

## Summary of Consultation Representations & Proposed Response (Brunel Centre, Bletchley, Development Brief DRAFT)

Response ID	Respondent	Summary of Responses/Issues	Council Response & Proposed Changes to Draft Brief
1	Christina Drewe	<p>[1] It would be nice to have a supermarket like Sainsbury's or Morrisons etc, a decent shoe shop and decent ladies and gents' shops, rather than lots of nail shops, betting shops and charity shops. Would also be great to have a greengrocer. I understand that we need foreign food shops, but they are overtaking the high street now. We do not have a newsagent either or a decent bakery!</p> <p>[2] I do not feel that Bletchley is a safe place to walk through now for us senior residents.</p>	<p>[1] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: "Retail development to serve the daily and weekly <u>food</u>, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate."</b></p> <p>[2] The demolition and redevelopment of the abandoned Sainsburys store will remove issues regarding vandalism and discourage antisocial behaviour, bringing the area back into active use.</p> <p>The Brunel Centre acts as a divide within Bletchley town centre, and the proposed demolition will create a wide throughfare between Queensway and Buckingham Road. Buildings will be outward facing providing natural surveillance of the street.</p>
2	Elizabeth Thomas	<p>Any increase in homes and population must be matched with an increase in GP and health care provision. Patients at all surgeries in the Bletchley area are currently experiencing lengthy waits for appointments to the point where many are very worried and becoming desperate. Please have some thought for people already living in the area, we are feeling totally excluded and overlooked.</p>	<p>Any demand for healthcare provision generated by the development should be provided on site or through S106 contributions towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development.</p>

			Paragraph 4.2.6. also states: “MKCC’s Council Plan Delivery Plan 2023/24 promotes a new Health Hub in Bletchley as part of the regeneration of the town centre. Health facilities would be appropriate on this site.”
3	Fiona Warford	<p>[1] Concerning the Brunel centre, I think future development should be a large walk in or medical centre maybe a centre for day surgery or even an emergency dentist somewhere for medical testing or just somewhere to get advice for these.</p> <p>[2] I don’t think there should be more flats in the centre of Bletchley as the ones that currently being built are an eyesore.</p> <p>[3] Please be considerate of what we really need in Bletchley as we have enough charity shops eating places and car washes and butchers.</p>	<p>[1] Paragraph 4.2.6. states: “MKCC’s Council Plan Delivery Plan 2023/24 promotes a new Health Hub in Bletchley as part of the regeneration of the town centre. Health facilities would be appropriate on this site.”</p> <p>[2] The sustainable location of the site and its proximity to public transport and services, supports the provision of flats above ground floor commercial units.</p> <p>[3] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p>
4	Barbara Lemmon	I would like to see at least a couple of decent shops, we have lost everything since Sainsburys etc. closed we have got nothing hardly in Bletchley now, not even a decent Paper shop, since Martins closed, everyone is now saying that Bletchley has been ruined, it used to be a lovely town, but now there is hardly anything left now, it is all foreign shops and nail bars, they have closed nearly everything that was good in the shops, and losing Wilko is the final straw, after all not everyone drives, or wants to go up to the City to shop, that is my opinion.	Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.
5	Ron Haine	[1] Those working on this new development should take into consideration the people of Bletchley, as we have many older and younger people. Large companies and small shops should be consulted.	[1] Consultation for this document has enabled residents and businesses to comment on the brief.

		<p>[2] The type of shops and housing should also be considered.</p> <p>[3] We also need affordable housing.</p> <p>[4] With the East West Rail line coming into Bletchley, we need suitable places for residents and visitors.</p>	<p>[2] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p>[3] Paragraph 2.3.10: Policy HN2 (Affordable Housing) states: "Proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing." Paragraph 4.2.4 is also relevant, stating "where residential development is proposed, affordable housing will need to be provided and is expected to meet or exceed current MKCC standards."</p> <p>[4] Noted. The brief acknowledges the importance of East West Rail as an important driver of change in Bletchley.</p>
6	Janet Savine	<p>[1] Bletchley train station currently has an entrance on Sherwood Drive - with the East West connection and a new entrance on the other side of the station will the existing entrance remain as a secondary entrance.</p> <p>[2] Will Bletchley train station have a ticket office.</p> <p>[3] Currently there are public toilets - will these remain or will there be additional public toilets in the proposed plans</p>	<p>[1] It is expected the existing entrance would remain in addition to any new Eastern entrance, though these decisions are outside the scope of this document.</p> <p>[2] The Council have no powers over the future of train station ticket offices, and hence, this topic is outside the scope of this document.</p> <p>[3] The current toilets on Albert Street are outside of the brief area and are maintained by Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council. Public toilets could potentially be provided within the development.</p>

			<b>Amend para 4.2.6 to include: “<u>Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub.</u>”</b>
7	Sean Porter	As an ex councillor for Fenny Stratford I was often dismayed by the poor quality retail and residential presence in Queensway. It dawned on me that the issue was that Queensway had its throat cut and caused a disconnected between east/west Bletchley. This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to fix this. Free floating roads between Buckingham road and Queensway are vital for its regeneration. I hope make this change that I fully support. Bletchley has so much potential and the people deserve a high quality regeneration of the site.	Support for the reconnection of Buckingham Road and Queensway is noted.
8	John Thompson	<p>[1] I am all in favour of developing areas as long as it has an impact for the good on the local area.</p> <p>My major concern is that building a considerable number of flats in an area with poor road networks is going to cause considerable problems for locals and may eventually lead to traffic accidents. Currently the only road into the Sainsbury’s area is Duncombe Street and this is a very narrow and busy road at present. Even if you are to add additional roads linking nearby roads you have the same problem.</p> <p>[2] Building a road through Stanier Square to link up Queensway to Buckingham Road robs Bletchley of a vocal point and place for events and entertainment. It also means</p>	<p>[1] Any development on this site will consider the impact on the wider road network. Policy CT2 of Plan:MK requires that development proposals that generate significant amounts of movement must be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and will normally be required to provide a Travel Plan, with mitigation implemented as required. <b>Include new para after para 4.8.5 to read: “<u>Any application for development should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment, in line with Policy CT2 of Plan:MK. A Transport Statement/Assessment identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport.</u>”</b></p> <p>[2] The link between Queensway and Buckingham Road has been identified as either, a pedestrian only route, or a potential bus, cycle, and pedestrian connection.</p>

		<p>there will no longer be a pedestrian area and a safe area to walk.</p> <p>[3] We already have a problem with the building of flats being built on the corner of Saxon Street/Princes Way. The number of cars will bring traffic chaos to Albert Street. The height of flats is already a blind spot for drivers coming out of Princes Way.</p> <p>[4] The lack of parking is going to mean that the car parks will be taken up by the flat occupants and their visitors, meaning those visiting Bletchley will have less places to park and therefore avoiding the town.</p> <p>[5] The plan also states that the old police station and fire station is being considered for SME units, yet this week plans have been revealed to build flats here also. Flats here will create traffic problems on Sherwood Drive. It is a busy road with train station visitors, The College and MK's number 1 visitor attraction Bletchley Park. The fact that two different plans out for this area questions what you really want to do, or what you want the public think you want to do. I do think you need to put all the residents of Bletchley first and not your money making schemes. You need to reconsider the whole road network, the safety of people first. People on the whole are happy with Bletchley as it is, they just want better shops in town.</p>	<p>Enhancements will be made to Stanier Square, to improve the public realm of the area, allowing markets and community events to take place, and maintaining a focal pedestrian environment for Bletchley.</p> <p>[3] Saxon Street and Princes Way are not included in the boundaries of the 'Brunel Centre, Bletchley Development Brief' area. Any development of the Brunel Centre site will consider the impact on the wider road network.</p> <p>[4] Paragraph 4.8.6 states: "The Council will be commissioning a parking strategy for Central Bletchley. The strategy will consider demands for parking in the town centre, appropriate future provision of parking in the town centre, the appropriate mix of bay types and lengths of stay and any potential future parking restrictions and enforcement. Development of the site will need to take account of the outcomes of this work."</p> <p>[5] Sherwood Drive and the former police and fire stations sit outside the boundary of the 'Brunel Centre, Bletchley Development Brief' area. Any development of the Brunel Centre site will consider the impact on the wider road network.</p>
--	--	---	---

9	Susan Hicks	<p>Whatever is done to improve the town centre it should certainly include lots of colourful plants in lovely displays. In our retirement, my husband and I have visited many towns both near and far, and we always admire the beautiful planting that they have. Why is it that Bletchley has no such features?</p>	<p>This scheme offers an ideal opportunity to improve the public realm within the brief boundaries, with green landscaping a key consideration for the area.</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.5.2 and 4.5.5 of the Brief both mention how “high quality landscaping, both hard and soft, including tree planting... will be sought” in new areas of public realm.</p>
10	Jeff Cooper	<p>I love these plans and proposals for redevelopment of Bletchley. A great opportunity to remove the eyesores of the Brunel Centre, Stainer Square and former Sainsburys building. A pity this could not be extended to Stephenson House, it would have been far better to demolish and build a new apartments that is going to be visually appealing in the long term.</p> <p>With the proposed plans, my suggestion, is to build for the long term, something that is visually appealing and will not look dated in 10 years, 20 years 30 years time etc etc it is easier to get it right now and not have to redevelop again in the future.</p> <p>The draft proposal has an artist image of apartments on top of a Costa Coffee. Apartments with balconies or Juliet windows and designed to be constructed from brick. This not only looks good, lasts the test of time but will blend with the surrounding Victorian houses of Duncombe St, Windsor St and Oliver Road etc.</p>	<p>Support for the Draft Development Brief is noted.</p>
11	Pamela Benson	<p>[1] Sainsbury should be a N H S medical health centre.</p>	<p>[1] Noted. Paragraph 4.2.6. states: “MKCC’s Council Plan Delivery Plan 2023/24 promotes a new Health Hub in Bletchley as part of the regeneration of the town centre. Health facilities would be appropriate on this site.”</p>

		<p>[2] Wilkos should be a B &amp; M store. Farmfood,savers, Card shop should be saved. No more nail bars. A bakery, clothes shops, another Supermarket is needed in Bletchley.</p>	<p>[2] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to control the use of ground floor commercial space, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: “Retail development to serve the daily and weekly <u>food</u>, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate.”</b></p>
12	Joan Atkinson & Ken Cutt’s	<p>[1] We are very concerned for the future of Central Bletchley, having seen how it used to be a thriving place with plenty of facilities that have been gradually taken away from us. We are older residents in Central Bletchley and have lived here for many years. Although we are not averse to change, it has got to be for the better.</p> <p>We missed Sainsbury’s, W H Smith’s, Boot’s, Wilko and Mc Colls it was a fatal blow to us. When they all left the area, these were the shops that we used daily for our provisions. We understand that you would like to build new homes on the site of both the Brunel Centre and Sainsbury’s instead of the shopping amenities that are desperately needed the existing shops provide a vital service to our community and we don’t want them to be lost. We would like it if Sainsbury’s or Morrison’s could return or defiantly have a presence. Also that there is a shop that stocked the vast amount of useful products like Wilko’s did here. We would all gain if the things we wanted could be purchased here, such as stationery, newspapers, food and fashion for all of the family. Perhaps they could think out of the box with bringing a chat cafe. Some other projects could be a shop for Men in Sheds.</p>	<p>[1] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 of the brief supports the provision of community, leisure and cultural uses.</p>

		<p>It would be absolutely fantastic if the old Working Men's Club could be used for social activities like an exercise, fitness or dance studio. A place that we could have exhibitions and collectors fairs.</p> <p>It would be lovely if the Brunel Centre had space to have a grotto with Father Christmas in, allow carol singers to be inside and special event traders in the winter or wet days. It's very unpleasant standing out in Stanier Square in bad weather.</p> <p>Although the area's population is being vastly increased, it wouldn't be to the benefit of the whole of Bletchley community if the facilities were to improve? The new residents might also be disappointed if they are unable to do things locally and have to possibly travel by car or bus to get what we want? It would improve our environment with less transport on the roads.</p> <p>We realise that now everyone is encouraged to shop and bank online but this should be by choice. It is good to have shops to visit and be given the help that one needs. It seems that all the things we have grown accustomed to and trust are being taken away, not just shops, but Banks and Building Societies. It is not good if for these we have to travel to Central Milton Keynes.</p> <p>Sometimes when dealing online the products arrive and are not what you are expecting them to be. With clothing the fabric, feel or size can be wrong. Also if the internet goes down or you have a problem with the technology it can stop us doing our day to day routines.</p> <p>We would like some of the money given to our council by the government spent to improving our shopping experience, with refurbishing the empty shops and letting them out to</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>businesses that would be more appealing to the general public, with more mainstream shops or things that would be popular and once more people would use.</p> <p>[2] We do appreciate that people require homes, but also we have to have the infrastructure to accommodate such changes places at schools and for patients at doctor’s surgeries.</p> <p>[3] It would be wonderful that we could keep our bus station where it is. This would be ideal being close to the railway station. It would be excellent to be able to connect with wider Milton Keynes and surrounding towns like Winslow and Luton. Bill’s and other coach companies pick up here for Holidays and coach trips, this is so useful.</p> <p>[4] We do not need a Multi storey car park, which people hate to use.</p>	<p>[2] The brief identifies health facilities as an appropriate use on the site. Contributions may be required to off-site infrastructure provision. <b><u>Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: “Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.”</u></b></p> <p>[3] Bletchley Bus Station sits beyond the brief area, and hence outside the scope of this document. However, the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which was adopted in April 2022, following consultation, identifies an opportunity to relocate the bus station to the Western side of Saxon Street.</p> <p>[4] Noted. Parking provision will be informed by the parking strategy which has been commissioned by the Council (paragraph 4.86 of the brief).</p>
13	Ian Revell (Chief Executive of MK Community Foundation)	<p>[1] We consider Bletchley to be one of the major town centres in Milton Keynes, with historic connections to the work of Bletchley Park during the second world war, and as a result there are many communities that have established themselves in the Bletchley area. We therefore believe there</p>	<p>[1] <b><u>Amend para 4.13.2 to read: “Developers should explore the potential for providing public art as part of their proposals. This could be about Bletchley Park which would form part of a wider initiative within Bletchley and Fenny Stratford. Developers will need to</u></b></p>

