

Milton Keynes East Local Stakeholder Group Meeting
19:00, Wednesday 27th February 2019
Room 1.25 (moved to 1.02), Civic Offices, Central Milton Keynes

DRAFT MINUTES

Attendees

Cllr Peter Geary	MKC, Olney Ward
Cllr John Bint	MKC, Broughton Ward
Ian Carman	Newport Pagnell TC
Alan Mills	Newport Pagnell TC
Hugh Read	Resident
Peter Meadows	Cranfield PC
Hilary Manning	Resident
Alison Stainsby	Resident
David Freeman	Resident
Paul Herbert	Resident
Keith Button	Hulcote & Salford PC
George Bouger	Resident
Cllr Keith McClean	MKC Olney Ward
Richard Wilson	Resident
Sarah Wilson	Resident
Ray Golding	Campbell Park PC
Val Dixon	Campbell Park PC
Cllr Sam Crooks	MKC Broughton Ward
Christopher Wardle	Resident
Dottie Gittenwood	Resident
Andrew Herman	Resident
Terry Richards	Resident
Ian Townsend	Chicheley Parish Meeting
Robert Ruck-Keene	Chicheley Parish Meeting
Steve Water	Moulsoe PC
Phil Windsor	Newport Pagnell TC

Officers/others attending

Paul Van Geete	Milton Keynes Council
Sarah Gonsalves	Milton Keynes Council
Sophie Lloyd	Milton Keynes Council
Andrew Turner	Milton Keynes Council
Jon Palmer	Milton Keynes Council

Item 1 – Apologies

Cllr Catriona Morris, Milton Keynes Council, Broughton Ward Member
Cllr David Hosking, Milton Keynes Council, Olney Ward Member
Cllr Douglas McCall, MKC, Newport Pagnell South Member
Desmond Eley, Olney Town Council
Bill and Brenda Lewis, Residents

Items 2 – Minutes of January meeting

The Chair passed over the draft minutes of the January 2019 group meeting for comment and agreement at the next meeting to allow enough time for Item 3.

Item 3 – HIF bid presentation and discussion

The Chair provided attendees with 5-10 minutes to review Sections 1 and 2 of the draft HIF document as this had only been circulated the day before.

Sarah Gonsalves and Paul Van Geete, with the support of Sophie Lloyd, provided a presentation on the Sections 1 (Project Summary) and 2 (Strategic Case) of the draft HIF bid. Officers noted that a further section of the HIF bid (Management Case) was not ready to be shared with the group but will be shared in due course. Sarah noted that the document circulated to the group was a working draft and is subject to change before being finalised for submission by 22 March 2019.

It was explained that Section 1 of the HIF bid explains why MKC are making the bid provides a summary of the bid itself.

It was explained that Section 2 of the bid sets out the wider strategic context that supports the bid, the housing need context and the objectives of the scheme. Sarah noted that the 'local support' section encompasses wider local support, such as SEMLEP, and not immediate local communities.

Sarah and Paul outlined the breakdown of costs the funding was being sought for at the Expression of Interest stage and how these figures have changed as MKC has done further work to develop the concept for MKE and the infrastructure design. Costings have been reviewed by two firms on behalf of Berkeley, MKC highways are reviewing them also, and will seeking a third party review by Jacobs as well.

Paul explained the various infrastructure elements of the bid and how a Tariff mechanism would work to recycle this to help part fund further infrastructure improvements associated with MKE later in the development cycle. Sarah noted that the overall infrastructure bill for MKE would be circa £400m, with the HIF bid only providing circa £90m of this with developer contributions, via the Tariff mechanism, funding the rest of the infrastructure.

Sarah and Paul explained that HIF funds were being sought for a primary school and health centre as there are no other funding cycles that can be drawn upon to deliver these early in the development of MKE, and therefore HIF money was needed to ensure these were in place early on to enable the site be delivered in accordance with Plan:MK.

