

## Chris Nash

---

**From:** Myles Joyce  
**Sent:** 26 February 2021 14:13  
**To:** Emma Walker  
**Subject:** FW: [EXT] RE: Bovis/Taylor Wimpey Development Olney - Steering Group -Minutes of today's meeting

**Importance:** High

**From:** Myles Joyce  
**Sent:** 26 February 2021 14:02

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** RE: [EXT] RE: Bovis/Taylor Wimpey Development Olney - Steering Group -Minutes of today's meeting  
**Importance:** High

Dear all,

Many thanks for those who attended to day's meeting. Please find draft minutes below:

Present: Myles Joyce(MJ) MKC, Christopher Walton (CW) MKC Victoria Southern (VS) Bovis Homes, Cllr Keith McLean (KM), Cllr Peter Geary MKC, Richard Crick (Taylor Wimpey), Christopher Tennant (Olney PC), Carl Beckett (Resident) Alison Stringfellow (Resident), Peter Sutton (PS) consultant.

1. Apologies for absence  
Cllr Hosking
2. Minutes of last meeting and matters arising  
Minutes accepted-some items on the agenda for discussion.
3. Matters arising  
Nothing not on agenda
4. Conditions Discharge  
VS confirmed website now up and running. PG suggested that forthcoming works should be put on website to give a heads up. MJ asked that these be CC'd to himself for internal liaison with other relevant officers. **Agreed.**
5. Conditions Discharge  
VS explained that Condition 21 (Archaeology) outstanding part post excavation report with her soon. Condition 28 Secured by Design Condition working on with Taylor Wimpey. These and the Reserved Matters application in relation to vehicular and cycle parking are pre-occupation conditions. **Noted by all**
6. CEMP and related matters  
Construction Traffic and Internal Route(s). PS explained consultant working for development consortium some 100-130 operatives on site. Great consideration with regard to health and safety on and off site. Timing of handover to residents and RSLs. Aspreys application has Health and Safety S implications with school. Option 1 using farmer tracked with two developers on site and POS, sewers being constructed need for this route. Happy to share report from CPM advisor after this meeting. Now gap fenced off from boundary. Route will be tarmacked and turn off towards public open space. For personnel and

deliveries not diggers and forklifts. Gatemen and traffic marshalls will be part of site management. Intend to put in in one to one and a half months depending on weather.

PG asked if Aspreys application to be withdrawn? VS confirmed it would be. PG also asked for map of route to be put on website, as it differs from previous. VS agreed. PG asked if no diggers/forklifts using it why is it needed as delivers etc are what one might expect on normal roads. PS explained it was the sheer quantity of vehicles is the issue.

CB concerned not residents not being listened to and have suffered noise and disturbance and will continue to do so, felt not necessary and feel alternatives could be employed. CT echoed this and felt relatively minor changes to build out could realise this. CT disappointed Aspreys application option to be withdrawn. CB and CT asked again is this PD. CT asked could we get a Legal opinion on this?

RC note bottleneck at TW location, a lot of plots including 11 HA plots would have to be altered which is part of the s106. RS noted Aspreys route residents have objected to this. On balance the farm track is the optimum route and this has been communicated over recent months. Vs noted the option of going across the other side of the field but very firm this we cannot take compounds onto the POS area, legal and drainage issues, which are sensitive would further restrict options and steep slope.

PG suggested potentially to vary matters in relation to the S106. CT said the PC would not object to changes that would improve matters for residents during construction phase. As raised enquiry of whether allowed under PD as well. MJ explained the GPDO is in effect planning permission granted by Central Government and wide scope under Part 4 where related to works. CT felt the road was material and MK were relying heavily on word 'works' MJ said the road was temporary and required to be removed after completion of construction works. CT asked for legal opinion on this. KM said he could not get involved in discussions on S106. **MJ agreed to take away this issue and potential amendment to S106 agreement and report back to next meeting.**

With regard to access/egress (turning right out of site) KM confirmed signage are in situ and noted road sweeping vehicle out more as well. KM noted some concerns from local business re mud on roads. PS noted jet washes on site this week. Engine stolen in this week's break in. Improve weather has assisted. VS confirmed it has gone out to all contractors form Directors and can follow up to ensure compliance.

KM raised issue of lighting implementation in light of break-ins on site. PS said midway through main service installed and then we can have electricity on site. KM noted road closures on 19<sup>th</sup> March for electricity, water and gas can this be done with one road closure to minimise disruption. PS said can try but may not be possible eg. water lower than electric. **PS agreed to send an update on this**

CT asked if 2 wheel washing facilities arrived as promised. PS said jet washes now in place as more effective as premade wheelwashers on slopes relatively ineffective.

AS asked about drainage. Temporary crossing pout in and permanent solution now being installed and isolate corner near pinch point where hedgerow issues arose. Further drainage will go into root protection are and put proposal to Stephen Narborough for his guidance and approval.

#### Construction Hours on site

PG noted breach of construction hours and that this had abated. CB agreed improvement. Concerns still arriving well before permitted construction hours. MJ noted new contractors on site and new foreman. VS said can only apologise. MJ sent across warning letter which has been circulated to directors of both TW and Bovis. PG said clear that consistent issues enforcement action should be taken and will be expected. MJ certainly option and issue is works of construction turning by and preparing for work would not be a breach. Half an hour before is not unreasonable. MJ noted distinction between permitted hours and statutory nuisance. **VS agreed to take to consultants meeting on expectations for clarification.**

- PS said PROW will be reopened by end of March along with area round frontage to landscaping standards. PG clarified is this same as statutory PROW and whether extension required. PS said would be end of March so no extension required.
- VS asked CT about Community Building Funding meeting. CT said QS had been appointed by PC. In progress.
- VS asked MJ about landscape specs still awaiting Sport England's response need response soon. MJ sad did pass it on. Elizabeth woodhouse no comment on this. **MJ take back to them for update.**

Date and time of next meeting

**26<sup>th</sup> March at 11am.**

Kind regards,

Myles Joyce  
Interim Service Development Manager  
Planning Service  
Milton Keynes Council



Web: [www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building](http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building)

**Milton Keynes Council** | Planning Service | Planning, Strategic Transport and Placemaking | Civic | 1 Saxon Gate East | Milton Keynes | MK9 3EJ