		<p>is a significant opportunity through this development to highlight this heritage and to connect the very many and diverse communities around the town centre and the Brunel site.</p> <p>Central to our considerations is the opportunity to further enhance links to Bletchley Park and for Bletchley Park (as a major heritage attraction internationally) to greater benefit of the Bletchley community.</p> <p>If possible, the development to begin the establishment of places to tell the story of Bletchley, pre-Bletchley Park, the role in the war years and the changing communities that call Bletchley home. Opportunities to create connection and a sense of local pride in the area linked to the people that have moved to Bletchley and made significant contributions. Stories of Marshal amps, The invention of the tea bag, the canals and railways the links to the rural past (cattle market) and the role of the place in innovation with the new Institute of Technology, even the most recent AI summit.</p> <p>[2] Additionally, we believe there is a great opportunity for the re-development to act as a benchmark to the wide range of environmental aspirations the city has as a whole.</p> <p>The Community Foundation strongly supports the aspiration for addressing the environmental impact of the development and to act as show case for best practice locally.</p> <p>The creation of a sustainability innovation centre might also be supported and viable if there is an opportunity to link the training available through MK College, but focusing on local</p>	<p><b><u>engage with the relevant parish and Council teams early in the design process.”</u></b></p> <p><b>Amend para 4.6.1 to read: “The architectural approach to development, should be informed by the contextual analysis. <u>Development proposals could take inspiration from Bletchley’s history of technology and innovation and reflect this heritage within its design.</u> However, this should not constrain architectural creativity with a contemporary design sought.”</b></p> <p>[2] Noted. Paragraph 4.10.1 of the draft brief states: “Plan:MK commits to continue the city’s dedication to high environmental standards, green urban landscapes and being ‘different by design’.” Para 4.10.2 refers to “the Council’s objectives of being carbon neutral by 2030 and carbon negative by 2050.”</p> <p>Opportunities for energy generation will be considered at the detailed design stage of the development.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>energy generation and insulation opportunities in the surrounding area.</p> <p>The redevelopment should consider the development of a micro generation scheme that utilises roof space, but unlike standard schemes, create an opportunity to reduce the cost of energy to the local communities, so not just to the benefit of the building owners.</p> <p>[3] The Community Foundation has a strong track record in providing community spaces at affordable rent to community groups. We would request that such an opportunity be considered in this development.</p> <p>In particular we believe there is a lack of available community spaces in the Bletchley Town centre, spaces where communities can come together and where community activities can be both based and supported from.</p> <p>[4] There needs to be strong links to the Duncombe Street Mosque, with the possibility of enhancing their support to the local community.</p> <p>[5] The holding of community programmes in Stanier Square and along the Bletchley High Street need to be supported, therefore we would support the provision of "plug-in" utilities that would make it easier and affordable for large community events to be staged, again supported from a community centre in the Brunel development facility.</p> <p>[6] The Community Foundation would wish to engage in the development of any community spaces, and we would</p>	<p>[3] Noted. Paragraph 4.2.6 of the brief states: "MKCC is seeking to rationalise its property assets via a 'hub-and-spoke' approach to service delivery and this area is seen as an ideal location to accommodate a multi-use community hub..."</p> <p>[4] The Council will seek to involve all local community groups in its future plans for the site.</p> <p>[5] Noted. Enhancements will be made to Stanier Square, to improve the public realm of the area, allowing markets and community events to take place. Details, such as plug-in utilities, will be considered at a later stage in more detailed discussions once a development partner has been secured.</p> <p>[6] Noted. The brief proposes the creation of new public realm through the reconnection of Buckingham Road</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>welcome the creation of spaces in and around the development that naturally bring communities and local people together. We would hope the development is able to provide more green landscaped space in the town centre (not locked courtyards), more trees, green roofs, and more habitable spaces that attract bees and insects.</p> <p>[7] The Bandstand is a good example, but there could be beautiful, landscaped spaces where people might meet and gather, playable spaces or sculpture that encourage children to play and families to meet. This would enhance the attraction of the shopping area by making the area more family friendly, as well as providing provision for children in the area and children that will live in the new residential area.</p>	<p>and Queensway. This provides the best opportunity for new tree planting which para 4.5.2 of the brief seeks.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.7 identifies “opportunities to include green infrastructure as part of the proposed building, either in the form of a green roof, roof garden, growing spaces, green wall, terraces, balconies and/or planters.”</p> <p>All major developments will be required by the Environment Act 2021 to provide 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.</p> <p><b>Add new sentence to para 4.5.6 to read: “Development proposals should be accompanied by a plan illustrating indicative landscape principles for the site. <u>This plan should indicate trees that are to be retained and areas of new planting.</u>”</b></p> <p>[7] Accepted. <b>Include new para after 4.5.4 to read: “<u>Provision should be made for children’s play as part of the development.</u>”</b></p> <p><b>Space could be provided for children’s play within the new area of public realm created by reconnecting Queensway and Buckingham Road.</b></p> <p><b>Amend para 4.5.2 to state that “Space could be provided for small kiosks, spillout areas from cafes, market stalls, <u>children’s play, parklets</u>, as well as seating and pedestrian and cycle movement. High quality landscaping, both hard and soft, including tree planting, <u>rain gardens</u> and the avoidance of street clutter will be sought.”</b></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>[8] We note the reference to a hotel or similar. such a facility would be a good addition, as it would provide a link to Bletchley Park, bring visitors into the town centre and may act as a counter to the possibility of residential spaces becoming short-term lets (Airbnb) as the Bletchley Park museum grows.</p> <p>[9] Due to the proximity to the rail station and connections to London, it is important that the homes developed strongly align to the needs of the local community and are affordable so that the local community might be able grow into the housing provided, and not act as a place where commuters sleep at night.</p> <p>[10] We support other initiatives highlighted in the emerging plans such as the Eastern entrance to the rail station and the creation of a new transport hub. The development should consider how its development has a positive impact on the development of these initiatives, and how it links to the transport hub that maybe developed. We note the promotion of secure cycle storage and would wish for these facilities to have a wider community offer and have strong links to the cycling network.</p>	<p>[8] Support for the inclusion of a hotel is noted.  <b>Amend para 2.3.15 to read: “Policy ER16 of Plan:MK states ‘Planning permission will be granted for new hotel and other purpose–built visitor accommodation in CMK, town and district centres either as single use or as part of mixed-use development opportunities. <u>The Council will also support the provision of new hotels and visitor accommodation to serve visitor attractions within the city.</u>’</b></p> <p>[9] Comment noted. Policy HN2 (Affordable Housing) in Plan:MK requires that: “Proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing. Proposals that provide greater than 31% of homes as affordable housing will be strongly supported.”</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 also reiterates, “where residential development is proposed, affordable housing will need to be provided and is expected to meet or exceed current MKCC standards.”</p> <p>[10] Support for an Eastern entrance for Bletchley Train Station and a new transport hub is noted. Development of the site will need to be cognisant of the wider context of projects proposed elsewhere in Central Bletchley.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>[11] In summary we would hope the Development brief that is agreed emphasises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community spaces.</li> <li>• Connection to existing local communities.</li> <li>• Acts to highlight and promote environmental and sustainability initiatives.</li> <li>• Enables innovative ways to provide support back to the community.</li> <li>• Provide space for families.</li> <li>• Enables the outside spaces and the high street to be more attractive and usable for event, parades and act a springboard for a curated community programme.</li> <li>• Connects Bletchley Park with Bletchley Town centre.</li> </ul>	<p>[11] Noted.</p>
14	Hilary McCoy	<p>[1] Please do not build ugly high rise buildings like those next to the bus station.</p> <p>[2] It will be wonderful to have a good shopping complex, but not helpful to those of us who do not have a bus service to Bletchley. (there was a comment that they were not being used enough but we were told many times to avoid using the buses during covid)</p>	<p>[1] Due to the sustainable location of this site and its proximity to local services and public transport, the council is promoting “a well-designed, mixed-use, high-density development with active ground floor uses on this site” (paragraph 2.7.1).</p> <p>Paragraph 4.6.2 states all buildings should have a “high standard of design, should enhance their surroundings and be constructed from high quality, durable materials.”</p> <p>[2] Bus services to Bletchley sit outside the scope of this brief. However, the site itself is well served by buses, sitting adjacent to Bletchley Bus Station.</p>

		<p>[3] Someone needs to police the parking in Bletchley as cars are frequently parked on double yellow lines and on the pavements.</p> <p>Will there be adequate parking for those who have cars?</p> <p>[4] With all these new houses and shops would it not be a good idea to build a reservoir to provide water for it all and give a lovely venue for people as well.</p> <p>[5] Just before the shops in the Brunel started closing there was a spate of smashed shop windows. Will security be improved?</p>	<p>[3] Regarding parking, paragraph 4.8.6 states: “The Council will be commissioning a parking strategy for Central Bletchley. The strategy will consider demands for parking in the town centre, appropriate future provision of parking in the town centre, the appropriate mix of bay types and lengths of stay and any potential future parking restrictions and enforcement. Development of the site will need to take account of the outcomes of this work.” The parking strategy has now been commissioned and is underway. <b>Amend para 4.8.6 to read: <u>“The Council has commissioned a parking strategy for Central Bletchley.”</u></b></p> <p>Any development proposals will need to provide parking in accordance with the Council’s Parking Standards SPD.</p> <p>[4] This brief only covers the boundary outlined, which would be unsuitable for a reservoir. However, the council is currently investing in the Blue Lagoon Nature Reserve, approximately one mile from the site, to improve the access to the nature reserve.</p> <p>[5] Ongoing management of the Brunel Centre is not a matter for the development brief.</p>
15	<p>[1] Helen Hupton</p> <p>Clerk to West Bletchley Council</p> <p>[2] Ben Chapman</p>	<p>[1] I am pleased to confirm West Bletchley Council’s formal comment regarding the brief as follows:</p> <p>Minute No. FC23/98 – Brunel Centre Development Brief Resolved: that this Council welcomes the Development Brief as guidance for the future development of this site.</p>	<p>[1] We acknowledge your support of the development brief.</p>

	Assistant Clerk, West Bletchley Council	<p>[2] West Bletchley Council has noted that the consultation period for this Development Brief has been extended, and they have resolved to add, in addition to their previous submission:</p> <p>“This Council welcomes the Development Brief as guidance for the future development of this site, however, West Bletchley Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) is concerned that the commitment to 31% ‘affordable housing’ will not meet the needs of Bletchley residents as most ‘affordable housing’ is not ‘affordable’,</li> <li>ii) believes that the development should have 30% of the housing as ‘social housing’ and that the social housing should preferably be council housing, or provided by a ‘local’ housing association.</li> </ul>	<p>[2] Policy matters, such as affordable housing, are set out in Plan:MK, with this brief unable to make changes to adopted policy documents. Policy HN2 states: “Proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing. Proposals that provide greater than 31% of homes as affordable housing will be strongly supported.”</p> <p>Discussions around social and council housing are outside the scope of this brief but have been noted.</p>
16	<p>Iain Stewart MP</p> <p>Member of Parliament for Milton Keynes South</p> <p>Member of the Bletchley Town Fund Board</p>	<p>My only comment is to request that the redevelopment design does not preclude a future crossing of Saxon Street to an eastern entrance to Bletchley station via either a footbridge or an underpass. I appreciate that such a station entrance and related matters are outside the scope of this brief but I oppose the current proposals to single Saxon St and to have a road level crossing, as I believe this will result in additional traffic congestion in the wider Bletchley area. I hope that a better option of a bridge or underpass connection to the station may be considered at a future date and would not wish to see the redesign of the Brunel Centre preclude this option being followed.</p>	<p>Changes to Saxon Street are included in the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document, which was adopted in April 2022, following consultation. The SPD proposes the reduction of Saxon Street to a single lane in each direction, in order to deliver a human scale street that better supports pedestrians with at grade pedestrian crossings. There are no plans to consider a bridge or underpass crossing of Saxon Street.</p>
17	Rita Norris	<p>My family have lived in Milton Keynes for 5 generations. I would like to see a food supermarket installed in the area adjacent to the bus station. At the moment we now only have Lidl’s’, which although very good, isn’t that convenient if</p>	<p>Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p>

		you wish to shop on Queensway or Brunel Centre area, especially if you have to rely on public transport.	<b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: “Retail development to serve the daily and weekly food, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate.”</b>
18	Sarah Butler	<p>[1] Encouragement of more shops and commerce to welcome known brand retailers back and reverse the decline of our town centre. In particular UK supermarket chain for the benefit of people who aren’t mobile and can’t get to out of town stores.</p> <p>[2] Insist on a requirement to maintain public services such as library, health services and public toilets.</p>	<p>[1] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: “Retail development to serve the daily and weekly food, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate.”</b></p> <p>[2] Paragraph 4.2.6 of the brief identifies the site is suitable for a health hub and a community hub, which might include a library.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.6 to include: “<u>Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub.</u>”</b></p> <p><b>Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: “<u>Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies</u>”</b></p>

