

Central  
Bedfordshire  
Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands,  
Shefford SG17  
5TQ



**please ask for** Sandra Hobbs  
**direct line** 0300 300 5257  
**date** 15 October 2009

**TO EACH MEMBER OF THE  
LUTON & SOUTH BEDS JOINT COMMITTEE**

15 October 2009

Dear Councillor

**LUTON & SOUTH BEDS JOINT COMMITTEE - Friday 23 October 2009**

Further to the Agenda and papers for the above meeting, please find attached the following additional report(s):-

**6. Emerging Core Strategy: Schedule of Responses Received on the Recent 'Preferred Options' Public Consultation**

Attached is a copy of the Appendix – Luton and South Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Key Diagram: Preferred Options Public Consultation;

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact Sandra Hobbs on Tel: 0300 300 5257.

Yours sincerely

Sandra Hobbs  
Democratic Services Officer  
email: [sandra.hobbs@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:sandra.hobbs@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix

# Luton and South Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Key Diagram: Preferred Options Public Consultation; Schedule of Responses, Suggested Joint Committee Response, Reason for Response and any Proposed Action

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
976	The Coal Authority	Mansfield	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Having reviewed your document, I confirm that we have no specific comments to make on this document at this stage. We look forward to receiving your emerging planning policy related documents; preferably in an electronic format. For your information, we can receive documents via our generic email address <a href="mailto:planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk">planningconsultation@coal.gov.uk</a>, on a CD/DVD, or a simple hyperlink which is emailed to our generic email address and links to the document on your website. Alternatively, please mark all paper consultation documents and correspondence for the attention of the Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department. Should you require any assistance please contact a member of Planning and Local Authority Liaison at The Coal Authority on our departmental direct line.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
1799	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The Conservation Board is a statutory independent corporate body set up by Parliamentary Order under the provisions of Section 86 of the Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000. The purposes of a conservation board is: a) the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty, and b) the purpose of increasing the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the area of outstanding natural beauty. Response to CS is attached.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact.</p>				
4077	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: SA Report: We welcome the 13 th bullet point and the final bullet point on page 37.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4078	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report identifies the potential damage that the Core Strategy can cause to the historic environment, as well as the potential benefits. Without greater recognition and policy coverage, the potential for damage is increased and the potential for benefit is reduced. It may also be appropriate to undertake characterisation studies to fully understand the historic environment resource, especially within existing urban areas. There are particularly pressing issues within the centres of the main towns in terms of regeneration and development proposals and a need to appreciate, preserve and enhance the historic environment of these places. We have also commented on site specific issues relating to the preferred urban extensions and the provision of new/expanded infrastructure and employment sites, and have made a number of more minor observations on the Core Strategy and SA Report.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4076	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: SA Report: On page 36, we welcome the first bullet point, although assessments should be carried out before permissions are granted, rather than before construction begins, as in some cases, such assessment may affect whether permissions should be granted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4075	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: SA Report: On page 29, the paragraph relating to town centres and the historic environment gives the impression that not all town centres within the Growth Area contain important historic features, citing Leighton Buzzard town centre as one that does have an important character. This is not the case, as every town centre contains important historic features and the Core Strategy therefore has the potential to both benefit and harm this resource.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4074	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: SA Report: On page 25, capital transport projects have the potential to damage known and designated heritage features (e.g. Dray's Ditches Scheduled Monument) as well as undiscovered archaeological remains.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4073	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: SA Report: On page 16, listed buildings and conservation areas should be added to list of important heritage features that are in close proximity to the edges of urban areas (as well as found within urban locations).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4072	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: In terms of specific comments on the SA Report: We would disagree that the relationship between SA Objective 10 and Strategic Objective 1 is neutral, as the historic environment can both benefit and constrain the delivery of sustainable and integrated communities, for example by adding a sense of place and distinctiveness, and limiting certain development proposals respectively. We therefore feel a "partially incompatible / partially compatible" symbol is more appropriate and follows the symbol used for many other environmental SA objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
749	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Comments on the Preliminary Sustainability Appraisal Report It is interesting to note that the SA Report identifies that the "potential for damage to the historic environment" is a likely effect of the Core Strategy that needs to be fully appraised by the sustainability appraisal (page 2 of the report). The potential negative effect of various policies (such as the spatial strategy, housing and employment policies) on the historic environment is also recognised by the report. Page 34 argues that "the Core Strategy has the potential to directly benefit and contribute towards the achievement of" SA Objective 10 on the historic environment. All of the above analysis strengthens the case for a specific policy within the Core Strategy relating to the historic environment. Without it, the potential for damage is greatly increased and the opportunity to benefit and contribute to SA Objective 10 is reduced.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
729	English Heritage	Cambridge	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Summary of English Heritage's Comments on the Core Strategy: Our principal concern with the Core Strategy Preferred Options document is the lack of recognition of historic environment and design issues. The current spatial portrait, vision and strategic objectives do not adequately refer to the historic environment, despite its strategic importance to the Growth Area. The preferred approach of addressing historic environment issues in a lower level Local Development Framework document exacerbates the lack of recognition.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Given the importance of all the town centres in people's lives and the potential that growth has to deliver their regeneration and increase the variety of opportunities and services in each town centre, the Joint Committee supports the preparation and adoption of master plans and site specific development briefs as SPDs. These will help to inform the location and nature of new development and identify a series of other measures needed to achieve the objective of creating vibrant, dynamic, distinctive, safe and populated town centres. The quality and attractiveness of the countryside and landscape in this area has been a key consideration in the identification of the preferred urban extensions.</p>				
73	Mr Sean Felstead	Eggington	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Hello. I am writing to declare my full opposition in any housing development in the Leighton Buzzard area and adjacent villages. Leighton Buzzard has already had more than a reasonable quantity of new housing development. The surrounding villages are located in green belt area that must be preserved. Any further housing development in this area is unnecessary and unsustainable. Thank you</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
361	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: I am a local resident in Leighton Buzzard and am concerned about the proposals for further urban extensions here in Leighton Buzzard.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
380	Mr Anthony Malloy	letchworth,herfordshire	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: This is important to me because it is encroaching on Hertfordshire green belt land</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3524	Mrs Diane Moles	Luton	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: The summary document that came in the free newspaper must have cost a lot of money and what a waste. It is very difficult to understand and comprehend how to give the right answer to the questions. Is this document meant to be hard to understand on purpose, so that you do not receive many replies. It will be extremely difficult for people to reply as there is no return address.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.</p>				
2216	Natural England	Peterborough	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: CS17 provides strong policy framework for protecting, conserving and enhancing wildlife sites and biodiversity. This policy would reduce habitat fragmentation and create green corridors for wildlife which would encourage conservation management focussed not solely on individual site protection but to rebuild the fabric of the landscape in which individual sites sit. This section includes advice on "designing for biodiversity". By incorporating ecologically sensitive design and features for biodiversity early within a development scheme, significant improvements for biodiversity can be achieved, with easier integration with wider environmental, design and planning aspects. By addressing ecological aspects early on, design aspects such as site layout can be tailored to provide enhancements and improvements for biodiversity that may not be possible later on. Measures to encourage biodiversity can include green roofs, planting and landscaping using native species, setting up bird and bat boxes and SUDs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
1088	Mrs Audrey Pratt	Breachwood Green	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: This Strategy affects the very lifeblood of our area and way of life.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact.</p>				
287	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: The very premise that Luton/Beds should be able to spill over into Herts is unacceptable. It allows Luton/Beds to avoid the fallout from contentious decisions by removing their consequences from the areas where their voters live.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. Council is a permanent member of the Committee, and consequently has been informed about every decision to be made.</p>				
1494	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Introduction 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Victoria Harvey of South Beds FoE was on the Board of South Beds LSP as a representative of the community and voluntary sector. South Beds FoE has worked closely with Bedfordshire CC, Arnold White Estates, DCLG and Arriva to produce a £7 million agreement for sustainable transport for a new housing development in the South of Leighton Buzzard. They have worked with Buckinghamshire CC to commission an alternative report to the A418 improvements. This report was presented to the Commission for Integrated Transport. They are currently working with Central Bedfordshire on providing bus information around Leighton Buzzard. They worked with Bedfordshire CC on the alternative report to the Luton Northern bypass. And have produced a cycling strategy for Dunstable. They have also campaigned for local food and renewable energy. In Leighton Buzzard they run a greening group planting shrubs around the town to increase biodiversity, and create wildlife corridors and improve community involvement.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: We welcome the hard work that contributors have done for Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1705	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Dismayed at the way the Core Strategy has been prepared and consulted. The Strategy cannot be delivered. "Supporting evidence" was withheld to the last possible moment. The public have suffered due to the short timeframe to evaluate the evidence and respond. S.A.D. have witnessed the most extraordinary acts of nimbysism, politically influenced and prejudged opinions, contradictions and inaccurate statements from members of the committee and planning departments. The Joint Committee has refused to answer our primary question. "Can the proposed Eastern Bypass be funded, built and delivered"? If we were represented in an honourable and professional manner and the strategy was robust, then we would not question growth. We object to the East of Luton as a possible urban extension and to the proposed Eastern Bypass. When the committee next convene, the members should recognise that a mistake has been made and vote that the East of Luton be withdrawn as a preferred option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work.</p>				
1771	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Essential information absent. It has been encouraged to make responses to the public consultation, yet essential information is lacking from the evidence presented by the Joint Technical Unit (J.T.U). S.A.D. has continually asked publicly for over a year, "Can the proposed Eastern Bypass be funded, built and delivered? We have taken two full page adverts in the local newspaper (Luton and Dunstable Express) and participated in two radio interviews, yet still we have received no direct answer. The Core Strategy, and all the evidence presented, does not address any of our issues and concerns raised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. We are aware of this issue and as a result we still gathering supporting evidence through further testing and transport modelling.</p>				
1773	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Core Strategy is fundamentally flawed S.A.D. has emailed and wrote to every voting member and senior planner representing the relevant local authorities. Again no one will directly answer our questions. This could be the most significant decision made on behalf of hundreds of thousands of people in our lifetime. In our opinion the strategy has been pursued in the most undemocratic and unprofessional manner we have had the displeasure to witness. The Core Strategy is fundamentally flawed and the process conducted so far has been nothing short of a charade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The consultation process has followed required guidelines and regulations.</p>				
913	TOC Recycling Ltd	Luton	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: 10,000 more cars will have a devastating impact on the countryside with fuel emissions and adding to already congested roads. Green Belt will be destroyed and adversely affect the local Environment Atmosphere and wildlife. The area is recognised as one of natural beauty that mirrors images from Devon and Cornwall. The main aim of my recycling company is to help protect the environment and minimise any harmful affects on human life achieved by reducing harmful emissions into the atmosphere, on the land and underground waterways and aspiring to a zero landfill policy. Hopes, along with thousands of others to stop the development, including the Park &amp; Ride facility, Industrial Area site and bypass cutting through beautiful Green Belt at Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1348	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade Town Council wishes to express its disappointment that the document is lacking detail concerning the need to resolve the issue of inadequate infrastructure within the Parish and the clear need for greater GAF and other related funding to achieve the aspirations of the Big Plan. The Town Council is concerned over the lack of a formal postal address for replies within the consultation document</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Ensure IDP is completed.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy aims to deliver required infrastructure throughout the plan area. <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure requirements will be detailed in the IDP.</p>				
25	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Introduction 1	No
<p>Comment: I agree with the priority on urban brownfield development but not with the incursion into the Green Belt to the east of Luton, nor with the illegal incursion into an AONB with a bypass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3146	Ms C Barry	LUTON	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: The Joint Committee have embarked on a consultation process that could be seen to be at best, less than inclusive, and at worst, a deliberate attempt to ensure the public cannot participate in the 'consultation' process. The summary document which was meant to be delivered to homes has not been received by many of my neighbours in Links Way. Those who have received it have failed to realise its implications because of the technical language used. Surely the document could be entitled 'Housing and road building in Luton and surrounding areas'. The full document is more verbose, overly long and overly repetitive. The fact that the full document was delivered in an on-line format means that many people were disenfranchised - particularly the elderly and the poor. Specific aspects of the document were also inadequate i.e. lack of clarity on specific routes the planned roads would take.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A full consultation programme was followed.</p>				
1729	Bloor Homes	Derbyshire	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: For the avoidance of Doubt NJL Consulting Ltd are submitting representations on behalf of the company in relation to our land interests East of Luton to which these representations are complementary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
188	Mr Oliver Burne	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Could the elected council please outline why they have not opposed the central government plans for the over development and massive increase of housing in Bedfordshire. I would like to have a break down of the local need for housing (that means local people / families who are registered as living in unsuitable accommodation etc). Given it is unlikely the local need is so vast, who is exactly going to live in the proposed developments? Where has this need come from - is it local, immigration or overflow from London? Given that many of the MP's were cashing in on the housing market via the gravy expense train did they want to continue the ridiculous over inflated housing market at the expense of green belt land? There are many questions that the local and central government need to answer!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Luton and South Bedfordshire have to follow the Growth agenda which has been set up by Government through the sustainable communities Plan ( 2003) which made Luton and southern Bedfordshire part of four growth areas in the east and south of England. In this area these proposals were elaborated through the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy ( MKSMSRS). These documents recognise that while some growth can be delivered in existing urban areas much will need to be delivered in existing urban areas much will need to be developed in sustainable urban extensions, on land which is currently designated as green belt. Housing requirements differs across the area. Low levels of recent house building coupled with high levels of immigration has led to price rises, making them unaffordable for many. This results in a need for high levels of affordable housing.</p>				
2392	Central Bedfordshire Council	Shefford	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: That the Executive supports the Luton and South Bedfordshire Core Strategy Preferred Options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
723	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: makes amendments to his comments - these have been included in the officer comments.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is detailing corrections to their responses</p>				
512	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: I live in Stevenage, but I have been doing case studies for this area for a book I am working on called "Connected Cities", and Luton is part of the picture. I am not opposed to all development in the green belt, but I agree with the campaigners against development between Luton and Hitchin because it's not a suitable location. The railway, if we get one (see recent consultants' report for the EWR consortium) will go from south of Luton to south of Broadwater; if there is to be development east of Luton it should go where it can be served by a station on this railway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy</p>				
3248	Mr M E Clarke	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: The comment is addressed to Government and queries the need to create policies dictating that houses must be built in large numbers everywhere, contrary to sustainable principles. An exhibition or presentation in Leighton Buzzard should have been a must in your consultation process.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The plans are made in the context of a growth area as described in the MKSMSRS and RSS. A public exhibition was held in Leighton Buzzard as part of this consultation process</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
212	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: I fail to understand how the development of Bedfordshire, as stated in your document, means that you propose to build on Hertfordshire land. When I last looked, there was sufficient space in Bedfordshire to build additional houses. How can you possibly justify building on Herts? What is worse is that the area of land you are selecting is one of great natural beauty. There are many areas of Beds where the land is flat and uninteresting and would not be ruined by additional housing. The land you are proposing to use is beautiful rolling countryside with a wealth of wildlife. By what right do you wish to despoil it? This is NIMBYism of the worst kind. If Beds want the houses, then you should build them in Beds, after all that is where you are arguing they are needed. Additionally it is completely undemocratic to have councillors instigating proposals for residents that they do not represent. I should be able to register my support or lack of it, with my vote but being in Herts I will be unable to do so.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				
2956	Peter Cousins	London	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure pre-submission version is checked for spelling and grammar.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Spelling and grammatical mistakes are present in the document</p>				
1220	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: The planners must act upon the submitted comments</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
1675	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: A problem could arise with implementation. Policy IMP1 of the East of England Plan makes a clear statement that implementation will be achieved by working in an effective and co-ordinated way. The absence of an agreed preferred approach compromises the implementation of regional policy and the core strategy, but this does not mean that the document is not in general conformity with the East of England Plan. If North Hertfordshire do not plan for sufficient growth, questions of general conformity would then arise, but only if there is insufficient justification for not following regional policy. When the 2004 Planning Act was introduced, the Government was clear that it is only where a local development document would cause significant harm to the implementation of the regional spatial strategy should the local development document be considered not to be in general conformity. However, the Core Strategy preferred options document does not cause significant harm to the implementation of the regional strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
1679	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Does the area covered include a key centre for development and change? Yes. Luton lies within the major growth area of the Milton Keynes South Midlands (MKSM) Sub-Region. The MKSM Sub Regional Strategy identifies potential for a Green Belt review at Luton/ Dunstable/ Houghton Regis / Leighton Linlade. Luton / Dunstable / Houghton Regis &amp; Leighton Linlade is a key centre for development and change (SS3) and as a priority area for regeneration (SS5). Luton is a regionally strategic employment location (E3), contains a town centre of strategic importance (E5).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1672	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Are there policies dealing with minerals? Policy M1 states that Luton and Bedfordshire LDDs should identify and safeguard environmentally acceptable sources for 1.93 million tonnes of land won sand and gravel per annum to 2016.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The subject is touched-on in chapter 12. Separate mineral and waste plans will be drawn-up to cover Luton and Central Bedfordshire</p>				
1659	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Is agricultural land and soils conservation covered by a policy? The Core Strategy should seek to minimise, and include measures to mitigate, the loss of high quality agricultural land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The subject is touched-on in chapter 12. <input type="checkbox"/> The locations for urban extensions do consider agricultural land quality.</p>				
1635	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Is there policy to address the accommodation needs of Travelling Show People? The Core Strategy should include policy to address this issue and set out a framework that reflects the needs of Travelling Show People.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Travelling showperson needs will be covered by separate gypsy and traveller work, as per paragraph 6.39</p>				
1676	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Does the area covered lie within the Eastern Region? Yes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
1678	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Are all references to the East of England Plan correct? Yes. References to regional policy are correct; however the Joint Committee should note that the East of England Plan no longer refers to itself as RSS14.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: To amend any reference to the former RSS14.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS will amend any reference to the East of England Plan as RSS14, and renamed accordingly.</p>				
1680	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Are there any key issues covered by the document that are of strategic or regional importance? Yes. Luton lies within the major growth area of the Milton Keynes South Midlands (MKSM) Sub-Region. The MKSM Sub Regional Strategy identifies potential for a Green Belt review at Luton/ Dunstable/ Houghton Regis / Leighton Linlade. Luton / Dunstable / Houghton Regis &amp; Leighton Linlade is a key centre for development and change (SS3) and as a priority area for regeneration (SS5). Luton is a regionally strategic employment location (E3), contains a town centre of strategic importance (E5).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
2800	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: As representatives of residents of the area, we want to be involved in deciding the way the area develops.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All Parish Councils within the Core Strategy area are consulted as Statutory Stakeholders.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1755	Government Office for the East of England	Cambridge	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Go-East recognises the particularly complex nature of delivering the challenging growth agenda in Luton and southern Bedfordshire and welcomes the progress which you are now making in moving towards a submission document. You have had an advisory visit from PINS which identified a range of issues needing to be addressed and I know that you have taken those comments on board. It is important to get to submission with a clear and demonstrably deliverable strategy which meets the requirements of PPS3 and PPS12 in particular.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Those deliverable strategies can be found at chapter 6 for PPS3 and chapter and chapter 1 and 4 for PPS12</p>				
72	Mr Gavin Hamilton	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Having reviewed the major document as it affects me and the area in which I live I find that major issues within the town (Leighton Buzzard) i.e. health care are admitted but absolutely nothing is proposed to be done to address the issue so that I will still need to visit a hospital in Oxford for continuing consultations by public transport. I can only conclude that nothing will change by the imposition of this strategy upon the residents of Leighton Buzzard or that we will be fobbed off with hollow promises as usual. We will, as result, suffer from years of chaos for no good result.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure IDP is completed</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The predicted housing and employment growth could be an opportunity for investing in health facilities and related infrastructure within Leighton Buzzard area.</p>				
3501	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: First paragraph claims that it gives readers an opportunity to influence emerging plans. In reality, how much influence do we have? If very little, this should be made clear. Otherwise, can we have an assurance that if there is significant opposition, the proposed development East of Luton will cease to be a preferred option?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The plans are made in the context of a growth area as described in the MKSMSRS and RSS and preferred options are based on technical evidence studies. <input type="checkbox"/> Local opinion is helpful to identify and seek to resolve local concerns to the preferred options.</p>				
527	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Village areas east of Luton were not consulted sufficiently in the early stages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All residents from all areas affected by the plan were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available. Details about the proposals can be found at the Core Strategy Preferred Options. All Parish Councils within the Core Strategy area are consulted as Statutory Stakeholders.</p>				
501	Dr John Noble	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: The area between Luton, Hitchin and Barton-le-Clay would be completely and irreversibly ruined by the proposed expansion. The unique rural nature of the area and the villages within it would be lost for all future generations. The environment would be destroyed. The proposed plan focuses solely on the perceived needs of the officials of Luton and South Bedfordshire and ignores the needs of the people of surrounding areas, including those of North Hertfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1911	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Its objections, summarised below, are set out in the following sections:.... Section 8: The Council's objections are not based solely on the inherent merits of the East of Luton site, but instead are based on an assessment of relative merits of all 13 sites originally identified at the Issues and Options stage. However, it would not be appropriate for NHDC to propose an alternative strategy to replace that currently advocated by the Joint Committee. Therefore, guidelines are suggested within this section for further consideration, which could and should lead to a much more sustainable (and less controversial) distribution of development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
1898	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: "1.3 In these circumstances, there is much in the current version of the Core Strategy: Preferred Options which North Hertfordshire District Council (NHDC) can support..." "1.4 The key issue addressed in the Core Strategy is where new development should be located. The JC has concluded that substantial development should be located within the North Hertfordshire "area of search." This includes:..." "1.5 NHDC has expended considerable effort to ensure that those likely to be affected by or interested in the proposals in North Hertfordshire were aware of them in time to respond to the public consultation before the final deadline of 12 June..." and "...1.6 The remainder of this document focuses on the preferred strategy of allocating the proposed growth in and around the Luton conurbation. NHDC objects to this in the strongest possible terms. Its objections, summarised below, are set out in the following sections:..."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
3302	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: The spatial vision has been limited by the partial and late introduction of the employment land review conclusions and the omission of suitable analysis. The strategic employment sites identified in the Preferred Options document are not the best locations for economic growth. There is a lack of clarity about the way in which a spatial vision will be delivered as there is no clear indication on how infrastructure needs and costs will be taken forward, prioritised and met.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Employment land review conclusions from South Bedfordshire and Luton are available for on line consultation at section 15 Employment Land Availability; 16 Annual monitoring Report; We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.</p>				
1295	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: A general comment - not really sure where to put it - is that there is a confusing level of detail within this strategy. In places, specific schemes are mentioned, whilst in others it is just broad policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2690	Mrs Cherry Thurstan		Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Questions regarding sexuality, ethnic background, skin colour etc are discriminatory and impertinent as well as being irrelevant. Any British citizen living legally in the area concerned should have the right to voice an opinion without feeling under an obligation to disclose any of the details asked for, most particularly those regarding learning difficulties and mental health problems.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
232	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 1.1	Yes
<p>Comment: As a resident of the area, I want to be involved with the way the area develops</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is now on the consultation database and will be kept informed of future developments</p>				
3039	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has been advised and informed about the different evidence studies and technical analyses.</p>				
174	Mr David Willingale	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: Because I am a resident of Leighton Buzzard and I am concerned about any future development of the town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work.</p>				
175	Mr David Willingale	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: As a resident of Leighton Buzzard for 35 years I have seen the town expand by up to 5000 homes without any accompanying increase in the infrastructure of the town . Leighton already has acute transport (both road and rail) problems because it is a market town with narrow streets and a rail network running at capacity. The current infrastructure is just about coping with the existing population. Leighton has already absorbed an acceptable level of expansion and has now reached the physical limits of the permanent layout and structure of the town. Leighton cannot absorb any further increase in housing stock without having an unresolvable impact on the quality of life of the existing residents . Therefore any further development is NOT ACCEPTABLE.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work.</p>				
559	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 1.1	No
<p>Comment: I agree with the priority on urban brownfield development but not with the incursion into the Green Belt to the east of Luton, nor with the illegal incursion into an AONB with a bypass</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3642	Graham Aldridge	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.2	No
<p>Comment: This whole business is a shame, nobody wants it. It is another government failure, this country wants less people not more homes ruining the countryside Local Councils should say no to Brown Co</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3214	DP9	London	Para. 1.2	No
<p>Comment: Para 1.2 identifies that the LDF documents will cover the period to 2031 and will be in general conformity with the sub regional and regional spatial strategy. With the review of East of England Plan begun in 2008 and against this uncertain background, it is clearly important that the Core Strategy has built in flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances, as outlined in PPS12 (para 4.1.4 and 4.46) to reduce the need for frequent updating.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The MKSMSRS and the East of England Plan ( RSS14) are both long term spatial planning strategies. It is likely that there will be multiple upward and downward economic cycles during the lifetime of these strategic planning documents. In light of this, it is important that this Core Strategy also takes a long term approach as well as allow enough flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances and is not deflected from the achievements of long term objectives at this stage.</p>				
528	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 1.2	No
<p>Comment: There appears to be some conflict between supposed local democracy and the fact that regional plans are imposed upon us.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The plans are made in the context of a growth area as described in the MKSMSRS and RSS.</p>				
4051	Natalie Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: North Herts residents were not consulted fairly, rendering the consultation as flawed and unfair.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council and residents were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available.</p>				
2168	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: A general strategy document with insufficient details of proposals is unsatisfactory if no further consultation is envisaged</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All residents from all areas affected by the plan were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available. Details about the proposals can be found at the Core Strategy Preferred Options.</p>				
3739	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: Why were NHDC residents not consulted about this plan well before any preferences were decided?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council and residents were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available.</p>				
2801	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: Very many opinions were canvassed during the original consultation: yet it would seem that in spite of the responses from this segment of the county, the "powers that be" have simply ignored those views. This is NOT democracy, and certainly not 'listening to the people'!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council and residents were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
108	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: Already the people of Leighton Buzzard - at least 10,500 of them - have expressed the view that the town cannot sustain any further house building beyond that which is currently under construction, especially to the east of the town. Originally Leighton Buzzard was not included in the regional strategy for new housing but a misguided town council at the time asked for inclusion without any consultation with the residents. Had they consulted, the resounding result would be have been not to be included.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. All residents from all areas affected by the plan were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available. Details about the proposals can be found at the Core Strategy Preferred Options</p>				
