



Milton Keynes Partnership
Central Business Exchange II
414-428 Midsummer Boulevard
Central Milton Keynes
MK9 2EA

Brian Sandom
Corporate Director Environment

David Hackforth
Head of Planning & Transport

FAO Lindsey Richards

Our Ref: 09/00430/MKPCR

Your Ref: 09/00430/MKPCR

Reply To: David Lawson

Direct Line: 01908 252510

31 March 2009

E-mail: David.Lawson@Milton-Keynes.gov.uk

Dear Lindsey

RE 09/00430/MKPCR APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT SITE 2B, NORTHERN EXPANSION AREA, MILTON KEYNES.

I refer to your consultation for the above planning application dated 17 March 2009 and I have the following comments:

In general the layout of the roads and footways appears to be acceptable; however, there are a few areas that do need to be addressed. These are as follows:

- The carriageway fronting plots 100/101 is too narrow, scaling at less than 4m wide, it also narrows across an access point from a width of 5.5m outside Block 1. The width of this route should be maintained at 5.5m until the bend by the junction leading to area 2A. The narrowing outside plot 102 is the appropriate point to change the width.
- The narrowed carriageway outside plot 103 is not acceptable at the junction. Such narrowings should occur away from junctions.
- The footway fronting plot 117 should continue to plot 119 allowing a direct connection to the path leading to the bridleway. The footway crossing outside plot 103 and the short section of footway opposite plot 103 should be removed.
- The carriageway between Blocks 2 and 3 is 5.5m wide; however, it narrows to less than 5m where the two parking courts join it. This narrowing part-way along a street is not acceptable. A consistent width needs to be maintained – in this case 5.5m.

- The area fronting plots 104-6 and 109 does not sufficiently delineate the prospectively adoptable highway from the private areas. The continuation of the adoptable street should be demarcated on the ground and take precedence over the private area fronting plots 107/8.
- Similarly, the parking spaces fronting plots 104-106 need to be set back to allow for an adoptable margin (min 1.0m) adjacent to the carriageway.
- Access to the rear courtyards (adjacent to plot 5, rear of plot 111, adjacent to plot 112, adjacent to plot 121 and adjacent to plot 52) should be taken via a dropped kerb crossing of the footway or verge, a full junction interrupting the footway is not necessary and the footway should take priority.
- These same courtyard access points are all too narrow to permit two-way movement at the entrance. A minimum of 4.5m width is required for at least the first 8m of each of these access points.

The distribution of visitor parking across the site is not acceptable as shown. Looking at the roads adjacent to plots 102, 103, 119 and 62, there are 11 visitor spaces serving these 4 plots. This is a clear over-provision and these spaces should be relocated.

Plots 63-68 and 120-121, fronting the pond, should have a visitor provision of 2 spaces, yet none are provided in a convenient location. However, plots 51, 52 and 122, which require one visitor space, have 4 spaces located opposite plot 52. Again, the distribution of these spaces should be addressed.

Plots 104-110 and 117 should have 2 visitor spaces located in the areas fronting them. No visitor provision is made in this area.

Turning to the allocated parking provision, the following needs to be addressed:

- Plot 5 requires 2 spaces, yet only 1 is shown (I note however that there is a space allocated to plot 20 in error, which could be allocated to plot 5).
- Plot 12 requires 2 allocated spaces yet only 1 is shown.
- Plot 23 requires 2 allocated spaces yet only 1 is shown.
- Plot 29 requires 1 allocated space yet none is shown. The space shown in the adoptable lay-by is not appropriate as the standards require every dwelling to have at least 1 private space.
- Plot 35's spaces are too remote from the dwelling.
- Plot 69 requires 1 space (excluding garages), but none is shown.
- Plot 79's space is too remote from the dwelling.

- Plot 110 requires 2 allocated spaces yet only 1 is shown.
- Plot 111 requires 2 allocated spaces yet only 1 is shown.
- Plot 112 requires 1 allocated space yet none is shown. The space shown in the adoptable lay-by is not appropriate as the standards require every dwelling to have at least 1 private space.
- Plot 113 requires 1 allocated space yet none is shown. The space shown in the adoptable lay-by is not appropriate as the standards require every dwelling to have at least 1 private space.
- Plot 117 requires 2 allocated spaces yet only 1 is shown.
- Plot 118 requires 2 allocated spaces yet only 1 is shown.

Overall I calculate that the minimum parking requirement on the site is 177 spaces (152 allocated plus 25 unallocated/visitor) and the maximum is 198 spaces. The actual provision is 177 spaces, matching the minimum number, but there are only 143 allocated spaces and 34 unallocated/visitor spaces.

I should be grateful if you would pass these comments to the applicant and request revised plans. Should you wish to determine the application without amendments, I can confirm that the current proposals are unacceptable and I would recommend that planning permission is refused.

Yours sincerely



DM Lawson
Team Leader
Highways Development Control