			<b>and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.”</b>
19	Elizabeth Woodhouse  Senior Landscape Architect at Milton Keynes City Council	<p>[1] Please check your paragraph references from the NPPF are correct as it was updated in September 2023; omit references to NPPF 2021.</p> <p>[2] Due to the increasingly high-density of housing and number of dwellings / occupants with young children being encouraged within central Bletchley, more consideration should be given in the document to creating and / or improving the provision of local and neighbourhood play areas for the health, well-being and safety of young people.</p> <p>[3] NPPF 2023 paragraph 131 should be referenced to increase the likelihood of getting more trees into new developments.</p> <p>[4] Section 4.7 refers to residential amenity. This section could be strengthened. For example:</p>	<p><b>[1] Update paragraph 2.4.1 to ‘The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in <u>December 2023.</u>’</b></p> <p><b>[2] Include new para after 4.5.4 to read: “<u>Provision should be made for children’s play as part of the development.</u>”</b> Space could be provided for children’s play within the new area of public realm created by reconnecting Queensway and Buckingham Road. <b>Amend para 4.5.2 to state that “Space could be provided for small kiosks, spillout areas from cafes, market stalls, <u>children’s play, parklets</u>, as well as seating and pedestrian and cycle movement. High quality landscaping, both hard and soft, including tree planting, <u>rain gardens</u> and the avoidance of street clutter will be sought.”</b></p> <p><b>[3] Include new para after 2.4.7 to read “<u>Para 136 states that planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, that opportunities are taken to incorporate trees elsewhere in developments, that appropriate measures are in place to secure their long-term maintenance and that existing trees are retained where possible.</u>”</b></p> <p><b>[4] Amend para 4.7.2 to include following sentence: “<u>Further guidance is provided in the New Residential Development Design Guide SPD (section 4.13).</u>”</b></p>

		<p>The New Residential Development Design Guide SPD (2012) and the guidance in relation to Outside Space for Apartments.</p> <p><u>Outside Space for Apartments (4.13.5 – 4.13.8)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within flatted developments, each apartment must have access to private open space. This can be provided in the form of private gardens for ground floor flats, a private balcony, a private roof garden or terrace, or private shared garden.</li> <li>• Where possible, ground floor apartments should have their own small private rear garden.</li> <li>• A balcony for an apartment should be large enough to accommodate a small table and two chairs to allow residents to sit out comfortably.</li> <li>• A balcony should be attached to a living rooms rather than a bedroom. ‘Juliet’ style balconies will not be acceptable as the primary provision for apartments.</li> </ul> <p><u>Private Communal Amenity Space (4.13.11)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minimum area for usable communal space is 50 square metres, plus 5 square metres per additional unit over five units. (This is in addition to private balconies)</li> </ul> <p>Policy D5 (Amenity &amp; Street Scene) says all proposals will be required to create and protect a good standard of amenity for buildings and surrounding areas, and in particular should ensure: External private or shared communal garden space, in its extent and design, meets the reasonable needs of its user(s).</p> <p>Where housing blocks or tall residential are proposed consider the following:</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inclusion of balconies for every flat/apartment typically inset or cantilevered balconies, equates to private external amenity space. As far as we are aware, there are currently no rules which do not permit balconies on high rise buildings however, the architecture/materials do have to be designed and specified to meet safety regs.</li><li>• In addition to private external amenity space, the provision of communal external amenity space should be in line with the residential SPD</li><li>• Alternative permanent provision of external recreation spaces integrated into the development to off-balance the lack of space on-site for the outdoor recreation space typically expected of traditional housing developments [like provision of parks, pitches, allotments, play areas under Policy L4]. Therefore, applicant to consider creating permanent functional outdoor spaces for food production gardening instead of allotments, intensive green-roof gardens in place of parks [but not just the usual planters which can be removed at any time] which should be incorporated into the development with irrigation.</li><li>• An outdoor equivalent of a MUGA [multi-use games area] as a good alternative to pitch provision for teenagers and adult sports. An indoor sports hall could be considered as an all-weather alternative.</li><li>• An indoor or preferably outdoor children's play area which meets MKCC local play area standard with some challenging play equipment for up to 8s, , dedicated to the apartment community.</li></ul> <p>Please note, while the provision of indoor amenity spaces such as gyms, cinema etc. is desirable for an apartment community it should not be presented as an alternative to</p>	
--	--	---	--

		the required external private and external communal amenity spaces.	
20	<p>Angie Ravn-Aagaard</p> <p>Chair of Bletchley Park Area Residents Association (BPARA)</p> <p>Chair of Consortium of Bletchley Residents Associations (COBRA)</p> <p>Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Deal Board Member</p> <p><b>Response on behalf of the Bletchley Park Area Residents Association (BPARA)</b></p>	<p>[1] Firstly, I would like to say that I found the Brief highly informative, and if the proposals are implemented, then I feel that MKDP/MKCC seems to have taken on board some feedback from residents in respect of future development, in particular, design of new residential development. However, I must question how many others were aware the Brief existed, let alone have taken the time to read the 48-page document!</p> <p>[2] However, as I have made clear on many occasions, whilst MKCC can claim they have “consulted” on planning policies, their form of consultation only ticks “the box.” The methods used do not reach most residents and consultation documents are lengthy, (albeit this brief with forty-eight pages is shorter than most consultation documents), and there is no Executive Summary. Other projects or proposed developments have a one-day drop-in session for residents – for instance, East West Rail, Salden Park, Solar Park.</p>	<p>[1] Noted.</p> <p>[2] Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief was undertaken over a 6-week period extending from 12 October to 23 November. The consultation period was subsequently extended until the 31 December to accommodate further community engagement.</p> <p>During consultation, the Draft Development Brief was made available on our website and at Bletchley Library.</p> <p>Details of the consultation were posted to the Groundbreaking Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford website and electronic notices placed on the BT display board in Stanier Square. We also distributed letters to properties adjoining the the site and flyers to businesses on Queensway.</p> <p>A presentation on the Draft Development Brief was made to the Town Deal Advisory Group on 9 November, West Bletchley Council’s Environment Committee on 23 October, to Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Council on 21 November, and to MKCC’s Planning Committee on 6 November.</p> <p>A public drop in event for local residents was held on 18 December at the Duncombe Street Community House.</p> <p>The Introduction section effectively acts as an executive summary. There will be further opportunities for residents to engage with this project, once more detailed plans are produced.</p>

		<p>[3] Section 2 Planning Policy The Brief states that it is a guide to facilitate MKDP’s marketing of the site, taking account of both national &amp; local planning policies which include:</p> <p>Office-based employment space – this should be minimal as there is an ample supply of office space in the area at a time when demand has dropped following lockdown and increased working from home.</p> <p>[4] New retail facilities should include provision for a supermarket (Lidl or Aldi should be encouraged to relocate) and for the traditional retailers and current occupants of the Brunel Centre, such as Hinds the Jewellers and Holland &amp; Barrett. In the intervening period between closure of the Brunel Centre and the opening of new retail units, these must be given suitable alternative premises. If there is not already an arrangement with these retailers, these must be negotiated at the earliest opportunity to end the exodus of established retailers from Bletchley. These retailers are key members of “the second-tier centre in the retail hierarchy of town centres in the Borough of MK, catering for daily and weekly convenience shopping” as referenced in the Brief.</p> <p>[5] Leisure facilities – there must be provision for activities for young people (to reduce the risk of Anti-Social Behaviour arising from boredom/lack of facilities and things to do), for the elderly and those with disabilities (to improve their health/wellbeing).</p>	<p>[3] Noted. The mix of uses within the scheme will take account of market conditions.</p> <p>[4] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre. Existing businesses within the Brunel Centre have, and will continue to be, consulted with in relation to the redevelopment proposals.</p> <p>[5] Noted. Para 4.2.5 states that community, leisure and cultural uses will be supported.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>[6] New higher density homes above offices and shops to create a more vibrant mix of uses and support local services. The Saxon Street/Albert Street area is currently dominated by poorly designed and unattractive high-density housing with inadequate parking provision, and more are likely to follow on the Burger King and Bus Station sites. Lower density residential properties for families, for the elderly and those with access needs should be provided – designed like those along Princes Way. Any development should not dwarf existing properties, have basement or undercroft parking and concealed service areas. The requirement for a developer to provide parking in an agreed location at the developer’s expense is desirable, maybe via reserved spaces in a nearby multi-storey carpark. An example of this is the carpark close to the Derngate Theatre in Northampton. However, MKCC’s Parking Standard does not provide for a minimum one parking space per property, and despite climate change and carbon footprint requirements, residents will require more than this in the years to come, plus sufficient Electric Vehicle charging points.</p> <p>[7] Affordable Housing – there must be no dilution of MKCC policy, and developers must comply with MKCC minimum requirement of at least 31%.</p>	<p><b>[6] Housing mix on the site should accord with Policy HN1 of Plan:MK by reflecting the Council's latest evidence of housing need and market demand. Add sentence to para 4.2.4 to state: <u>“The mix of housing should accord with Plan:MK Policy HN1.”</u></b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.4.3 states: “The scale and massing of development will need to respect the existing two storey development along Duncombe Street, Oliver Road, and Osborne Street.” Paragraph 4.8.7 states, “car parking for the residential uses should be provided in the form of integrated basement or undercroft parking.” Paragraph 4.8.9 also states: “Electric vehicle parking points will be expected as part of the car parking provision” for this development. Parking will be provided in accordance with the Council’s car parking standards.</p> <p>[7] Paragraph 4.2.4 of the brief emphasises “where residential development is proposed, affordable housing will need to be provided and is expected to meet or exceed current MKCC standards.”</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.10 also cites Plan:MK Policy HN2 where “proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing. Proposals that provide greater than 31% of homes as affordable housing will be strongly supported.’</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>[8] There is no mention of any provision for increase in services such as health, education etc. or infrastructure to meet the increased population needs from existing and planned residential developments. Remember, I before E – Infrastructure before Expansion!</p> <p>[9] Improved public realm. Currently, this area is dominated by ugly concrete and steel buildings, untidy service areas and lack of green space. The same applies to the adjoining areas including Stephenson House and the rear of the former Co-op building. These private landowners should be encouraged to improve the exterior/landscape of their properties.</p> <p>[10] National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that town centres can be used for retail, offices, leisure, entertainment, sport, recreation as well as residential. Queensway units are owned by a small number of private landlords who appear to be content with the status quo, and there is an absence of better-quality night-time economy. The Brunel Centre area provides a clean sheet for MKCC/MKDP to make this a showcase centrepiece for Bletchley taking account of its traditions – the former Roman</p>	<p>[8] The brief identifies health facilities as an appropriate use on the site. Contributions may be required to off-site infrastructure provision. <b><u>Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: “Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.”</u></b></p> <p>[9] Key to this brief is the improvement of public realm around the Brunel Centre, former Sainsburys and Stanier Square. This is evident throughout the document including part of the vision statement: “This site will deliver an enhanced public realm”. The brief notes the current poor quality public realm. Paragraph 3.4.4 states “there are areas of poor quality public realm such as the area in front of Stephenson House.” Paragraph 4.5.4 states that “Proposals should also fund improvements to the public realm around Stephenson House making it more legible, and pedestrian friendly”.</p> <p>[10] Noted. The Council agree this development offers an exciting opportunity to create a vibrant town centre with a variety of uses. The suggested uses are all appropriate town centre uses supported by the brief.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Camp and Watling Street, the Canal, the Railway, Bletchley Park, Marshall Amplification – and its future – South Central Institute of Technology and East West Rail. Potential development could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A hotel, if not earmarked for the former Police/Fire Station site – this would be a splendid landmark building. MKDP website promulgates its excellent partnership with Premier Inns which has brought 6 hotels to MK – Bletchley should be next!</li> <li>• Quality restaurant(s)/bar/pub/coffee shop</li> <li>• Health/fitness, including Health Hub which is currently being promoted via MKCC’s Plan 2023/24.</li> <li>• Multi-Use Community Hub including Library, social activities such as Indoor Bowling, Bingo, and youth activities to cater for all generations.</li> </ul> <p>[11] To include a Banking Hub to cater for residents who either currently travel in droves to CMK, or are unable to travel, and those from the Western flank of MK who used to bank in Bletchley prior to the closure of main banks. In July, Bucks CC, in conjunction with Cash Access UK, opened a temporary Banking Hub in Buckingham for residents to access banking services and cash in the town centre pending completion of permanent premises. MKCC could do the same for Bletchley using a vacant Brunel unit.  <a href="http://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/news/buckingham-temporary-banking-hub-opens/">www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/news/buckingham-temporary-banking-hub-opens/</a>. Local businesses at the “We are Bletchley” meeting arranged by MKCC in July flagged the reduction in numbers coming to Bletchley since the withdrawal of major banks.</p> <p>[12] Section 3 Contextual (Site) Analysis</p>	<p><b>[11] Amend para 4.2.6 to include: “<u>Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub.</u>”</b></p> <p>[12] Support for the reconnection of Buckingham Road and Queensway is noted. Changes to Saxon Street are</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Restoration of link between Buckingham Road and Queensway for pedestrians/cyclists is welcome. However, as MKCC/MKDP own this expanse of land, a bridge to link the eastern side of the rail station and Queensway should be investigated as a priority as this must be less costly and complex than major alterations to Saxon Street and the existing railway area. Elsewhere in MK, there are numerous pedestrian bridges over both dual and single carriageways – Saxon Street could continue as a dual carriage way until such time as the Mass Rapid Transport System comes to Bletchley.</p> <p>[13] Section 4 Design Principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Layout – creation of new streets within former Sainsbury’s site to provide access to car parking and discrete servicing would be a much-welcomed improvement. However, a multi-story carpark and public toilets are urgently needed.</li> <li>▪ Public Realm &amp; Landscape – Stanier Square with landscaping, small kiosks, spill-out areas from cafes, market stalls, and seating would be welcome, subject to vehicles being prevented from parking in this area, plus green areas/private gardens throughout the rest of the site. Random and illegal parking and lack of enforcement is a current blight on the Central Bletchley landscape and was identified in a previous study by City Science and remains so, yet another Parking Strategy study will confirm!</li> </ul> <p>[14] BPARA’s other comments on the Brief: There are positive points such as MKCC’s recognition of current parking issues/lack of enforcement.</p>	<p>included in the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document, which was adopted in April 2022, following consultation. The SPD proposes the reduction of Saxon Street to a single lane in each direction, in order to deliver a human scale street that better supports pedestrians with at grade pedestrian crossings. There are no plans to consider a bridge or underpass crossing of Saxon Street.</p> <p>[13] Noted. A wider parking study is currently underway in Bletchley. Development of the site will need to take account of the outcomes of this study.</p> <p><b><u>Amend para 4.2.6 to include: “Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub.”</u></b></p> <p>[14] Support regarding the Central Bletchley Parking Strategy and basement or under croft parking for residents is noted.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Central Bletchley Parking Strategy will look at current provision and take account of future provision.</li> <li>- The requirement for developers to provide integrated basement or undercroft parking on site or elsewhere at their expense.</li> </ul> <p>[15] BPARA’s concern is about the number of vehicles that will have access to/use of the developed site and the lack of infrastructure to support it, which will be seriously worsened by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MKCC’s plan to reduce Saxon Street to one carriageway, plus</li> <li>- Removal of the Brunel roundabout with left in/left out only access to and from Duncombe Street which will increase the amount of traffic obtaining access to Saxon Street via Buckingham Road and the Sherwood Drive roundabout, plus</li> <li>- Relocation of the bus station to a point along Saxon Street further from Queensway, and the proposed subsequent residential development of this privately-owned site.</li> <li>- Narrow width of Albert Street which currently results in congestion from vehicles entering and leaving Queensway</li> <li>- Residential development under construction at Beacon (formerly known as Bletchley) View, that almost completed at Caspian View, plus 1,795 new homes at Salden Park on the fringe of Bletchley will only add to the number of vehicles already using the major route of Buckingham Road/Saxon Street – this is before any additional new development in Central Bletchley!</li> </ul>	<p>[15] Any development on this site will consider the impact on the wider road network. Policy CT2 of Plan:MK requires that development proposals that generate significant amounts of movement must be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and will normally be required to provide a Travel Plan, with mitigation implemented as required.</p> <p><b><u>Include new para after para 4.8.5 to read: “Any application for development should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment, in line with Policy CT2 of Plan:MK. A Transport Statement/Assessment identifies what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated transport impacts of the scheme and to improve accessibility and safety for all modes of travel, particularly for alternatives to the car such as walking, cycling and public transport.”</u></b></p>
--	--	---	--