2305	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: The County Council is concerned that the Sustainability Appraisal, incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment requirements is only at a preliminary stage given the Core Strategy has now been in preparation for some time and the Joint Committee has arrived at its Preferred Options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is and iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4071	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: The SA/SEA process is currently comprised of a working paper and a preliminary assessment, with a separate non-SA/SEA site assessment matrix having no formal SA/SEA credentials. The County Council hopes the intention is that these separate working documents be brought together into a single assessment and reporting process to inform decisions on the pre-submission document and accompany the consultation on it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is and iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
4070	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: The Sustainability Appraisal is deficient and needs more work in assessing the identified strategic locations and reasonable alternatives including the two fall-back strategies referred to by the technical studies in the event that the development east of Luton does not come forward.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is and iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
191	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: "Growth allocated to this area" - who says any growth is needed in the UK? who says any growth that is needed, should be in the South East of England? The south-east of England should be regarded as full and no further growth allowed in it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3907	John Keys	Unknown	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: 10,000 people from Leighton Linlade signed a Petition in 2007 stating that they didn't want the Eastern Development. In addition, I took part in a well attended demonstration March earlier this year, to once again voice our objections to the Easter and Western unwanted additional housing developments.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				
1973	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: It is noted that the Preferred Options do not coincide exactly with any of the 10 development options considered at the Issues and Options Stage. It is perhaps most closely aligned with Option 8 therein. Thus at present, no appraisal has been carried out of the selected development sites - a fundamental flaw. Such appraisal needs to look not only at the Preferred Options, but also at reasonable alternatives to growth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Preferred Options, follows the Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper, which set out various strategic spatial options to secure the implementation of the Growth allocated to this area. Consequently, the Preferred Options document sets out preferred policy approaches for delivering this Growth through a spatial vision and set of spatial principles, taking into account different technical evidence streams, public consultation responses and sustainability appraisal findings. The document aims to set out broad policy approaches and outline the processes undertaken to reach them.</p>				
1915	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: 2.3 It is remarkable that little or no weight seems to have been given to Sustainability Appraisal incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) in the selection process. This is a critical aspect of the current planning system, and it is surprising that, at this relatively late stage in the emergence of the Core Strategy, the SA/SEA is only at a preliminary stage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: All Statutory Consultees will be consulted on the Sustainability Appraisal Report</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability Appraisal is an iterative process and subject to continuous improvement. There will be a separate consultation process for the Sustainability Appraisal which is due to be published at the same time as the Pre Submission Core Strategy document.</p>				
2207	Andrew Rogers	Lilley	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: Draft Core Strategy issued without detailed financial impacts analysis Draft Core Strategy not supported by North Herts DC No technical analyses provided to Committee Members</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Urban Extensions Site Development Economic Study was completed in February 2009 with the purpose to undertake an assessment of economic viability of the preferred urban extensions as identified in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document. North Herts. District Council and residents were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available at</p>				
2185	Derek Rogers	Harpenden	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: Object to lack of detailed financial impacts analysis and technical analyses not made available to Committee Members</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Urban Extensions Site Development Economic Study was completed in February 2009 with the purpose to undertake an assessment of economic viability of the preferred urban extensions as identified in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document. This study is available on-line; <a href="http://www.shapeyourfuture.org.uk/EvidenceStudies3.html">http://www.shapeyourfuture.org.uk/EvidenceStudies3.html</a></p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3303	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: The consultation exercise on issues and options pre-dated the evidence and conclusion from the Employment Land Review (January 2008) and failed to look at strategic employment options beyond urban extension areas A-M, such as the L&amp;G land in the vicinity of M1 Junction 10A.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The preparation of the LDF is conducted over many years. Reference can only be made to the evidence available at the time.</p>				
3703	Ruth Sayers	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: No heed has been given to the LOUD petition signed by 10,500 residents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council and residents were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available.</p>				
3409	The Coach House	Lilley	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: The evidence provided in the background reports is either prejudiced by poorly (or deliberately mis-) drafted terms of reference, lacks the rigour that I would have expected from such reports, or is contradictory. Any basis for you decisions seem to result from a very selective interpretation of the various reports that you have commissioned - at public expense I might add.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Due to the extensive range of evidence produced, there will be some contradiction. <input type="checkbox"/> The Site Assessment Matrix was produced to bring various evidence streams together.</p>				
432	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 1.3	Yes
<p>Comment: Any growth / development should be confined to town centres. Luton and Dunstable are badly in need of regenerating</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				
233	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 1.3	No
<p>Comment: Very many opinions were canvassed during the original consultation: yet it would seem that in spite of the responses from this segment of the county, the "powers that be" have simply ignored our views. This is NOT democracy, or even listening to the people! It's about Councillors who've got vested interests in making life easy for themselves rather than representing their constituents!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All residents from all areas affected by the plan were consulted properly. All the evidence is currently available. Details about the proposals can be found at the Core Strategy Preferred Options.</p>				
1510	Ms C Barry	LUTON	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: how can building on green belt land help existing communities in Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It will support urban regeneration within central and east Luton as well as contribute to the provision of new facilities within the city that might be currently in demand and or insufficient .</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2802	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: The challenge is about putting houses near to where there are jobs, on existing routes for people to be able to get to the jobs that exist NOW. Not for the jobs that don't exist - the vague hope that those thousands of jobs will perhaps be created sometime in the future.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC support the aspirations of the community to maximise Brownfield land prior to the development of land in the Green Belt. However, they also recognise that when planning for such large housing targets, appropriate regard needs to be given to the suitability and achievability of any approach and therefore propose a balanced approach to meeting the housing targets which achieves an appropriate balance between previously developed land and development in urban extensions.</p>				
3502	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: Cannot see any benefits of the 'growth agenda'. The majority of people most directly affected do not want the East of Luton development and can see no benefits whatsoever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The benefits derived from the Growth agenda will be envisaged in a way that the principal conurbation of Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis will have stronger identity based on a number of interconnected communities. All this will be supported by an enhanced and reinvigorated economy benefiting from reduced congestion and improved accessibility. The new and rejuvenated communities will be connected by an integrated public transport system and will have access to local jobs, services, leisure and cultural facilities, together with access to a web of well managed green infrastructure as well as the surrounding countryside. People living in East Luton will also be benefited from this enhanced and reinvigorated economy as well as a better interconnection between other adjacent communities.</p>				
1809	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: The strategy does not benefit existing communities. It should emphasise deprivation, regeneration and investment of Houghton Regis, as well as Luton. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In Houghton Regis, a master plan was prepared in 2008 which outlines how the town centre can improve its appeal and the range of services offered, building on the commitment to develop a new library and health centre. In the case of Luton town centre, the existing Development Framework published in 2004 outlines Luton Borough council preferred approach to the future of the town centre.</p>				
529	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: It will not benefit the existing communities in villages east of Luton. A large development in Lilley Bottom will throw even more traffic down our small lanes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Many existing villages are isolated and still reliant on the neighbouring towns for many leisure, retail and other services. The development to the east of Luton will increase the level of services as well as include new facilities and improve transport connections with the main urban centres.</p>				
283	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: Why is the emphasis on growth in an already overcrowded area? There is something called quality of life... I attended the undemocratic East of England Examination in Public where a handful of unaccountable bureaucrats made the decisions. I pointed out the futility of expanding already prosperous areas to the detriment of less prosperous areas further from London</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
234	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: The challenge is about putting houses near to where there are jobs, or existing routes for people to be able to get to the jobs that exist NOW. Not for jobs that don't exist - in the vague hope that those thousands of jobs will perhaps be created sometime in the future.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC support the aspirations of the community to maximise Brownfield land prior to the development of land in the Green Belt. However, they also recognise that when planning for such large housing targets, appropriate regard needs to be given to the suitability and achievability of any approach and therefore propose a balanced approach to meeting the housing targets which achieves an appropriate balance between previously developed land and development in urban extensions.</p>				
560	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 1.5	No
<p>Comment: The development to the east of Luton does not benefit existing communities and by engulfing existing hamlets it contravenes the priorities established by public consultation in 2007. The associated bypasses will mostly benefit people not in Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Many existing villages are isolated and still reliant on the neighbouring towns for many leisure, retail and other services. The development to the east of Luton will increase the level of services as well as include new facilities and improve transport connections with the main urban centres.</p>				
2662	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Para. 1.6	Yes
<p>Comment: The LDF must be in conformity with the RSS and cannot otherwise be regarded as sound. The Parish Councils accept the need for growth in principle and acknowledge a purpose of the LDF being to identify the location of new development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
513	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: I don't like these large areas of search. They encourage you to look in places that are unsustainable (remote from railway lines, therefore inevitably too car-dependent) and they inevitably miss possible places. For example we could have a station for Broadwater, and if we get one the question will immediately arise of a possible urban extension south of Stevenage, but it's not part of the SNAP study area. Similarly if the railway from Luton to Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard is restored, you could have a station (Dunstable East?) near where the closed railway crosses the A505. I'm not familiar with the area, but it looks as if the land south of the railway and within walking distance of this station could be suitable for an eastward extension of Dunstable. It's wrong for options of this kind to be closed off by the rather arbitrary "areas of search". Areas of search should be defined round railway stations, where residents will have a wider choice of public transport and won't have to use their cars.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton and East of Leighton Buzzard as the areas of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Scale of development to the is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements.</p>				
3714	Jackie Davies	Kings Walden	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: The housing growth is unrealistic as the area cannot sustain such development. HCC has recently challenged the RSS successfully; perhaps Luton and South Bedfordshire can challenge the plans in the same way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC recognise that when planning for such large housing targets, appropriate regard needs to be given to the suitability and achievability of any approach and therefore propose a balanced approach to meeting the housing targets. Based on the evidence, particularly in the SHLAA, the JC believe that figures in Tables 6.2 to 6.4 represent a suitable basis for long term strategic planning to achieve this approach.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1222	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.6	No
Comment: Why do we need all this housing?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.				
3448	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 1.6	Yes
Comment: Support the strategy of need to develop sustainable urban extensions on land currently designated as green belt.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact				
3709	Keith Ewington	Kings Walden	Para. 1.6	No
Comment: The housing growth is unrealistic as the area cannot sustain such development. HCC has recently challenged the RSS successfully; perhaps Luton and South Bedfordshire can challenge the plans in the same way.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: The JC recognise that when planning for such large housing targets, appropriate regard needs to be given to the suitability and achievability of any approach and therefore propose a balanced approach to meeting the housing targets. Based on the evidence, particularly in the SHLAA, the JC believe that figures in Tables 6.2 to 6.4 represent a suitable basis for long term strategic planning to achieve this approach.				
335	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Para. 1.6	No
Comment: The second option being considered and the impact that this will have on Hitchin and the A505 are only referenced throughout the document, with the main emphasis being towards the first option. Why consider an option that impacts on Herts and its people more than Beds. Putting extra traffic onto the A505 will affect so many and there's the pollution impact. The "by pass options" consider adding more traffic to the A505 going into Hitchin - so dumping the traffic issues and problems on other people i.e. people near Hitchin to deal with in their day to day lives ..... Totally objects to you considering building to the east of Luton and affecting not only the lifestyle of the villages but also the impact on the current residents (traffic, noise from the A505, school) and our ability to live and work and protect our environment.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: Strategic bypasses will reduce through traffic and, combined with encouraging local travel by PT/walk/cycle, will contribute to minimising congestion, and indeed reduce congestion in some parts of the area. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
109	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.6	No
Comment: it is important to stress that Leighton Buzzard was not included in this original strategy. It was only added following the ill-judged intervention of the then Town Council who made the decision to request inclusion without consulting the people of the town. When people did make their views known - an overwhelming 10,500 signatures on a petition against any further housing- this seems to have been ignored.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2353	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: 77. Whilst the manner in which the POCD handles the Joint Committee's aspirations' outside the area of its control is much improved from the contents of the Issues and Options consultation the County Council has very significant concerns that a process necessarily confined to a specific and clearly defined administrative area can come to any conclusion in a binding way on any land outside that area to the east within Hertfordshire or west within Buckinghamshire. The County Council has consistently called for legal opinion/GO EAST advice to be sought to inform this issue, but to the County Council's knowledge that opinion/advice has either not been sought or is not available as part of this consultation exercise. This matter should be resolved in advance of the next stage in CS preparation and a clear statement made available as part of the next consultation exercise.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
530	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: Growth for Milton Keynes and Luton should be concentrated toward the centre of that area not on and beyond its edge.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				
65	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: It is not clear where employment for the additional population, much of it relocating to the area, will come from. The car industry is all but dead, Luton Airport scratches a living flying out budget airlines which employ a minimum of staff. The stated aim appears to be that jobs will accrue from the building of these new homes. In the short term yes but then what? A curious and shortsighted rationale</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The JC are committed to providing new strategic employment land around Junction 11a and the airport with a range of employment uses including business start up units and innovation centres. Subject to appropriate rail and road access and appropriate mitigation of impact on the neighbouring SSSI, they are also supportive of the development of part of Sundon Quarry for a rail freight interchange for B8 type warehousing and distribution development.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC identified the need for a supportive framework to be created to facilitate the creation of a range of new jobs within the local area for both existing and new communities. In particular , the Core Strategy recognises the importance of London Luton airport and the proposed road infrastructure improvements as important means of attracting investment into the area for both existing and planned strategic employment sites.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1899	Luton Assembly	n/a	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: Summary (see attached) Circumstances have changed since the MKSM Inquiry. The plans may now be revealed as based on erroneous growth assumptions, and could be scrapped after the general election in 2012. The scale of the Government's growth agenda must be challenged in the light of: decreases in eastern European population in the UK economic downturn - will affect sustainability as becomes more unaffordable environmental unsustainability - MKSM guidelines are not followed on biodiversity, landscape, or the amount of nearby green spaces plans are inequitable, placing too much pressure on this area - they do not follow natural evolution of urban areas, are in the form of a high risk social experiment in a place with insufficient jobs, high unemployment and high poverty levels, so could undermine social coherence the form of consultation unreasonable pressure for housing which will lead to extinction of many wildlife species impact on the water cycle given the nature of the east of England and Global warming</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The " Growth Agenda" has been set up by Government through the " Sustainable Communities Plan " 2003. In this area these proposals were elaborated through the (MKSMSRS) and employment growth target set up by the SEEP. The recent economic downturn will have a negative impact on the delivery of development across Luton and south Beds in the short term. However, the MKSMSRS and the EEP ( RSS14) are both long term spatial strategies. In light of this, it is important that this CS also takes a long term approach and is not deflected from the achievement of long term objectives at this stage. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments</p>				
3673	Alan Murphy	Luton	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: I am sceptical about the Government's overall house building requirement, which has not so far been adequately scrutinised or tested.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
1756	Pegasus Planning Group	Histon	Para. 1.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Consultee supports reference to MKSMSRS but feels that greater reference should be made to what it advises about the exceptional circumstances for the revision of the Green Belt boundary</p>				
<p>JC Response: agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact</p>				
3814	D Simpson	Unknown	Para. 1.6	Yes
<p>Comment: What will happen if reviews find a failure to meet development targets?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The review process would analyse why the targets have not been met through its Annual Monitoring Report. There will also be a 5 year Review. If the Plan is off-course then it will be amended.</p>				
433	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: "Growth" is a disbenefit rather than a benefit. If there has to be growth, it should not entail the creation for new communities, rather the regeneration of existing communities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
762	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: A ridiculous quantity of unnecessary housing. However, should the government proceed with this ludicrous plan, the areas to the north and west should be considered before the already overstretched eastern/south-eastern options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
3767	Mr G Willis	Tebworth	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: This number of houses is excessive and are not needed for local people, only for commuters and therefore of no benefit for the local community.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work.</p>				
561	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 1.6	No
<p>Comment: The MKSMSRS document specifically states that any non-urban extension should exclude the Chiltern AONB - invaded by the bypass proposals</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Eastern bypass connecting the A505 to Airport Way will cater for traffic from north Herts. going to the Airport and through traffic, as well as any non-local travel from the east of Luton development. In particular it will reduce traffic (and therefore emissions) on the dual carriageway section of Hitchin Rd and on Vauxhall Way.</p>				
1041	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 1.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 1.7 Support/Object/Comment: Comment Comments: With reference to the housing numbers, it is noted that 1,000 dwellings are to be provided in rural settlements. It is noted that this dwelling requirement is separate to that of the MKSM Growth Area, defined as Luton, Dunstable, Houghton Regis, Leighton Buzzard and Leighton Linlade and any urban extensions to these settlements. It is assumed that the residual area relates to any rural settlements outside of the main settlements and any extensions to these. The "residual" area as defined could be more clearly marked on the Key Diagram and in the description within the Core Strategy DPD.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.</p>				
514	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: The Luton conurbation is already too large and shouldn't grow much more. Better to think in terms of "Greater Luton" with village clusters or possibly eco-towns in satellite locations on the existing railway to the north and south, or on the new railways if we get them. The idea of a "hub city" with satellites is explored further in the book I'm writing, "Connected Cities". Possibly there may be more scope for urban extensions at Leighton-Linslade, with suburban stations serving new neighbourhoods as well as some of the existing development on the outskirts of the two towns.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that there is a need to develop urban extensions to meet the development requirements.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2803	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: This makes no sense at all. It says about the larger of the two requirements relating to Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, and the smaller to Leighton-Linslade. It then says the smaller requirement will be delivered in a 'residual area' relates to the rest of the former South Bedfordshire District outside these Growth areas. But Leighton-Linslade is IN the growth area, as designated and shown in the area maps!!</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.		
JC Reason for Response:	We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.			
1841	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: This is very confusing in terms of what has been allocated under the RSS and in which location, particularly the second half of the paragraph. (Agreed late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.		
JC Reason for Response:	We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.			
110	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: See response to 1.6 above.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Representation replicates comment ID 109.			
64	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: The east and south of Luton falls within green-belt another local authority area, Hertfordshire. Logically this is not Luton Borough Council's for the taking. Hertfordshire has already had a massive housing quota imposed, much of it destined for green belt. If quality of life within the county is to be maintained this ill thought out scheme cannot proceed.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: no action required		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.			
1306	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 1.7	Yes
<p>Comment: In accordance with our representations at the Issues and Options stage, we are pleased to note that the Core Strategy now specifically makes reference to the additional East of England housing requirement. However, we note that the first sentence of paragraph 1.7 only refers to the 1,000 units up to 2021, rather than the extended requirement to 2031 (which is referred to later in Table 6.1). In the interests of clarity, we suggest amending this sentence as follows: "In addition to the 41,700 new homes from MKSM SRS the East of England Plan additionally requires a further 1,000 new homes to be delivered to 2021 (and a further requirement of 500 units up to 2031) outside of the main 'Milton Keynes and South Midlands Growth Area' focused on rural settlements."</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.		
JC Reason for Response:	We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1216	Mrs Janet Montgomery	Luton	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: I do not think the plans are sufficiently thought out and joined up to consider the impacts on all areas of live for people already living in the areas and those to be brought in. I do not think that they are the best plans and options put forward and that all options should be reviewed and the whole process restarted and viewed in the light of starting from a green infra structure with provision for joined up transport community facilities local employment in the new developments and to bring new relevant employment to the area locally and make it accessible to people of Luton and area. ~There are other suitable options that serve Luton and Dunstable much better the Luton West proposal is the prime case in example.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that there is a need to develop urban extensions to meet the development requirements.</p>				
372	Mr Andrew Weber	Knebworth	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: This is going to destroy green belt land in North Herts District Council - not your own council land - and fill this tranquil, rural area with new roads, traffic and noise. It is foisting your problem onto somebody else. And green belt land is supposed to be permanent anyway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
761	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: This number of new properties, along with associated strains on transport and utilities infrastructure, is simply unsustainable. alternatives should be sought, such as regeneration of inner cities, both within Luton and in the deprived areas of the north of the country.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				
235	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 1.7	No
<p>Comment: This makes no sense at all. It says about the larger of the two requirements relating to Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, and the smaller to Leighton-Linslade. It then says the smaller requirement will be delivered in a €'residual area' relates to the rest of the former South Bedfordshire District outside these Growth areas. But Leighton-Linslade is IN the growth area, as designated and shown in the area maps!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a more easy to follow structure and maps.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.</p>				
2804	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.8	No
<p>Comment: If there's no details here to be seen, why is this section even included? Don't try to hide things by causing discontinuity!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The final document will be written in plainer English with less technical terminology and with a structure that is more easy to follow.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: We acknowledge the need for improving the clarity of the existing document as well as its structure.</p>				
381	Mr Anthony Malloy	leetchworth, herfordshire	Para. 1.8	No
<p>Comment: With the general election coming within the next 12 months, I think it would be prudent to wait and see the outcome before jumping in and spending money when the next government may well cancel the plans what's the rush!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC has to follow the LDS scheme and work with the policies directed under the existing government and political decision makers.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
434	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 1.8	No
Comment: Growth should not be focused on rural settlements!!				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.				
236	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 1.8	No
Comment: If there's no details here to be seen, why is this section even included? Don't try to hide things by causing discontinuity!				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
515	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 1.9	Yes
Comment: I strongly agree that a long-term approach is important. Even 2031 is only 22 years away. You should be looking beyond 2031 to 2051 at least, when some really ambitious projects, such as a London orbital railway, may be completed. The restored railway from Leighton Buzzard to Luton and the new link from Luton to Stevenage could be part of the orbital railway, as well as the proposed East-West Railway from the East Coast ports and Cambridge. The two railways can be funded by contributions from these projects and from the new development that could be served by new stations. But not much is likely to happen in this regard till the present period of austerity is over.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: This is the legal framework set up by the RSS which set up a period up until 2031. The reason for not extending the timeframe is due to the difficulty of forecasting growth figures beyond the time period provided.				
2299	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 1.9	No
Comment: 34. Deliverability is a fundamental attribute of a sound Core Strategy. PPS 12 states that Core Strategies must ensure that partners who are essential to the delivery of the plan are signed up to it. Paragraph 8 above hints at the scale of the challenge facing the conurbation given the current economic climate. The County Council is concerned that there CS appears to be blindly accepting the scale of growth contained within RSS without satisfactorily considering whether it is likely to materialise. Further work should be commissioned to explore the realism of the growth targets for the greater conurbation. 35. PPS 12 also states that Core Strategies must be based on sound infrastructure delivery planning. The POCD contains minimal information relating to how major pieces of infrastructure are to be funded and the partners required to bring them forward - this is particularly the case in terms of major transport proposals.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The " Growth Agenda" has been set up by Government through the " Sustainable Communities Plan " 2003. In this area these proposals were elaborated through the (MKSMSRS) and employment growth target set up by the SEEP. The recent economic downturn will have a negative impact on the delivery of development across Luton and south Beds in the short term. However, the MKSMSRS and the EEP ( RSS14) are both long term spatial strategies. In light of this, it is important that this CS also takes a long term approach and is not deflected from the achievement of long term objectives at this stage. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. We are aware of this issue and as a result we still gathering supporting evidence through further testing and transport modelling.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
76	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.9	No
<p>Comment: The current Recession - being the worst since WW2, has already shown that existing new developments cannot sell what they have already built, and thus these properties lie empty for the foreseeable future. It makes no sense to build even more homes and infrastructure, and not occupy them, just to keep property developers and the building industry busy in the short-term. This "build it and they will come" approach shows a lack of joined-up thinking, just to blindly meet targets set by Government. The population increase predicted has nothing to do with an increase in birth rate, but a lack of control on immigration.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that there is a need to develop urban extensions to meet the development requirements.</p>				
3741	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 1.10	No
<p>Comment: I object to the Joint Committee taking decisions without having been presented with the technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint committee has produced a Site Assessment Matrix in which an evidence base about the suitability of development and its impact on different areas is presented.</p>				
2805	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.10	Yes
<p>Comment: This may be true, but the area represented formerly by SBDC is now considerably expanded (as Central Beds). Does this enlarged area still have the same number of representatives on this committee?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Yes, they currently have 6 representatives. Before JC arrangements, South Beds had 3 and Beds Council another 3.</p>				
2705	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Para. 1.10	No
<p>Comment: The document has a strikingly urban orientation with little said about the concerns of villages affected by the strategy. Villages have no direct representation to the Joint Committee and have to provide input through their BAPTC representative who must also be a Houghton Regis or Leighton Buzzard town councillor. It is essential that there should be village representation on the Joint Committee to provide the opportunity for direct input to the Core Strategy and not just its implementation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Every Parish Council affected by the LDF has been invited to provide their input as a Statutory Consultee. In addition, councils surrounding the area to be affected have also been invited to participate on the process.</p>				
237	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 1.10	Yes
<p>Comment: This may be true, but the area represented formerly by SBDC is now considerably expanded (as Central Beds). Does this enlarged area still have the same number of representatives on this committee?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Yes, they currently have 6 representatives. Before JC arrangements, South Beds had 3 and Beds Council another 3.</p>				
1373	MR EDMUND WRIGHT	Hitchin	Para. 1.10	No
<p>Comment: why should Luton and beds make plans for Hertfordshire? Especially as it is on the most beautiful AONB I am incensed at the callous lack of strategy that is demonstrated here</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2861	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.11	Yes
<p>Comment: Heath and Reach Parish Council must be actively engaged and involved in any further potential development activity in and around Leighton Linslade, irrespective of where developments are located as the village lies on the direct route to the north for traffic accessing Milton Keynes, the A5, the M1 and the western bypass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Consult with Heath and Reach Parish Council.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further consultation to be undertaken at each stage of the LDF preparation as stated in the SCI. All Parish Councils within the Core Strategy area are consulted as Statutory Stakeholders.</p>				
214	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 1.12	No
