse will not be tolerated and if a member of CAG does not treat officers with respect warning will be given followed by not inviting the member to CAG event.	

2	<p>The purpose of the meetings of CAG, today's and future workshops are to provide with discussion and recommendations on the detailed points raised. Following a workshop, the advice will be put into a document with recommendations, but it is Cabinet Member's executive decision to agree or disagree with the advice given.</p>	<p>Action for officers: to draft note from the workshop and circulate mid-week commencing 31 August 2020 with actions noted</p>
3	<p>PM asked if there were any comments on the timeline of event and there were no comments from CAG members</p> <p>PM mentioned that he would like workshop and future meetings of CAG to be supported by Democratic Services to ensure minutes and actions are captioned.</p>	<p>Action for officers: to request Democratic Services support for CAG meetings and workshops</p>
4	<p>Site Context was presented by NS with associated photographs of the allocation with site analysis showing the sites constraints. This was followed by a slide which listed 8 points of the SEMK Draft Vision for Site as identified by LSG. A list of key points of reference from policies from Plan:MK were presented. CAG members were invited to comment on the vision and answer 2 questions:</p> <p>Where the vision says 'south of the railway feels like living in the countryside' how does CAG interpret that in terms of strategic infrastructure and character?</p> <p>Should the strategic movement network be influenced by the future nature of the railway crossing in Woburn Sands?</p> <p>DH: member of CAG and LSG as well. Answers need to be given in relation to the future of the Woburn Sands station and whether it is going to be moved or not. The preference is for it to remain where it is and for the SE SUE MK site to provide additional parking for the users of the station. There is limited opportunity to do anything with Woburn Sands railway crossing unless you build some form of by-pass to a new crossing point, however there are many negatives to building a by-pass to create a new crossing point with a route off Newport Rd. The impending Swan Hill development would presumably make such a road more challenging. There is option for bridge at Bow Brickhill which will require land take. There are questions around the area south of the railway line.</p> <p>PM: underlined that the 8 points from the vision is a list and it is unlikely that all could be achieved and asked for guidance regarding prioritisation.</p> <p>DH: started that he is a director of Greens Sands Trust and mentioned Brickhill Woods and need for its protection and extension. The Development Framework should provide guidance on how development especially south of the</p>	<p>Full policy wording of the Plan:MK policies can be found here: https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/dpd-s-and-spds-spgs</p>

	<p>railway should respond to this context setting. The grid road system not to be extended beyond the self-contained site, grid road access is good but must address issues raised around South Caldecotte . The framework should be mindful of the extension of the road and managing moderating the existing traffic too on Woburn Sands/Bow Brickhill Road. Greens Sand ridge is leisure opportunity we need to incorporate safe, secure and sustainable access points to the Greensands Ridge and Brickhill Woods from the whole of Milton Keynes by linking this area into the linear park network. In relation to no 5. There should be no residential dwellings in the buffers of any kind including G&T site. No 7 is a statement of fact, densities to be sensitive and responsive to the local context. South of the railway should be lower densities and style of housing should reflect character and proximity to Bow Brickhill and Greensands Ridge. Parish councils and residents' groups should be involved.</p> <p>JF: Concerned with the statement in the vision that was south of the railway line would feel like living in the villages as this suggests lower densities. We need to be more realistic and have an average density that is broadly the same north and south in order to achieve overall housing numbers of 3000. With lower density's in smaller areas directly bordering the villages and the green areas.</p> <p>Strategic movements- Need to retain crossing at Bow Brickhill because nowhere else for traffic to go. it is important that good connections are provided including the "bullet bus" (reference made to Mass Rapid Transit- MRT). It needs to be explored which routes are needed and viable. The crossing at Bow Brickhill is essential as it provides the link to SE MK and to the south of Bletchley and beyond. Providing the road and bridge is essential, but it should be able to accommodate the MRT. The MRT is essential to ensure There is not too much traffic in the south of the city. The strategic Group weighted to people who live in the villages rather than people that live in the town. In a number of areas the effectiveness of it as a place to live has been sacrificed in order to reduce the impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>Growth seems very focussed on people living in villages (tail is wagging the dog). Needs to focus on rest of city. Tension between development is part of MK or whether it should be led by view of local stakeholders who have a more local view.</p> <p>PM: asked if the site should be designed as a part of MK or the LSG vision should be considered and which parts of it can be taken forward. Viability issues need to be considered and the need for the site to deliver around 3000 homes. Example given by Pete included Old and New Great Linford where the sites are close by, yet they have their distinctive character, or</p>	
--	---	--