21	<p>Ron Haine</p> <p>Chair, Leon Residents' Association Committee</p> <p>Member of COBRA (Consortium of Bletchley Resident Associations)</p>	<p>[1] For too long, Central Bletchley and Queensway has felt like the poor relation to West Bletchley. Queensway in Central Bletchley used to be a shopping destination for people across Milton Keynes, but has gone downhill the more large retail units are opened and with Centre MK nearby as well. Hard working local residents and business owners have every right to feel proud of Bletchley high street again, and also proud of the shared heritage of the wider town: the pioneering codebreakers at Bletchley Park in World War II and new Institute of Technology.</p> <p>[2] I can see the document mentions Bletchley Park in West Bletchley being nearby, but I feel the vision for Bletchley town centre fails to respect this key aspect of the town's shared heritage in the design brief. Myself and other residents want to see more visitors from Bletchley Park coming into the town centre for shopping, eating and leisure activities. There is no mention of clear signage to make sure visitors arriving at the train station know how to get to the high street from the <u>current</u> station entrance. At the moment, the design brief looks like a copy and paste job that could have been written about any town centre, there is no mention of the need for developers to demonstrate the town's rich heritage in their designs. Please make sure this requirement is included as part of the design brief.</p> <p>[3] The brief talks about hundreds of new homes being built in a very small area next to the town centre. I find this really concerning because parking is already a red hot issue for residents living nearby because people shopping in</p>	<p>[1] Noted.</p> <p>[2] Amend para 4.13.2 to read: <b><u>“Developers should explore the potential for providing public art as part of their proposals. This could be about Bletchley Park which would form part of a wider initiative within Bletchley and Fenny Stratford. Developers will need to engage with the relevant parish and Council teams early in the design process.”</u></b></p> <p>Amend para 4.6.1 to read: <b><u>“The architectural approach to development, should be informed by the contextual analysis. Development proposals could take inspiration from Bletchley’s history of technology and innovation and reflect this heritage within its design. This should not constrain architectural creativity with a contemporary design sought.”</u></b></p> <p>[3] Regarding wider parking issues outside of the site boundary, the Council has commissioned a parking strategy for Central Bletchley. Development of the site will need to take account of the outcomes of this study.</p>
----	---	--	---

		<p>Queensway already flout parking restrictions and park on the pavements. I make no secret of the fact that I am unhappy with MKCC's current enforcement of the parking on Queensway and it is a topic that comes up at every Leon Resident Association meeting with local people reporting near misses between pedestrians (adults and children) and cars taking over the pavements and streets surrounding Queensway. This is captured in the minutes of all our monthly Leon RA meetings and I have even had to raise the issue with the Secretary of State for Transport because of the lack of adequate action by MKCC Highways team. This brief needs to be much stronger about parking requirements for this high density housing and new flagship shopping area to make sure an issue that's already causing residents serious problems does not become worse.</p> <p>[4] I noticed in the draft development brief that 'leisure' use of the units could be for casinos or nightclubs. As MKCC and TVP are well aware, Bletchley town centre already suffers with high levels of anti-social behaviour and regular stabbings. According to data publicly available, in September 2023 alone, there were 33 crimes reported in Queensway (15 incidents of violent crime and 5 of anti-social behaviour), this amounts to more than one each day of the month, so it is already a big problem for local residents and businesses. I have worked hard with local businesses on Queensway to provide them with bleed kits in case of further stabbings and the RA has worked with Ward Councillors to fund bleed kits at seven venues along the high street to help respond to this issue. I feel strongly that a nightclub or casino <u>would not be welcome</u> in the high street and would make the area even</p>	<p>Parking requirements for new development is set out in the Council's Car Parking Standards SPD. This development will need to accord with those standards.</p> <p>[4] <b>Accepted in part.</b> Night clubs are a legitimate night-time use and the provision of a certain type of late night bar and entertainment would actually benefit the night-time economy of Bletchley. <b>Remove reference to casinos in para 2.7.2.</b></p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>more dangerous for local residents, many who are already nervous to go into the town centre after dark. In addition, with more homes next to the town centre, this is likely to cause a noise disturbance and further fear of anti-social behaviour for current and new residents which will drive people away from Queensway. In addition, central Bletchley is home to a very diverse community with a many residents from religions where gambling is forbidden and frowned upon, so this should be respected in the design brief. Bearing all this in mind, please can you remove any reference to nightclubs and casinos in the design brief as this would not be acceptable for our diverse, growing community.</p> <p>[5] Lots of good shops and businesses have closed and left Queensway in recent years because of extortionate rent increases from private landlords. Businesses cannot keep up with competition from the numerous large retail outlets nearby and Centre MK and I have recently been made aware of several rents increasing by between £2k-£6k for one year. This is clearly not sustainable for smaller independent shops along Queensway now, let alone in the future. How will MKCC ensure that private owners and developers of the new units keep rental costs low to attract a wide range of businesses to Queensway? The brief needs to include stipulations about this to make sure we can not only attract a new business, but retain it for decades to come. Please make sure this is written into the brief because it must be managed properly or shops will just close after a few years if rental cost increases are too high.</p>	<p>[5] Commercial rental rates are outside the scope of this brief.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>[6] Many local businesses in Queensway are small and independently run so they risk losing a lot of income from the disruption the building works will cause. Please can you make sure there is financial support available through section 106 funds for those businesses who are loyal to Queensway but who might consider closing because of the disruption the development will cause.</p> <p>[7] We have lost many high street banks recently as well and there is need for a banking hub to serve residents who can't easily drive or take public transport into central Milton Keynes.</p> <p>[8] There should also be more information in the high street about the development work. For example, hording should go up immediately with information and also on the digital screens to keep people informed otherwise businesses will give up and Queensway will become a ghost town long before the new buildings are complete. MKCC also need to be much more proactive about face to face communication with shop owners and landlords to improve the future of the high street. For example, there should be an info stand at all Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council events on Queensway over the next four years while work is taking place and there should be a Bletchley specific Business Innovation District to support the needs of business owners here, not just in central Milton Keynes.</p> <p>[9] Finally, I formally request more information on Section 106 money from this development. There is no mention of this in the brief and the community deserves to have money</p>	<p>[6] Financial support for businesses on Queensway would not be an appropriate use of Section 106 funding.</p> <p><b><u>[7] Amend para 4.2.6 to include: "Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub."</u></b></p> <p>[8] Noted. These are not matters for the development brief to address.</p> <p>[9] The brief identifies health facilities as an appropriate use on the site. Contributions may be required to off-site infrastructure provision. <b>Include new para after</b></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>available from the development to pump back into local services for residents, making sure it is ring fenced to improve life for local residents in Bletchley. With hundreds of additional homes being built, there will be more pressure on already stretched public health services so residents and I expect section 106 monies to come forward for local infrastructure including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A health hub to support access to NHS GP and health and social care charity services</li> <li>2. Local family centres and health visitor access</li> <li>3. Community banking hub of high street banks</li> <li>4. Additional green space and landscaping to improve the public realm</li> </ol>	<p><b><u>4.2.7 to state: “Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.”</u></b></p>
22	Ruth Thomas	<p>[1] I am a long-term resident of central Bletchley, having lived in Windsor Street for over 27 years. I walk past the Brunel Centre daily and use shops within it at least weekly. So was somewhat horrified that the “Brunel Centre Development Brief” was so poorly publicised that I only heard about it on Monday 20<sup>th</sup> November when it had apparently been running for 5 ½ weeks. Did nobody think it a good idea to inform those most closely affected?</p>	<p>[1] Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief was undertaken over a 6-week period extending from 12 October to 23 November. The consultation period was subsequently extended until the 31 December to accommodate further community engagement.</p> <p>During consultation, the Draft Development Brief was made available on our website and at Bletchley Library.</p> <p>Details of the consultation were posted to the Groundbreaking Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford website and electronic notices placed on the BT display board in Stanier Square. We also distributed letters to properties adjoining the the site and flyers to businesses on Queensway.</p> <p>A presentation on the Draft Development Brief was made to the Town Deal Advisory Group on 9 November, West Bletchley Council’s Environment Committee on 23 October, to Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Council on</p>

		<p>[2] I have a number of comments on the development brief. It seems to be written primarily in terms of making maximum money out of the site, with very little thought given to the needs of those who currently live, work and shop in central Bletchley. This needs urgent rethinking to prioritise local people over developers.</p> <p>[3] By far the most urgent need is for a decent supermarket in central Bletchley. The heart went out of the town when Sainsbury's closed and the lack of a good food shop becomes ever more acute as the cost-of-living crisis deepens. Large numbers of local residents cannot afford cars (nor is there sufficient space on the older streets for every household to have a car). Farm Foods is currently the only shop in central Bletchley that sells milk. There are numerous "ethnic" food shops but few that sell the everyday foods needed by the western European population. For those with dietary allergies and suchlike, the options are even worse. I am coeliac, and gluten-free bread is available precisely nowhere – the discounters such as Farm Foods, Home Bargains and Lidl finding demand too low for it to be worthwhile stocking. A proliferation of "convenience" retailers will not fix the problem, since all will be too small to stock it. There is an absolute need for a food retailer big enough to be able to offer at least some choice and comparison options to local residents without them having to carry heavy groceries home from Tesco a mile or more away.</p>	<p>21 November, and to MKCC's Planning Committee on 6 November.</p> <p>A public drop in event for local residents was held on 18 December at the Duncombe Street Community House.</p> <p>[2] The document is aimed to offer planning guidance and design principles to developers to ensure any development maximises the benefits for residents and Bletchley town centre.</p> <p>[3] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: "Retail development to serve the daily and weekly food, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate."</b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>[4] The developers must take steps to protect the existing shops. If Farm Foods were to close, even temporarily while work takes place, the town centre would die and quite possibly so would some local residents who cannot obtain sufficient food anywhere else. The other shops remaining in and near the Brunel Centre are also important to the town. New sites must be found for these before any works make their locations unusable or inaccessible.</p> <p>[5] Bletchley does not need a “landmark building” or any more high-rise buildings. The Brunel Centre was itself hailed as a wonderful landmark building in its day, as was Stephenson House. Anything that sets out to be a “landmark” is typically ugly and always quickly dated (and often demolished). Decent ordinary buildings are generally far preferable to residents and locals, even if nobody wins an award for them. Please think about locals rather than media commentators.</p>	<p>[4] Noted. Existing businesses within the Brunel Centre have, and will continue to be, consulted with in relation to the redevelopment proposals. There is still significant design work to be done with a development partner, but the quantum of new retail space, the phased delivery of the scheme, and disruption during construction, will be carefully considered.</p> <p>[5] Due to the sustainable location of this site, and its proximity to local services and public transport, the council is promoting “a well-designed, mixed-use, high-density development with active ground floor uses on this site” (paragraph 2.7.1).</p> <p>The intention is for a key building, or buildings, that marks the gateway to the town centre, in order to aid legibility. This can be achieved in a number of ways through the building design. Generally, the document refers to key buildings but for consistency reference to landmark buildings should be removed.</p> <p><b>Amend paras 4.3.2 and 4.3.3 to read: “A new gateway to Queensway will be created as a result of the redevelopment of the Brunel Centre. This gateway should be marked by key buildings, or building elements, that stand out from their background by virtue of <u>an increase in height, or scale</u> or some other aspect of design.”</b></p> <p><b>“The <u>former</u> Wilko store could be retained within</b></p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>[6] In the last few years, far too many trees in the former Sainsbury's car park and in Queensway have been cut down, with the Council making no attempt to plant new ones. This must be reversed. Trees and green areas are essential to any town, as well as to our planet as a whole. This must be a primary requirement of the plans.</p> <p>[7] New residential buildings are by no means essential. Central Bletchley has gained large numbers of new dwellings in the last few years, with more in the process of being built, and there is no need for even more to be built on what should be prime retail and commercial land. Residential use should be the lowest priority for this development.</p>	<p><b>development proposals. However, if the store were to be redeveloped, it should be replaced by a <u>key building which marks this gateway location with positive frontages to the public realm.</u></b></p> <p><b>Amend para 3.3.3 to read: "The Brunel Centre provides a blank elevation to the street <u>with retail units accessed via an internal pedestrian mall.</u>"</b></p> <p>[6] Noted. The brief proposes the creation of new public realm through the reconnection of Buckingham Road and Queensway. This provides the best opportunity for new tree planting which para 4.5.2 of the brief seeks.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.7 identifies "opportunities to include green infrastructure as part of the proposed building, either in the form of a green roof, roof garden, growing spaces, green wall, terraces, balconies and/or planters."</p> <p><b>Add new sentence to para 4.5.6 to read: "Development proposals should be accompanied by a plan illustrating indicative landscape principles for the site. <u>This plan should indicate trees that are to be retained and areas of new planting.</u>"</b></p> <p>[7] The council propose a mixed-use development for this area, meaning retail and other town centre uses, will be the predominant land use in ground floor units. Homes will sit above the active ground floor units, taking advantage of the close proximity of shops, services and public transport. This will bring more people into Bletchley Town Centre, encouraging new businesses to</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>[8] There is little or no consideration in the draft brief for road access and parking for existing residents. It has been proposed to reduce Saxon Street to one carriageway and remove the Brunel roundabout (as shown in figure 7 of the brief). This would cause massive problems for access to any new commercial or residential premises on the former Sainsbury's area, and make the existing congestion on Duncombe Street even worse. Parking in and around this area, for residents and visitors (particularly mosque users), urgently needs improvement. As much space as possible must be made available for local needs as well as allowing some flow of traffic in both directions. For residents of Windsor Street, Sandringham Place, Osborne Street and Clifford Avenue, this is the principle road access to and from Milton Keynes and must be preserved. Far more thought needs to go into managing the roads around the site.</p> <p>[9] Finally, provision of an eastern entrance to Bletchley railway station should be included in the brief. Visitors to the town need to have the option of arriving other than by car, and residents need good public transport links. It would be far easier to encourage station users to arrive on foot if they did not have to cross all the way over the tracks within the station only to have to cross all the way under them again</p>	<p>open in the area. Additional homes will also help ease housing pressures.</p> <p>[8] Saxon Street itself sits beyond the boundaries of the Brunel Centre Development Brief, and hence outside the scope of the document. Changes to Saxon Street are discussed in the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document, which was adopted in April 2022, following consultation.</p> <p>Regarding parking, paragraph 4.8.6 states: "The Council will be commissioning a parking strategy for Central Bletchley. The strategy will consider demands for parking in the town centre, appropriate future provision of parking in the town centre, the appropriate mix of bay types and lengths of stay and any potential future parking restrictions and enforcement. Development of the site will need to take account of the outcomes of this work."</p> <p>Policy CT2 of Plan:MK requires that development proposals that generate significant amounts of movement must be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment and will normally be required to provide a Travel Plan, with mitigation implemented as required.</p> <p>[9] Bletchley Train Station sits beyond the boundaries of the Brunel Centre Development Brief, and hence outside the scope of the document. However, the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document identifies an opportunity to create a transport hub utilising a future Eastern Station entrance.</p>
--	--	--	---