<p>Comment: This comment is not true. You are attempting to hoodwink the population of the area into thinking that these proposals are about Bedfordshire and for Bedfordshire. You are planning to desecrate a beautiful area of Hertfordshire and not giving the people of Hertfordshire the chance to have a say in a democratic way because as a Hertfordshire dweller, I am unable to vote for or against any Bedfordshire Councillor. You cannot possibly represent me or any other person of Hertfordshire because you should have no political authority on Hertfordshire land. Political representatives should represent the community over which they have jurisdiction. You should not be making decisions about areas over which you are not politically responsible. I should be able to vote you off any council when elections are running, if I don't agree with your custody of the area in which I live. This proposal to build on land which you do not represent is making a mockery of the supposedly democratic system of England and I am appalled.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. Council is a permanent member of the Committee, and consequently has been informed about every decision to be made. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
730	English Heritage	Cambridge	Spatial Portrait 2	No
<p>Comment: Welcome general references in paras 2.1 and 2.2 to protecting the character of towns and villages within the Growth Area. Although there is some reference to the historic character of Dunstable, Houghton Regis and Leighton Linslade in paras 2.9, 2.10 and 2.11, there is little attempt to define what this really means. Concerned about absence of any reference to Luton's long, varied and important historic character in para 2.8. This needs to be rectified, with a short summary of the historic character of the Growth Area's main towns and villages. Existing documents are available to help eg Conservation Area Character Appraisals. Extensive Urban Surveys exist for Luton, Dunstable, Leighton Linslade and Toddington which characterise their archaeology, topography and historic buildings. It may also be appropriate to undertake further historic characterisation work to understand specific places in more detail, particularly where significant levels of change are proposed. We would be happy to advise on such work.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: According to a recent Planning Inspectorate report on examining DPDs (September 2009), the strategy "should focus relentlessly on the critical issues that relate to the way the area is intended to develop and the strategies to address the critical issues identified" with extraneous and descriptive material stripped out. As the historic environment is not a key strategic issue for Luton, it is important to include information about this aspect in the Spatial Portrait. It is likely that references to the historic character of Dunstable, Houghton Regis and Leighton Linslade will be removed. Chapter 12 does provide details of Luton's historic character, including the number of listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens although it is likely that this will be taken out of the Core Strategy submission document. The pre-submission document will be structured differently and will be geographically based rather than theme based as in this document.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1174	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Spatial Portrait 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Pleased that document recognises the "attractive countryside and valued landscapes" (para 2.1) that South Bedfordshire and Luton contains. To truly reflect the importance of this and reinforce SO7, suggest that the Spatial Portrait contains a section on the Natural Environment and refer to the national significance of the 18 Sites of Special Scientific Interest found within S Bedfordshire and Luton. It should also recognise the variety of habitats and species that exist across the rest of the area, including County Wildlife Sites. The benefits of protecting biological diversity are outlined in PPS9:development should: "Enhance biodiversity in green spaces and among developments so that they are used by wildlife and valued by people, recognising that healthy functional ecosystems can contribute to a better quality of life and to people's sense of well-being." Should also emphasise the importance of conserving and enhancing the Chilterns AONB as legally required by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000).</p>				
JC Response: Not Agree		Proposed Action: The pre-submission document will be structured differently and will be geographically based rather than theme based as in this document. Therefore, the natural environment relevant to each area will be part of each section.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: According to a recent Planning Inspectorate report on examining DPDs (September 2009), the core strategy "should focus relentlessly on the critical issues that relate to the way the area is intended to develop and the strategies to address the critical issues identified" with all extraneous and descriptive material stripped out. Chapter 12: Preserving and Enhancing our Countryside and Heritage contains a section on Biodiversity &amp; Geology which mentions the SSSIs and Country Wildlife Sites as well as the requirement of PPS9 which requires policies to protect and enhance biodiversity in the LDF. Policy CS15 Country and Landscape seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Policy CS14 says that developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				
3390	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Spatial Portrait 2	No
<p>Comment: Over the last 30 years, Leighton-Linslade has experienced very high levels of housing development, particularly towards the South, with limited additional infrastructure provision. The local population has quadrupled from 11,000 to 38,000 over that period, yet little additional facilities have been provided to cope with these additional people. there are fewer shops open in the town centre. Long term unsustainability of the current situation.</p>				
JC Response: Not Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 9: Improving Town Centres, paragraph 9.8, sets out plans for enhancing Leighton Buzzard through encouraging new retail, office and community and leisure uses and improving accessibility into the town centre especially from the train station. As stated in this paragraph, initial work on a master plan for the town centre shows potential sites within and on the edge of the town centre to provide these facilities and help improve the vitality and sustainability of the town as a whole.</p>				
2234	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.1	No
<p>Comment: 'A challenge' implies something is actually impossible. The document makes no attempt to address this challenge leaving an observer to guess at what might be envisaged.</p>				
JC Response: Not Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy acknowledges that it is a challenge providing for the growth of the principal towns and villages, whilst protecting their individual character as well as the areas of high landscape quality. Working closely with key stakeholders will ensure that these challenges are addressed with the help of expert advice and guidance.</p>				
521	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 2.1	No
<p>Comment: It will be less of a challenge if you adopt the right methodology.</p>				
JC Response: Not Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy acknowledges that it is a challenge providing for the growth of the principal towns and villages, whilst protecting their individual character as well as the areas of high landscape quality, regardless of methodology chosen. Working closely with key stakeholders will ensure that these challenges are addressed with the help of expert advice and guidance.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1225	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.1	No
Comment: This paragraph says it all, more housing in Leighton Linslade will ruin it.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements.				
336	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Para. 2.1	No
Comment: You only reference the Bedfordshire towns/villages and yet one of the options will impact Hitchin and the associated villages much more... like Lilley directly and Offley with the extra traffic and noise pollution from traffic speeding down the A505 towards Hitchin - given one of your by pass options will bring it to Putteridge Bury. Why is the impact on these places/ and roads into Hitchin being considered as part of this proposal? Please don't pass the buck to someone else from a district /council perspective.....				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including viability assessment.				
111	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.1	No
Comment: Leighton Buzzard's unique identity as a historic market town is already compromised by the growth of housing already finished or under construction. The preservation of quality of life in this town depends on their being no further growth of housing.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Policy CS16 seeks to minimise the impact of development of the Growth Areas rich historic environment.				
531	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 2.1	No
Comment: So far the "challenge" has not been taken.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy acknowledges that it is a challenge providing for the growth of the principal towns and villages, whilst protecting their individual character as well as the areas of high landscape quality. Working closely with key stakeholders will ensure that these challenges are addressed with the help of expert advice and guidance.				
288	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 2.1	No
Comment: North Herts also contains such areas of beauty yet these are not mentioned in the document despite the proposal to build over a swathe of them. This is a case of double standards - recognising areas of beauty where the electorate votes for Luton/Beds councillors but ignoring other areas where the electorate is outside Luton/Beds.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. The Chilterns AONB is referred to in Chapter 12 as high quality countryside and Policy CS15 states the need to protect, conserve and enhance the AONB. 12.10 refers to working with key stakeholders including the Chilterns Conservation Board.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
435	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 2.1	No
<p>Comment: It is not possible to allow villages to grow, "whilst protecting their individual character as well as the areas of high landscape quality". This aim can only be achieved by confining development to town centres through increasing population density.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including viability assessment. Policy CS1 refers to new development being primarily focused within existing urban areas and encouraging opportunities for high density development in town centres.</p>				
562	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.1	No
<p>Comment: A bypass does not necessarily serve the town well in terms of development. Entirely consuming villages - for example Mangrove Green &amp; Cockermhoe - is not consistent with this strategy. Building a bypass in the Chiltern AONB is not only illegal but against this policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including viability assessment.</p>				
5	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 2.2	No
<p>Comment: That will continue to happen as your proposals do not develop the town centres but outskirts, creating a vacuum as per American cities with out of town malls.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS11 Improving Town Centres provides strategies for facilitating the regeneration and enhancement of all the major towns in the area to increase the variety of services and opportunities available for each one thereby creating "vibrant, dynamic, distinctive safe and popular town centres".</p>				
2235	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.2	Yes
<p>Comment: I support this aspiration</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
532	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 2.2	No
<p>Comment: Adding on development on or beyond the eastern edge of the area conflicts with "increasing the self containment".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a misunderstanding of what is meant by 'self containment'. Self containment means enabling people to remain in an area for work, shopping, leisure etc. Adding on development to an area simply expands the area in which residents are encouraged to meet their living needs.</p>				
104	Mr Jerry Hynes	Luton	Para. 2.2	No
<p>Comment: The proposed East of Luton development will fall within the gravitational pull of Hitchin, so it would likely do little to promote the self containment of the Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation. Unless some sort of physical barrier is constructed, people in the East of Luton development would look to Hitchin as the preferred choice for work, shopping and cultural amenities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3869	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 2.2	No
<p>Comment: The analysis of the plan area and its outcomes focus on the former South Bedfordshire and Luton area and yet a significant part of the infrastructure required to deliver the strategy lies outside the Plan area (North Hertfordshire District).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. North Hertfordshire Council is a permanent member of the Committee, and consequently has been informed about every decision to be made.</p>				
382	Mr Anthony Malloy	leetchworth, herfordshire	Para. 2.2	No
<p>Comment: AVAILABLE 'BROWNFIELD SITES SHOULD BE DEVELOPED BEFORE DESTROYING GREEN BELT LAND!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy promotes urban development first but a balance is needed to ensure timely delivery of housing. SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area and allowance is made for on going development in urban area. Policy CS1 refers to new development being primarily focused within existing urban areas and encouraging opportunities for high density development in town centres.</p>				
282	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Para. 2.2	No
<p>Comment: This is merely an argument for expanding the towns to the size of London and Milton Keynes. Why should a town be able to meet all the needs of its residents?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is considered that this is an essential component of the deliverability of sustainable communities.</p>				
436	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 2.2	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
4	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 2.3	No
<p>Comment: why focus on the East of Luton when the areas of deprivation are located to the West</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assesses potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions.</p>				
1228	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.3	No
<p>Comment: Jobs cannot be created from thin air.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review. Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008.</p>				
2806	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.3	Yes
<p>Comment: The reduction of commuting is a prime concern, since the available arteries are already near to gridlock!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS9 seeks to reduce levels of commuting.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
66	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Para. 2.3	No
<p>Comment: As 2.3 notes, 'the area has suffered from the national decline'. What jobs? Luton airport takes up a large area of land which could be used for housing, whilst at the same time contributes little to the national economy except greenhouse gas and traffic. The stated aim is to reduce the need to commute long distances to work and reduce pollution and congestion. Most new residents will be London bound commuters.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling and employment land study.</p>				
3304	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 2.3	Yes
<p>Comment: Welcome the recognition of the importance of continuing local economic diversification and regeneration as the key to reducing commuting and improving the wellbeing of the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
1379	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 2.3	Yes
<p>Comment: The need to grow and diversify the employment offer within Luton and southern Bedfordshire is something we strongly support as well as reducing out-commuting from Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
968	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.3	No
<p>Comment: The reduction of commuting is a prime concern, since the available arteries are already near to gridlock!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS9 seeks to reduce levels of commuting.</p>				
77	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.3	No
<p>Comment: This area has a long history of failing to attract major players in certain industry sectors, especially high-tech. industries. This is mostly due to the proximity of Milton Keynes, which was able to attract certain sectors due to the favourable conditions created by the now defunct Milton Keynes Development Corporation. To try and change this now, would require time, money and land - none of which available in sufficient quantities to persuade high-tech. Companies to relocate here, especially in a downturn. Therefore, people will still have to commute, including myself. I don't want to, but have little choice.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.</p>				
3	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: there are 100's of empty houses in Luton- why build at great cost when you have an easier more affordable solution</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS1 refers to new development being primarily focused within existing urban areas and encouraging opportunities for high density development in town centres.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1229	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: High levels of immigration need to be curtailed. The country is dangerously over populated.</p> <p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2807	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed - in and around Luton. Don't push them out of that area, just to make them travel to work!!</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3512	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: Paragraph states that there is a need for affordable housing in Luton but concedes that house prices are lower than neighbouring areas. Logic would suggest that affordable housing should be built elsewhere where housing is even less affordable. Luton is one of the most densely populated areas in the country and its infrastructure cannot cope with its existing population's needs, let alone any extra growth.</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Affordable housing will be provided across the Luton and southern Bedfordshire area according to need. The SHMA will provide more detailed information on housing needs, including affordable housing within the CS area.</p>				
533	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: "House prices in the area are lower than neighbouring areas" conflicts with "making them unaffordable for many".</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The wording of the paragraph does not contain any contradictions. House prices in Luton may be lower than in neighbouring areas, however this does not mean that they are affordable for everyone.</p>				
437	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: Affordable housing should be located within town centres to minimise car use and urban sprawl.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
238	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed - in and around Luton. Don't push them out of that area, just to make them travel to work!!</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
78	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: You have missed one other factor - the greed generated by the "buy to let" market, placed a large number of properties into the hands of a smaller amount of people, and thus also pushed upwards the prices to an unrealistic level. As soon as property prices fall to what they realistically should be, then the market will kick-start again - but only if "buy to let" is capped or scrapped.</p> <p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
563	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.4	No
<p>Comment: Much of the need for affordable housing is NOT in a separate area like the east of Luton. The need is affordable housing to serve the communities mostly centred on deprived area of the urban conglomeration. The access to jobs from the proposed east of Luton development is at the very least likely to be problematic</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Affordable housing will be provided across the Luton and southern Bedfordshire area according to need. The SHMA will provide more detailed information on housing needs, including affordable housing within the CS area.</p>				
2236	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.5	No
<p>Comment: The suggested 'improvements' will merely increase the bottleneck at the entrance to Hitchin town and the use of dangerous rural rat runs</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
865	Mrs Chris Chapman	Luton	Para. 2.5	No
<p>Comment: Surely by adding more housing and other developments including roads you just move the congestion else where.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling.</p>				
523	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 2.5	Yes
<p>Comment: I agree. An east-west railway is the key - see previous comments. To improve east-west road links will only make the congestion worse. The railway should have a station directly serving the airport terminal, with services direct to Milton Keynes and Oxford to the west, Stevenage and Cambridge to the north-east, Harlow and Stansted to the east and London and Gatwick to the south. The parkway station and bus link can still serve passengers on the Midland Main Line.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
131	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 2.5	No
<p>Comment: The infrastructure of the old Dunstable to Luton branch railway line is still there. Turning this disused line into a modern rail/tram line would be far more successful and provide a much greater impact on reducing congestion than a bus route. There is a real opportunity here especially if some national lottery or 'green' funding can be found. It would connect the centres of Dunstable and Luton directly, providing a real alternative to the car, which, as your report suggests, is one of the main routes of congestion. Saying that car use is not sustainable, ignores the reality that car use is certain to increase if 25,000 new homes are added to the area. A tram line would create a separate new route, unaffected by road congestion and road works, providing a more desirable alternative to the bus (in terms of reliability and status). Having a tram would be a big kudos/sense of pride and development for Luton. A tram would also fit very well in with the whole future vision of Luton as a 'Green Growth Area'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2808	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.5	No
<p>Comment: The M1 has been widened to the South of Luton, providing greater capacity to carry vehicles: however, the links from the Southwest to join the M1 are being ignored/pushed back further into the future. This renders the East of Leighton Buzzard poorly connected to that transport artery. It cannot be 'sound' policy therefore to hope that employment will come, if the transport infrastructure isn't there!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.</p>				
1842	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 2.5	No
<p>Comment: Needs to mention providing sustainable transport options, cycle routes, etc. to improve east-west links. (Agreed late with prior permission from JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Reference to sustainable transport is made in paragraph 2.6 and the Core Strategy Preferred Cycling and Walking Network (Figure 2) shows cycle routes and footpaths. The section on 'Maximising the Opportunities for Sustainable Travel' in Chapter 5 contains more detail regarding sustainable transport, including east-west links. Provision for the level and type of transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2462	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Para. 2.5	No
<p>Comment: Para 2.5 recognises congestion on the A505, how will more houses and cars resolve this? The assumption that public transport options will be good enough to inhibit the use of cars is unrealistic. <input type="checkbox"/> Your proposals will include building a road around or under the airport - have you adequately consulted the airport authorities? Do you have confidence in the initial costs of a tunnel, there is concern that they are inaccurate and it will be prohibitively expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling and consultation with all key stakeholders including airport authorities.</p>				
3788	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 2.5	Yes
<p>Comment: Hitchin suffers gridlock during the rush hour and the single track lanes around Cockernhoe and Lilley Bottom are unable to accommodate the current levels of traffic safely. A development of 5,500 houses in this area would have a correspondingly large increase in traffic which would only exacerbate these appalling congestion problems.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling. Further work will be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
3798	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 2.5	Yes
<p>Comment: Hitchin suffers gridlock during the rush hour and the single track lanes around Cockernhoe and Lilley Bottom are unable to accommodate the current levels of traffic safely. A development of 5,500 houses in this area would have a correspondingly large increase in traffic which would only exacerbate these appalling congestion problems.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3716	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Para. 2.5	No
Comment: You stop short of referring to the traffic gridlock in Hitchin and fail to address the impact of a huge increase in traffic as a result of east of Luton proposals.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.				
JC Reason for Response: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.				
763	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 2.5	Yes
Comment: Completely agreed about the need to improve east-west links; but building new roads is not the answer, especially the ruinous bypass to the north of the town. How about a proper joined-up public transport infrastructure instead?				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling.				
970	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.5	No
Comment: The M1 has been widened so has more capacity to carry vehicles - but the links from the Southwest to join the M1 are being ignored/pushed back further into the future. This means the East of Leighton is not easily connected to that transport route. It cannot be 'sound' therefore to hope that employment will come, if the transport infrastructure isn't there!				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling and employment land study.				
564	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.5	Yes
Comment: There is no access to Milton Keynes by rail. Improving public transport east-west will not improve the congestion within Luton. The northern bypass above Dunstable will have the greatest effect.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling. Further work will be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.				
2	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 2.6	No
Comment: This will not happen as rural communities rely mainly on cars to travel. The east of Luton proposal will add to the already precarious driving and traffic conditions along Lilley Bottom and to and from the A1/M1				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling.				
2237	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.6	No
Comment: Cycling and walking not helpful to mothers with shopping. Public transport not helpful to mothers with pushchairs due to limited space on buses for them and space being taken up with wheelchairs				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: This issue should be addressed by the Sustainable Communities Strategy				
866	Mrs Chris Chapman	Luton	Para. 2.6	Yes
Comment: The reason most people use their cars is that public transport is non-existent and does not go where people want to go.....				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS3 seeks to improve public transport and people's access to it through delivering strategic public transport improvements.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
524	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 2.6	Yes
<p>Comment: I agree. In most "connected cities" the interurban transport network must be on rail, because buses are nowhere near fast enough. At the moment you have three stations - Luton Airport Parkway, Luton, and Leagrave. In Greater Luton the way I imagine it, there are several more local stations, the trains are frequent and it's easy to get to Luton town centre from any station in less than 15 minutes. Houghton Regis still lacks a station, but it's fairly close to Dunstable North station. With all these stations, and all new residential development taking place within walking distance of a station, fewer people than at present depend on buses for their public transport - many more have a choice of mode.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1232	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: Mass housing will obviously make matters much worse and should be rejected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling. Policy CS3 seeks to improve public transport and people's access to it through delivering strategic public transport improvements.</p>				
2809	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: So it makes real sense to build ALL these houses close to where the jobs ARE - not build houses and hope the jobs will become available. With all the new housing in Leighton-Linslade in recent years there have been no 'recent' large scale employment opportunities for the new residents! Indeed the large employers have all left the area. Where are all the new jobs going to come from? The occupants of the new development will either live on benefit or commute out of the area (to London by train, or Milton Keynes/Luton by car). Hardly a viable (or sustainable) strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area. Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
112	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: Recent experience in the Leighton Buzzard area suggests that little influence can be brought to bear on public transport companies to improve public transport - e.g. the re-routing of the X15 bus away from Leighton Buzzard and Heath and Reach so that direct routes to Milton Keynes and Aylesbury are unavailable and the rail links to London are already at capacity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3831	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 2.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the recognition of the importance of public transport, walking and cycling as the solution to congestion and poor air quality in some areas but Not Agree that public transport cannot provide an attractive alternative to car use because of the constrained road network.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1502	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Reason for lack of public transport is due to: - to lack of information about public transport and - lack of funding for buses - lack of night time public transport. Traffic calming in Leighton Buzzard and the Cycling town are excellent positive steps forward.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1344	Mrs Gloria Twells	LUTON	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: Instead of suggesting building more roads, there should be a better public transport system, to encourage people to leave their cars at home.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS3 seeks to improve public transport and people's access to it through delivering strategic public transport improvements.</p>				
239	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: So it makes real sense to build ALL these houses close to where the jobs ARE - not build houses and hope the jobs will become available. With all the new housing in Leighton-Linslade in recent months/years there are no 'recent' large scale employment opportunities for the new residents! Where are all the new jobs going to come from? Answer: they won't and the occupants of these new developments will either live on the dole or commute out of the area (to London by train, or Milton Keynes/Luton by car). Hardly a viable (or sustainable) strategy!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area E</p>				
79	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: Make up your minds. In 2.5 you say there is a need to improve East-West traffic routes, and now you say you want encourage people not to use their cars. Also, as I commute daily to Slough from L.Buzzard, how do you suggest I make that journey without a car ?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Improving east west traffic routes will reduce the number of cars needing to travel though town centres and enable cars to travel at more consistent speeds which is more sustainable in terms of carbon emissions. Policy CS3 which seeks to improve public transport and people's access to it through delivering strategic public transport improvements.</p>				
565	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.6	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton is not on the proposed guided busway. Its location will encourage local commuting for shops and for employment</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Key Diagram shows the proposed extension to the Luton-Dunstable bus way which will include the East of Luton extension should the development be progressed.</p>				
2238	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.7	No
<p>Comment: A challenge implies something is actually impossible. The document makes no attempt to address this challenge leaving an observer to guess at what might be envisaged</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy acknowledges that it is a challenge providing for the growth of the principal towns and villages, whilst protecting their individual character as well as the areas of high landscape quality. Working closely with key stakeholders will ensure that these challenges are addressed with the help of expert advice and guidance.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
215	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.7	No
Comment: How will the water supply support so many additional houses in Hertfordshire?				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including a Water Cycle Strategy, which included North Hertfordshire. The Water Cycle Study will be confirming whether or not there will be adequate facility in this area.				
795	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.7	No
Comment: Supplying renewable energy to the proposed development is not here described and one gets the impression that the weasel words "significant challenge," also applied to safeguarding unique village communities, actually means 'impossible'.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure. Policy CS12 seeks to ensure that all new developments contribute and comply with national and regional targets for resource efficiency.				
1844	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 2.7	No
Comment: This section is very weak. Provide examples where Luton is working on climate change adaptation and mitigation. Distinguish between adaptation (e.g. climate resilient construction) and mitigation (e.g. reducing construction and operation carbon costs) and provide more information on both. Educate the public on low-carbon living, provision of open space networks, SUDs, water efficiency and sustainable construction at this stage, as well as later in the document. Recognise methods of mitigation that improve environmental quality and migratory corridors. State that several locations are already at significant risk of flooding and that projected impacts of climate change will increase the risk and breadth of flooding. (Agreed late with prior permission from JTU)				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Chapter 10, Adapting to and Mitigating Climate Change, provides more detailed discussion and policies on these issues (CS12 - Resource Efficiency, CS13 - Mitigating Flood Risk). Technical studies will provide targets for reducing carbon etc and a Development Management DPD, an Urban Design SPD and a Water Management SPD will address issues of guidance and implementation of policies.				
1175	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 2.7	No
Comment: LBC - National Indicator 188 (climate change) - currently poor performance. Document only encouraged use of renewable energy - tackling climate change broader issue therefore section needs expanding to include: sustainable design and construction, biodiversity, floodplains.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure appropriate strategic coverage of these matters is included in the Core Strategy.				
JC Reason for Response: LDF should be read as a whole. The Core Strategy is a strategic document which covers these elements as part of the overall strategy, but cannot address issues in detail. LDDs will build on issues at a detailed level. The objectives of the LDF including the CS will be monitored through the Annual Monitoring Report using National and Regional Indicators.				
284	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Para. 2.7	No
Comment: I see paragraphs like this in other planning documents. The energy consumption in the UK is 125 kW hours per person per day. How do you intend to meet even one quarter of this with renewables? It is best done at a national level with something called nuclear power...				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee will work with stakeholders to consider whether it is suitable, viable and achievable to develop joint targets and measures which exceed national and regional targets.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
80	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.7	No
<p>Comment: The impact of the U.K. on climate change is minimal as it stands. All of us, including the Government need to address the impact of traditional 3rd world / developing nations on climate change e.g. India, China.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
6	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 2.8	No
<p>Comment: Do you think a bypass will achieve this? No. It will create a central vacuum and open up scarce Luton jobs to other communities. People need jobs at present not new houses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling and employment land study. Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
1800	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Para. 2.8	No
<p>Comment: The fact that Luton is severely constrained by the Chilterns AONB to the east and north should be recognised, particularly in paragraph 2.8.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy "should focus on relentlessly on the critical issues" according to the Planning Inspectorate's Report, September 2009. The Chilterns AONB is well documented and referenced throughout the CS. It is referred to in the first paragraph (2.1) of the Spatial Portrait and is shown on the Key Diagram (Figure 1) where its nature as a constraint is clear.</p>				
535	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 2.8	No
<p>Comment: Building east of Luton will reduce the value of the phrase "good access to surrounding countryside".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies CS14 and 15 seek to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside as well as maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure including existing green space and infrastructure.</p>				
67	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Para. 2.8	No
<p>Comment: If these plans go ahead the issue of responding to climate change will be pie in the sky. More traffic, more sprawl less green belt and less attractive landscape for people to walk, cycle and generally reduce stress levels.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies CS14 and 15 seek to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside as well as maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure including existing green space and infrastructure.</p>				
1380	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 2.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: 2.8 Support/Object/Comment: Support Comments: We support the need to raise the profile, image and appeal of Luton. Our client's land at M1, Junction 10A is located at an important gateway to Luton for those entering the town from the south. It also represents a key gateway to Luton Airport. We consider that development of this site creates a prime opportunity for Luton to deliver a high quality gateway including iconic architectural design. The development could itself raise the profile of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. It does not include development around Junction 10A of the M1</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1786	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 2.8	No