The Chair thanked the officers for the presentation and opened the meeting up for discussion of the draft bid document and the presentation. The following is a summary of the points of discussion and queries raised:

1. Group welcomed the increase in costings for the highway infrastructure since the Expression of Interest stage

2. Query to clarify what 'Link V1' was as the plan wasn't clear.
3. Query to check where Link B2 extends to and whether this would loop around Cranfield. Noted that this would be beyond MKE and the HIF to decide, design and plan for. For future plans and stages of growth to determine.
4. Queried why there was no red line on the plan provided. Noted, a revised plan with the red line would be circulated with the minutes.
5. Queried why the costs for the primary school and health centre had gone down since Expression of Interest. Explained that costs of the health centre reflect the latest experience in designing and procuring the Whitehouse health centre within the WEA in discussion with the NHS, so a good basis to use. The primary school would benefit from some basic needs funding which would top up the HIF funding to the required level.
6. There was discussion of how the HIF roads would link up to existing roads to enable construction traffic to access the site in a suitable way.
7. Queried how crossings of the A422 would be delivered. Noted that these could be delivered via planning and wider developer obligations for the site.
8. Concerns were raised about the pace at which this site is now coming forward and an apparent democratic deficit surrounding the approval for submission of the HIF bid – no formal scrutiny and discussion within the decision making process.
9. Significant concern and disappointment was raised in relation to section 2.2.3 of the HIF bid document which refers to Local Support. As currently worded to suggest the Local Stakeholder Group supports the HIF bid. This needs to be changed to make it clear this is opposition from local communities and parish councils to the HIF bid. Officers noted that when submitting the HIF bid via the Government's portal the Council has to state in YES/NO terms whether the local community supports the bid. This will be clearly marked as 'NO'.
10. Concern was also raised about the wording of the bid in relation to MPs' general support for the Council Plan to grow MK to 500,000, and whether this figure was indeed Council policy. Noted by officers who would follow this up with the MPs to ensure they are happy with the wording of the bid.
11. Queried why MKC is not bidding for funds for the secondary school. Officers explained that HIF can only be used to fund early infrastructure that enables early delivery of the site. The secondary school is not needed during the early phases of the development and so would not qualify for funding under the HIF bid.
12. It was suggested that MKC should overbid for infrastructure in the expectation that Government would knock this down, rather than bid at the necessary level and risk Government reducing this to an insufficient level.
13. Queried why there has been no formal consultation on the bid. The Chair noted that this meeting seem to be the only form of consultation taking place. It was noted that the Council's administration has decided to submit the bid, and that there will be future statutory consultation on the development framework and planning applications.
14. The Chair asked officers to explain what would be contained in the Management Case section of the bid which is still being prepared. It was explained that it describes how MKC would deliver the infrastructure and the manage the project and risks. The Chair made it clear the group needed to see this, particularly the risk management and liability to MKC.

15. Queried what contingency was built into the costs and bid. Noted this was £3.5m on the highway elements (£80m), and around £7m overall. This was considered by the group to be too small given cost overruns of Civic refurbishment project.
16. The Chair asked when the independent third party costing review would be done. Noted this would be done before the bid is submitted
17. It was noted that the documents shared with the group were marked confidential. The Chair noted that ward members and certain parish representative will be bound by the Member Code of Conduct, but that others in the group would not be. Matter of trust between the Council and those in the group not share the documents more widely.
18. Queried the cost of dualling Tongwell Street and the existing bridge. Advised a breakdown of the cost for each element of the HIF highways infrastructure would be circulated after the meeting.
19. Queried the capacity of the Coton Valley STW to accommodate MKE and other growth without worsening the odour problems affecting nearby residents, and questioned a statement in the Council's Water Cycle Study about the capacity of the STW to accommodate Plan:MK growth. Officers noted the query and will follow this up.
20. Queried what provision would be made for public transport. Officers noted that the framework will accommodate a Mass Rapid Transit corridor and planning obligations would be used to subsidise public transport in the normal way. Funding for the mass rapid transit system itself would not be secured through the HIF. This would need to be secured through planning or other funds.

The group agreed to meet on the 13 March to discuss the Management Case and further details on cost breakdown. Information to be sent out on email by 8 March ahead of the meeting.

AOB

None