		outside it before they could reach the town centre. A pedestrian-only eastern entrance would massively improve communication between the town and its railway.	
23	Clare Baars-Gordon	<p>[1] It is no secret that there is widespread concern and confusion among my fellow neighbours about the upcoming plans, so I was delighted to attend your presentation at the Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council meeting on 21 November attended by 24 residents including myself. Despite being held less than 48 hours before the consultation deadline, on the whole it was reassuring to hear many of your comments and responses to resident and Councillor questions. In particular, I noted Adam's comment around not wanting to 'parachute in' and deliver decisions taken in your office in isolation from engagement with the local community, which I hope will continue to be the ethos throughout the project.</p> <p>Overall, I welcome the design brief and proposals for the long-overdue regeneration of Bletchley town centre. I support the intentions outlined in the draft brief, although I feel the vision for Bletchley could be far more ambitious and explicit in a few key areas as outlined below:</p> <p><u>[2] Parking and Travel</u></p> <p>I echo comments by the Chair of Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council at the aforementioned meeting on 21 November; parking is of paramount importance in Central Bletchley, with residents of all ages (myself included) experiencing regular near misses on Queensway due to cars flouting parking restrictions and parking on the pavements. I appreciate this wider issue is beyond the scope of your design brief and will be dealt with elsewhere, however, should the proposal bring in hundreds of new homes as</p>	<p>[1] Support for the intentions outlined in the draft brief are noted.</p> <p>[2] Parking for new homes will be provided in accordance with Plan:MK Policies CT10 and HN1 and the Parking Standards SPD. The site is located in a highly sustainable location, next to a railway and bus station, and town centre.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.9 also states: "Electric vehicle parking points will be expected as part of the car parking provision" for this development.</p>

		<p>planned, they simply must be accompanied by double the number of parking spaces. This is not only to allow for 1-2 vehicles per family as is common, but for visitors to the new families arriving on weekends when parking is most in demand.</p> <p>In keeping with the environmental and sustainable ambitions of MKCC, I would also ask that electric vehicle charging points feature in the design brief for developers to include as standard to ensure future proofing of these new homes in line with national government strategy moving away from petrol and diesel and towards Electric Vehicles. As an EV user myself, this is something I believe will help Bletchley uphold its reputation as a pioneering town in the realm of technological advances and will support new residents to keep pace with incoming legislation. In addition, I would ask that active travel is captured as a core part of the design brief with requirements for secure bike storage for residents to encourage the use of cycling for commuting and leisure purposes using the ever-improving Redway network that serves Bletchley.</p> <p>I would personally not support the relocation of the main bus terminal further from Stanier Square as it seems highly likely it would simply discourage people from using the high street.</p> <p><u>[3] Economic Development, Facilities and Night Time Economy</u></p> <p>I welcome the proposal for both apartments and houses as part of the brief, in order to attract residents with a range of socioeconomic means looking to make good use of the rail connections, and retail and leisure offer on their doorstep.</p>	<p>Touching on active travel, paragraph 4.8.2 states: “Improved cycle access should be provided between Queensway and Buckingham Road, possibly in the form of a Redway.”</p> <p>Paragraph 4.8.10 states: “Provision shall be made for secure cycle parking and, within commercial development, facilities for cyclists (changing rooms, showers, lockers etc.) in order to encourage greater cycle usage. Proposals should provide, as a minimum, the cycle parking standards in force at the time of the planning submission”.</p> <p>Bletchley Bus Station sits beyond the brief area, and hence outside the scope of this document. However, the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document, which was adopted in April 2022, following consultation, identifies an opportunity to relocate the bus station to the western side of Saxon Street.</p> <p>[3] The brief refers to retail, community, leisure, culture and hotel uses as being appropriate for the site.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>As a resident with a growing family, I would personally like to see more provision for young people and families in the new development that would also increase overall dwell time in the town centre. For example: a soft play and café, youth club, board games/table tennis café, bowling alley etc... I am familiar with Watford Borough Council's attempts to attract more footfall to their town centre in my previous role and they have even successfully installed a climbing wall unit in their shopping centre.</p> <p>Some leisure and retail uses that I would personally consider a welcome improvement that would also increase dwell time, attract new audiences and those attending Bletchley Park, IoT or MK College include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hotel</li> <li>▪ Restaurants, cafés, cocktail bar (e.g. a 1930s-1940s speakeasy style bar / Cosy Club)</li> <li>▪ Performance spaces and indoor live music venues (i.e. weather-proof)</li> <li>▪ Art exhibition space and demo space for technological innovation (e.g. Tesla hub as in Centre MK)</li> <li>▪ Activity spaces, e.g. climbing wall, escape rooms, board game café, table tennis pop up (as in Centre MK)</li> </ul> <p>[4] I would like to formally request the removal of reference to casinos and nightclubs in the permitted use for town centres from the brief. Although these may be acceptable uses in many town centre settings, these would simply not be welcome or appropriate in Bletchley. This is due to already high levels of violent crime and anti-social behaviour (<i>statistics are readily available via Google or TVP data</i>). I'm a confident individual who regularly travels into London for</p>	<p>[4] <b>Accepted in part.</b> Night clubs are a legitimate night-time use and the provision of a certain type of late night bar and entertainment would actually benefit the night-time economy of Bletchley. <b>Remove reference to casinos in para 2.7.2.</b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>evening social events, but I do not feel safe walking home after dark through Queensway at present. Furthermore, we already have a small casino and Paddy Power on the high street, so additional casinos or new nightclubs would not serve to enhance the town centre, neither would they create a more prosperous or safer community within Central Bletchley.</p> <p>[5] However, in order to attract and maintain high quality national retail brands, MKCC will first need to address rental costs of the units to avoid these shops closing in future. I include this comment because high private rental costs and sharp rent increases have become prohibitive for many independent retailers currently on Queensway with many forced to leave in the last year due to inflation-based rent increases up to £6k per annum. I have just this week spoken with one retailer forced to set up a Go Fund Me campaign in order to raise funds to cover the rent increase on their current unit in Stanier Square. This extortionate rent rise cannot go unchecked on the new development. Please include stipulations of low-cost rents for the new businesses moving into the new units so that Bletchley can both attract AND retain them, rather than having a ‘flash in the pan’ approach with lots of shops launching in the new development that close a few years later due to the unreasonable and unsustainable rental increases such as those businesses are currently exposed to in Bletchley town centre.</p> <p>[6] We are in desperate need of a household name supermarket in the new development. We have many independent shops at present, but nothing that is recognisable and dependable for everyday items. We are</p>	<p>[5] Future commercial rent prices are outside the scope of this brief.</p> <p>[6] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>already surrounded by large superstores of nearly all high street supermarkets, so to complement this I hope a retailer of a medium price-point such as Sainsbury's / Morrisons/ Tesco could be attracted to open a smaller, 'local' branded retail unit as it would certainly be in high demand.</p> <p>[7] In addition, there needs to be more mention of space available for mixed community use, including the following local services that are already stretched and will be under even greater pressure with hundreds of new homes on this development and thousands more in the pipeline locally:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community space running activities similar to Old Bath House in Wolverton (<i>e.g. physical fitness and dance classes, children's activity groups, toddler groups etc...</i>)</li> <li>• Banking hub provision for residents who are unable to travel into Centre MK</li> <li>• Public health provision of GP and Health Visitors, as well as 'wellbeing hub' style space hosting charity health and social care support, Information, Advice and Guidance (IAG) services to bolster NHS services</li> </ul> <p>[8] <u>Section 106 Funds</u> Having worked closely with Watford Borough Council on high value community development projects, I'm painfully aware that MKCC does not have a Community Infrastructure Levy in place. Therefore, it is crucial that Section 106 monies are secured for this development and ring-fenced for spending in the Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council area. This funding is essential to ensure that wrap-around health and wellbeing support services are available to the thousands of</p>	<p>businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: "Retail development to serve the daily and weekly <u>food, convenience and comparison shopping</u> needs of the growing local population would be appropriate."</b></p> <p>[7] Paragraph 4.2.6 of the brief identifies the site is suitable for a health hub and a community hub. It states: "MKCC is seeking to rationalise its property assets via a 'hub-and-spoke' approach to service delivery and this area is seen as an ideal location to accommodate a multi-use community hub, which might potentially house Bletchley Library. MKCC's Council Plan Delivery Plan 2023/24 promotes a new Health Hub in Bletchley as part of the regeneration of the town centre. Health facilities would be appropriate on this site."</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.6 to include: "<u>Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub.</u>"</b></p> <p><b>[8] Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: "<u>Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.</u>"</b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>current and new residents so that the development is not only synonymous with good aesthetic design, but also community-centred design principles that truly benefit residents of all ages and walks of life. I was encouraged to hear you mention the Bletchley Pathfinder discussions around a health hub which are happening locally and look forward to you sharing information with residents on how we can influence how these funds are allocated.</p> <p>In Watford, for example, I supported one round of CIL funding applications worth £200,000 which was made available for charities and NGOs to apply for using Common Place as a virtual public noticeboard where residents could up-vote their favourite projects and proposals for funding. These projects ranged from mental health and wellbeing activities, youth disability charities, food banks and sports groups and it served the dual purpose of raising awareness of the not-for-profit organisations offering support locally as well. I would welcome this level of transparency of Section 106 funding and would be more than happy to share my experience working with Watford Borough Council on this scheme in 2022.</p> <p><u>[9] Historic Identity of Bletchley</u>  Finally and, in my view, most importantly; the re-development of the town centre area outlined in the brief is a pivotal moment in the town’s history and offers a unique opportunity to create a single visual identity for Bletchley for residents and visitors alike to enjoy. I do not feel the brief goes far enough in outlining expectations of developers to showcase the town’s rich history of the codebreakers of Bletchley Park.</p>	<p><b><u>[9] Amend para 4.13.2 to read: “Developers should explore the potential for providing public art as part of their proposals. This could be about Bletchley Park which would form part of a wider initiative within Bletchley and Fenny Stratford. Developers will need to engage with the relevant parish and Council teams early in the design process.”</u></b></p> <p><b>Amend para 4.6.1 to read: “The architectural approach</b></p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>As you know, Bletchley has two Councils serving different areas, which in my view can sometimes result in disjointed approaches to public events, funding of services and communications across the town. Therefore, this project needs to be a paragon of cohesive and sustainable design, in keeping with the town’s unique heritage and pioneering nature of the code breakers at Bletchley Park during the second world war. Please review the wording of the design brief to capture the importance of creating a ‘One Bletchley’ identity that will allow Central Bletchley to capitalise on the international visitors coming to Bletchley Park. Please ensure that this is made explicit in the brief.</p> <p>As the recent AI Summit and restoration of Bletchley Park in West Bletchley have demonstrated, there is much to be made of the town’s heritage and Bletchley as a whole has the opportunity to be an increasingly successful international tourist hot spot. Indeed, the planned Alan Turing statue would find a welcome home in the heart of a bustling Bletchley. I would personally also welcome Council-commissioned public street art and murals as a means of improving the public realm having seen the footfall and tourism opportunities this attracts in other places I’ve lived such as Bristol and in Shoreditch near what was once termed ‘Silicon Roundabout’ in London.</p> <p>The design brief should require developers to include visual reference to the heritage of the town in their submitted design proposals. Please can this be considered a key criteria for choosing the successful final development partner.</p>	<p><b>to development, should be informed by the contextual analysis. <u>Development proposals could take inspiration from Bletchley’s history of technology and innovation and reflect this heritage within its design.</u> This should not constrain architectural creativity with a contemporary design sought.”</b></p>
24	Catherine Bedford	<p>[1] I live in Osborne Street, in front of what was formerly Sainsbury’s. The closure of Sainsbury’s has left a massive hole (literally and metaphorically) in the heart of Bletchley. Not</p>	<p>[1] Demolition of the former Sainsburys' store is proposed for 2024. The surrounding residents and businesses will be engaged with through the process.</p>