<p>Comment: Proposals will ultimately deprive East of Luton The Core Strategy states at 2.8 "Raising the profile, image and appeal of Luton to maximise its potential through delivering regeneration and renewal to its central and deprived areas is important", and S.A.D. agree. The most deprived areas in Luton are (in order of deprivation according to the East of England Development Agency) Dallow, Biscot, Northwell, Saints, Lewsey, Farley and High Town. These Luton wards are predominately to the North and West of the conurbation. None are near the East of Luton preferred urban extension. How can the Core Strategy statement possibly be fulfilled in any way in relation to the East of Luton? It is a total contradiction and S.A.D. believes your intended Core Strategy will in fact deliver deprivation rather than regeneration if the East of Luton proposals are realised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence and further work is to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Policy CS11 addresses the issues of regenerating and renewing Luton. Implementation of the Luton Development Framework and the preparation, adoption and implementation of the Town Centre Master plan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Luton will also address these issues in a practical way through redevelopment proposals such as Power Court.</p>				
764	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 2.8	Yes
<p>Comment: "Some parts of the central area are in need of renewal, regeneration and increased investment." This is the understatement of the century! We have a demolition site for a bus station, Power Court lies derelict and the area in between is highly polluted. Other areas of the town centre are a shabby disgrace. Let's have some investment here please!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS11 seeks to facilitate the regeneration of Luton, with emphasis on the redevelopment of large sites such as Power Court and implementation of the Luton Development Framework and the preparation, adoption and implementation of the Town Centre Master plan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Luton.</p>				
566	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.8	No
<p>Comment: One of the highlights is that some urban areas have access to countryside - this strategy will take that option away for Stopsley and Wigmore</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies CS14 and 15 seek to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside as well as maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure including existing green space and infrastructure.</p>				
337	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Para. 2.9	No
<p>Comment: Again, you only reference the Bedfordshire towns and yet one of the options will impact Hitchin much more... and surrounding villages like Offley with the extra traffic and noise pollution from traffic. Why is the impact on these places not considered as part of the proposal?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
568	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.9	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree that the congestion is bad. The bypass and other measures will benefit the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1811	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Para. 2.10	No
<p>Comment: Gives a false impression that HR is fine. It has severe levels of deprivation, overwhelming need for investment and very limited/ restricted local services. The third sentence should read, 'These now experience severe/ multiple deprivation'. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Include change in pre submission document</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Pre submission CS to include multiple deprivation in Houghton Regis housing estates.</p>				
3558	Mr Barry Brownsell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
3588	M J Carr	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Due to the recent expansion of Leighton Linslade no further large scale housing developments can be sustained.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
1238	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: A lot of industry and other businesses have been lost in Leighton Linslade with no hint of being replaced. further housing cannot help employment in this area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
2810	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: The Town can't handle its current development - let alone add huge slice of extra residential bodies! The Town Centre is no longer "thriving" with small shopkeepers being 'priced out of business' - and that includes the Estate Agents! Nor is there sufficient space to increase the retail capacity within the Town Centre - which only serves to split the town centre further.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including employment land study. Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
3560	Mr Keith Fish	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
924	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Nothing said about congestion and regeneration of Leighton Buzzard town centre. Also no mention of lack of employment for increased population. Some area's of deprivation on Council owned/Housing Association estates exist.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Policy CS11 Improving Town Centres provides strategies for facilitating the regeneration and enhancement of all the major towns in the area to increase the variety of services and opportunities available for each one thereby creating "vibrant, dynamic, distinctive safe and popular town centres". Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
113	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: I submit that protecting this town is only possible by reducing to an absolute minimum any further expansion of housing. Please take into account the housing that is currently under way off Billington Road towards the by-pass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
3536	Jon Green	Eggington	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Due to the recent expansion of Leighton Linslade no further large scale housing developments can be sustained.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
2137	Ms Jayne Green	Eggington	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Due to the recent expansion of Leighton Linslade no further large scale housing developments can be sustained.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
3561	Linda Holbrook	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
3901	John Keys	Unknown	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: "Leighton Linslade has experienced high levels of recent housing development, particularly to the South East, with limited additional infrastructure provision". - This being the case (the Town's population has grown from 11,000 to 38,000 in recent years) no further large scale housing developments can be sustained and must not be built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3557	Leighton Buzzard Opposed to Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
105	Mr and Mrs Tony and Veronica Moran	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade suffers from congestion, poor facilities, poor transport links and does not get priority over Luton/Dunstable/Houghton Regis. Lack of local employment facilities to match the development in Leighton which will lead to commuting and more congestion. important that facilities are in place before more development.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including employment land study. Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
3488	Mrs G Nash	Eggington	Para. 2.11	Yes
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade's population has grown from 11,000 to 38,000 in recent years and further large-scale housing developments cannot be sustained and must not be built.</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
26	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Despite many promises and supposedly planning requirements development has taken place without the necessary improvements to infrastructure</p> <p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3554	Mr C Shane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
2742	Stephen Sheppard	Eggington	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: 'Leighton Linslade has experienced high levels of recent housing development, particularly to the South East, with limited additional infrastructure provisions' This being the case (the town's population has grown from 11,000 to 38,000 in recent years) no further large scale housing developments can be sustained and must not be built.</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1507	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade has an attractive town centre with a range of shops. However its continued success is in question. Many residents in the town do not shop locally and the range of shops is not as wide as it could be. Promotion is minimal with a very poor shopping guide so that most people are unaware of the shopping offer and there is no easy way to discover it. It is crucial that the core strategy acknowledges the weak health of the town centre so that a concerted effort will be made to ensure that it does not follow the decline of Dunstable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS11 Improving Town Centres provides strategies for facilitating the regeneration and enhancement of all the major towns in the area to increase the variety of services and opportunities available for each one thereby creating "vibrant, dynamic, distinctive safe and popular town centres".</p>				
3550	Mr David Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
2744	Sue Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: 'Leighton Linslade has experienced high levels of recent housing development, particularly to the South East, with limited additional infrastructure provisions' This being the case (the town's population has grown from 11,000 to 38,000 in recent years) no further large scale housing developments can be sustained and must not be built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
3562	Edward Syrett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: Quotes from the spatial portrait paragraph for Leighton Buzzard which indicates that limited infrastructure has been provided despite the housing growth in the town to demonstrate that further housing development can not be sustained</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including viability assessment.</p>				
2636	Mr Michael Turton	Linslade	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: There is no current local need for anything like these number of houses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered..</p>				
240	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: The town can't handle its current development - let alone add a huge slice of extra residential bodies!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
971	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: The town centre is no longer "thriving" as shop-keepers are now 'priced out of business' - and that includes the estate agents! Nor is there space to increase the retail capacity within the town: therefore only new capacity outside the town centre can be developed - which only serves to split the town centre further.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS11 Improving Town Centres provides strategies for facilitating the regeneration and enhancement of all the major towns in the area to increase the variety of services and opportunities available for each one thereby creating "vibrant, dynamic, distinctive safe and popular town centres".</p>				
81	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.11	No
<p>Comment: I was born in L.Buzzard, and have lived here for 52 years. Believe me when I say that saying it is still an attractive market town is looking through rose-tinted glasses. Due to appalling mis-management and planning, several past (and current) local governments have allowed this town to die, with focus and money going to Dunstable and Houghton Regis. Employment within the town was once vibrant, but being unable to compete with proximity of M.K., this has withered. The town is basically a huge commuter barracks, and the proposed developments will only make this worse.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS11 Improving Town Centres provides strategies for facilitating the regeneration and enhancement of all the major towns in the area to increase the variety of services and opportunities available for each one thereby creating "vibrant, dynamic, distinctive safe and popular town centres". The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area.</p>				
517	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: I have seen little evidence of the exclusion in villages suggested here. Perhaps the authors might point to a time when first time buyers could buy, in significant numbers, housing in villages. This appears to be a unsubstantiated growth justification.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified a need for development in residual area.</p>				
1042	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 2.12	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 2.12 Support/Object/Comment: Whilst accepting that many of the villages within the District will accommodate limited growth in comparison the larger urban extensions to the conurbation, in order to ensure housing delivery, the Council should be committed to delivering sensitive development in the rural areas. In fact, the East of England Plan allocates an additional 1,000 dwellings to be accommodated outside of the MKSM Growth Area, within the remainder of South Bedfordshire for the period 2001 to 2021. Early delivery of dwellings in such locations is considered to be particularly relevant given likely delays in delivery of larger residential extensions due to the strategic infrastructure requirements, and likely delays in delivery of urban brownfield sites whilst existing market conditions may slow down delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified a need for development in residual area. A Site Allocations DPD will be produced to identify development opportunities in the residual area.</p>				
2250	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: Villages are least likely to suffer social exclusion. My village has good social facilities and a free taxi scheme for the vulnerable to access services and supplies.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
525	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: Not much can be done about public transport in most of the villages; they will always be car-dependent. But there are some villages within walking distance of a railway. They often have no station at present, but if new villages are created nearby to form a cluster, it can have a station and a bus route, giving the whole cluster good public transport and a choice of mode. These clusters are where new village housing should be built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified need for development in the residual area. The Site Allocations DPD will review development opportunities around the villages to meet residual housing need.</p>				
211	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: Do you understand what constitutes the term 'village?' It would appear not. Of course there is 'limited growth' and a 'reliance on towns for leisure and retail services', if this were not the case, they would not be a village. If an area of dwellings is large enough to support these elements, it is generally known as a 'town'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1240	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: Further mass housing will infill between villages and towns, which is undesirable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy acknowledges that it is a challenge providing for the growth of the principal towns and villages, whilst protecting their individual character.</p>				
2811	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: The "east of Leighton-Linslade" shows little (if any) scope for relieving the "suitable" housing growth for the local villages - many of whom would be prepared to take a small amount of appropriate development, which might also help their sustainability. But throwing a huge development alongside a village environment will only succeed in throttling the village!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified a need for development in residual area. A Site Allocations DPD will be produced to identify development opportunities in the residual area.</p>				
376	Mr Stuart Harries	Luton	Para. 2.12	Yes
<p>Comment: Improving links to villages may be beneficial to both those who live in the villages themselves and those in the surrounding communities. Amalgamating villages into one anonymous conurbation is not.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Villages will not be amalgamated. The Core Strategy seeks to retain the character and individuality of villages.</p>				
377	Mr Stuart Harries	Luton	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: There is a substantial difference between improving links to villages and destroying them by amalgamation into an anonymous conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Villages will not be amalgamated. The Core Strategy seeks to retain the character and individuality of villages.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
508	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: A village is a small group of dwellings in a rural area where people have chosen to live. Villagers themselves don't expect to be dependant on public transport. First time buyers do not usually choose a village as their preferred place to live.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Travel by car is likely to remain a significant means of travel during the forthcoming plan period.</p>				
285	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: Isn't it the nature of a modern village to be partly reliant on the nearest town? What is wrong with that? If it wasn't reliant, it would be called a town... I agree that villages would benefit from expansion if it meant a better bus service for the elderly. This argument against the private car flies against what people want. Cars are cheap, convenient and useful. Try carrying an 8 x 4 board on a bus! Cars are becoming more efficient and with the advent of electric/fuel cell cars there is the possibility of reducing reliance on unstable regimes for oil.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Revise Spatial Portrait</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy does not seek to make villages self sufficient.</p>				
438	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: Transport links do not merit investment for the relatively few village dwellers and, instead, villages should be allowed to wane.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All parts of the community will benefit in some way from the developments through provision of housing, new facilities and improved public transport.</p>				
973	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 2.12	No
<p>Comment: The "east of Leighton-Linslade" shows little (if any!) scope for relieving the "suitable" housing growth for the local villages - most of whom would be prepared to take a small amount of appropriate development, which might also help their sustainability. But throwing a huge development alongside a village environment will only succeed in throttling the village!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified a need for development in residual area. The Core Strategy seeks to protecting the individual character of villages. A Site Allocations DPD will be produced to identify development opportunities in the residual area.</p>				
570	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 2.12	Yes
<p>Comment: It is important to improve links to the surrounding towns and to make housing more affordable, but it's also important to preserve them, not totally absorb them into an urban extension</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy acknowledges that it is a challenge providing for the growth of the principal towns and villages, whilst protecting their individual character as well as the areas of high landscape quality.</p>				
7	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 2.13	No
<p>Comment: Villages have limited services because that is what rural life means. if amenities come at the expense of countryside then no. Also, over 18 developments have taken place in recent memory East of Luton- what is wrong with the West!!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including a Site Assessment Matrix.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
796	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 2.13	No
<p>Comment: In England village communities are characterised by their social inclusion-not as claimed here. We have innumerable clubs and societies for all ages and interests. Families and children are catered for and the disabled and elderly cared for. In my village we operate a car service for those that need to visit hospital etc and also a meals service in the local pub. Despite the effects of legislation that make it difficult for country pubs to survive, the post office to operate and the restriction in bus services, we survive because we are a proper organic community, not an urban sprawl.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
68	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Para. 2.13	No
<p>Comment: Villages in the proposed Luton east extension will be completely subsumed and lose all identity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area. These matters will be considered in this context.</p>				
1347	Mrs Pauline Wilson	Harpenden	Para. 2.13	No
<p>Comment: No mention of HERTFORDSHIRE</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Hertfordshire is mentioned in the Core Strategy</p>				
1730	Bloor Homes	Derbyshire	Vision and Objectives 3	Yes
<p>Comment: We are generally supportive of the Vision and Objectives set out in the consultation document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1586	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Vision and Objectives 3	Yes
<p>Comment: We commend the Vision as stated, but have very deep concerns that it can ever be realised given the overwhelming scale of housing and population growth proposed for an area whose infrastructure and countryside is already under stress. The further proposed expansion proposed for Leighton Buzzard, on top of committed Local Plan growth is hardly compatible with the vision. The southern and eastern urban extensions will produce a situation wholly at odds with the principles of sustainable development. We applaud the reference at SO6 to 'distinctive' town centres, but this receives no clear support in Chapter 9. SO7 talks of offering 'the highest level of protection' for the natural environment but this isn't compatible with the scale of growth envisaged. Proposals that are highly damaging to the environment are being proposed, notably a dual carriageway bypass through the Chilterns AONB north-east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives. SO6 The JC supports the preparation and adoptions of master plans and site specific development briefs as SPDs. These will help to inform the location and nature of new developments and identify a series of other measures needed to achieve the objective of creating distinctive and popular town centres. SO7 The JC will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the SBLA 2007 and ESA 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside is preserved and enhanced.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3454	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Vision and Objectives 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Support identification of a preferred direction of growth to the East of Luton and has provided evidence for a 3,500 unit scheme. Support Joint Committee's Vision for Luton and South Bedfordshire. Acknowledge that new communities will be connected by an integrated public transport system and will have access to local jobs, services, leisure and green infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivering growth to the East of Luton is considered to be a sustainable objective</p>				
3019	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Vision and Objectives 3	No
<p>Comment: Delete the principle "Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District"</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3.</p>				
1132	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 3.2	no
<p>Comment: The last paragraph of the Vision reads: The area will also be a place that is recognised for its attractive surrounding rural villages, whose identities have been safeguarded where practical , as well as its protected and enhanced natural environment, notably the Chilterns. The addition of the words "where practical" undermines the principle of safeguarding the identity and character of the rural villages. Even where villages take some development, it should be of a form and design which always retains their individual identity and character. The words "where practical" should be deleted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By avoiding the development of urban extensions in the AONB and limiting development in other sensitive areas of landscape, the impact of development on valuable landscape areas has been minimised. However, impact will occur. Therefore, the joint Committee will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the SBLA 2007 and the ESA 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside are preserved and enhanced.</p>				
8	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley	Para. 3.2	No
<p>Comment: Is this a vision or a dream? Housing and a bypass situated on greenbelt do not develop communities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By integrating the provision of new development including , homes, employment and social/community infrastructure uses with high quality public transport, which will help to shape both new development and future travel patterns in a highly sustainable way. Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which planning system can contribute to sustainable communities generally.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
714	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 3.2	No
<p>Comment: Abandon the eastern by-pass and replace it with the proposed rail link to Stevenage, to encourage travellers from the east to reach the airport area by public transport instead of by car. Unlike the new station, the new rail link can be "aspirational" at this stage. Keep the northern by-pass to carry the A505 traffic, allow it to join/leave the motorway at the new junction and relieve the town centres, but take it along the edge of the AONB. Keep parts of the northern extensions and include more land to the north if need be, but limit residential and high trip-generating uses to within walking distance of the station. Abandon the eastern urban extension or limit it to the area close to the airport. Put the development that cannot go in the urban extensions in satellites on the railway north and/or south of Luton, for example at Westoning (with a new station), Harlington and/or New Mill End. There should be enough room in these satellites for all the new dwellings, especially if one of them can be a new town.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
172	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 3.2	yes
<p>Comment: If development is to take place in the 'preferred' areas to the East of the town, a further 'spoke' in the 'green wheel' should be considered along Miletree Road. This would assist in preserving the historical context and attraction of the Light Railway, which is currently suffering from a form of planning blight.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. MKSMSRS requires a Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it</p>				
536	Mr Chris Howe	Luton	Para. 3.2	No
<p>Comment: The thought that a densely populated and built upon urban area can be transformed into a "Green" growth area is wild dreaming and not realistic. This vision has been designed by Jargonauts ... "Rejuvenated communities" ... why will yet another attempt to improve the image of Luton necessitate development on beautiful countryside to the east? If the surrounding countryside is to be built over then the vision of "access to a web of well managed green infrastructure as well as the surrounding countryside" is clouded.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review .Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3.</p>				
192	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 3.2	No
<p>Comment: It is laughable to describe Luton as a shopping centre of choice. The borough council's appalling traffic schemes have made it awful to get into, unpleasant and costly to park (if you can find anywhere, and worse to get home. The Mall Arndale is dying with more and more empty units. Increasingly, Luton residents choose to shop elsewhere. At peak times, it is quicker and cheaper to go to Milton Keynes instead. Luton is also a nightmare to pass through from anywhere to anywhere else. Mass improvements to roads are needed BEFORE any "growth". Luton also has poor public transport which will scarcely be improved by spending 80 million on a guided busway that no-one except the Borough Council wants. Extend the Thameslink railway to Dunstable for half the price.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: The CS will require that the impact of all new development proposals on the town centre is fully considered.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The evidence shows us that the current retail hierarchy remains the most appropriate one, with Luton town centre the principal and sub regional centre within the main conurbation. The transport Appraisal predicts that public transport usage will increase as a result of both investment in the Luton-Dunstable Bus way and traditional bus routes that will serve the preferred strategic mixed use urban extensions. The importance of delivering large regeneration sites, improving pedestrian movement within the town centre, particularly between the central station, the main shopping area, Power Court and adjoining areas, is identified in chapter 9 of Core Strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
27	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 3.2	No
Comment: The vision indicated here is laudable but is not new and has not been adhered too in the past				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The vision aims to contribute to the delivery of sustainable communities				
3305	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society	Wimborne	Para. 3.2	No
Comment: The vision does not match the requirement that major growth is employment rather than housing led. This is recognised in objective SO3 and for balance needs to be stressed in your vision.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Both, employment and housing constitutes the main requirement for the area. The Vision does address employment within its strategic Objectives.				
1194	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 3.2	Yes
Comment: The vision mentions "...access to a web of well managed green infrastructure as well as the surrounding countryside". Although we welcome reference to GI as part of the vision, we prefer the term "network" rather than "web", and it should be noted that 'green infrastructure' includes the surrounding countryside, and is not distinct from it. Specific reference to the Leighton Linlade Green Wheel and a "much greener environment" for Dunstable is most welcome at this stage, however we would also wish to see reference to improved environmental resources in and around the whole of the main conurbation. There should be stronger reference to reducing carbon emissions as part of the 'Green Growth Area' ethos.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure the Core Strategy uses well known terms when referring to Green Infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will refer to Green Infrastructure using well known terms.				
571	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 3.2	No
Comment: It is bizarre that there has been no collaboration with the LSP for North Herts, when part of the preferred urban extension is in their area				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: North Herts. Council is a permanent member of the Committee, and consequently has been informed about every decision to be made.				
516	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 1	No
Comment: No, for the following reasons: 1. The plans do not accord with the aspiration in SO1. On a "sustainability" basis, development in existing brownfield sites is a more appropriate way forward. In particular, the ex-Vauxhall and IBC sites appear to be a better location for immediate large scale development 2. The aspiration in SO7 appears to be entirely broken by this proposed development: I note that Hertfordshire with its building plans has not contemplated putting additional housing in this location. 3. I struggle to see how large scale suburban housing development will enable SO8 to be met.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review.				
1126	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 1	No
Comment: The addition of the words "where practical" undermines the principle of safeguarding the identity and character of the rural villages. Even where villages take some development, it should be of a form and design which always retains their individual identity and character. The words "where practical" should be deleted.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1683	Bedfordshire Police Authority		Q. 1	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text though is in agreement with the strategy.				
9	Mr Kamal Bengougam		Q. 1	No
Comment: because it is done at the expense of the environment and has been ill conceived from the beginning. To make a decision to build based on a bypass is not wise and for people to vote on a big project with limited evidence is stupid. How did the other options measure up and where are the documents. What impact will it have on local taxes and who will foot the bill. Why are there no developments West of Luton since it is their vision- why dump it in North Herts.				
JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work.				
1043	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)		Q. 1	Yes
Comment: Support spatial vision				
JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text though is in agreement with the strategy.				
2253	David Bowles		Q. 1	No
Comment: Clearly where it becomes 'impractical', villages identities will not be safeguarded. We are not told the conditions under which village identities will not be safeguarded. What are the proposals to enhance the natural environment? Enhancement, by definition renders the environment unnatural.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: By avoiding the development of urban extensions in the AONB and limiting development in other sensitive areas of landscape, the impact of development on valuable landscape areas has been minimised. However, impact will occur. Therefore, the Plan will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the SBLA 2007 and the ESA 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside are preserved and enhanced.				
2170	Breachwood Green Society		Q. 1	No
Comment: Vision of a "Green Growth Area" stops at County boundary whilst advocating destruction of high quality landscape beyond.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will establish a defensible revised Green Belt boundaries. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial Strategy and its review. SO7 To deliver growth which offers the highest levels of protection for and access to the natural environment				
2663	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils		Q. 1	Yes
Comment: Creating identifiable but connected separate communities is a sensible approach but the location and scale of new development needs to be directed to creating substantial and sustainable settlements within the network of 'interconnected communities'. Such a scheme must focus on the existing primary locations, especially the Luton-Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: SO1 To use Growth to help deliver sustainable and integrated communities				
JC Reason for Response: The principal conurbation of Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis will have a strong identity based on a number of interconnected communities. All this will be supported by an enhanced and reinvigorated economy benefiting from reduced congestion and improved accessibility.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3340	Cemex UK Prop. & Trenport Inv. Ltd	Not given	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The vision for Dunstable in the proposed submission version of the Core Strategy should encompass the town as a whole and should highlight the potential arising from a North West Dunstable urban extension for integrating currently disjointed neighbourhoods in this sector of the town and for integrating the town as a whole with its westerly countryside setting through quality green infrastructure on a strategic scale.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
Proposed Action: SO1 States that Growth will be used to help deliver sustainable and integrated communities.				
JC Reason for Response:	One of the three preferred urban extensions within Central Bedfordshire lie to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis.			
2002	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Incorporate specific references to healthy lifestyles and social infrastructure. For example, the last sentence of the first paragraph could be re-written as, 'The new and rejuvenated communities will be connected by an integrated public transport system and will have access to local jobs, services, leisure and cultural facilities, and social activities, as well as a web of well managed green infrastructure and the surrounding countryside, providing healthy lifestyles for all.'</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response:	Chapter 8 Building Communities states that the delivery of Social infrastructure in step with housing development is a key priority for all three LDPs and Government who see the Core Strategy as the means of "orchestrating the necessary social and physical infrastructure needs for sustainable communities."			
Preferred Option CS10- Providing Social and Community Infrastructure.				
1939	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Incorporate specific references to healthy lifestyles and social infrastructure. For example, the last sentence of the first paragraph could be re-written as, 'The new and rejuvenated communities will be connected by an integrated public transport system and will have access to local jobs, services, leisure and cultural facilities, and social activities, as well as a web of well managed green infrastructure and the surrounding countryside, providing healthy lifestyles for all.'</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response:	Chapter 8 Building Communities states that the delivery of Social infrastructure in step with housing development is a key priority for all three LDPs and Government who see the Core Strategy as the means of "orchestrating the necessary social and physical infrastructure needs for sustainable communities."			
See Preferred Option CS10- Providing Social and Community Infrastructure.				
867	Mrs Chris Chapman	Luton	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: I agree that this is what is required but not at the expensive of green belt land. there are a number of brown sites which should be used first.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review			
1801	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Though the Board generally has no objection to the proposed vision it objects to the emphasis on new road buildings as a means of easing congestion and improving the environment for pedestrians. An environment that is safer for pedestrians (not just in Dunstable but the whole conurbation) should be brought about by changes in public transport provision, a package of sustainable transport measures, change in priorities away from the car and towards pedestrian and cyclists rather than the provision of bypasses as referred to in the third para of the vision (page 9). The final paragraph of the vision should refer to the natural environment being 'conserved and enhanced' in order to comply with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7</p>				
JC Response:	Partially Agree			
<p>Proposed Action: To identify the potential to meet this demand and to improve the overall appeal of the town, a master plan is being prepared which will seek to examine ways to improve the public realm as well as the movement and access to and from the town centre.</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	In Dunstable town centre, the evidence shows that in recent years there has been an increase in vacant floor space and a reduction in pedestrian flows which is largely attributable to the level of congestion along the A5.			



