

MARSTON MORETEYNE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting of Marston Moreteyne Parish Council held on Tuesday 7th April 2026, in the Francis Keep Room at Marston Moreteyne Community Centre, Great Linns, Marston Moreteyne, MK43 0DD commencing 7.00pm.

Present: Councillors Hugh Roberts (Chairman), Chris Banks & Steve Lonsdale
Councillor Ted Pilbeam (non-committee member)
Ward Councillors Sue Clark & Robert Morris

In attendance: Officer: Mrs Hazel Trustam – Parish Clerk

Minute Reference	Item	Power	Action
26/04/121	Election of meeting chairman Due to the absence of the chairman, it was resolved to appoint Cllr Hugh Roberts as chairman for this meeting.		
26/04/122	Planning Matters The following application was brought forward for discussion by the chairman. (a) <u>Planning Application No. CB/18/01969/OUT</u> Outline Application (EIA): Development for up to 5,000 new homes specialist residential accommodation, up to 30ha of employment land, retail, community, open spaces, leisure and sport uses, hotel uses, four lower schools, two middle schools, one upper school, woodland planting, waterbodies and waterway links, ecological areas, accesses, cycle and pedestrian routes, supporting infrastructure , ground remodelling, landscaping and demolition works. Land between Brogborough, Lidlinton and Marston Moreteyne. Amended documents for consultation: • Response to CBC on the Environmental Statement Chapter • Response to CBC on Public Transport Strategy 22.12.2025 • Response to CBC on Development Flows • Marston Valley Phasing Note by Stantec • Indicative site wide PRow plan • M1 J13 Junction improvements • M1 J13 Swept paths • M1 J13 Queue data • M1 J13 Walking, Cycling & Horse-Riding Assessment Report • M1 J13 Safety Risk Assessment BK+CU+JSH Final		Clerk to respond

Chairman Signature

Date

	- NH comment on M1 J132 sensitivity testing (email) - Final Local Junction Drawings - The applicants current s106 Heads of Terms (indicative) It was resolved to formally object to the planning application and to highlight a number of significant concerns which it believes must be addressed prior to any determination. See Appendix A for objection in full. <i>Ward Cllrs Sue Clark & Robert Morris left the meeting.</i>		
26/04/123	Apologies for absence Apologies for absence were received and noted from Councillors Bill Chandi, Janice Green & Chris Martin.	Local Government Act 1972, Part V, s85 (1+2) & Sch 12, Part VI, p40	Clerk to keep on file
26/04/124	Disclosure of local and/or disclosable pecuniary interests No interests were declared.	Localism Act 2011, Sch 7, s31	N/A
26/04/125	Dispensation Requests No dispensation requests were received.	Localism Act 2011, Sch 7, s33	N/A
26/04/125	Open Forum No matters raised	Public Bodies (Admissions to Meetings) Act 1960, s1 (1).	N/A
26/04/127	Minutes of meetings It was resolved to approve as an accurate recording of proceedings the minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting of Marston Moreteyne Parish Council held on Tuesday 17th March 2026. Proposed Cllr Banks, seconded Cllr Lonsdale. Agreed.	Local Government Act 1972, Sch 12, Part VI, p41 (1)	Parish Clerk to keep on file
26/04/128	Matters arising from the minutes – for information only. No matters arising were reported.	N/A	N/A
26/04/129	Planning Matters The following applications was discussed, and a response formulated: (b) <u>Planning Application No. CB/25/03682/FULL</u> Erection of an outbuilding (Retrospective) 2 Chapman Paddock, Marston Moreteyne <u>Comments:</u> The parish council has reviewed the amended documentation. Plan A107 Rev 1 shows the amendment of cladding extending to ground level. The parish council does not believe that this amendment alters its original objection and comments dated 18th March 2026. The parish council expressed its concern regarding retrospective applications whereby development has been carried out without prior planning	Town & Country Planning Act 1990, paragraph 8 of Schedule 1.	Parish Clerk to respond

Chairman Signature

Date

	permission, which removes the opportunity for proper assessment and community input before the works were undertaken. The Council does not support the principle of retrospective development and considers that this undermines the integrity of the planning process. It was agreed that previous comments dated 18th March 2026 remain valid. (c) <u>Planning Application No. CB/26/00709/FULL</u> Single storey rear extension and roof lights with a detached garage conversion. 1 Johnson Close, Marston Moreteyne <u>Comments:</u> Resolved no objection, neighbours. (d) <u>Planning Application No. CB/26/00857/FULL</u> Proposed single storey rear extension 33 Moat Farm Close, Marston Moreteyne <u>Comments:</u> Resolved no objection, neighbours.		
26/04/130	Correspondence No correspondence received.		
	There being no further business to transact the meeting was closed at 7.52 pm.		