		<p>only was it a handy and useful shop used by a lot of local residents, which enabled people to do shopping without a car, it was an unofficial community meeting point, a place to regularly see one's neighbours. I understand that the current building needs to be demolished, but it has been left to rot, attracting antisocial behaviour, for ages. And the communication about the plans for demolition, etc. with local residents has been very poor.</p> <p>[2] If the former Sainsbury's site is redeveloped, I would be extremely concerned if a block of flats or offices was thrown up there, bang slap in the middle of our roads of Victorian houses. Any building that is higher than the current one would risk throwing our houses and gardens into shadow/darkness, plus there would be privacy issues in terms of us being overlooked.</p> <p>[3] Parking in central Bletchley is currently a real problem, and I don't see how building any more residences in the area and possibly taking away from the existing car park would help this in any way.</p> <p>Parking and pedestrian crossings also need to be looked at: Queensway is sometimes a nightmare to walk up and down thanks to the traffic on a bad day.</p>	<p>[2] Paragraph 4.4.3 of the brief states: "the scale and massing of development will need to respect the existing two storey development along Duncombe Street, Oliver Road, and Osborne Street."</p> <p>Plan:MK also supports this, with Policy D5 highlighting the importance of a satisfactory level of sunlight and daylight within buildings and gardens. Section A5 of Policy D5 goes on to state that applications for new development should only be approved if the "new development is not overbearing upon existing buildings and open spaces."</p> <p>[3] Regarding parking, paragraph 4.8.6 states: "The Council will be commissioning a parking strategy for Central Bletchley. The strategy will consider demands for parking in the town centre, appropriate future provision of parking in the town centre, the appropriate mix of bay types and lengths of stay and any potential future parking restrictions and enforcement. Development of the site will need to take account of the outcomes of this work."</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>[4] And, by the way, the mention of closing off the back of Osborne Street in the plans doesn't really make much sense: our gardens are already closed off with railway sleepers? Would it be possible to write things in plainer English?</p> <p>[5] I've lived in Bletchley for over ten years now, and the town has significantly declined in terms of being a nice and convenient place to live in the time I've been here. So many useful, normal shops and businesses (e.g. banks) have closed down in the time I've lived here. And the loss of Sainsbury's and Wilko and WH Smith are a blow. I believe there is now only one pharmacy left in the centre of Bletchley too: when I moved here, there was a Boots and a Superdrug as well as Lloyd's Pharmacy.</p> <p>[6] This is a vicious circle: if there are more residences, there will be more cars, and if people need cars to do their shopping, there will be less incentive for people to visit the (declining) high street, as well as increasing the weight of traffic. I don't understand the logic of possibly closing off the Brunel Centre roundabout either, unless a new route to our residences opens up nearby.</p> <p>[7] If there are plans to redevelop the centre of Bletchley in an intelligent way, I hope that the existing high street will be factored into these plans in an organic way. The high street needs to encourage useful shops that 'normal' people want and will use, instead of yet more barbers, nail bars and betting shops. And if you are trying to attract professionals into Bletchley, the current set up is not very appealing.</p>	<p>[4] <b>Amend para 3.5.1 (sixth bullet point) to read: <u>"Close off' exposed rear boundaries of houses along Osborne Street with development, improving their security."</u></b></p> <p>[5] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to control the use of ground floor commercial space, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p>[6]. It is expected that additional homes within Bletchley Town Centre will increase footfall and dwell time within town, supporting local businesses and encouraging new businesses to open, breaking the cycle of decline. The Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework proposes removing the Brunel roundabout, but this would not affect existing road connections.</p> <p>[7] Key to this development brief is the reconnection of Buckingham Road and Queensway, to better connect Bletchley Town Centre and remove the current isolated and narrow passageways between the two. As mentioned, it is expected the new development, improvements to the public realm and additional investment within Bletchley Town Centre will create a more attractive urban environment, increase footfall and encourage new businesses to the town centre.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>[8] I hope that existing healthy trees will be retained, and that consideration will be given to the wildlife in the area (e.g. we still get hedgehogs here, though they suffer badly because of the roads as well as vanishing habitat).</p> <p>[9] Milton Keynes/Bletchley is the most modern city I've lived in, but depressingly has some of the worst infrastructure and public transport. I think it's profoundly irresponsible of the city planners to be allowing hundreds and thousands of houses to be built without having to invest in the infrastructure and in particular in a twenty-first century public transport system. I don't see how developing the centre of Bletchley and throwing up yet more flats can be at all a good idea if there are no plans in tandem to improve the transport network here. (It's fine if you want to get on a train and leave Bletchley, but are you trying to turn Bletchley into a dormitory town?) For example, I work at the Open</p>	<p>[8] Redevelopment of the Sainsbury's store car park will invariably result in the loss of some trees.</p> <p>However, the brief proposes the creation of new public realm through the reconnection of Buckingham Road and Queensway. This provides the opportunity for new tree planting which para 4.5.2 of the brief seeks.</p> <p><b>Add new sentence to para 4.5.6 to read: "Development proposals should be accompanied by a plan illustrating indicative landscape principles for the site. <u>This plan should indicate trees that are to be retained and areas of new planting.</u>"</b></p> <p>All major developments will be required by the Environment Act 2021 to provide 10% Biodiversity Net Gain.</p> <p>[9] This site is a highly sustainable location being within the town centre and adjacent to a railway and bus station.</p> <p>Public bus services in Milton Keynes are in the main commercially delivered by private operators. Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) is available to bus users that don't have access to the weekday daytime routes.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>University, and used to be able to travel there by direct bus, but this is no longer possible since the pandemic.</p> <p>[10] If I was house hunting in Milton Keynes now, I don't know that Bletchley would be on my list any more for all of the above reasons. While I would welcome intelligent investment and development of the town, I hope that its history will not be completely sacrificed to modernity. Lots of us chose to live in Bletchley, as opposed to on modern estates or in CMK because it has/had character. I, for one, find CMK very unappealing, and would be sad to see too many similar buildings appearing in Bletchley.</p> <p>[11] I also want to flag that I don't think the communication about this draft development brief has been very good, both for those of us who live in the affected area and for other Bletchley residents. Lots of people I've spoken to about this have not heard about the plans. The brief document is very long and not very accessible for lay people. A lot of Bletchley's residents don't speak English as their first language and a lot of older people are not online, so I'm not sure how these groups are supposed to be involved in the consultation and planning process. It's a shame that there has been no physical presentation of this idea in Bletchley, for example in one of the many empty shop premises in Bletchley.</p> <p>Apologies, I have just spotted that there is something at Bletchley Library, but I wasn't aware of it until now, and don't know what percentage of the local population use the library regularly ...</p>	<p>[10] <b>Additional text will be added to ensure a high quality development that respects its heritage and context. Include new para after 4.4.1 to read <u>"Development will need to demonstrate how it provides a high quality response to the existing heritage and context of buildings adjacent to the site."</u></b></p> <p>[11] Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief was undertaken over a 6-week period extending from 12 October to 23 November. The consultation period was subsequently extended until the 31 December to accommodate further community engagement.</p> <p>During consultation, the Draft Development Brief was made available on our website and at Bletchley Library.</p> <p>Details of the consultation were posted to the Groundbreaking Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford website and electronic notices placed on the BT display board in Stanier Square. We also distributed letters to properties adjoining the the site and flyers to businesses on Queensway.</p> <p>A presentation on the Draft Development Brief was made to the Town Deal Advisory Group on 9 November, West Bletchley Council's Environment Committee on 23 October, to Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Council on</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>[12] I had a couple of other thoughts: I hope that if Bletchley is redeveloped, this results in some sort of ‘heart’ or centre for the town. I.e. the fact that it didn’t occur to me that anything would be on display in the Library made me realise that I don’t know where I would go to look for information about Bletchley, except online ... (The proposal possibly mentions something along these lines.)</p> <p>[13] And also I hope that it makes sure that spaces are accessible to all, including people with disabilities, and doesn’t involve the over-privatisation of public space (which is the situation in CMK with the shopping centre and a lot of spaces there.)</p>	<p>21 November, and to MKCC’s Planning Committee on 6 November.</p> <p>A public drop in event for local residents was held on 18 December at the Duncombe Street Community House.</p> <p>[12] Paragraph 4.2.6 identifies the opportunities for a central multi-use community hub within this development.</p> <p>[13] Paragraph 4.3.4 says, “the Brunel Centre is an inward facing development with blank elevations fronting the public realm. New development must be outward facing with active ground floor frontages facing and framing the public realm.” This would remove privatisation of public space, with outward facing development being publicly accessible.</p>
25	Angela D’Aponte	<p>[1] I write as a long-term resident of Central Bletchley and as a dedicated long-term volunteer/ community advocate working for and associated with a wealth of local community groups, local charities, anti-bullying schemes and supporting disabled individuals requiring specific advocacy support.</p> <p>At this time, I believe it is vital that an extension is actioned by yourselves in respect of delaying the end date for the aforementioned consultation. It is imperative that consideration be given to the wealth of our community who have not been able to respond to the consultation, either because they do not know that there is a consultation, or that</p>	<p>[1] Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief was undertaken over a 6-week period extending from 12 October to 23 November. The consultation period was subsequently extended until the 31 December to accommodate further community engagement.</p> <p>During consultation, the Draft Development Brief was made available on our website and at Bletchley Library.</p> <p>Details of the consultation were posted to the Groundbreaking Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford website and electronic notices placed on the BT display board in Stanier Square. We also distributed letters to properties</p>

		<p>they are unable to comprehend in detail the extensive Development Brief, whether or not they have access to a computer.</p> <p>In consideration of the mammoth changes to Central Bletchley that have been documented within your Development Brief, it is vital that this consultation attracts not only a wider audience than it has so far, but a “bridge” to effective community engagement is provided for by yourselves/MKCC. It is imperative that every opportunity is implemented to reach out to members of our community – residents and retail/business’ alike – who may not have been made aware of this consultation, or do not have access to, or the ability to use, internet facilities.</p> <p>Ideally, not only does the consultation period need to be extended, but effective community engagement needs to be actioned in order to provide for essential communication with the Bletchley communities. There are many avenues available for effective and responsible community engagement.</p> <p>On behalf of our diverse and varied age range residents who have so far been excluded from responding to you, and have not been given due consideration in respect of equal opportunity to participate within this consultation, I request that every attempt is made to facilitate a more reliable, integral and inclusive public consultation.</p> <p>[2] Building hundreds of residential units in high-rise blocks – these residents will require facilities, such as a GP, school places, communal outside green space, an outside play area for the children, youth facilities close to home. Currently</p>	<p>adjoining the the site and flyers to businesses on Queensway.</p> <p>A presentation on the Draft Development Brief was made to the Town Deal Advisory Group on 9 November, West Bletchley Council’s Environment Committee on 23 October, to Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Council on 21 November, and to MKCC’s Planning Committee on 6 November.</p> <p>A public drop in event for local residents was held on 18 December at the Duncombe Street Community House.</p> <p>[2] Health facilities are included as an appropriate use on the site. <b>Include new para after 4.5.4 to read: <u>“Provision should be made for children’s play as part of the development.”</u></b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Stephenson House has no outside “healthy” space, nowhere for the children to play, too few car parking spaces. Where will the tenants/ residents of the new high-rise developments access vital resources? GP surgeries and local schools are already over-subscribed.</p> <p>[3] Fire Station – more than ever our local Bletchley Fire Station should have remained in situ. Have you consulted with MK Fire &amp; Rescue how many times they have been called to Stephenson House in recent years (for instance)? The current and intended high-rise blocks will add to this worrying lack of essential facility.</p> <p>[4] Illegal parking in Queensway, illegal electric scooters and irresponsible cyclists are a constant danger to pedestrians. How do you plan to eradicate these anti-social behaviours and make our high street safe?</p>	<p>Where demand for infrastructure generated by the development cannot be accommodated on site contributions may be sought towards off site provision. <b><u>Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: “Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.”</u></b></p> <p>[3] The fire station sits outside of the draft brief area and is hence outside the scope of this document. The fire service has been relocated to the Blue Light Hub in West Ashland.</p> <p>[4] Queensway sits beyond the boundaries of the brief area, and hence outside the scope of this document.</p>
26	<p>Adam Collier</p> <p>For Adams Hendry Consulting Limited on behalf of East West Railway Company Limited</p>	<p>[1] As part of EWR Connection Stage One, the East West Rail Alliance are expanding Bletchley Station, with work underway to add two new platforms, as well as creating a new footbridge to link the new platforms with the remainder of the station. In addition to this ongoing work, and as originally set out in EWR Co’s 2021 consultation ‘Making Meaningful Connections’, EWR Co are considering a range of further improvements to Bletchley Station, which may include altering or replacing the current footbridge, improving and enlarging the station car park, and creating a new station</p>	<p>[1] Noted.</p>