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
526	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Q. 1	yes
<p>Comment: I support most of the spatial vision, but (a) I see not one but two "connected cities" - Greater Luton and Leighton-Linslade, each with its own character and its own hub city. (b) I haven't looked yet at your proposed transport infrastructure but it looks too road-based. Of course you'll need new roads, but you need new railways (and stations) even more, because the roads will never provide satisfactory interurban public transport.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Transport Appraisal predicts that public transport usage will increase as a result of both investment in the Luton -Dunstable Bus way and traditional bus routes that will serve the preferred strategic mixed-use urban extensions. The West Coast Main line has recently been upgraded . Network Rail's Thameslink 2000 programme will deliver upgrades on the Midland Mainline too; specifically longer platforms at key stations to improve station capacity and to enable longer, 12 car trains, to be progressively introduced between 2009 and 2014.</p>				
3742	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: It is wrong that a vision concerning Luton and South Bedfordshire should include major proposals for North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
3342	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: It ties well with the need to create sustainable mixed use urban extensions to deliver sizeable new growth in the area in association with planned Green Infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice</p>				
213	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Because it is not a vision for Bedfordshire but is taking Hertfordshire land when it is completely unnecessary. This is the worst kind of stealth development, couching your terms in as misleading a way as possible. Selling the fact that it is about Bedfordshire and the main county to suffer is Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
271	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Although I feel more emphasis needs to be given to car drivers. People living in Luton and environs use their cars and want to use their cars. Reducing the amount of roads they can use through bus lanes etc will have the affect of more congestion. Clearing bottlenecks through new road junctions (around/under the railway line and M1) and bypasses to divert traffic that does not need to pass through the town is good planning. Controlling speed of traffic should increase traffic flow and increase safety (unfortunately I think enforcement is needed to achieve this).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Transport Appraisal predicts that public transport usage will increase as a result of both investment in the Luton-Dunstable-Bus way and traditional bus routes that will serve the preferred strategic mixed use urban extensions.</p>				
1511	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The physical consequences of the 'spatial vision' have not confined themselves to the geographical scope of Bedfordshire. As such, it is flawed. This is an attempted land grab by Luton &amp; South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial strategy and its review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3255	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: PNNH are broadly in agreement with the Spatial Vision but it is the view of PNNH that the Core Strategy as a whole does not entirely accord with the vision of a "Green Growth Area" and that the evidence base contradicts these proposals. Vision should refer to Leighton Linlade not Leighton Buzzard to be consistent with Para 2.11.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: We acknowledge the lack of consistency in our denomination for Leighton Linlade on one hand and Leighton Buzzard on the other hand and we will amend it accordingly.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives. Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF.</p>				
1245	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The 'vision' is all words with no substance behind it. It requires money and entrepreneurs, sadly lacking in the British Isles nowadays.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF.</p>				
1581	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Importantly, your vision also recognises that the economy forms an integral part of any sustainable place and the ambitions in this respect are therefore positive and are well reflected through the remainder of the document. The Spatial Economy Goal of the RES recognises the importance of the cultural diversity of the sub region and it is good to see this being recognised as a strength in your core strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is considered that the jobs figure contained within the East of England Plan represents an ambitious but realistic target for the area to seek to aim for. To achieve this, they identify the need for a supportive framework to be created to facilitate the creation of a range of new jobs within the local area for both existing and new communities.</p>				
1587	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				
1636	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with culture and leisure?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Generally conforms to RSS Policies C1 and C2. The Joint Committee will work closely with service providers, developers and stakeholders to identify appropriate sites for new and existing facilities for both, social and community services, encouraging their co-location where appropriate.</p>				
1662	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the achievement of a high quality built environment addressed?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In Luton identifies the importance of delivering large regeneration sites and improving pedestrian movement. Generally, the Joint Committee supports the preparation of master plans and site specific development briefs as SPD. These will help to inform the location and nature of new developments and identify a series of other measures needed to achieve the objective of creating vibrant, dynamic, distinctive, safe and popular town centres</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2111	Edlesborough Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The strategy is driven by the need to build more houses, as directed by Central Government, the major concern is that the vision, objectives and spatial development strategy are there to meet the housing target rather than the other way around. An example of this is the proposed road from the A505 to a new Junction 11a on the M1 - described as a "Committed Highways Scheme" but without commitments from the Highways Agency or air pollution identified by another government department, making this strategic element uncertain. Could the road and house building plans be suspended or put into disarray by a change in government next year?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: See SO2, SO3 and SO4. Employment, housing and infrastructure constitutes the main requirement for the area.</p>				
2778	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	yes
<p>Comment: We support a vision but disagree with the elements in as much as it should consider the global effect on the whole area. Houses need to be where there are existing jobs, not ones that may come along in the future. If there are no local jobs then new workers will have to travel out of the area. The strategy seems predicated on building houses where they can most 'satisfy the government' rather than the population or the environment and there's little chance of that whilst the transport links aren't in place. The West Coast railway line is almost at full capacity now: at peak times London Midland/ Railtrack claim it won't take many more trains. At issue is an attempt to put a relatively large number of houses into an area which already has insufficient jobs, with a poor/ inadequate transport infrastructure for those already working here. There's insufficient capacity to provide the volume of water for further large-scale development beyond what is already being built in the area around Leighton Linlshade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The vision has been formulated following extensive consultation with relevant stakeholders.</p>				
731	English Heritage	Cambridge	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: We are concerned to see that the Core Strategy Vision lacks any reference to the historic environment. This does not give it parity with the natural environment, which the final paragraph of the draft vision seeks to 'protect and enhance'. None of the paragraphs on specific places refer to their historic character and there is a danger that the historic environment is overlooked as an important element of the Growth Area. Our recommended amendment to the vision would be to refer to the "natural and historic environment" in the final paragraph.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: We agree with the lack of reference to the Natural and Historic Environment and we will amend the vision accordingly</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SO7 Refers to deliver growth which offers the highest level of protection for and access to the natural environment to enable greater enjoyment of this resource. However, it does not mention the " natural and historic environment"</p>				
1845	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: No environmental definition of sustainable communities. River Lea has not been mentioned. Naturalising the river will help connect people to the environment, encourage ownership of their town, adapt to climate change and enhance the environment. Add coverage of water services infrastructure planning, wise use of resources and the net reduction of water demand, carbon emissions and flood risk. Include a component of biodiversity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: We agree with the inclusion of a biodiversity component into the document so we will amend the vision accordingly.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The vision does not provide a definition of sustainable communities.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
925	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The Spatial Vision in the planning stage sounds wonderful. However, how the 'finished article' will end up is another thing. Leighton Buzzard's independent &amp; specialist stores are closing due to the recession, and LB is left with stores selling mainly 'cheap' commodities. Also, the vision of the 'Green Wheel' for the Clipstone Brook area may not exist if developers 'cut it in half' with their Eastern Distributor Road: and after water balancing etc has taken place, there will be little green space left for birds, animals and the public to enjoy. Leighton Linslade has already had enough development: we want to keep our green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The 2009 Retail Study identified that the ambience and attractiveness of Leighton Buzzard Town Centre make it suitable for the promotion of niche or speciality shopping and identified capacity for 11000 sq m of comparison floor space to be tested. This reflects the ambitions of the Town council in their " Big Plan" who also identified the potential for new cultural, leisure and community facilities. Initial work on a Master Plan for the town centre shows that there are potential sites within and on the edge of the town centre to provide these and help improve the vitality and sustainability of the town as a whole. These should be the focus for such development and be supported by improved linkages to and across the towns, including to and from the train station.</p>				
339	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Not when the impact has not been considered beyond the Beds borders which seems very narrow sighted in today's world. The people of Offley/Lilley/Hitchin are against these proposals as are Herts. Please prioritise the building within the Dunstable/Luton area where these objectives can be fully supported and the pros/cons considered from one perspective. Not the Luton/Hitchin area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
114	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: While I fully support the proposals which refer to Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, I do not support the proposals for Leighton Buzzard because the vision expressed sounds excellent, it is incapable of being delivered in this area if there is any further expansion of housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
173	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: While I have no issues with the Spatial Vision's coverage of the Luton &amp; Dunstable area, the plans for Leighton Buzzard/Linslade are clearly not sustainable. The employment &amp; other needs of the new residents are only dealt with superficially in the report; is clear to me that the town centre &amp; its surrounds will not be able to support the proposed expansion. Unless these issues are addressed the net result will be an increase in traffic to/from the Luton and Milton Keynes areas, and increased pressure on train services.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
837	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: It is not possible to both expand Leighton Buzzard and yet 'retain its compact market town feel'. These objectives cannot co-exist. Clipstone Brook already has houses built right up to its banks and designating it an important corridor suggests significant noise and nuisance to existing residents living close by. The main priority needs to be to reduce the flood risk to these properties, not to worry about making it a cut through to the town for any new developments.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
362	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard has reached its optimum size as a small town and cannot continue to be one if yet more urban extensions are added. Expansion will irreversibly damage this small town and change its character for the worse, seriously impacting those that live here.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Increasing the self containment of this conurbation, whilst safeguarding the character of the towns, is important if future growth is to be sustainable.</p>				
363	Mr Richard Halse		Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard needs to be excluded from the growth areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Leighton Buzzard is part of the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Growth Area</p>				
2706	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The strategy fails to put the emphasis on the AONB that it deserves, instead focussing on L&amp;SB as a so-called 'Green Growth Area'. Removal of through-traffic from Dunstable is dependent on the north Dunstable bypass linking the A505 at Thorn with the M1 at Chilton. Clarify how the abandonment of Greenbelt designation around Dunstable and LB can lead to a 'greener' community.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Vision states that; Dunstable will have a much greener environment which is safer for pedestrians since through traffic has been diverted onto the new strategic highway routes around the conurbation and the ongoing programme of regeneration will have created new gateways and high quality designed building and spaces. With regards to LB, the River Ouzel, Clipstone Brook and Grand Union Canal will be important corridors reaching right in to the centre of the town, providing spokes in a green wheel of attractive and publicly accessible open spaces.</p>				
378	Mr Stuart Harries	Luton	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The respondent objects to the Core Strategy and does not make any further comment</p>				
790	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: I do not support building on the green belt on the eastern side of Leighton Buzzard. I do not want to see house building along Vandyke Road as this will ruin the Narrow Gauge Railway. I think the proposed development in Leighton Buzzard would have a detrimental affect on the traffic , environment ,wildlife and flood control . I do not think enough consideration has been given to alternative sites for building in Leighton Buzzard and that there has been a lack of joined up thinking when it comes to the needs of the community regarding flood protection, commuting out of town by car and rail, and infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
3503	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The statement that the Green Growth area will be an area recognised for its attractive surrounding villages, whose identities will be safeguarded cannot be reconciled with the adverse affect of the proposed East of Luton development on Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: SO7 To deliver growth which offers the highest levels of protection for and access to the natural environment</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Local Development Framework offers a significant opportunity to help achieve the Green Growth Vision through policies that require new developments to meet higher levels of sustainable construction and resource efficiency, notably energy and water efficiency, management of waste and use of materials.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1735	Holmes Antill	Loughborough	Q. 1	Yes
Comment: We endorse the approach it takes to the prospect of a "Green Growth Area" and a "truly Sustainable Community". (Core Strategy Vision).				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities				
2551	Holwell Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 1	No
Comment: The proposed development to the east of Luton simply does not match your stated aims and hoped-for green credentials.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will establish a defensible revised Green Belt boundaries. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review.				
1812	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 1	No
Comment: Prioritise Houghton Regis as no other location in the area will see a doubling in size. Include delivery of new leisure facilities to attend to the current deficit in provision. The vision needs to be aspiring for HR. (Late submission, not duly made)				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: There is no justified reason for prioritising Houghton Regis over the other locations				
2953	Mr Chris Howe	Luton	Q. 1	No
Comment: The vision is full of the latest fashionable jargon and full of hope rather than substance. The proposal to develop east of Luton conflicts with the vision for a green growth area and desire for access to well managed green infrastructure and surrounding countryside. Luton's vision for rejuvenated communities should start by rejuvenation from the heart not the edge.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.??				
537	Mr Chris Howe	Luton	Q. 1	No
Comment: In case such a positive answer is used in statistics to support development east of Luton.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial strategy and its review.				
1521	Mr Martin Howes		Q. 1	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text though is in agreement with the strategy.				
1231	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Q. 1	Yes
Comment: The vision for Dunstable is supported in principle, particularly the vision for the creation of new gateways to the town which my client's believe are particularly important to enhance the image of the town. My clients site located at Beech Road, to the immediate south of Dunstable is considered to be suitable as such a gateway site and therefore its allocation for an urban extension is sought. We have previously submitted an illustrative Masterplan for the development of the site that demonstrates how development could be suitably assimilated into this urban fringe location.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy presents a vision for Dunstable at an appropriate level of detail for this document. Later, more detailed documents in the LDF will go into more detail.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
193	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 1	No
Comment: No more growth in south-east England. Abolish the regional planning boards and spend the money on improving life for those who are already here.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The " Growth agenda" has been set by Government through the Sustainable Communities Plan ( 2003) which made Luton and Southern Bedfordshire part of one of four growth areas in the east and south east England.				
545	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 1	Yes
Comment: The vision itself is ok. The problem lies with the strategy not being entirely inline with the vision.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.				
383	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 1	No
Comment: Although the vision is fine in principal the problem I have with it is that Luton and South Bedfordshire now appear to include a large part of North Hertfordshire. Why is this? Why do Luton and South Bedfordshire councillors think that they can make decisions on land they have no jurisdiction over?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review.				
1883	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 1	No
Comment: This submission provides both formal objections and representations. It has been prepared by Kirkby and Diamond on behalf of Mr Anthony Kimble, the principal landowner of the proposed site known as West of Linslade Urban Extension. Whilst the principal landowner broadly agrees with the Spatial Vision set out in the Preferred Option document it is our view that the Core Strategy as a whole does not entirely accord with the vision of a "Green Growth Area". It is our view that the evidence base contradicts these proposals. The principal land owners also considers that the vision on Page 9 of the Core Strategy should refer to Leighton Linslade not Leighton Buzzard consistent with Paragraph 2.11.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: We acknowledge the lack of consistency in our denomination for Leighton Linslade on one hand and Leighton Buzzard on the other hand and we will amend it accordingly.				
JC Reason for Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF.				
69	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Q. 1	No
Comment: The wholly negative effect on surrounding areas: loss of green belt, loss of attractive landscape amenity, construction of major roads, hugely increased road traffic on surrounding minor roads with additional rat running. Loss of tranquility and quality of life for thousands of people living in the areas adjacent too and to be subsumed by the new development.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3				
3372	Land Securities Group PLC		Q. 1	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text though is in agreement with the strategy.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1280	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: No problem with the strategic level, which seeks to fit externally imposed targets into the local environment. The devil, as ever, lies in the detail.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy Section of the Core strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the core strategy is part of the LDF process . This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy . There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements.</p>				
2109	London Luton Airport	Luton	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: LLAOL would like to suggest some Minor Changes to the CSPO to ensure the airports interests are protected and future growth is not stymied to the detriment of the local and regional economy. LAOLL would like to suggest some amendments for the vision "... centre of innovation and enterprise. The growth of London Luton Airport will be supported in order to capture the assorted economic benefits for existing business and inward investments. Its positive image..."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre-submission Core Strategy to address this.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further detail regarding the future planning framework for the area is appropriate</p>				
3824	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the Vision's focus on a future in which public transport is seen as the key to enhanced accessibility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				
1897	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Summary (see attached) There is not enough detail on how housing, transport, environment, green and social infrastructure, jobs and where development should take place all join up and their impact or whether local communities actually support these major changes to their lives and surroundings.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy includes and appropriate level of detail for a plan of this nature</p>				
2075	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: It's inline with central, regional and sub-regional policy, advocating sustainable communities via a "Green Growth Area", mixed use communities and urban extensions, climate change urban design policy / advice. It also identifies LSP involvement.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				
1918	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Incorporate specific references to healthy lifestyles and social infrastructure. For example, the last sentence of the first paragraph could be re-written as, "The new and rejuvenated communities will be connected by an integrated public transport system and will have access to local jobs, services, leisure and cultural facilities, and social activities, as well as a web of well managed green infrastructure and the surrounding countryside, providing healthy lifestyles for all.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The last sentence of the first paragraph already mentions access to leisure activities and cultural facilities which corresponds with social infrastructure and healthy lifestyles</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
246	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: I object to the qualifying "where practical" in the sentence relating to rural villages "...whose identities have been safeguarded where practical". This is no safeguard at all. It should say "safeguarded if at all possible", or something much stronger.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By avoiding the development of urban extensions in the AONB and limiting development in other sensitive areas of landscape, the impact of development on valuable landscape areas has been minimised. However, impact will occur. Therefore, the joint Committee will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the SBLA 2007 and the ESA 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside are preserved and enhanced. or The Core Strategy will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
3793	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The Strategy's vision says that the area "will also be a place that is recognised for its attractive rural villages, whose identities have been safeguarded where practical". Several extremely attractive villages would be completely absorbed by the east of Luton scheme, losing their unique identities and destroying these rural communities in the process.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The deploying of detailed design techniques developed through other more detailed plans in the LDF will safeguard the character of all affected settlements.</p>				
3783	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The Strategy's vision says that the area "will also be a place that is recognised for its attractive rural villages, whose identities have been safeguarded where practical". Several extremely attractive villages would be completely absorbed by the east of Luton scheme, losing their unique identities and destroying these rural communities in the process.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Therefore, the joint Committee will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the SBLA 2007 and the ESA 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside are preserved and enhanced.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By avoiding the development of urban extensions in the AONB and limiting development in other sensitive areas of landscape, the impact of development on valuable landscape areas has been minimised. However, impact will occur.</p>				
3331	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The scale of growth being proposed in urban extensions to the conurbation provides a real opportunity to regenerate and improve this area to the benefit of the population of Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				
3674	Alan Murphy	Luton	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: I am pleased to read of the intention to take the opportunity presented by the required growth to 'green' the conurbation and to regenerate the town centres of Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent in agreement with Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2166	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Natural England generally supports the Vision, emphasising the delivery of the 'Green Growth Area', use of river corridors in Leighton Buzzard as green infrastructure open spaces and working with us. Also that it takes account of the attractive surroundings and they will be protected and enhanced, e.g. The Chilterns. The LDF should conserve and enhance the AONB and avoid any proposals that would damage its' integrity and beauty.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial strategy and its review.</p>				
498	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockermhoe	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: It's ok having the vision. The strategy proposed does not accord with the vision.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				
3757	Yvonne Peacock		Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Object the spatial Development Strategy on the following grounds; Other options for urban extensions identified in the Core Strategy that would have less impact on the environment. Development to impact on Grade 1 Green Belt Land. The proposed development will be part of the cause for the loss of villages as a result of the urban sprawl. Northern Bypass route cutting through an area of the Chilterns AONB, considered a significant asset for the area. Rural character of Lilley to be lost as a result of the Northern Bypass development impact. Luton Airport has not got potential growth, consequently, it does not require a supporting industrial area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible.</p>				
28	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The principles set out are admirable and would if achieved be very beneficial to the areas and the population. Past experience does not give confidence that the vision set out will be adhered too</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				
3306	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: See CSOP3302, 3303, 3304 and 3305 comments.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: 3302. New development will be expected to aid the delivery and management of Green Infrastructure by ensuring that green open space is provided for in the emerging preferred urban extensions and other new developments provided through s106 agreements. In addition, the conservation and enhancement of existing GI will be supported by the Joint Committee to meet existing and future needs. 3303, 3304 N/A / 3305 Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				
289	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Because the practical proposals do not add up to sustainability or retention of existing rural communities. Nor do they have any democratic basis. The proposal to build east of Luton will create traffic problems on existing roads or create new roads through unspoilt countryside, attracting more and more traffic. And the proposal simply uses Herts countryside as a resource to be plundered by Luton/Beds.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1508	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Vision not in accordance with Sustainable Community Strategy for South Beds and is now a weakened vision especially regarding the green issues and public transport. Not in accordance with PPS1.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The vision states that the area will have a strong identity based on a number of interconnected communities, all supported by an enhanced and reinvigorated economy benefiting from improved congestion and improved accessibility. Consequently, the Joint Committee will work closely with service providers, developers and stakeholders to identify appropriate sites for new and existing facilities for both, social and community services, encouraging their co-location where appropriate.</p>				
2612	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The overall spatial strategy does not entirely accord with the vision, which in itself is unsatisfactory.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				
1381	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: References to Luton &amp; southern Bedfordshire forming a "Green Growth Area" appear to be a little clichéd. The thrust of planning policy as set out in Planning Policy Statements requires a sustainable approach to development and as such this reference does not add anything distinctive to the vision for the conurbation. I would support efforts to develop Luton's role as a sub-regional centre through enhancing retail offer, public transport connectivity and a thriving business sector and that it will be a prosperous centre of innovation and enterprise.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The vision states that Luton will continue to develop as the sub-regional shopping and service centre of choice with excellent public transport links, a well-trained workforce and thriving business sector. This means that a sustainable approach has been taken as well as Luton supported as Sub-regional Centre.</p>				
1354	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The spatial vision for Luton and South Bedfordshire importantly reflects the preferred option to develop a strategic urban extension (SUE) to the north of Houghton Regis and is fully supported by Taylor Wimpey.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1405	The Crown Estate	London	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: In respect of Luton, the Vision is desirable, realistic and achievable. No negative comment should be assumed in respect of the remaining areas covered by the Vision upon which no comment is made.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1168	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: We support the principle of a 'green growth area' and welcome reference to Green Infrastructure, and the Leighton Linlade Green Wheel specifically. However, the essence of the vision needs to be followed through the whole document - we do not feel that this happens consistently. Neither does the vision reflect a strong enough direction and commitment in terms of carbon reduction and combating global warming.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The vision refers to; Green Growth Area, enhanced and reinvigorated economy benefiting from reduced congestion and improved accessibility, communities connected by an integrated public transport system, together with access to a web of well managed green infrastructure. Increased public transport and green infrastructure means more responsibility towards carbon reduction and global warming.</p>				
1176	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The Wildlife Trust supports the vision of Luton and southern Bedfordshire as a €'Green Growth Area'. We are pleased that this covers a range of 'green' issues and particularly support the creation of €'access to a web of well managed green infrastructure as well as the surrounding countryside.' The paragraph concerning Leighton Buzzard promotes green corridors running into the heart of the town. We would like to see similar schemes promoted in Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis alongside the measures to rejuvenate town centres and elevate traffic problems. The 'Green' emphasis in the initial paragraph of the vision we feel becomes diluted in the visions for each area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
3717	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The EoL options will do exactly the opposite by destroying existing green space, which is irreplaceable. The plan will build 5,500 houses on Green Belt land with the highest sensitivity rating. Land Use Consultants concluded that development is not recommended in this area. Why has this expensive advice been ignored? Several extremely attractive villages will be absorbed in this scheme. An example is Lilley which will certainly not be enhanced or safeguarded when it is overwhelmed by the aptly named Back Route of the northern bypass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review .Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
2003	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Incorporate specific references to healthy lifestyles and social infrastructure. For example, the last sentence of the first paragraph could be re-written as, 'The new and rejuvenated communities will be connected by an integrated public transport system and will have access to local jobs, services, leisure and cultural facilities, and social activities, as well as a web of well managed green infrastructure and the surrounding countryside, providing healthy lifestyles for all.'</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The last sentence of the first paragraph already mentions access to leisure activities and cultural facilities which corresponds with social infrastructure and healthy lifestyles</p>				
2888	Mrs I I Walker	Stanmore	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: The vision and context do not concur with the preferred options</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
439	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The Vision sets out plans for regenerating and improving the quality of life in the towns of south Bedfordshire, while, ostensibly, conserving the countryside and rural qualities of the surrounding areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1349	Mr Barry Wardle		Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text though is in agreement with the strategy.</p>				