Chairman Signature

Date

Appendix A

Minute Reference 26/04/122

Planning Application No. CB/18/01969/OUT

Resolved to object to application:

The parish council writes to raise a formal objection to the above planning application and to highlight a number of significant concerns which it believes must be addressed prior to any determination.

1. Environmental Statement

The Environmental Statement indicates that a Flood Risk Assessment will not be undertaken until development commences. The Parish Council strongly considers that circumstances have changed since 2018, and this approach is no longer appropriate.

An updated Flood Risk Assessment, along with a contamination assessment, should be carried out at this stage to ensure that potential risks are properly understood and mitigated.

2. Highways, Traffic and Strategic Infrastructure

There are longstanding and unresolved concerns regarding traffic congestion, particularly in relation to Junction 13 of the M1. The cumulative impact of:

- Existing developments
- The proposed Marston Valley scheme
- Growth associated with Milton Keynes expansion
- Cranfield University and associated airport activity

raises serious doubts about the adequacy of planned mitigation.

In particular, the prior delivery of key infrastructure — including the Cross Link Road and Spine Road — should be a prerequisite to development, not a consequence of it.

There is little change proposed for M1 Junction 13, with modifications largely limited to line marking within the existing layout. The proposals fail to account for the impact of Universal on traffic volumes and should be coordinated into the overarching scheme.

Although the proposal focuses on improvements to Junction 13 itself, there are existing major issues with traffic flow on the M1. During periods of congestion on the A421, drivers regularly divert via local routes, including the C94 (Brogborough/Marston Moreteyne), Cranfield and Millbrook. This displacement traffic has not been adequately considered or mitigated.

The proposed two-to-one lane merge at Beancroft Road also raises road safety concerns and could increase the risk of collisions.

Overall, the supporting traffic documentation does not appear to adequately account for the cumulative impact of Universal, and this omission undermines the robustness of the assessment.

Furthermore, the timing and potential overlap with East West Rail construction introduces additional uncertainty. Without a coordinated and clearly phased approach, there is a real risk of compounded disruption across the area.

Chairman Signature

Date

3. Landscape and Environmental Mitigation

The proposal references green buffering; however, such mitigation must be implemented well in advance of development. Early planting is essential to ensure effective screening, biodiversity establishment, and landscape integration.

4. Affordable and Social Housing Provision

A key concern relates to the viability assessments submitted by O&H Properties, which cast doubt on whether even a 10% affordable housing provision is achievable. This position is deeply concerning, particularly when considered alongside the Council's own independently commissioned viability assessment.

This stands in stark contrast to earlier developments such as Marston Park and Marston Fields, where affordable housing provision was in the region of 30–35%, with no apparent viability concerns at the time.

The implication that a significantly reduced — or potentially negligible — level of affordable housing is now being proposed raises serious questions about the social sustainability of the scheme.

This proposal appears to fall short of addressing the clearly identified housing needs of the local community. Many residents within Marston Moreteyne, particularly younger people and those on lower incomes, already face significant barriers to home ownership or access to secure housing. The absence of meaningful affordable provision represents a failure to meet these needs and undermines the wider objectives of the development plan.

Given house price inflation it is difficult to see why 30% affordable housing is no longer viable in 2026 when it was in 2018.

The introduction of Universal Studios presents a unique scenario for both private and social housing along with associated amenities within the proposed development. Unlike any previous instances in the UK, this project involves the creation of a significant number of homes alongside the establishment of a major international theme park. This combination brings forth challenges and opportunities that warrant careful examination.

It is crucial to evaluate how the social housing element and the theme park development will coexist. The proximity of such a large-scale entertainment facility to residential areas introduces several areas of overlap that must be addressed.

5. Social Impact and Community Cohesion

The reduction in affordable housing provision is not merely a technical issue of viability; it reflects a broader lack of social balance within the proposal. Historically, as highlighted in community discussions dating back decades, access to local housing has been a persistent concern.

It is disappointing that, in 2026, this issue appears to be worsening rather than improving.

6. Future Use and Uncertain Development Dynamics

A further emerging concern relates to the potential interaction with major commercial or leisure developments, including proposals linked to Universal Destinations & Experiences.

Chairman Signature

Date

Without a coordinated and strategic approach, there is a risk — however unlikely it may seem — of unintended consequences such as a proliferation of short-term rental accommodation (e.g. Airbnb-style uses), which could significantly alter the character of the area and further reduce housing availability for permanent residents.