<p>shall the site have its own independent character. According to the policy wording it is an extension of the city. The chair made the point that the interpretation of Plan MK policies allows for 2 different options for development: one that reflects grid squares and extending the grid and the other is about having a more contextually specific character that respects and protects the identity of surrounding housing.</p> <p>Pete: policies make classification neutral in this type of development, it is an extension to MK since it is Plan:MK. It will be named in the future for example new Woburn Sands or something else..</p> <p>KF: area south of the railway,who is it for? Can young families afford to live in a place that has low densities, big houses, big spaces remaining village feel but who will benefit it?</p> <p>JB: residents in existing villages I imagine want to be cocooned and protected from the impact of the new development. Low density homes will be expensive (so low density is not a solution) so adopt the approach of cocooning the villages to retain the feel of the villages whilst getting sufficient development on the expansion area and for the design principles and materials to be carefully considered to reflect the context heading towards the woods. This occurs around many existing villages in MK e.g. MK Village, Simpson, Great Linford where they have been 'cocooned' from the surrounding growth of MK. Around strategic movements- the need to retain good/improve connectivity , extend the v10 which is a principle route to the A5. H10 to be improved/extended further east so people can visit other further areas and add decent connectivity.</p> <p>RK: concerns were raised that the vision is at principle level and there is a need for fundamental information around site constraints, densities. South of the railway- hard to discuss without densities options and detailed level drawing. Hard to imagine how 3000 homes looks like on site like this and it would be good to be able to compare to existing densities sites with similar constraints. Strategic movement network- there is a need to look at much bigger area to be able to see how traffic moves across. There are site constraints in the south so no need to extend them. The work needs to be more data driven, need to understand trade-offs.</p> <p>PM: The 3000 homes would mean that there would be around 30dpha. Funding for infrastructure and affordable housing needs to be considered and where higher densities will be required to make site affordable.</p> <p>JB2 Supports the comments around the Greensands Trusts land and need to talk to Parks Trust to create integrated network especially for those living south of the railway. Good example would be Woughton on the Green where new and</p>	
--	--

<p>existing settlements work well together. Ward borders Dansborough Ward in MK- traffic to and from Central Bedford to be considered where road north of Ashley Guise, filling the last bit of the green space between Woburn Sands and the A421 (3000 homes). 5000 homes allocation in Bedford's Plan at junction 13. No detrimental impact on JB2 ward should take place.</p> <p>PM: Summarised points raised in the workshop: Consideration should be given if this an extension or an individual urban extension of its own nature.</p> <p>Need to get clarity over the future of the Woburn Sands station – EWR.</p> <p>Affordability vs design (for whom is the site for)</p> <p>DH: need for results of transport study and data before any decision is taken.</p> <p>NS: presented another part of the workshop around 4 key strategic elements of SEMK: the strategic movement network, buffers, green infrastructure and pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and connectivity and how these have responded to Plan:MK policy and the LSG Vision.</p> <p>PM: Commented that he wanted to know from the CAG of any red lines. He asked officers a question of how an SPD can be built, can you have options within it of what type of development this could be?</p> <p>NS: Single option would be ideal. Response 1 around protecting the villages where as per Cllr Hopkins concerns strategic movement network respects identity of the village providing a movement network that discouraged movements in to Woburn Sands. This response will result in development from SEMK gravitating towards CMK and any future development east of Woburn Sands gravitates towards the widened A421, The response includes an extension of the H10 and then south over the railway line with no left turn onto Bow Brickhill Road to be considered. Two bridge crossings at the western and eastern end of the site and protected corridor along V11. North of Bow Brickhill-bypass extension to H10 grid. Option 1 is in line with the LSG which saw Newport Road as the edge of the city. Option 2a next response: an expansion of MK Grid , transport routes integrated with the existing road network, including extension of H10 across Newport Road to connect to potential future development to the north and east of Woburn Sands. This response could undermine the integrity of existing development. It includes as with Response 1, two bridge crossings at the western and eastern end of the site</p>	<p>Action for PM: to contact EWR to get clarity on their plans for stations within the SEMK SUE</p>
--	---