1457	Mr Matt Warman		Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The idea of the vision is acceptable - but the most important part is about how the place feels. "The area will also be a place that is recognised for its attractive surrounding rural villages, whose identities have been safeguarded where practical, as well as its protected and enhanced natural environment, notably the Chilterns." That is not compatible with the idea of an East of Luton extension that will change the character of the AONB by its proximity, and destroy villages that are currently outside Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: Ensure development integrates into its landscape setting.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible.</p>				
765	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Local jobs, improved education and integrated public transport are all good goals; I feel however that they will not be reached. I'd like to be proved wrong.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategic objectives and the subsequent chapters which follow outline how the Joint Committee will achieve it. New development will be expected to contribute to the achievement of both the vision and the Strategic Objectives and this will be considered in the determination of planning applications.</p>				
205	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: It is trying to put a relatively large volume of housing into an area which has insufficient jobs, and poor/inadequate transport infrastructure for those already working here - even before the new housing is built. There's an insufficient capacity in provision of water for any further large-scale development beyond what is already being built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Based on the evidence, particularly in the SHLAA, the Joint committee believe that the figures in Tables 6.2 to 6.4 represent a suitable basis for long term strategic planning to achieve this approach.</p>				
257	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: In as much as it should consider the global effect on the area. Houses need to be where there are jobs - existing jobs, not one's that MAY come along. If there are no jobs, then any new (incoming) workers will need to travel out of the area. That's why there has to be a strategy behind all this. Unfortunately, that strategy seems predicated on building houses where they can almost "to satisfy the government" rather than the population, and that has little chance when the transport links aren't there. The West Coast railway line is almost at capacity now: it won't take many more trains or they'll just be nose to tail all the way to London!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
974	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: I support the fact that there will be a 'Vision' - but I disagree with the elements thereof. The statements regarding Leighton-Linslade are fantasy! There's no current plans to develop the town centre, and what "New Developments within and adjacent to the town centre ." since these are completely undisclosed to the local population! Yes, there are green elements to Leighton-Linslade, but they are neither enhanced by nor related to the Vision!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: See Preferred Option Core Strategy 1- spatial Development Strategy</p>				
3005	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockermhoe	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The vision is fine. However, the overall spatial strategy proposed does not entirely accord with the vision.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				
82	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: ill conceived, with focus on meeting Government targets, rather than objective planning and the guts to challenge these targets.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
3882	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Q. 1	Yes
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy vision for the town (Leighton Buzzard) is supported. In terms of Green Infrastructure, the ability for the Clipstone Brook to provide an alternative green corridor from the east into the town (Leighton Buzzard) is supported.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1095	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Despite the fine words, the Vision appears to be based on a nineteenth century view of the Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation as three separate towns. In particular, continued reliance on Luton as the sub-regional shopping and service centre while ensuring that it migrates further to the southern fringes of the conurbation appears perverse. A twenty-first century vision must recognise the need either to extend the conurbation to the south or to establish a modern retail, culture and leisure core closer to the geographic centre. This would allow the old town centre to be developed to serve modern employment needs clustered around the University campus.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Vision reflects that the principal conurbation will have a strong identity based on a number of interconnected communities. Given the fact that Luton already offers the most specialize services such as University and Airport, it make sense to be reinforced as sub regional shopping and service centre.</p>				
2549	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 1	No
<p>Comment: Vision based on 19th Century view of the Luton, Dunstable, Houghton Regis conurbation as separate towns Continued reliance on Luton as sub-regional shopping and service centre while ensuring it migrates further to southern fringes appears perverse 21st Century vision must recognise the need either to extend south or establish modern retail culture and leisure core closer to geographic centre, allowing old town centre to serve modern employment needs clustered around university</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Vision reflects that the principal conurbation will have a strong identity based on a number of interconnected communities. Given the fact that Luton already offers the most specialised services such as University and Airport, it make sense to be reinforced as sub regional shopping and service centre.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
343	Mrs Francesca Wroe		Q. 1	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agreed				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text though is in agreement with the strategy.				
573	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 1	No
Comment: The vision is laudable, but will not be achieved by building on the Green Belt, creating a semi-isolated community and encroaching into an AONB with a bypass.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional spatial strategy and its review.				
1127	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 2	Yes
Comment: Strategic Objective SO7 is particularly supported. However, a Strategic Objective to achieve the safeguarding of the identity and character of the rural villages, as set out in the Vision, should be added.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: The Joint Committee will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the South Bedfordshire Landscape Assessment 2007 and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside are preserved and enhanced.				
JC Reason for Response: Despite the fact that rural villages are not addressed as a strategic objective, section 12.9 of the document states that ; the Joint Committee recognise the importance of the distinctive landscapes found across Luton and south Beds. The quality and attractiveness of the countryside and landscape in this area has been a key consideration in the identification of the preferred urban extensions.				
1684	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 2	Yes
Comment: In part - although one of the objectives deals with ensuring town centres are safe places; however, needs to be expanded or an additional objective added to encompass making the whole of the area safe in order to reduce the potential threat of crime and anti-social behaviour.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Note SO6, revitalization of an urban area also implies improving its safety and security.				
10	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley	Q. 2	No
Comment: because I see no plans that seek to deliver the objectives...just houses that people cannot afford and roads that cost the taxpayer money. If you wish to fulfil the objectives, provide jobs.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: The JC are committed to providing new strategic employment land around Junction 11a and the airport with a range of employment uses including business start up units and innovation centres. Subject to appropriate rail and road access and appropriate mitigation of impact on the neighbouring SSSI, they are also supportive of the development of part of Sundon Quarry for a rail freight interchange for B8 type of warehousing and distribution development.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy recognises the importance of London Luton airport and the proposed road infrastructure improvements as important means of attracting investment into the area for both existing and planned strategic employment sites.				
1044	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 2	Yes
Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Strategic Objectives Yes/No: Yes Comments: None				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2254	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Do not support objectives SO1 and SO7. Growth of itself cannot deliver sustainable and integrated communities. Growth cannot minimise the area's carbon footprint. There should be a specific objective to conserve and protect the landscape and natural environment without caveat.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Growth of itself can not deliver sustainable and integrated communities, however, the way growth is managed can facilitate to do this.</p>				
2665	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: New development of the scale proposed should be beneficial and any harmful effects should be minimised. The opportunity presented by the proposed development on such a large scale should be seized to ensure that development will promote a good environment, encourage economic growth and foster social cohesion.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1940	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Amend SO5 to read, 'To ensure that existing communities and new development are supported by a range of cost effective and well supported community and social infrastructure in step with changing needs'. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The last sentence of the first paragraph from the vision already mentions access to leisure activities and cultural facilities which corresponds with social infrastructure and healthy lifestyles</p>				
1802	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: SUE's are initially considered in para 4.21 to 4.30. Whilst accepting that the key diagram cannot be completely accurate, the Board objects to those parts of the proposed urban extensions that are identified and located within the Chilterns AONB (to the north of Luton and east of A6) as this fails to satisfy the requirements set out in the MKMSRS, does not meet the tests set out in PPS7 and would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB.</p>				
<p>The Board also objects to the lack of recognition given to the proximity of the AONB to most of the sites to the north and east of Luton and the fact that development should also conserve and enhance the setting of the AONB. This will be vitally important in connection with design and materials for any development that abuts the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SO4 Can not be amended, as Major transport infrastructure ( major roads) is considered a key element in improving existing and future connectivity in the area. SO7 Can not be amended because it refers to a strategic objective that is general to the whole area, not just the Chilterns AONB</p>				
534	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: They're in line with Ebenezer Howard's vision of the "social city". It's important to realise though that SO1 and SO4 are interdependent: growth can only deliver sustainable and integrated communities if it's located on an efficient integrated public transport network that provides connectivity at all levels, and as far as possible in all directions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
3743	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: SO8: cannot minimise carbon footprints with the amount of road development being planned.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC has commissioned a Resource Efficiency study and the Phase 2 of the Core Strategy to help inform development management policies and accompanying supplementary planning guidance on the sustainable design of new development. In addition, the Resource Efficiency study will explore the potential for implementing a carbon offset fund, whereby energy and water efficiency measures could be retro-fitted to existing development.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
849	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: SO1 simply isn't logical. Growth introduces change which needs to be controlled and managed in order not to damage the sustainability and integration of communities. It is absurd to conclude that one can use growth to deliver either sustainable or integrated communities. If the intent behind the point is different, it needs to be re-worded to remove the ambiguity. The same goes for SO8. I cannot understand how growth could be used to minimise carbon emissions. It's not logical. Growth needs to be controlled and managed in order to minimise emissions, it doesn't follow that growth on its own will do so, quite the opposite. If these points around the environment and communities are real objectives they should be uncoupled from growth as an objective.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: To amend CS in order to change some terminology with regards to the strategic objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered. In addition, we acknowledge that some sentences involving growth within the Strategic Objectives could be reworded in order to substitute " to use growth" by " to manage/control or administer" instead.</p>				
216	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Am I being consulted on Luton and Southern Bedfordshire, or Hertfordshire. If you can't be upfront about your questions, you have to expect that people will be unable to support you,</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
273	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: You use the word growth as if it is a panacea. In this plan growth is defined in relation to expansion of the existing urban area through house building. Having more houses and people in itself is just as likely to cause higher levels of unemployment, greater usage/strain on services (thus poorer quality services), lead to an increase in congestion, take the rural environment further away and not make towns/neighbourhoods safer. One does not guarantee the other so I can not agree with the using growth to achieve these objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
272	Cottrell		Q. 2	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text and they are not in agreement with the Core Strategy.</p>				
1714	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: The wording of the objectives betrays a desire to use growth and development as the solution to all problems. Amend SO1 to, 'To manage growth in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered'. Amend SO7 to, 'To conserve and enhance the countryside, landscape and natural environment, while facilitating access to countryside for leisure and recreation purposes'. Amend SO8 to, 'To manage growth in such a way that the area's carbon footprint is minimised and mitigation of climate change is facilitated'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Consider the respondents suggested wording in that context</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
794	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Growth of itself cannot deliver sustainable and integrated communities. Growth must be managed as also must the objective of maintaining sustainable and integrated communities. Growth into the natural environment, specifically the green belt which is planned according to this document negates SO7. Similarly, growth in households, with the inevitable, concomitant increase in car ownership, which is still the aspiration of families despite the fine words here about improved public transport, will increase the carbon footprint and negate SO8. There is no 'vision' in this document about how to sustain the natural environment, the natural carbon sink. The natural environment is of finite size it cannot continually be eroded without fundamental damage to the environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3, By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered</p>				
1514	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Use of the term 'growth' is vague. Economic growth does not necessarily require physical growth, especially beyond administrative and local government boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
3258	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: PNINH support the principle of SO 1 and 2 but are of the view that the Core Strategy fails to meet the Joint Committee's Strategic Objectives in terms of sustainability, delivery of a constant supply or housing, improvement of strategic and local connectivity and the use of growth to help minimise the area's carbon footprint.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				
1172	Ms Joan Drage	Breachwood Green	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: I support it as long as the development doesn't encroach into the North Herts countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
1246	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Quite simply because growth will only make matters worse (congestion, unemployment, carbon footprint etc)- it is common sense!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3511	Drivers Jonas	London	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: USS supports Strategic Objective SO4 which seeks to improve strategic and local connectivity through a number of transport options. This will support the emerging Masterplan for Dunstable through encouraging improved linkages between the White Lion Retail Park and the town centre.... USS also supports Strategic Objective SO6 which seeks to revitalise the town centres. However, this objective should specifically state Dunstable and Luton are the Main town centres, to make it clear that retail development should be focussed on these locations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities</p>				
3277	Drivers Jonas for and on behalf of Universities Superannuation Scheme		Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports S04 which seeks to improve strategic and local connectivity through a number of transport options. This will support the emerging Dunstable masterplan through encouraging improved links between White Lion Retail Park and the town centre. Offers to provide EDAA with recently commissioned Access &amp; Movement Framework document for additional background evidence to improve connections within Dunstable. Supports S06 which seeks to revitalise town centres however the objective should specifically state Luton and Dunstable as being the main town centres to make it clear where retail should be focused.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Luton will continue to develop as the main sub-regional shopping and service centre due to its more specialized services. Nevertheless, Dunstable could eventually become recognised as part of Luton sub regional centre, but not at this stage.</p>				
1582	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: The principles of sustainable place making lie at the heart of the RES and the aspirations as set out under Spatial Objective 1 directly align with this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1588	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1624	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the East of England Plan employment target met? Regional policy on employment around Luton is limited. Policy E1 sets a target for this area of 23,000 jobs between 2001 and 2021; the document supports and continues this approach. The preferred policies allocate a strategic employment site east of Luton in the district of North Hertfordshire. The MKSM strategy refers to the growth of Luton airport and the East of England Plan refers to the need to make provision for direct and indirect employment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1666	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with the reduction of CO2 emissions? Although energy efficiency measures and use of energy from renewable sources are noted, there is no target for provision of renewable energy. ENG2 includes the aim that by 2010 10% of the region's energy and by 2020 17% of the region's energy should come from renewable sources. This should also be reflected in the Core Strategy; The Council is encouraged to set ambitious local targets for carbon reduction and provision of renewable energy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: The results of the study undertaken by the consultant will be completed in October and subsequently included in the CS.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A Consultant was appointed in order to study and to identify the viability of introducing an appropriate range of separate local targets and criteria for different development opportunities in; the existing urban areas ( including retrofitting), the urban extensions and rural areas as well as other policy advice for Luton and Southern Bedfordshire in accordance with the recommendations in national guidance , notably the PPS1 Supplement and PPS22;</p>				
1654	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Are landscape, wildlife, woodland and geological conservation addressed?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1653	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with green infrastructure?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1610	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the role of city and town centres clear? Is there a clear retail hierarchy? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1632	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there an affordable housing policy and does it meet the East of England Plan target?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: The findings from the completed SHMA will inform these policies with the Regional target of 35% affordable housing used as the basis for the targets and thresholds. This will be outlined in the pre-submission version of the Core Strategy due to be published late 2009.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee recognises the importance of providing a range of homes to meet the varied needs of a diverse community both now and in the future. It will propose flexible policies which include varying affordable housing targets for different parts of the Luton and southern Bedfordshire area.</p>				
1628	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the East of England Plan housing target met? Is there a 15 year plan for housing delivery? The growth of Luton within the boundary of North Hertfordshire was envisaged when the MKSM strategy and the East of England plan were developed. Growth rates to 2021 were identified by the MKSM strategy but precise numbers for each district were not identified. The East of England Plan does not identify the number of homes allocated to the North Hertfordshire part of the resultant Luton growth and excludes this growth from their allocation in policy H1.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1643	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy seeking to try and change travel behaviour? Is there a policy seeking to enhance provision for non-motorised forms of transport? Partnership working with the Hertfordshire authorities is supported. The Luton-Dunstable Busway is an RFA priority and scheduled for delivery between 2011/12 and 2018/19. The Luton Town Centre Transport Scheme was put back by the Region to ensure that is remained deliverable and the schedule suggests completion by 2012/13. The A5-M1 Link Road (Dunstable Northern Bypass) is scheduled to be delivered by 2014/15.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: See section 5 Preferred Option Core Strategy 5- "Maximising Opportunities for Sustainable Travel"</p>				
3456	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the Strategic Objectives, in particular SO2 to deliver a consistent supply and range of housing types and tenures to help ensure greater affordability and choice.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
2112	Edlesborough Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: The strategy is driven by the need to build more houses, as directed by Central Government, the major concern is that the vision, objectives and spatial development strategy are there to meet the housing target rather than the other way around. An example of this is the proposed road from the A505 to a new Junction 11a on the M1 - described as a "Committed Highways Scheme" but without commitments from the Highways Agency or air pollution identified by another government department, making this strategic element uncertain. Could the road and house building plans be suspended or put into disarray by a change in government next year?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Employment, Housing delivery and Green infrastructure are equally the most important objectives of the Spatial Vision. Advice on the needs for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
2780	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: The stated objectives are laudable but it's the way they are achieved that will make the difference. The objectives have the best intention of providing for the people of Luton - though I'm not convinced of the benefits to the remainder of southern Bedfordshire!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: South Bedfordshire as well as Luton will undertake significant improvements according to each area needs. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
732	English Heritage	Cambridge	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: We have similar concerns with the Strategic Objectives, which do not mention the historic environment or the need to protect and enhance the character of the Growth Area's towns and villages. Again, there is no parity with the natural environment which is mentioned explicitly in Strategic Objective 7. We feel that Strategic Objective 6 should be amended to refer to the wider built environment beyond town centres to incorporate settlements as a whole. Strategic Objective 7 should refer to the "natural and historic environment", although there should be a caveat with regards to 'accessing' this resource, which should only be achieved where it is appropriate. Access to certain parts of the natural and historic environment may not be desirable for various reasons.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SO6 The importance of Town Centres in people lives is reflected in the vision for the area, in the Sustainable Community Strategies and in national and regional planning guidance. The MKSMSRS identified the regeneration and enhancement of the Town centres as an important objective and outcome of growth. PPS6 also encourages the enhancement of the physical environment of town centres by improving the public realm. SO7 Preferred Option Core Strategy 16- Heritage and Townscape enhance Luton and southern Bedfordshire's rich historic environment, principally through the implementation measures emanating from the findings of the ESA December 2008 to minimise the impact of development on the Growth areas rich historic environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1846	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: SO7 needs to include the enhancement of natural resources to provide net gain of well designed green infrastructure through development. SO8 needs to include a commitment to use growth to help reduce the threat to groundwater from historic land use. Comply with the forthcoming Water Framework Directive targets of the Thames River Basin Management Plan and Anglian RBMP. Development must not deteriorate the status of surface water bodies. (Agreed late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The LDF offers a significant opportunity to help achieve the vision through policies that require new developments to meet higher levels of sustainable construction and resource efficiency, notably energy and water efficiency, management of waste and use of materials.</p>				
1080	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: But planned employment and vital infrastructure must come before any development commences, especially the A5/M1 link road.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Housing development will not happen without providing for the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Stages for Infrastructure, Employment and housing development are still to be decided.</p>				
340	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Not when the ramifications of these proposals impact on people outside your area. I think you need to re-think the delivery of the objectives or have the courage to re-think and say you need a lower target. Let's face it surely with the financial crisis and changes the demand will decrease..... compared to targets set in a financial and political climate that is no longer relevant. I'd be interested as would many others in supporting this approach.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3.</p>				
115	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: As stated previously, the objectives sound fine in principle but recent experiences tell us that housing gets built without the necessary infrastructure being provided. Even if Leighton Buzzard is left out of the proposals, the fine-sounding plans for the other areas would need commitment to support/provide the infrastructure from a great many sources (PCTs, Health Authorities, Education authorities, water and sewerage providers to name but a few) which have notoriously not materialised with previous such grand plans.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To ensure timely delivery of housing and infrastructure through the close work with landowners, developers and other stakeholders.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC in partnership with the LDV will work closely with landowners, developers and stakeholders to bring forward the necessary infrastructure and measures to deliver the strategic urban extensions and overcome any constraints that may prevent or delay the delivers of this sites.</p>				
1750	Government Office for the East of England	Cambridge	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Vision states that Luton and southern Bedfordshire will be known as the 'green growth area' - other than highlighting public transport initiatives and greenspace provision the document is silent in respect of climate change/carbon challenge agenda despite including it as SO8. Would expect to see these issues highlighted in the Core Strategy. Advised to look at submitted Mid Beds Core Strategy by way of example.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The JC will commission a Resource Efficiency study and the phase of the Core Strategy to help inform development management policies and accompanying supplementary planning guidance on the sustainable design of new development. In addition, the Resource Efficiency Study will explore the potential for implementing a carbon offset fund, whereby energy and water efficiency measures could be retro-fitted to existing development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
241	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: SO2 is flawed in concept, being based on the premise that affordability is governed by supply &amp; demand. Delivery based on hoping landowners and developers will build what is needed relies on house prices remaining high. SO7 is unachievable, however much the natural environment is protected, enabling greater enjoyment of that resource will lead to its degradation. SO8 is nonsense; growth will do nothing to reduce the area's carbon footprint (it can only increase it) while the suggestion that urban development can help the area mitigate and adapt to climate change does not seem to be based on science.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3. By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered</p>				
838	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for yet more development in east LB have no provision for significant green spaces (only spokes/corridors are talked about). The East of LB has no parks, no infrastructure and no facilities for residents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The GSS will identify green space needs and deficiencies and set out local green space standards to ensure adequate provision across the growth area, both in the emerging preferred urban extensions, other new developments and in the existing urban area. Also, the GI plan has identified a network of multi-functional areas within the east of LB that are priority for investment and a focus for enhancement of the GI resource. The areas east of LB identified include; Ouzel-River Corridor, the Chalk Arc Corridor, and Leighton Linlade to Dunstable Corridor.</p>				
379	Mr Stuart Harries	Luton	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent objects to the Core Strategy and does not make any further comment</p>				
1333	Mrs Ann Horner	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: I have never understood the rationale for all the additional houses and I think the projections should be reconsidered in light of the current housing demand</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Housing competitions and supply will be monitored in accordance with Core Indicator H1, H2 and H3 in the Annual Monitoring Report as well as regular updates to the SHLAA and associated housing trajectory in accordance with the monitoring framework contained within it.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Based on the evidence, particularly in the SHLAA, the Joint Committee believe that the figures in Tables 6.2 to 6.4 represent a suitable basis for long term strategic planning to achieve this approach. See 6.16 Providing New Homes</p>				
538	Mr Chris Howe	Luton	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: In case such a positive answer is used in statistics to support development east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
194	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Frankly they are a lot of waffle. No more growth in South East England.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
546	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Growth and integration can be delivered without ruining the country side.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
384	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Regarding SO1. I don't see how growth in itself can deliver sustainable and integrated communities. Surely the objective should be to manage growth in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered. Regarding SO8. Please tell me how growth in itself will minimise an area's carbon footprint and mitigate climate change. Growth must be carefully managed to meet this objective. Finally, there should be a specific objective, unrelated to growth, that should be aimed and conserving the natural environment not only for us but for future generations.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The JC will commission a Resource Efficiency study and the phase 2 of the WCS to help inform development management policies and accompanying supplementary planning guidance on the sustainable design of new development. In addition, the Resource Efficiency Study will explore the potential for implementing a carbon offset fund, whereby energy and water efficiency measures could be "retro-- fitted" to existing development. CS to be amended in order to address sustainable development in non growth related strategic objectives.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: SO1; By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered. SO8 The Joint Committee support the aspiration to be known as the "Green Growth Area", and will work with partners and stakeholders to consider whether it is suitable, viable and achievable to develop local joint targets and measures which exceed established national and regional targets. Answering the last question, we acknowledge that there is no a specific objective, unrelated to growth, and aimed at conserving the natural environment for present and future generations. Consequently, this issue should be addressed as a Strategic Objective and within Core Strategy environmental policies.</p>				
1884	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: This submission provides both formal objections and representations. It has been prepared by Kirkby and Diamond on behalf of Mr Anthony Kimble, the principal landowner of the proposed site known as West of Linslade Urban Extension. The principles of Strategic Objectives S01 and S02 in delivering sustainable and integrated communities and in particular the objective to deliver a constant supply and range of house types are supported. The Draft Core Strategy is considered not to meet the Joint Committee's Strategic Objectives however in terms of sustainability, delivery of a constant supply of housing, improvement of strategic and local connectivity and the use of growth to help minimise the area's carbon footprint. The reasons for this view are explained in the later comments (See attached).</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3. Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.</p>				
3373	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The respondent agrees with the Core Strategy with no further comment</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1905	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Summary (see attached): The Strategic objectives sound welcome until one remembers the scale of "growth" proposed, the existing creaking infrastructure (water, transport energy) and where it would have to go (much loved countryside), Luton's barely contained social problems and addiction to the car. There is an over optimistic reference to "the new and rejuvenated communities but no real plan for how we are to create these.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. The strategic urban extensions will each contain a mix of land uses, supporting infrastructure and services, together with a high quality environment. these will be provided in a timely way that meets emerging community needs in-parallel with the delivery of growth.</p>				
