



## Agenda item P24/010

# Central Milton Keynes Town Council Planning Committee Meeting held at Centrecom Meeting Place On 20<sup>th</sup> February 2024

### **Present:**

Andrew Thomas (Chair)  
Peter Lightfoot  
Philip Murphy  
David Stabler  
Paul Cranfield (Clerk)

**Apologies:** None

**In attendance:** Jon Muncaster and a representative from Packaged Living

### **P24/001 – Apologies**

None.

### **P24/002 – Declarations of Interest**

None.

At this juncture the representative from Packaged Living advised that he would not request to speak.

The Clerk noted that he had received a paper from Packaged Living by email, which had been circulated to councillors and was tabled at the meeting. This was to be considered as part of the papers for the meeting.

### **P24/003 - Ratification of Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023**

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> December 2023 were agreed as a true record of the meeting and duly signed by the Chair.

### **P24/004- Planning Update**

The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.

## **P24/005 – Minor applications**

The paper, as previously circulated, was noted.

The response to the applications was agreed as follows:-

24/00126/FUL- Proposed external alterations- Vizion- SUPPORT, with the following comment:-

Support is subject to a condition that the finishes match the existing colour palette and are subject to subsequent approval.

24/00146/FULM-Variations to Condition, D4.4 - SUPPORT

## **P24/006- Planning application 24/00036/FUL- Theatre MSCP**

The papers, as previously circulated, were noted.

The Chair, whilst outlining the background to the site being marketed, emphasised the need to consider the application as submitted on planning policy alone. He noted MKC Council's property consultants had concluded that the site could not be developed profitably, but nevertheless the Council decided to offer it to the market. He considered that the application as submitted has squeezed as much as possible out of the site.

He sought the views of councillors on the areas of concern, which were agreed as:-

**No affordable housing provision or s106**- comments were as follows:-

- The scheme is unviable, hence no allowance for affordable housing and s106 has been offered.
- A small (£2.5m) 'offline' contribution has been offered, probably encouraged by MKCCouncil. This will enable a small number of dwellings to be built elsewhere in MK, but goes nowhere to meet that required by the Council's affordably housing policy.
- The comments submitted by Housing officers should be supported in full.

Disappointment was expressed that, for a site wholly owned by the Council, the Council was taking a return on the land value rather than seeking to use that return to improve the amount of affordable housing.

**It was agreed to OBJECT to the scheme as the lack of affordable housing does not comply with policy and there is no effort to make s106 contributions.**

**Car Parking**-comments were as follows:-

- Car parking provision at the site is well below that required by parking standards. Even the small amount of parking allocated relies upon MKCCouncil dedicating 39 spaces to support parking for the scheme. Although there is some precedent for this, the numbers are still woefully short in a location which has great demand for leisure use.

- The development at Almere, which was granted with similar low levels of allocated parking, is understood to be experiencing demand from residents for the need for additional parking.
- If MKCCouncil were to give up public car parking spaces, the pedestrian routes need to remain as permeable adopted highway.

**It was agreed to OBJECT to the scheme as the proposals are an infringement on parking standards, even when allowing for the 39 MKCCouncil spaces.**

**External Amenity Space-** comments as follows:-

- The scheme is lacking external amenity space, in particular the lack of balconies, given its aspect towards Campbell Park was felt to be important for a prime location.
- It was noted that the practicality of this at higher levels within the building, given the wind, would need to be further investigated.

**It was agreed to express concern at the lack of external amenity spaces for flats.**

**Infrastructure-** comments as follows:-

- The infrastructure is being changed dramatically.
- A councillor expressed the view that the proposed changes improve the area significantly.
- The amount of effort the developers have put into the infrastructure and public space needs to be acknowledged.
- The concerns by MKCCouncil Landscape officers were noted.

**It was agreed that the principle of improving the infrastructure is supported, however the detailing of movement and connectivity, together with materials used should be Conditioned.**

**Social & Economic Benefits-** comments as follows:-

- Due to the height of the proposed building, CMKAP G9 applies.
- The pre-app meetings were useful in taking the design as far as was possible.
- The compulsory benefits required under Policy G9 were considered not to have been evidenced.
- The large 1<sup>st</sup> floor leisure space is recognised, and this mixed-use is welcomed, but the benefits required under G9 remain unclear.

**It was agreed to OBJECT to the inability of the scheme to satisfy Policy G9.**

The meeting closed at 7.22 pm.

**The next scheduled meeting to be held on Tuesday 19 March 2024 at 6.10pm at Centrecom Meeting Place**

**Chair's Signature..... Date.....**