		<p>entrance on the east side of the station. In addition to these, EWR Co continue to review opportunities for further improvements at Bletchley Station.</p> <p>In May 2023, EWR Co released a Route Update Report which explains that EWR Co are working closely with Milton Keynes Council and Network Rail to support the development of a vision and masterplan for the Bletchley Station area, including a potential eastern entrance to the station, which could be transformational for Bletchley. EWR Co will need to consider the funding implications for this option, however, remain committed to working with the local authority and other local stakeholders in order to improve connectivity between the existing station and the surrounding area, and to develop understanding of how an enhanced public realm, as well as opportunities to engage in active travel, could support this.</p> <p>[2] EWR Co therefore support the production of the Development Brief (Consultation Draft) for the Brunel Centre in Bletchley (DBBC), and the recognition that it makes within it, to the future role of EWR at Bletchley Station in helping drive this change to Bletchley.</p> <p>The policies which underpin the DBBC are supported by EWR Co, especially Policy SD16 (Central Bletchley Prospectus Area) which sets out the guiding principles for the development and states that “development should further improve the quality of pedestrian routes to and from Bletchley Station” and “development should not preclude the delivery of an ‘eastern entrance’ to Bletchley railway station” (para 2.3.4 – 7/8).EWR Co recognise the role of the Brunel Centre Development Brief in helping to ensure that development</p>	<p>[2] Support for the Brunel Centre Draft Development Brief is noted.</p>
--	--	---	--

		proposals for the Brunel Centre remain co-ordinated with the delivery of East West Rail at Bletchley Station, in order to best support growth and investment in the town.	
27	Cllr Nigel Long (Bletchley Park ward)	<p>[1] I welcome the development brief and the opportunity to comment on it. I strongly support the 'Vision Statement' and the emphasis on: Pedestrian connections; Improvements to the public realm; Refurbishment proposals; Importance of parking.</p> <p>[2] Policy HN2 Affordable housing. I do not think this policy with a commitment to 31% of Affordable housing will meet the needs of local people. There is massive evidence that I am happy to supply that 'Affordable housing' is 'not affordable' for many low income households. I would support a target of 30% of the housing as social rent housing. My preference would be Council housing, but accept that it might have to be provided by a housing association.</p>	<p>[1] Support for the development brief and the vision statement is noted.</p> <p>[2] Policy matters, such as affordable housing, are set out in Plan:MK, with this brief unable to make changes to adopted policy documents. Policy HN2 states: "Proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing. Proposals that provide greater than 31% of homes as affordable housing will be strongly supported."</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.4 is also relevant, stating "where residential development is proposed, affordable housing will need to be provided and is expected to meet or exceed current MKCC standards."</p>
28	Philip Murphy  Chair, Milton Keynes Cycling Forum	<p>[1] The opportunity to redevelop the centre of Bletchley presents an ideal opportunity to create a fully integrated transport hub involving a bus, rail, and active travel hub.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We fully support the objectives of the brief, land uses proposed and urban design principles</li> <li>• We fully support the intention to create a major transport hub centred on a new entrance to the rail station and relocating the bus interchange to the west side of Saxon Way</li> </ul>	<p>[1] Support for the development brief especially related to the proposed land uses, design principles and the creation of a new transport hub is noted.</p>

		<p>[2] The brief lacks clarity about how the new station entrance on the east side of the station and how access is to be achieved.</p> <p>[3] We also have concerns about the lack of connectivity to existing cycling and walking routes and suggest the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Redway/track along Saxon Way is wholly inadequate and unsafe, this should be replaced along the whole length of Saxon Way</li> <li>- This route will need a signalised crossing across Princess Way</li> <li>- The draft plan shows new routes within the development area but makes no reference to how these should connect to exiting routes to surrounding areas, and beyond in particular west to Buckingham Road, east towards Fenny Stratford and south towards Water Eaton and Lakes Estate/Newton Leys</li> </ul> <p>[4] The draft plan seems to suggest that the roundabout at the junction of Saxon Street and Duncombe Street is to be removed. We are concerned that a swept turn here without a roundabout will increase traffic speeds adding risks to pedestrians and cyclists trying to get across the existing crossing.</p> <p>[5] Whilst we understand that this brief is confined to the red line boundary, the document should seek to improve off-site infrastructure and make prospective developers aware of the need to ensure that adequate connectivity for walking and</p>	<p>[2] Bletchley Train Station sits beyond the boundaries of the Brunel Centre Development Brief, and hence outside the scope of the document. Policy SD16 of Plan:MK states that development within Central Bletchley should not preclude the delivery of an 'eastern entrance' to Bletchley railway station.</p> <p>[3] The brief indicates how the site will connect to existing pedestrian routes on the edge of the site. Proposed works to Saxon Street and Queensway are separate projects and do not form part of this development brief. The Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework which is an adopted SPD considers the wider pedestrian and cycling connectivity.</p> <p>[4] Changes to Brunel Roundabout are proposed in the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework Supplementary Planning Document, which was adopted in April 2022 following consultation. Proposed works to Saxon Street are a separate project and do not form part of this development brief.</p> <p>[5] <b><u>Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: "Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure"</u></b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>cycling is made in their designs and that contributions will be sought by MKCC to fund these off site works.</p>	<p><b><u>required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.</u></b></p>
29	Tim and Ruth Chase	<p>[1] We are concerned about the lack of decent shops in Bletchley town centre and feel that priority should be given to encourage more shops into the area. Since Sainsbury moved out the residents of Bletchley had little choice, especially the elderly who find it difficult to travel too far and to residents without transport. We think that the Council should give priority and help in encouraging this. Given the amount of flats that are springing up around the bus station and the ones already built we would have thought it imperative that there were a considerable choice of shops, but most importantly another supermarket and newsagents/stationers (there is nowhere in Bletchley town where you are guaranteed to get a daily newspaper for instance!) Please no more nail bars!!!</p> <p>[2] Many of my neighbours find it very depressing going into Bletchley town given the run down feel of the Brunel Centre and Queensway and feel urgency should be given to rectify this.</p> <p>[3] It was muted some time ago that the area near Bletchley College, which is currently fenced off (and yet another eyesore!) was going to be landscaped with seating areas. What happened to this idea?</p>	<p>[1] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: “Retail development to serve the daily and weekly food, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate.”</b></p> <p>[2] The brief proposes the regeneration of the Brunel Centre site with new built development and enhanced and new areas of public realm.</p> <p>[3] This area sits beyond the boundaries of the Brunel Centre Draft Development Brief, and hence outside the scope of this document.</p>
30	Phil Caves Senior Engineer	<p>[1] It is unfortunate that the main pedestrian east west route and desire line has the constraint of the levels. The brief acknowledges this, of course, but clearly design will be challenging to overcome. The brief refers to the potential for mass transit – gradients will need to be shallow to</p>	<p>[1] <b><u>Include new sentence within para 4.5.1 to state: “New built development should follow the existing building line of Queensway.”</u></b></p>

	<p>Highways Development Management MKCC</p>	<p>accommodate this. In other words if you were to make a pedestrian route potentially upgradeable sometime post development of the site, then it is worth designing out this constraint during development both for the horizontal and vertical alignments. In the design brief you may wish to specify a minimum protected corridor width that can accommodate pedestrians / cycles and mass transit.</p> <p>[2] Under constraints you have “accommodating servicing”. I am sure this can be provided but tends to be a constraint when developers attempt to use “on highway” (which we would be against) rather than providing themselves. Section 4.9 states requirements to provide on site and clear of the highway and I am happy with this section, so question whether servicing needs to be mentioned as a constraint?</p> <p>[3] Within section 4.9 under utilities I note there is information within the appendix. The electricity information is small at the scale provided so consider perhaps a different scale or make the sheet larger. As you are probably aware there is a sub-station within the footway on Locke Road that completely blocks this. The brief does refer to improvement potential for Locke Road so this would need to form part of these considerations.</p> <p>[4] Bottom of page 34 section 4.8.1 which starts – “Gaps in the footway along the eastern edge.....” I do not understand what was meant by gaps in the footway.</p>	<p>[2] Accommodating servicing tends to be a constraint on the ability of a development to create active frontages to the street. It is therefore considered as more of a design constraint than a highway constraint.</p> <p>[3] <b><u>Amend para 3.4.4 to include sentence: “There is a sub-station which completely blocks the footway.”</u></b></p> <p>[4] The footway along the eastern edge of Duncombe Street is not continuous, i.e. there are stretches where there is no footway.</p>
31	<p>Delia Shephard  On behalf of Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council</p>	<p>[1] Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council welcomes the publication of a draft development brief. The town council supports the Vision Statement on page 5 of the brief and believes that the combined ownership of the sites within the</p>	<p>[1] Support for the vision statement and the Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework SPD is noted.</p>