<p>and a protected corridor for a potential additional bridge crossing on the V11 alignment.</p> <p>Response 2b variation of that option with road parallel road towards the railway line hard technically for the grid roads to meet because of level differences where they would naturally intersect. H10 extending across Newport Road as in Response 2a Newport Road, continuation outwards MK.</p> <p>Given the technical difficulty of delivering a new grid road parallel to the railway it was questioned by JF why not move it further south into the middle of the site. NS explained that this would sever the part of the allocation south of the railway line and result in 2 very long but very narrow grid squares (each just approx. 300m wide) which is not typical of MK Grid square dimensions (normally 1km x 1km).</p> <p>JF Option 1 will it be wide enough width road for MRT.</p> <p>PM asked to focus on the principles</p> <p>NS: Option 1 preserves integrity of the villages. Fast access points in/out of MK; possible disruption to Wavendon if grid road extended to other areas. , Newport road. Response one takes into consideration LSG finding and the protection of the existing communities.</p> <p>PM: To be noted: Newport Road to be considered a natural barrier to grid road extension. PM asked CAG members if the first response would be considered as the option to be taken forward based on the preferred nature of the connectivity and invited CAG members to comment.</p> <p>JB: The SPD should answer the question of what sort of place are we trying to create. JB would urge the document to say this area is unmistakable MK. Would like to see the existing villages protected and cocooned in a way we have done well but doesn't think that should involve huge areas of green buffer should involve careful design-conversion of historic lanes and through routes into cul-de-sacs. SEMK should be unmistakably MK. JB raised question over any future possible extensions or will this be the end of expansion in the areas. There should be proper grid roads provided not a grid road corridors. Transport studies should be developed to support and accommodate future growth. There is a need for V10 extension, V11 extension, H10 extension east and upwards. There is no need for an additional grid road in the middle of the site running east to west as the site is too narrow and that can be dropped.</p> <p>RK :Can't see how you would expect public transport to serve the brown residential areas Consideration needs to be given not only towards infrastructure but how future routes could be delivered effectively. Meandering through estates would not be efficient for PT. Response 2 to looks much better from the Public Transport point of view, layout is better.</p>	<p>Points agreed: Response 1 was generally more preferred apart from Public Transport where more direct links presented in Response 2 were preferred</p>
--	--

<p>PM: a separate discussion will be required on Public Transport, MRT etc.</p> <p>PM invited CAG members to make any general comments around principles.</p> <p>JB: Grid roads, not reserve corridors, consideration to Local centres within estates which are very popular. The best local centres are on one side of the grid road rather than straddling both sides</p> <p>JB: if SEMK generates attractors like a skatepark then need to make sure there is the supporting infrastructure. DH said Bow Brickhill woods does not have enough parking provision</p> <p>PT: Access to the new MRT, do we know anything regarding its dimensions, more info should come out of traffic surveys when can we see that level of detail?</p> <p>JF: densities 30/40 hard to achieve as well as meeting SHMA so more likely to be 40. SHMA showing the need for 3 bed homes. In order to get the housing we need the density should be the same north and south of the railway line with small areas of lower density on sensitive edges, otherwise we will not get the houses we need. Consideration to be given to MRT and especially last mile issue and parking provision.</p> <p>DH: prefers 1st option designed differently?</p> <p>CAG members agreed that Newport Road is to be considered the barrier for the development and hence should not be joined /crossed by vehicular access.</p> <p>JB: comments made in relation current provision for schools especially around the lack of spaces at secondary school. Would like to discuss the schools provision issue at the future CAG meeting.</p> <p>JF: Health facilities and schools should be provided at appropriate locations – near PT stops</p> <p>PM: an e-mail address to be set up to invite public for comments around principles to allow PM to review. Comments received to mailbox will be collated and reviewed.</p> <p>PM thanked everyone for participating and advised that the next meeting will be arranged in the future.</p>	<p>Action for officers: CAG discussion to be arranged in future on Public Transport matters for the SE SUE site</p> <p>Points agreed: Newport Road being the natural barrier</p> <p>Action for officers: to set up an e-mail address and publicise to allow public to comment on the principles by middle of week commencing 31/08/2020. E-mail is now set up:</p>
---	--

	Close of the workshop.	semk@milton-keynes.gov.uk
--	------------------------	--