The Planning Authority should give careful consideration to how overlapping developments align, including:

- Construction impacts
- Traffic generation
- Workforce demand and housing pressures

7. Strategic Capacity Concerns

It is noted that planned improvements to Junction 13 are expected to bring it to a level described as “just below adequate.” Given the scale of cumulative growth — including Milton Keynes expansion, Cranfield development, and the Marston Valley proposals — it is reasonable to conclude that such improvements will be insufficient in the medium to long term.

8. Public Transport Provision

The proposal relies heavily on public transport provision, including service enhancements and specific bus stop infrastructure. These should be operational and in place in line with occupation begins with clear requirements which can then be enforceable if not provided.

9. Draft S106 Heads of Terms – Summary

a. Cemetery Provision

Draft proposal: Expansion of Marston Moreteyne Cemetery. 6,121.50m² of land required (1,626 plots).

The number of burial plots is consistent with the calculations provided by the Parish Council in its letter dated 1 April 2025. However, the proposed land allocation does not account for several essential elements previously requested, namely:

- Provision of an additional car park to serve the extended cemetery area
- Adequate buffer zones to enable maintenance of perimeter hedging
- Space for soft landscaping and seating areas to allow for quiet reflection

The existing car park was designed solely to serve the current cemetery. The extension area will only come into use once the existing cemetery reaches capacity or is nearing full occupancy. At that stage, the existing car park would need to accommodate general visitors, but it is not of sufficient size to also cater for funeral attendance associated with the new burial area. A separate, appropriately designed and accessible car park will therefore be required.

Furthermore, the existing cemetery benefits from a perimeter buffer that facilitates maintenance and contributes to its semi-rural character. It is not a highly formal layout but instead incorporates soft landscaping and informal seating areas. It is reasonable to expect that any extension should reflect this established character and functionality.

Chairman Signature

Date

In light of the above, the Parish Council objects to the proposed allocation of 6,121.50m² and instead reiterates its requirement for a minimum of 12,140.6m², as set out in its letter dated 1 April 2025.

b. Indoor Sports Facilities

Draft proposal: On site: 4 court sports hall expected to be linked to the Secondary School (using community use agreement) provided to Sport England technical specification. 2 x floodlit tennis courts and 2 floodlit netball courts also to be provided at secondary school site for community use with spec to be confirmed.

The proposed arrangement does not guarantee freely accessible facilities for residents. Community access would be restricted to out-of-hours periods and subject to the school’s control, including responsibility for bookings, maintenance, and cleaning.

This places reliance on the school to facilitate and prioritise community use. Given the financial pressures under which many schools operate, there is a risk that such arrangements may not be consistently upheld over the long term, despite any prior agreement.

While it may be argued that the school will be aware of and committed to the community use agreement from the outset, the Parish Council’s experience indicates that monitoring compliance and enforcing such agreements can be complex, time-consuming, and resource intensive. Any failure to adhere to the agreement would result in reduced access for the community, potentially for extended periods while enforcement action is pursued.

c. Community Hall or halls

Draft proposal: Provision of a flexible hall space

This proposal lacks sufficient detail to enable meaningful assessment. The term “flexible hall space” is ambiguous and does not specify key aspects such as size, capacity, intended uses, management arrangements, or accessibility. Further clarification is required before the Parish Council can provide informed comment.

10. Outstanding Section 106 Obligations and Infrastructure Delivery

The Council has an immediate concern regarding the applicant’s indicative Section 106 Heads of Terms. Given the scale of previous developments within the Parish — including Marston Park, Marston Fields, and Moreteyne Park — there remain substantial outstanding obligations relating to infrastructure delivery, unfulfilled commitments, and unadopted assets.

It is the Council’s strong view that outstanding S106 obligations should be fully honoured prior to commencement of development. This must include:

- Completion of agreed infrastructure
- Adoption of highways and utilities
- Delivery of all associated community provisions

Allowing further development in the absence of these would undermine confidence in the planning system and set an unacceptable precedent.

Chairman Signature

Date

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, including concerns regarding inadequate cemetery provision (notably insufficient land to accommodate parking, buffering, and appropriate landscaping), uncertainty over the long-term accessibility and management of indoor sports facilities, and the lack of detail surrounding the proposed community hall provision, alongside wider issues relating to infrastructure delivery and affordable housing, the parish council respectfully request that the Planning Authority:

- Refuse the application in its current form or
- At a minimum defer determination pending:
 - Full delivery of existing Section 106 obligations
 - Robust and co-ordinated infrastructure planning
 - A clear and policy-compliant affordable housing offer

Without these safeguards, the proposal risks placing unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure, failing to meet community needs, and setting a concerning precedent for future development.

Chairman Signature

Date