2076	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: The Council supports the objectives - these will be helpful in monitoring progress of strategy delivery and can be supported through the setting of specific and measurable targets where appropriate e.g. climate change, emissions and renewable energy contributions. The evidence base to support the Core Strategy continues to be developed with further studies to establish indicator and baseline information which will allow specifying a quantifiable direction of travel. Evidence based Targets, by definition, will be more achievable and realistic. We particularly value the inclusion of objectives relating to the integration of communities, and the aim to support both the existing and new communities, as it is important that growth areas are complemented by improvements to the existing areas of deprivation. Importantly, objectives will also support the need to secure design quality in new development and the enhancement and regeneration of existing areas, town centres and the public realm - including open spaces.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1919	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Amend SO5 to read, 'To ensure that existing communities and new development are supported by a range of cost effective and well supported community and social infrastructure in step with changing needs'. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: To amend CS in order to address social infrastructure within the Strategic Objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Vision Statement already mentions access to leisure activities and cultural facilities which means social infrastructure in the . Nevertheless, social infrastructure as such is not mentioned within the Strategic Objectives and we acknowledge that it should be included in future documents.</p>				
247	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: SO8 is verging on an oxymoron. Most forms of growth can only result in increasing carbon footprint. This objective pre-supposes that growth is necessary, and attempts to justify it in terms of its potential green impact. This should be rewritten to something like "Avoid growth that does not contribute to the reduction of the areas carbon footprint, and seek to mitigate and adapt to climate change"</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered</p>				
3675	Alan Murphy	Luton	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: I strongly support the aspiration to work in partnership to deliver the Green Infrastructure and Green Space Strategy and to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape. The delivery of sustainable and integrated communities and efficient, sustainable transport solutions will contribute to the mitigation of and adaptation to the effects of climate change. There is a clear need for a range of additional housing types and employment growth capable of supporting economic development and regeneration.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2167	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Strategic Objectives: We generally support the strategic objectives but particularly SO7: To deliver growth which offers the highest level of protection for and access to the natural environment to enable greater enjoyment of this resource. We also support SO8: To use growth to help minimise the area's carbon footprint and to mitigate and adapt to climate change. However, we would also suggest that there should be an additional objective on green infrastructure so that it is established as an objective of the Core Strategy right at the start of the plan. Such objectives must be taken as a package in no order of priority in line with the principle of sustainable development. The aim should be to achieve all these objectives and a net gain for the social, environmental and economic interests of the area with no significant losses to any of them from development.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: We acknowledge the importance that Green infrastructure has for the plan so we will amend the strategic objectives accordingly.		
JC Reason for Response: We will consider the addition of a Strategic Objective specifically addressing Green infrastructure				
29	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: As previous question the objectives are fine, but local authorities are not, in themselves, able to deliver these objectives. Currently the need to preserve green belt and flood plains is being locally ignored and section 106 items never delivered. We even have the local authority proposing to use an area designated for leisure to be used for residential development!</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3.				
3307	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Q. 2	Yes
Comment: See CSOP3302, 3303, 3304 and 3305 comments.				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core 3302; The JC identified the need for a supportive framework to be created to facilitate the creation of a range of new jobs within the local area for both existing and new communities. In particular, the Core Strategy recognises the importance of London Luton Airport and the proposed road infrastructure improvements as important means of attracting investment into the area for both existing and planned strategic employment sites. Most infrastructure needs and costs will be funded by new development. Core Strategy 3303 Additional sites were put forward following issues and options and been evaluated Core 3304; agree. N/A Core Strategy 3305; Housing development and employment are both addressed in the vision as important leading factors for facilitating growth.</p>				
290	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Because the undemocratic way in which the east of Luton plan has been put forward means no-one can have any faith in the adherence of the authorities concerned to any of the lofty principles espoused.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1512	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: They do not reflect the aspiration of the Greenest growth area, or even of a green growth area, as they are not strong enough. SO3 is not nearly as strong as the SCS which says "develop centres of excellence in construction and mass market renewables" and "sourcing renewable and manufactured materials locally, so creating local employment and considering sustainable procurement." We disagree with SO4 as it mentions strategic transport infrastructure first and there could be risks with the funding it will need a step change in provision just to make a slight difference. to modal shift. SO8. We are glad that climate change is mentioned however the South Beds SCS has a vision of 60% cuts in CO2 by 2020.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the planning system can contribute to environmental sustainability as well as sustainable communities generally.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By integrating the provision of new development including, homes, employment and social/community infrastructure uses with high quality public transport, particularly in the form of the Luton and Dunstable Guided Bus way, which will help to shape both new development and future travel patterns in a highly sustainable way.</p>				
2613	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: SO1 - Growth, in itself, cannot deliver sustainable and integrated communities. The objective should be to manage growth in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered. SO8 - Growth, in itself, cannot minimise the area's carbon footprint and mitigate climate change. Growth must be managed in such a way that it achieves those objectives. There should be a specific objective, not tied to delivering growth, aimed at conserving and protecting the countryside, landscape and natural environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: We acknowledge the fact that growth should be better managed or administered rather than used and this will be amended accordingly.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Changes in the wording relating Growth will be considered in order to provide more appropriate terminology.</p>				
1383	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Strategic Objectives Yes/No: Yes Comments: The strategic objectives seem to represent the key priorities for Luton and southern Bedfordshire. In particular we support Strategic Objective SO3. Development at Junction 10A would contribute to the key employment objectives of the Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1460	The Crown Estate	London	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: They are commendable objectives</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1169	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: We do not feel that the vision of a 'green growth area' is adequately followed through in terms of the Strategic Objectives. We feel that SO7 is very general and does not go far enough. It should state that the 'Green Infrastructure' network for the area will be protected and enhanced, creating a truly multi-functional network of connected and robust green spaces, access routes and green corridors for the benefit of people and biodiversity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Green Growth Area concept will be considered for inclusion within Joint committee's Strategic Objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SO7 Could mention Green Growth Area in its strategic objective</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1177	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Q. 2	Yes
<p>Comment: The inclusion of SO7: To deliver growth which offers the highest level of protection for and access to the natural environment to enable greater enjoyment of this resource is strongly supported by The Wildlife Trust. It is vital that all the strategic objectives are given equal weight in every development to promote truly sustainable development. We would also recommend the inclusion of a Strategic Objective specifically addressing green infrastructure provision. Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy recognises the importance of incorporating green infrastructure into new developments and enhancing it in existing urban and rural areas. It would bring greater consistency to the document if there were a Strategic Objective to support it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: To consider the inclusion of Green Infrastructure provision within a new or existing policy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To consider the inclusion of a strategic Objective particularly addressing green infrastructure provision should be included in order to provide more consistency to the document</p>				
286	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: I am against the notion of growth in an already overcrowded area - SO1 I agree with the need for lower cost housing, but this can best be achieved by breaking the grip of the major house builders on the supply of building land, and by government initiatives on the supply of finance - SO2 I don't believe the planning system can do much about this - SO3 I see this frequently in planning documents and never see this "dream" realised - So4 See SO1 comment - I am particularly against the growth proposal in the North Herts Green Belt - SO7 I see this frequently in planning documents and never see this "dream" realised. Currently, growth is like increasing population, it equals an increasing carbon footprint...</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The JC will ensure that the mitigation measures identified in the South Bedfordshire Landscape Assessment 2007 and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment 2008 are implemented and ensuring that in areas where growth is not accommodated the landscape and countryside are preserved and enhanced.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3. SO3; To achieve the jobs target set up by East of England Plan, the JC have identified the need for a supportive framework to be created to facilitate the creation of a range of new jobs within the local area for both existing and new communities. SO7; By avoiding the development of urban extensions in the AONB and limiting development in other sensitive areas of landscape, the impact of development on valuable landscape areas has been minimised. However, impact will occur.</p>				
2004	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: Amend SO5 to read, "To ensure that existing communities and new development are supported by a range of cost effective and well supported community and social infrastructure in step with changing needs".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To amend CS in order to address social infrastructure within the Strategic Objectives.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Vision Statement already mentions access to leisure activities and cultural facilities which means social infrastructure in the . Nevertheless, social infrastructure as such is not mentioned within the Strategic Objectives and we acknowledge that it should be included in future documents.</p>				
440	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 2	No
<p>Comment: No such thing as "sustainable" growth. All growth is unsustainable and should be minimised. SO4 alone implies substantial traffic growth and, no doubt, road building.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: By integrating the provision of new development including, homes, employment and social/community infrastructure uses with high quality public transport , particularly in the form of the Luton and Dunstable Guided Bus way, which will help to shape both new development and future travel patterns in a highly sustainable way</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1350	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	Yes
Comment: They will improve the quality of life for existing residents and make the area a good place for others to live and work				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review				
766	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 2	No
Comment: The objectives are like the Curate's Egg: SO1 - Luton does not need to "grow". It is big enough already. It needs redeveloping to make it a pleasant place to live and work, but this does not constitute "growth". SO4 - Yes, the area needs substantially better transportation links; building upon the existing road, rail and air infrastructure. This does not mean more roads (although improvements to existing ones will help) SO7 - Again, "growth" ...why is "growth" a good thing? SO8 - "Growth" cannot minimise carbon footprint. This is an oxymoron.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3. By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered				
258	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 2	Yes
Comment: These objectives are all laudable - but it's the way they are achieved that will make the difference.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review				
975	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 2	Yes
Comment: The objectives no doubt have the best intention of providing for the people of Luton - though I'm not at all convinced of the benefits to Southern Bedfordshire!				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development for both, Luton and South Bedfordshire areas and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.				
3006	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Q. 2	No
Comment: Objectives SO1 and SO8 should address the management of growth to deliver sustainable and integrated communities. There should be an objective, not tied to delivering growth, aimed at conserving and protecting the natural environment.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver sustainable communities				
83	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 2	No
Comment: Housing and related infrastructure growth is not compatible with reducing carbon footprint and protecting the environment. Just as the plans to increase Heathrow Airport are not compatible with reducing emissions, building on what little countryside we have in South Beds., involving concreting over fields and cutting down trees but adding more people, roads etc. will only increase emissions. Wake up to the fact that this is a small country, we do not have the room for any more expansion without compromising the well-being of the current population.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review. Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3. By taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which growth can be managed in such a way that sustainable and integrated communities are delivered				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1097	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 2	No
Comment: The L, D & HR conurbation has great potential but needs a viable plan to make it work.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: By integrating the provision of new development including, homes, employment and social/community infrastructure uses with high quality public transport , particularly in the form of the Luton and Dunstable Guided Bus way, which will help to shape both new development and future travel patterns in a highly sustainable way. Taking an integrated approach to the provision of new development and its associated sustainable transport linkages is probably the most powerful way in which the Core Strategy proposals can comply with the Vision and Objectives.				
574	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 2	No
Comment: The strategic objective is flawed, in that it fails to maximise the possibility of benefiting existing communities within the region. Some of the proposals - for example the bypasses - will benefit others outside the existing communities than the current residents				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To resolve this, the study recommended a strong partnership approach between the Joint Committee, developers and the service providers to ensure an alignment and agreement regarding the plans and investment priorities required to meet both the current social and community infrastructure deficiencies and the future infrastructure needs of this growing community.				
JC Reason for Response: To inform the IDP, a Social and Community Infrastructure Study was commissioned to specifically examine the current and future social and community infrastructure requirements. A key funding from the study was the identification that significant additional funding would be needed beyond existing budgets, and over and above that which could reasonably be provided by the private sector in the form of development contributions.				
2258	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram	Yes
Comment: Paras 4.6, 4.8, 4.10, 4.16, 4.17, 4.19, 4.20 Agree and support: improved public transport sequential development starting with urban concentration and regeneration new development concentrated near improved transport facilities and jobs				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/a				
3596	M J Carr	Leighton Buzzard	Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram	No
Comment: The Spatial Strategy mentions the provision of "further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside" but this is contradicted by the fact that Green Belt land will be taken for the Eastern development of Leighton Buzzard				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt Review. Open space and green linkages to the countryside will be provided as part of the master planning of the urban extensions.				
2202	Ms Jayne Green	Eggington	Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram	No
Comment: The Spatial Strategy mentions the provision of "further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside" but this is contradicted by the fact that Green Belt land will be taken for the Eastern development of Leighton Buzzard				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt Review. Open space and green linkages to the countryside will be provided as part of the master planning of the urban extensions.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3541	Jon Green	Eggington	Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram	No
<p>Comment: The Spatial Strategy mentions the provision of "further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside" but this is contradicted by the fact that Green Belt land will be taken for the Eastern development of Leighton Buzzard</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt Review. Open space and green linkages to the countryside will be provided as part of the master planning of the urban extensions.</p>				
2147	Mrs Nicola Sadler	Lilley	Spatial Strategy and Key Diagram	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton is within an area of great landscape value and is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB whereas other options for growth are not. These other options have not been properly explored. In addition, the area is Green Belt and the boundary should not be changed unless there is no alternative. The housing in this area will not be able to fund the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
11	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: Should not be building houses to the East of Luton and infrastructure to the west.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Significant infrastructure is required and proposed throughout the Growth Area</p>				
3990	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: Concerned that only a preliminary SA has been published. The consortium has supplied an Environmental Compendium for east of Luton to inform the evidence base for the SA.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Prepare SA.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A full SA will be prepared to support the Final Core Strategy</p>				
2812	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: We agree that an integrated approach is required - but see little in the way of it being planned as such. There exists only the most rudimentary links from Southern Bedfordshire to Luton - all via car, with an hourly bus service which fails to join either train service together. Buses leave Leighton-Linslade station before trains arrive, and then the service gets cut short at the Luton end! NO wonder people revert to private vehicles to make the trip! This makes one wonder if there's any evidence of planning being involved!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: An integrated approach is required., Chapter 5 outlines how this will be achieved.</p>				
1847	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Imperative to outline water services infrastructure within environmental limits (see Water Cycle Study) (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Section to be added in Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
195	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: The guided bus way is a white elephant wanted by no-one except Luton Borough Council. They recently proved they cannot run a major project which was delivered 15 months late. The consultation was rigged against the obvious option which could be half the price, namely to directly connect the Dunstable branch to the Thameslink and electrify it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector.</p>				
3832	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Support</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2292	Mr Neal Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: General comment made about the nature of plan making and strategic development Not directly relevant to Luton &amp; South Beds CS - respondent opposes development to the west of Linslade in Aylesbury Vales's administrative area</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
441	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Development should be confined to town centres only so that no traffic growth results, thereby minimising the environmental impact and road miles.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that there is a need to develop urban extensions to meet the development requirements.</p>				
977	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: I agree that an integrated approach is required - but see little in the way of it being planned as such. There exists only the most rudimentary links from Southern Bedfordshire to Luton - all via car, with an hourly bus service which fails to join either train service together. Buses leave Leighton-Linslade station before trains arrive, and then the service gets cut short at the Luton end! No wonder people revert to private vehicles to make the trip! I see only "words" here - with no evidence of any planning being involved!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: An integrated approach is required., Chapter 5 outlines how this will be achieved.</p>				
575	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.1	No
<p>Comment: The east of Luton development will have no direct link to the proposed guided bus way unless it is specifically included by North Herts District Council in its planning.. The development is such that access to/from the new housing will be easier from outside the area than it will from inside the area - eg Luton itself</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Bus way extensions will be a combination of short lengths of segregated bus way and buses running on roads to serve new development. The Joint Committee will work with North Herts. to provide this.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
797	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.2	No
<p>Comment: The strategy outlined here uses the buzzword sustainability to a considerable extent. What may be sustainable as an urban development is not that which can in any way contribute to environmental sustainability, indeed it negates it. How can the environment be sustained when the spatial strategy involves covering virgin land with housing and the infrastructure required to sustain those new communities?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy seeks to balance economic, social and environmental sustainability and is subject to ongoing SA.</p>				
2813	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.2	No
<p>Comment: And this means? We know PPSs exist, but how do they 'enhance' this consultation?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: National and Regional Planning documents are part of Development Plan for the area and therefore relevant</p>				
2461	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Para. 4.2	No
<p>Comment: Para 4.2 recognises that East of Luton housing and bypass proposals are within North Hertfordshire and that the Core Strategy cannot allocate land there for development. NHDC is firmly against this development, the concern is that you are wasting public money by pushing the plans forward without support from key local bodies expressing their opposition, including refusal of planning permissions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. A Green Belt Review is required to meet the development needs. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
978	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.2	No
<p>Comment: All of which means ....? Yes, PPSs exist, but how do they enhance this consultation??</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: National and Regional Planning documents are part of Development Plan for the area and therefore relevant</p>				
2255	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: Object strongly to the Green Belt review which is just a euphemism for taking away green belt land and replacing it with agricultural land. The purpose of the Green Belt was to curtail urban extension and the proposed East of Luton extension will swallow up valuable wildlife habitats currently preserved by the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Green Space will be included in urban extensions</p>				
567	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: The strategy should not rely on urban extensions alone. There should be village clusters on the interurban transport network, and possibly an eco-town as well. The area of search east of Luton is a particularly poor choice for reasons of both sustainability and strategic connectivity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1611	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: Whilst significant growth is planned for greenfield locations and a strategic review of green belt land is proposed, local policy should protect the integrity of the green belt and enhance the character of the urban fringe. The green belt revision around Luton is highlighted in the MKSMSRS. This included two areas - west of Dunstable to the A6 in the north and east and south east of Luton. Housing allocations to 2021 were included and reviewed during the preparation of the East of England Plan. The panel report on the East of England Plan identified the potential for compensatory green belt extensions for the Luton (para. 4.24). However, the Secretary of State noted that all of rural South Bedfordshire is already greenbelt and that no extension was required (GO-East (2006) page 15). The adopted East of England Plan notes that the previous structure plan provides a sound basis for redefining boundaries (para.3.34). This policy included extension to the boundary in North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries. Compensatory Green Belt issue beyond scope of Core Strategy and to be pursued through RSS review.</p>				
2814	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: There is a real need to maintain the Green Belt - to prevent the coalescence of Towns with surrounding rural communities (i.e. exactly what it was originally conceived to be for). We support the concept of developing the "main conurbation" - before any development around Leighton-Linslade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: n/a</p>				
116	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: This sounds like double-speak for permission to build on Green Belt land. The psychological well-being of citizens relies upon access to green open space - especially with the high density housing now being built. Any rolling back of the green belt is detrimental to well-being. When will planners take this into consideration??</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Green Space will be included in urban extensions</p>				
431	Mr John Hamilton	Hitchin	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: I find it astonishing that Bedfordshire Council are allowed to plan and build thousands of home in North Hertfordshire, taking up valuable Hertfordshire land, destroying beautiful Hertfordshire Green Belt and farming land and yet gain "credit" for it as part of Bedfordshire's allocation of new housing. Bedfordshire Council should build in Bedfordshire. Many people will object to and fight the plans regardless of which council gets "credit" for it but for Bedfordshire Council to benefit from Hertfordshire's loss is ridiculous, bordering on insane. Hertfordshire Council already need to find space for many thousands of homes and should be free to plan for this within it's boundaries. Perhaps they should build 10,000 homes around Dunstable?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
2708	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: Rolling back greenbelt designation will provide justification for opportunistic proposals in the remaining greenbelt, such as around J12 where farming land is now regarded as 'waste land' awaiting some application that will meet with approval. Once the majority of Greenbelt land has been lost, the argument will be made that it is hardly worth keeping the rest.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Green Space will be included in urban extensions</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2249	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: Unless the Core Strategy process can satisfy these Green Belt review exceptional circumstances tests identified in PPG2, it will be neither sound nor legally compliant.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine the proposals in the Preferred Options document against the guidance in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine the proposals in the Preferred Options document against the guidance in PPG2.</p>				
160	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: Having been a Luton resident for 50 years, I can see the need for the urban extensions which lie to the north-west and north of Dunstable, north of Houghton Regis and Luton. I do not support the proposed extension to the east of Luton which currently lies in the North Hertfordshire district.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3677	Alan Murphy	Luton	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: The area of search is incomplete and should include the south east of Luton, as per MKSMSRS policy 2a. This area is of Great Landscape Value and was excluded by the Joint Committee on these grounds. It was therefore excluded from the Environmental Sensitivity Studies and so it is not possible to compare the value of this land with that of the east of Luton and other sites. The landscape east of Luton is at least of equivalent value to that of the south east.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The MKSMSRS identified broad areas of search. Land to the South of the Airport is not considered appropriate for development for landscape constraints, lack of developer interest and inability to connect to the urban area.</p>				
2069	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Para. 4.3	Yes
<p>Comment: Our land to the north of the A5-M1 link also benefits from being within the area of Green Belt review identified in the MKSM Sub-Regional Strategy (as opposed to Caddington to the south west of Luton). Should it be released for development it also would not impinge on areas of AONB to the north east and south west of the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact. Development beyond bypass is not preferred.</p>				
979	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.3	Yes
<p>Comment: I support the concept of developing the main conurbation before any development around Leighton-Linslade</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: n/a</p>				
259	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: However, there is a real need to maintain the Green Belt - to prevent the coalescence of Towns with surrounding rural communities (i.e. exactly what it was originally conceived to be for).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. Coalescence of villages will be prevented where possible.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
576	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.3	No
<p>Comment: MKSMSRS does not allow for any incursion into the Chiltern AONB. The proposed bypasses do go into this AONB. Just because an area that should be properly considered, such as west of Luton, was not in the original MKSMSRS does not mean it should be excluded from consideration</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
12	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: please do tell us what is wrong with the West of Luton apart from a bunch of NIMBY politicians who are afraid to not be re-elected</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
1045	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Early delivery of the residual of 1,000 dwellings is important given delays that might occur on delivery of new dwellings in the Growth Area and associated urban extensions. Early delivery would also help maintain a 5 year supply of deliverable sites.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This encourages urban extensions to main towns and limited growth in residual area.</p>				
2256	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: Object strongly to this item. Why has this option been selected ahead of the others listed in Issues and Options paper and which cannot be found on the website. No reasoned explanation has been given of this decision.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
135	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.4	Yes
<p>Comment: I feel Caddington and the surrounding area should definitely be considered for the growth area. This area benefits from being geographically close to the centre of Luton, and also being very well located for transport connections of the M1 and A5. This area would fit well in to sustainable transport use and lower impact congestion. Caddington is also large enough that it would keep its high street and village green if it was enlarged or even linked up to Luton. As a local plan this area should definitely be included in growth plans.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The Site Allocations DPD will review development opportunities around the villages to meet residual housing need.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Caddington is a large village which is suitable for small scale new development to meet the development in residual area.</p>				
1589	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: The statement that 'the North Herts District LDF will progress the planning' of the direction of growth to the East of Luton is highly questionable given the level of opposition known to exist in Hertfordshire to such a concept. The statement is surely no more than an aspirational recommendation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1717	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 4.4	No
Comment: No mention made to the other areas of search from the Issues and Options stage.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Clarified in 4.24				
798	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.4	No
Comment: The issues and Options paper identified 13 locations that might be used for development. It appears that the option described in this paragraph has been prioritised without explanation. I therefore object to this option-in particular for the reason that it pinpoints Green Belt land for development.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.				
1516	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Para. 4.4	No
Comment: It is arrogant in the extreme to assume that an adjoining local government area should model its framework on Luton and South Bedfordshire's demands. NHDC has its own priorities and impositions from the East of England Plan.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
839	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.4	No