		<p>brief can unlock positive opportunities for the development of Bletchley.</p> <p>We note that the brief sits within the context of the Bletchley Urban Design Framework SPD, a policy which the town council strongly supports.</p> <p>Community engagement work undertaken to inform that SPD, the Town Deal Investment Plan, and the developing Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Neighbourhood Plan points to the community's continued desire for change in the physical environment and appearance of the town centre as described at s 1.19.12 of the SPD.</p> <p>The town council remains committed to the aspirations of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• opening up the physical and visual links between the town centre and the railway station including provision of an Eastern facing entrance and changes to the Brunel site</li><li>• improving the quality of the public realm especially safety and wayfinding</li><li>• 'green' improvements to Queensway and creation of space for public/community activities and events</li><li>• addressing car parking – enforce illegal parking and plan for more car parks</li><li>• reuse and redevelopment of empty buildings for new uses</li><li>• improved access to the Redways network and improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists including links to the station and greater permeability of the town centre</li><li>• investment in culture and heritage to nurture the community and celebrate the area's distinctive heritage linked to Bletchley Park.</li></ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>As well as the key placemaking themes shown in S3.5 of the illustrative masterplan in the SPD.</p> <p><b>[2] Relationship to Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework SPD (adopted 2022)</b>  As noted above, the town council is supportive of the Urban Design Framework SPD but the brief does not appear to take the SPD any further forward in terms of detail. The brief does not include land in the Town Centre West opportunity area of the SPD which includes the former Co-op building and the car parking land on Albert Street. Yet the SPD correctly defines the former Co-op building and the Wilko building as crucial to defining the northern side of a new larger Stanier Square. The Wilko building is already in the ownership of MKDP; but the brief seems to allow for the retention of this building in apparent contradiction of the SPD.</p> <p>[3] We welcome the parking study (which was proposed in the SPD) and is now being undertaken by MKCC and the commitment in the brief that the council will be commissioning a parking strategy for Central Bletchley (p35 – 4.8.6) but the exclusion of the current car parking sites on Albert Street and the failure to synchronize the development brief with the parking study completely undermines the value of the brief. Decisions about the numbers and distribution of car parking spaces affect the whole town centre not just the area contained within the brief and we argue it is premature to produce the brief without sight of the results of the study.</p>	<p>[2] Paragraph 1.3.1 of the brief explains “the purpose of this document is to provide planning guidance and design principles that should underpin any proposal. This will aid the development process by allowing developers to submit informed proposals for these sites that respond to MKDP, Council and other local stakeholder expectations for the sites.”</p> <p>The brief area covers that area of land in the ownership of MKCC and MKDP which is being considered for development. The former Co-Op building is not under the ownership of MKCC or MKDP and is hence outside the scope of this brief.</p> <p>The possibility of retaining the Wilko building allows for some flexibility in options for the development of the site.</p> <p>[3] While the results of the parking study are not yet available to form part of this brief, it is made clear that future development will be required to respect the conclusions of the study following its completion. While the brief area only covers certain areas to the west of Bletchley town centre, the parking strategy covers the whole of the town centre, including the brief area.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>The brief and the parking study outcomes and are streams of work which should inform each other.</p> <p><b>[4] Land uses</b> The land use requirements in the development brief are ambiguous and too flexible in comparison with the SPD. We would like to have seen more detail and stronger guidance for developers on the requirements for housing numbers, commercial space and mix, and potential community use. For example on page 31 at 4.2.5 the brief states it will support a range of complementary “main town centre uses” (as defined by the NPPF) including evening economy, community/leisure and cultural. This is not very specific and the next section 4.2.6 is vague about the requirement for a multi-use community hub which “might” house the Library and a Health Hub. We would ask that the potential relocation of public WCs is also included along with the provision of an indoor town centre community meeting space to replace that which has already been lost from the library in Westfield Road.</p> <p>[5] The town council supports the development of an evening economy but does not wish to see specific reference to nightclubs and casinos (p19 2.72).</p> <p>[6] The town council anticipates housing densities of 150 -250 per hectare as prescribed in HN1 of Plan:MK and notes that “taller buildings will be sought that capitalize on Central Bletchley’s sustainable location”. But the design requirements are also imprecise and we would welcome details about maximum building heights so that residents can</p>	<p>[4] The mix of uses will be dependent on viability and market conditions. However, the brief supports the provision of a health hub, community centre and library on the site. Discussions with providers of services such as libraries and health services would need to take place before any firm commitment could be made to include these uses within any development.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.6 to include: “<u>Other possible community uses might include public toilets, and a banking hub.</u>”</b></p> <p>[5] <b>Accepted in part.</b> Night clubs are a legitimate night-time use and the provision of a certain type of late night bar and entertainment would actually benefit the night-time economy of Bletchley. <b>Remove reference to casinos in para 2.7.2.</b></p> <p>[6] <b>Not Accepted, maximum building heights are not the determinant of a high quality scheme. Additional text will be added to ensure a high quality development that respects its heritage and context. Include new para after 4.4.1 to read “<u>Development will need to demonstrate how it provides a high quality</u>”</b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>understand what is planned and how it is justified. The town council would welcome strengthening of the parts of the brief that require that high standards of amenity should be provided along with good design for this housing (p34 – 4.6 and 4.7).</p> <p>[7] Also, policy HN2 must be adhered to and the town council wants to see genuinely “affordable” housing provision which should include affordable service charges.</p> <p>[8] The town council supports mixed use development with retail development at ground floor level recognizing and welcomes the recognition in the brief that retail development should be capable of serving the daily and weekly convenience shopping needs of the increasing number of residents living in the town centre (p 31 – 4.2.2). It is recognized that provision of retail floor space of an equivalent size to the existing buildings may not be necessary. There is a limit to the to the volume of commercial floorspace which the town centre can sustain without risk to the critical mass of retail and commerce in Queensway. Active frontages with retail uses are considered important (p31 – 4.2.1) as are outward facing developments which connect with the public realm (p32 – 4.3.4). However, the brief is not precise about spatial distribution of uses as it allows for any distribution on the three main development plots shown at p33 Fig12. So, for example, does this allow for</p>	<p><b><u>response to the existing heritage and context of buildings adjacent to the site.”</u></b></p> <p>The brief already requires that buildings should be of a high standard of design (para 4.6.2) and that a good standard of amenity should be provided (para 4.7.1.).</p> <p>[7] Paragraph 2.3.10 cites Plan:MK Policy HN2, which states: “proposals for 11 or more homes should provide 31% of those homes as affordable housing. Proposals that provide greater than 31% of homes as affordable housing will be strongly supported.”</p> <p>Affordable service charges are outside the scope of this document.</p> <p>[8] Without knowing the mix of uses, it is not possible to be prescriptive about their distribution across the site. The brief identifies the buildings facing the new public realm created by connecting Buckingham Road and Queensway as key frontages. These frontages will have the greatest footfall and will be the focus for public-facing uses.</p> <p><b><u>Insert new paragraph after para 4.3.1: “The new street created will have the greatest pedestrian footfall and will be the focus for public-facing uses. These key frontages will have building facades that respond positively to the street and particularly at the ground floor will include uses, entrances, and windows that generate activity, thereby improving surveillance of and safety on the street.”</u></b></p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>commercial retail active frontages along the length of Oliver Road and Duncombe Street? This does not feel especially compatible with these residential terraces.</p> <p>[9] Within the brief there is little analysis or reflection on how the proposed redevelopment will impact on the rest of the town centre because it has been taken out of the context of the SPD.</p> <p><b>[10] Public Realm and Green Space</b>  We agree that there are areas of poor-quality public realm around the edges of the Brunel Centre site (p27 – 3.4.4) and we want to see improved public realm provision which is pedestrian and cycle friendly and which connects any new developments with the existing town centre, Stanier Square and Queensway. As well as the visual re-connection of Queensway and Buckingham Road there must be physical space for community events and activities both formal and informal and soft landscaping to “green” the area. We support the content at 4.5 of the brief (p 33- 34) but note that adequate provision must be made for the maintenance of any green spaces and soft landscaping which should not be derived primarily from service charges levied on leaseholders (fleecehold) but via alternative funding such as S106 commitments.</p> <p><b>[11] Sustainability, Flooding and Ecology</b>  The town council shares the city council’s carbon reduction objectives and would wish to see any development exceed policy SC1 in Plan:MK. However it is recognised that measures to mitigate the effects of climate change increase development costs and so we support 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 as</p>	<p>[9] The Central Bletchley Urban Design Framework SPD provides the overall context within which the Brunel Centre site sits.</p> <p>[10] The Council’s Planning Obligations SPD states that “New, improved or enhanced open space, play areas and green infrastructure must be managed and maintained into the long term if it is to meet the requirements of Plan:MK. Developers are required to include a management and maintenance strategy for all new or extended open space and green infrastructure.”</p> <p>[11] Support for sections 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 is noted.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>written though we would like to see the lowest carbon emissions possible.</p> <p><b>[12] Identity, heritage and public art</b>  The Central Bletchley SPD talks about “Creating a ‘Place Identity’ for Central Bletchley Building on Bletchley’s history of technology and innovation to create a long term future for Central Bletchley focussed around an environment that supports sustainable and healthy lifestyles .” (p38) The brief refers to Bletchley’s war time history, the proximity of the site to Bletchley Park tourist attraction and the IOT and National Museum of computing (eg p31 4.2.6) but it could place more emphasis on the role that this site could play in supporting tourism and acknowledging the heritage of our town. It is suggested that any public art which is funded by the development should recognise this heritage and that the design and/or naming of buildings should seek inspiration from the local history and the vision of “Groundbreaking Bletchley and Fenny Stratford” which is embodied in the town deal’s strap line. The town council does recognise that opening the view from the town centre towards the station and increasing good pedestrian links between Bletchley town centre and the railway station/former fire station site could also assist with this goal.</p> <p><b>[13] Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Neighbourhood Plan</b>  The town council asks that the development brief strengthens references to the emergence of policy ideas in the Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Neighbourhood Plan and encourages developers to actively engage with both town councils in respect of their NDPs.</p>	<p><b>[12] Amend para 4.13.2 to read: “<u>Developers should explore the potential for providing public art as part of their proposals. This could be about Bletchley Park which would form part of a wider initiative within Bletchley and Fenny Stratford. Developers will need to engage with the relevant parish and Council teams early in the design process.</u>”</b></p> <p><b>Amend para 4.6.1 to read: “The architectural approach to development, should be informed by the contextual analysis. <u>Development proposals could take inspiration from Bletchley’s history of technology and innovation and reflect this heritage within its design.</u> This should not constrain architectural creativity with a contemporary design sought.”</b></p> <p><b>[13] Amend para 2.3.18 to read: “<u>The Town Council consulted on emerging policy ideas for the neighbourhood plan in January/February 2024. Developers are encouraged to actively engage with the Town Council as part of the neighbourhood planning process.</u>”</b></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p><b>[14] S106/Planning Gain</b></p> <p>The town council and many residents are keen to influence any S106 agreements or planning gain which arises out of proposed developments on this site. Whilst we recognise that this is not strictly part of our response to the brief itself, we would like to state now to both MKCC and MKDP that we hope to be actively involved at as early a stage as possible in consideration of planning gains from developments on this site. The planning gain must be focussed on the infrastructure needs of the residents of Bletchley and the prioritise the strengthening and enrichment of the town.</p>	<p>[14] Noted. The town council will have a role to play in informing the negotiation of Section 106 agreements. <b><u>Include new para after 4.2.7 to state: “Development may generate a demand for infrastructure, facilities and resources that cannot be provided on site. Section 106 contributions may have to be sought towards the delivery of the necessary off-site infrastructure required to support and mitigate the impact of the development. MKCC services, other delivery bodies and the Town Council will be consulted as part of the negotiation process.”</u></b></p>
32	<p>Kason Ali</p> <p>On behalf of 35 residents of surrounding streets.</p>	<p>I am writing to you on behalf of the residents of Osborne Street and the surrounding areas. We would like to propose the use of the rear gardens in Osborne Street, Bletchley to be used as car park spaces for homeowners.</p> <p>Access to the rear gardens in Osborne Street is via the ex-Sainsbury entrance and exit roads. This is shown in the attached drawing. The Duncombe Street Community House already has access to this road and the use of car park spaces in the rear garden.</p> <p>As you may already be aware there is a shortage of car parking space available in Osborne Street and the surrounding roads causing frustrations with the residents. On occasions, there is no other option other to park on double yellow lines causing additional risk to cars and pedestrians. Allowing homeowners to use their rear gardens for vehicle parking will help improve the safety of the roads.</p> <p>We hope you will consider this proposal and will look into this further. We have also obtained the signatures of residents in</p>	<p>Noted. There is still significant design work to be done with a development partner, and further consultation with residents will take place with residents as the scheme progresses.</p>

		Osborne Street and the surrounding areas to show the support we have for this proposal.	
33	2 <sup>nd</sup> November Planning Committee Minutes	<p>The Chair opened the meeting to comments and questions from the Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councillor McLean commended officers for the document, noting that the expectations for the site were clearly laid out and included the Utilities Plans at Appendix C.</li> <li>• Councillor Petchey noted the eastern station entrance referenced in the SPD and queried the absence of this passageway within the draft development brief.</li> <li>• In response, the Senior Urban Designer advised that the possibility of retaining the Wilko store remained an option, but no decisions had been made on the footprint of the building at this stage.</li> <li>• The Head of Planning advised that the consultation period for the development brief ran until 23 November 2023 and invited the Committee to submit comments as necessary.</li> <li>• Councillor Ahmad praised the brief but suggested that the document should be publicised more widely to local residents.</li> <li>• The Senior Urban Designer confirmed that meetings were ongoing with Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Council and that the brief represented a small part of the engagement related to this site.</li> </ul> <p>RESOLVED – That the Committee noted the contents of the draft development brief.</p>	Committee minutes noted.

34	Peter Denchfield	<p>[1] Most of the existing buildings in the streets in the immediate vicinity of the site covered by the document are traditional two storey residences. Many of the buildings in the length of Queensway to the east of the site and in the immediate lengths of roads running from Queensway (for example Brooklands Road) are also two storey properties. Those which are not are, I believe, no higher than three or four storeys. In order to try and reduce to some extent the impact on those living in the immediate vicinity of the land covered by the document and to ensure that any buildings built on the land do not have a disproportionate impact on the wider area, I believe that there should be a specific limit to the height, say five storeys including ground floor, of any buildings built on the land.</p> <p>[2] I would suggest that for many of those living in the town, whether or not the redevelopment of the land is considered successful will depend to a large extent on the number and range of retail facilities provided. For the last three years or so, there has been no supermarket in the town centre. Other than hairdressers, takeaway outlets and nail bars, the range of shops in Queensway is very restricted - there has not been a newsagent on the street for more than a year now.</p> <p>[3] Paragraph 2.7.2 refers to the site as being part of the primary area of the town centre and goes on to list a whole range of possible uses for premises in such an area, of which retail is just one possible use. In my opinion, a number of these uses (casino, nightclub, hotel and conference</p>	<p>[1] <b>Not Accepted, maximum building heights are not the determinant of a high quality scheme. Additional text will be added to ensure a high quality development that respects its heritage and context. Include new para after 4.4.1 to read <u>“Development will need to demonstrate how it provides a high quality response to the existing heritage and context of buildings adjacent to the site.”</u></b></p> <p>[2] Noted. This brief promotes a mixed-use development, including retail units. The council are only able to stipulate that the ground floor is in commercial use, and hence, are unable to control the specific businesses which choose to open within the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.2. to read: “Retail development to serve the daily and weekly <u>food</u>, convenience and comparison shopping needs of the growing local population would be appropriate.”</b></p> <p>[3] <b>Accepted in part.</b> Night clubs are a legitimate night-time use and the provision of a certain type of late night bar and entertainment would actually benefit the night-time economy of Bletchley. <b>A hotel use would support the tourist potential of Bletchley Park. Remove reference to casinos in para 2.7.2.</b></p>
----	------------------	---	--

		<p>accommodation) will be of little value to the daily lives of many residents.</p> <p>[4] Paragraph 4.2.1 refers to the fact that developers will be 'encouraged' to use ground floor accommodation for retail purposes. This seems rather weak. I would suggest that there is a need to ensure that, at the least, the retail space in the Brunel Centre (whether currently occupied or unoccupied) and that formerly operated by Wilko, is replaced on a like for like square footage and that a broad range of good quality retail outlets is provided and that these requirements are explicitly stated in the document.</p> <p>[5] I would be interested to know what steps the City Council took to actively inform residents that it was seeking views on the document and of the document's contents. I only learnt of the document's existence because an item about it happened to be on same page of the 'News' section of Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council's website as an item concerning arrangements regarding the local Remembrance Parade held last month.</p> <p>Much the same situation arose last year regarding the planning document setting out the proposals for the wider development of Bletchley town centre, which the Council released for consultation over the Christmas and New Year period.</p>	<p>[4] Not accepted. The mix of uses will be dependent on viability and market conditions. Whilst retail will be a key component of the development, there are other potential non-retail uses which will enhance the vitality of the town centre.</p> <p><b>Amend para 4.2.1 to read “Mixed use development with <u>active frontages</u> at ground floor level will be sought.”</b></p> <p>[5] Public consultation on the Draft Development Brief was undertaken over a 6-week period extending from 12 October to 23 November. The consultation period was subsequently extended until the 31 December to accommodate further community engagement.</p> <p>During consultation, the Draft Development Brief was made available on our website and at Bletchley Library.</p> <p>Details of the consultation were posted to the Groundbreaking Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford website and electronic notices placed on the BT display board in Stanier Square. We also distributed letters to properties adjoining the the site and flyers to businesses on Queensway.</p> <p>A presentation on the Draft Development Brief was made to the Town Deal Advisory Group on 9 November, West Bletchley Council’s Environment Committee on 23 October, to Bletchley &amp; Fenny Stratford Town Council on</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>21 November, and to MKCC's Planning Committee on 6 November.</p> <p>A public drop in event for local residents was held on 18 December at the Duncombe Street Community House.</p>
35	Nicola lysandrou	<p>[1] There are a lot of rats which live around the area of the old Sainsbury's building. I am sure this is something that has been considered, but will there be a fumigation ahead of knocking down the building? Additionally, will the close residents be given suitable notice before the demolition begins, as this is likely to cause us some disruption?'</p> <p>[2] In the plan, in section 3.5.1 it mentions that you would want to 'Close off' backs of houses along Osborne Street, improving their security' - We understand design plans are in a very early development stage, with nothing yet finalised but can you confirm what is meant by this? Whilst we agree to the improved security, it would be good to understand what options are being considered with regards to this comment.</p>	<p>[1] Noted. Details of the demolition process for the former Sainsbury's building are not matters for the development brief. However, residents will be kept informed in relation to the redevelopment proposals.</p> <p><b>[2] Amend para 3.5.1 (sixth bullet point) to read:</b>  <b><u>"Close off' exposed rear boundaries of houses along Osborne Street with development, improving their security."</u></b></p>