Comment: It seems crazy to me to put another urban extension to East of LB...when the vast bulk of the strategy revolves (correctly) around the main conurbation of Luton/Dunstable where all the infrastructure and transport proposals are focussed!. LB it seems is to get houses...and houses! That's it! Has due credit/allowance been made for the many thousand houses built in the south of LB in the last five years...and still being built. LB should be excluded...10,000 plus residents signed a petition to this effect (and are being ignored)				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Linlade as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.				
1233	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 4.4	No
Comment: concerned that two large urban extensions north of conurbation being proposed which will have devastating effect on landscape/green belt. these development entirely reliant upon provision of A5-M1 link and improvements to M1 both with serious funding doubts. extension in north Herts. - joint committee has not direct control over this development therefore unsound. propose that it is more acceptable to designate large number of smaller urban extension, Beech Road to be one such site as it is capable of being delivered now, no over-riding landscape/bio-diversity issues, can contribute 350-400 dwellings, not reliant on major infrastructure provision, well located. potential to be gateway site for Dunstable, well connected for public transport, site not within green belt or AONB				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. Delivery is a key factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core strategy. There is a mechanism in PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
547	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: I completely object to this statement. There is NO repeat NO available evidence to support this. A comparative assessment should be available in order for alternative sites to be ranked.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
385	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: I totally object to this. The available evidence does not support this choice of option and no real evidence or justification is given in this consultation document. I cannot see how land in a separate county can be included in this document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
1326	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: This 'preferred direction of growth' to the east of the main conurbation' - is there anywhere that you give the analysis to support this selection? As far as I understand it, this would not have been a natural choice given the evidence in the issues and Options consultation - and no further argument for this site is given at any point during this consultation document. If we cannot see the process behind the decision making, how are local residents expected to support what looks like an unnecessary destruction of the green belt?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
756	Mrs Ann Morfon	St. Albans	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the urban extension into another county. Hertfordshire has its own housing allocation to decide where it is best located. Bedfordshire/Luton must not be able to use Hertfordshire land for any of its housing numbers allocation, especially in the case of east of Luton in North Hertfordshire District where it will be inappropriate development of green field Green Belt land. In addition strongly object to any residential development being provided in the flight paths for Luton Airport - both the current and any potential future flight paths areas should be kept free of housing development. Please can we learn from the noise and quality of life issues for residents because housing was built around Heathrow Airport and under its flight paths.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
161	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the preferred direction for growth that lies to the east of the main conurbation which mostly lies in the North Hertfordshire District. I have lived in the east of Luton for 50 years. This is for two main reasons. The proposal would destroy a wonderful amenity that many people currently enjoy. This area is Green Belt land that is valued by those in this area. This development is quite inappropriate. Furthermore, a large housing development here would put additional strain on the main route into town - that is Crawley Green Road. This route is already under almost intolerable strain at times. The addition of several thousand houses to the east of Luton would quite simply be unworkable in these transport terms.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
509	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: I would like to know why this option has been selected above all the others. Available evidence does not support this option. There is no real evidence or justification given.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
2614	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: Why has the option east of Luton been selected ahead of the others from the Issues and Options paper? The available evidence does not support this option and no real comparative assessment of the options has been provided.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
1455	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.4	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the preferred urban extension to the north of Luton. Parts are well placed to deliver early growth to meet the objectives of the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1193	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Although we agree with the broad areas of search, we feel that special consideration should be given to minimising the impacts upon smaller settlements nearby, ensuring they maintain their rural identity and are not impacted by increased road movements - for example Heath and Reach.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis.</p>				
442	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt should, under NO circumstances, be utilised to accommodate urban extensions (i.e. urban sprawl) whether "sustainable" and "strategic" or not. The Green Belt exists precisely to guard against such short-sighted actions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
464	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: The Green Belt in North Hertfordshire has high amenity value, with much of high agricultural value and categorised Grade 1 Landscape.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1461	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: This is an horrific incursion - it's grade one green belt, it's outside Luton and south Beds' jurisdiction and building here is completely unsupported by evidence. Worse still, this area's infrastructure is already painfully poor.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
373	Mr Andrew Weber	Knebworth	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: How is it that Luton and south Bedfordshire think they can build on land within North Hertfordshire District Council without their agreement, which they definitely do not have?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Delivery Strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
767	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: None of these "growth" areas is needed; regeneration of existing conurbations should be completed before even discussing the possibility of green field development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs.</p>				
3007	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockermhoe	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: No evidence available supports this choice of option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
84	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: Development to the East of L. Buzzard is preferred by who ? Certainly not by anyone who actually lives there. A petition was submitted to our local M.P., containing 10,000 signatures, but this was ignored in a so-called democratic country.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
578	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.4	No
<p>Comment: This states what has been chosen as preferred but does not even address the reasons. The Joint Planning Committee members had not seen this reasoning before they made the decisions, which must be wrong</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
518	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.5	No
<p>Comment: It is not clear why the east of Luton option has been chose ahead of, what appear from the evidence provided, to be more appropriate locations (specifically but not limited to, west of Luton). In the absence of overwhelming evidence, one must conclude that the fact that the EOL development is in NHDC, with its electorate unable to pass judgement on the councillors' decision, must play a significant role.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.</p>				
1046	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.5	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 4.5 Support/Object/Comment: Support Comments: We support the inclusion of "appropriately scaled growth to main rural settlements as illustrated on the Key Diagram". It is noted that this will include potential development at Slip End. We would support this and suggest sensitive development to the south east of Slip End on land north of Front Street and east of New Street.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS proposes development in and around Slip End</p>				
2257	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.5	No
<p>Comment: Diagram fails to clearly describe what is intended. When printed the type is very small and indistinct, even when enlarged.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Key Diagram to be improved in CS</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Key Diagram to be improved in CS</p>				
582	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.5	No
<p>Comment: This is the wrong definition of the growth areas. The growth area of Greater Luton should include satellite towns and/or village clusters within 15 minutes by rail from Luton as well as urban extensions. The growth area of Leighton-Linslade should similarly include satellites as well as urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
136	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.5	Yes
<p>Comment: If expansion does take place to the East of Luton, it is my belief this should occur only to the area north of Mangrove green, Mangrove Lodge and Mangrove Hall. The area between Beech Hill (A505 Road) and Lilley Bottom (road); i.e. Putteridge and North East. This should be able to link up with the proposed North Luton bypass. The reasons why I think extending this area further south to Wigmore and the airport would be inappropriate are: 1. All the hamlets e.g. Mangrove and Cockernhoe would completely lose there rural nature. They could not exist. 2. The traffic levels on Crawley Green road in to Luton town centre (A505) can not cope at the moment, building 5,500 new homes with this as there only sensible route in to town would create horrific traffic queues for ever. (i.e. it is completely foreseeable, but would be irreversible once all the housing is built). This traffic problem is still definitely the case now with the ELC complete, rush hour and even weekends.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The JC will work with North Herts. to plan and deliver the proposed development through the North Herts. LDF.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The JC will work with North Herts. to plan and deliver the proposed development through the North Herts. LDF.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3991	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.5	Yes
<p>Comment: Important that timescales for housing delivery in all areas is kept reasonably flexible to ensure a constant supply of effective housing sites is achieved. Do not apply a single point in time that cannot be guaranteed. Support phased approach that aims to deliver initial phase completions in 2012.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy will outline approach to ensuring delivery of housing including approach to contingency.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy.</p>				
1	Mrs D Slater	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 4.5	No
<p>Comment: N.H. District has its own pressures for development. Luton &amp; Beds need to keep within their own boundaries. It appears from the document that Luton &amp; Beds wish to protect the distinctiveness of some of their villages, are they intending to do this by the proposed encroachment into N. Herts?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The JC will work with North Herts. to plan and deliver the proposed development through the North Herts. LDF.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The JC will work with North Herts. to plan and deliver the proposed development through the North Herts. LDF.</p>				
1386	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.5	No
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Paragraph 4.5 Support/Object/Comment: Object Comments: It is noted that the Core Strategy defines the Growth area as "comprising the main conurbation of Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, and the market town of Leighton Buzzard and Linslade, together with any preferred urban extensions of these settlements." This paragraph refers to the Key Diagram at Figure 1 which illustrates the preferred locations for strategic new development. The key diagram fails to include our client's land despite the site being excluded from the Green Belt, being subject of an existing allocation for development and the proposal to continue to safeguard this gateway site for development through Policy CS10.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is not practical to show all development sites on the Key Diagram</p>				
1209	Mrs Jill Anderson-Dixon	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.6	No
<p>Comment: Why has LB to lag behind Luton and Dunstable. You appear to be saying they are bigger therefore more important</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that LB is less sustainable than the main conurbation.</p>				
3247	Barton Willmore	Reading	Para. 4.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the approach which places emphasis on the consideration of brownfield sites within Dunstable and Luton in the first instance. In particular, employment sites should be reviewed to ascertain whether they are still required for that purpose and whether the site is incongruous in its setting due to adjacent changes to land use. This is of particular relevance given the current economic climate, where employment sites may no longer be in active use.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development but also seeks to protect employment sites.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3327	Barton Willmore on behalf of CBRE Investors		Para. 4.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the approach which places emphasis on the consideration of brown field sites within Dunstable and Luton in the first instance. Employment, sites should be reviewed to ascertain whether they are still required for that purpose. However, the Employment Land Review (January 2008) does not represent the most up to date evidence on employment land, given that the economic downturn has been at its peak since the latter part of 2008 and as such a review prior that may provide a misconstrued picture of the situation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development but also seeks to protect employment sites.</p>				
217	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.6	No
<p>Comment: This is blatantly not true. How can you possibly say that 'The first choice location for growth related development is within existing urban areas' when you are planning to build on true beautiful English countryside? Not the often flat and uninteresting areas of Bedfordshire, but the rolling countryside of Hertfordshire. Since when does Cockernhoe, Darley Hall etc. fall into the category of an urban area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS proposes development within the urban area but not all the development required can be met in the urban area.</p>				
138	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Regarding building housing within existing urban areas. I particularly support this aim. Especially with Luton where manufacturing and factories are on the decline, there is a good supply of brownfield sites to continue to develop in this way. It also benefits from closeness to Town Centre and real alternatives of walking to work and leisure and shorter car journeys (more sustainable).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development but also seeks to protect employment sites.</p>				
1585	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.6	No
<p>Comment: We note the admission here that expansion at Leighton Buzzard raises greater questions of sustainability than does expansion of the main conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
799	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.6	No
<p>Comment: The key diagram at figure one lacks any detail about the proposed developments in North Hertfordshire. Indeed it is extremely difficult to read the caption that indicates that development is proposed in N Herts. It appears that urban extension can be anticipated from Luton into N Herts and N Herts villages, Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green, Tea Green together with farmland and woodland will be swallowed up and the villages of Breachwood Green and Lilley extensively affected. What on earth is meant by "scaled growth" in rural settlements?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Continue to liaise with North Herts. to agree level of detail to be shown on the Key Diagram</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Key diagram provides as much information as is possible given that the delivery of the urban extension to the East of Luton will be delivered through the North Herts. LDF.</p>				
2815	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.6	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the view that growth be directed towards the main conurbation, before being directed towards Leighton-Linslade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3374	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Para. 4.6	Yes
Comment: Support making full use of previously developed land by selecting existing urban areas as the first choice for the location of growth				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1282	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.6	Yes
Comment: The priority given to infill around the Luton/Dunstable/Houghton Regis conurbation is sound, and based on infrastructure improvements such as the guided bus way system.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
162	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.6	Yes
Comment: I thoroughly support the notion of the first choice location for growth related development being within existing urban areas. This "brown-field" development is to be preferred before any "green-field" development, particularly in Green Belt areas.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1467	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.6	No
Comment: The concept of a "first choice" location is not well conceived. The urban extensions will have a natural lead time before delivery is possible but beyond that development of the urban extension should be accelerated to ensure the wider benefits for Luton are delivered at the earliest time. The existing urban area of Luton will have its own timeframe for development relevant to its market.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Prepare Housing Delivery Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS in the early years. Housing Delivery Strategy will outline the timing and phasing of the urban extensions.				
443	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.6	No
Comment: Growth should NOT be permitted at any rural settlements.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This includes some limited growth in residual area.				
980	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.6	Yes
Comment: I support the view that growth be directed towards the main conurbation before being directed towards Leighton-Linslade				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
338	Mr David Willingale	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.6	No
<p>Comment: With regard to any further new housing development in Leighton - Linslade, the town cannot accommodate any further expansion due to the unresolvable problems of narrow town centre roads. At the current population levels these roads only allow single file traffic due to on street parking. The rail transport from Leighton is already running at capacity. There is no potential to attract any further employment due to neighbouring high employment towns like Milton Keynes and Luton. I believe these problems are insurmountable restricting any further expansion of the town.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.		
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling and employment land study.				
579	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.6	Yes
<p>Comment: I am entirely in favour of building on brownfield sites first - in fact I would like to see evidence that this brownfield potential has not been understated in the Preferred Options document.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development. SHLAA identifies potential sites for development.				
13	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: no it does not- there already is a planning application to the West of Stevenage. the East of Luton would squeeze Herts out and bring Stevenage, Hitchin and Luton into coalescence</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
2259	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: Growth in the east will benefit urban community at the expense of the rural community which is discrimination.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.		
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence balancing benefits and impacts.				
137	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: Given that the census shows that Luton has a declining population, why do we need to build such a huge amount of housing? Given that housing in Luton is far more affordable than so much of the South East and that prices have dropped significantly since the start of this plan, wouldn't a revised lower target be far more sensible/practical.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered..				
800	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree. Considerable housing development can be achieved by compulsorily purchasing old, decrepit Victorian buildings and building modern flats to accommodate all the new families' requirements. these could be near the urban centres with all the advantages that offers. Improved transport and infrastructure without the increased carbon footprint that building outwards will entail will supply all access needs.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development. SHLAA identifies potential sites for development.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3992	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree that the amount of growth cannot be accommodated within the existing urban areas and support the delivery of growth through sustainable urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1848	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Sites at high flood risk need to ensure that new developments can adapt to and reduce the risk of flooding ('betterment'). Need to sequentially test proposed site allocations using SFRA or EA flood maps. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 10 outlines approach to managing flood risk</p>				
539	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: Regenerate the core of Luton first before taking the easy option of green field site development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Prepare Housing Delivery Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS in the early years. Housing Delivery Strategy will outline the timing and phasing of the urban extensions.</p>				
196	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: No: the only sustainable option is no growth at all, or growth only in under populated areas such as almost anywhere in Europe outside South-East England.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered..</p>				
3375	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Para. 4.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Whilst the difficulties in identifying sufficient land within existing urban areas to accommodate identified future growth is appreciated, it is considered that urban extensions should not take priority over the release of existing urban sites.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Prepare Housing Delivery Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS in the early years. Housing Delivery Strategy will outline the timing and phasing of the urban extensions.</p>				
3678	Alan Murphy	Luton	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: Clause 4.1 of the Final Core Strategy Issues and Options SA Working Paper' (Jan 2009) states that spatial option 7 is the best performing and that this is based on minimum land-take without including the area east of Luton. The Core Strategy Preferred Options, however, most closely matches the non-preferred option 8 with maximum land-take.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including further preparation of Sustainability Appraisals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The SA appraised 10 options and recommended a hybrid of the options based on the principle of widespread growth proposed in Spatial Option 7. Preferred Options based on evaluation of evidence, including evidence prepared after the publication of the SA working paper.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1757	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 4.7	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC agrees with the statement at paragraph 4.7 of the Preferred Options document that the evidence base clearly demonstrates that the amount of development established in the East of England Plan and the MKSMSRS for the Luton area cannot be accommodated within existing urban areas. As a consequence, the provision of planned urban extensions at the northern edge of the conurbation is the most sustainable strategic spatial strategy to pursue.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
768	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: This presupposes that "growth" is either required or necessary. I question this assumption. I also do not believe that development cannot be confined to existing urban areas. I do not want to see what will eventually become a continuous belt of development from Stevenage to Leighton Buzzard. This is just not acceptable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development. SHLAA identifies potential sites for development.</p>				
580	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.7	No
<p>Comment: A development east of Luton, bordered by an outer bypass will not fit into existing conurbation centres such as Luton itself. Access to Luton and its facilities from this development will be extremely congested, congestion made worse by the new housing itself.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Infrastructure Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport modelling.</p>				
2817	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed! It is VERY important to safeguard the future of Leighton-Linslade - and its surrounding rural communities - else it's historical value as a market town' will be entirely lost. As it is, Leighton has already lost its 'cattle market' - because agriculture in the surrounding area has been blighted by roads, houses and mineral extraction.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports growth in and around Leighton Linslade whilst seeking to protect its character including key areas of landscape and biodiversity.</p>				
1470	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.8	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the role for Luton and the consequent priority it is given.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
444	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Urban extensions can be minimised by vastly increasing the population of the town centres.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development. SHLAA identifies potential sites for development.</p>				
982	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed! It is VERY important to safeguard the future of Leighton-Linslade - and its surrounding rural communities - else it's historical value as a market town will be entirely lost. As it is, Leighton has already lost its 'cattle market' - because agriculture in the surrounding area has been blighted by roads, houses and mineral extraction.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS supports growth in and around Leighton Linslade whilst seeking to protect its character including key areas of landscape and biodiversity.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1047	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.9	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 4.9 Support/Object/Comment: Support Comments: We support the recognition within the plan that rural settlements can contribute to the Growth Area by meeting the local needs of the communities they serve. We support the intention of "identifying such settlements where appropriately scaled development potential may exist" to include land south east of Slip End.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS proposes development in and around Slip End</p>				
2261	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.9	Yes
<p>Comment: A fine aspiration but lack of detail gives little confidence in how this can be delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission version of Core Strategy to include more detail about the planning of development in rural areas</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further detail would be helpful to provide greater certainty.</p>				
801	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.9	No
<p>Comment: As ever and with para 4.4 the weasel word 'appropriate' is used. What is 'appropriate' is not explained. Clearly what may seem appropriate to some points of view will not be to others. Thus until this term is explained no observation can be made.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the planning system is to balance the different needs to arrive at an appropriate strategy. In the case of the scale of rural development, this will be considered through the preparation in the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
1308	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.9	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the reference to meeting the needs of rural settlements in this paragraph.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
163	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.9	No
<p>Comment: Regarding the proposed growth area to the east of Luton, I have noted that the residents of the rural settlements of Cockernhoe, Tea Green, and Mangrove Green in particular do not feel that the addition of several thousand houses which would obliterate their communities is "appropriately scaled development". Knowing a number of them, particularly the parents of children at Cockernhoe school, of which my wife and I are included. Opposition is sincerely and strongly felt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify this.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified the area to the East of Luton as an area of search for new development. Outside of the proposed areas for urban extensions limited development will occur.</p>				
445	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.9	No
<p>Comment: Rural settlements are not sustainable and they should be allowed to die out, with rural dwellers encouraged to move to urban areas where the jobs are. Rural settlements should not under any circumstances be expanded.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This includes some limited growth in residual area.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
583	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.9	No
<p>Comment: Selected small scale building on the edges of existing rural settlements is almost inevitable, but totally engulfing rural settlements is not in any way in line with this stated objective.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify this.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified the need for urban extensions in area of search. Outside of the proposed areas for urban extensions limited development will occur.</p>				
1136	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Barton-le-Clay Parish Council strongly supports limiting major development to the principal towns and selected urban extensions. Development in the rural area should be severely limited to that which is necessary to maintain viability whilst safeguarding the separate identity and individual character of the rural villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Meeting housing needs in rural areas needs to balance a number of considerations.</p>				
14	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 4.10	No
<p>Comment: how are you protecting the countryside- your plan shows total neglect of the countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that development will be required in the countryside. Chapter 12 outlines approach to protecting the countryside.</p>				
3745	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Support paragraph</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
218	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.10	No
<p>Comment: How will building on the beautiful natural countryside of Hertfordshire fulfil this part of the strategy?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that development will be required in the countryside. Chapter 12 outlines approach to protecting the countryside.</p>				
850	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Totally agree with this</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
803	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: I support these admirable objectives. However the means by which they are to be achieved is not given.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapters 4, 6, 7 and 8 outline approach to sustainable development and regeneration through new development. Chapter 12 outlines approach to protecting the countryside.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2818	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.10	No
Comment: Then "Protect the Countryside"! Don't swallow up Greenbelt land - no matter who owns it.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.				
JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that Green Belt boundaries will need to be revised in some locations.				
3504	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 4.10	No
Comment: Questions that the countryside will be safeguarded (referring to proposed East of Luton development).				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals.				
2555	Holwell Parish Council	Holwell	Para. 4.10	No
Comment: How can the creation of 5,500 new dwellings in a profoundly rural setting, to the east of Luton, be in line with this paragraph?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.				
JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that Green Belt boundaries will need to be revised in some locations. East of Luton is identified as a potential area for development				
548	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.10	Yes
Comment: I am in support of the bullet points raised.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
386	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.10	Yes
Comment: I support this for the reasons given.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
164	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.10	Yes
Comment: I thoroughly support the Core Strategy's three fold aims as stated. The proposed development to the east of Luton does not, however follow all these aims. It does not protect the countryside, it would destroy a large chunk of what is currently Green-Belt land and put a strain on that Green Belt land surrounding it.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.				
JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that Green Belt boundaries will need to be revised in some locations. East of Luton is identified as a potential area for development				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2223	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Natural England endorses the reasoning given for safeguarding the countryside as stated in paragraph 4.10, and supports the general approach that the Spatial Development Strategy takes e.g. the package of proposals to deliver a strengthened public transport framework outlined in paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15, and the €urban area first principle identified in paragraph 4.17.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
510	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockemhoe	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Fully support this To ensure the most sustainable pattern of development is delivered; To help support and secure the regeneration of existing areas; and To protect the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1336	Toddington Estates Ltd	Cambridge	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the principle of providing some growth at the edge of identified rural settlements</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core strategy identifies need to provide for new housing developments in residual area.</p>				
465	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Rural settlements are not sustainable and should not be expanded. Development should be confined to town centres.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered..</p>				
1462	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: These are very laudable ambitions, ignored elsewhere in the proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that development will be required in the countryside. Chapter 12 outlines approach to protecting the countryside.</p>				
983	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.10	No
<p>Comment: Then Protect the Countryside! Don't swallow up Greenbelt land - no matter who owns it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that development will be required in the countryside. Chapter 12 outlines approach to protecting the countryside.</p>				
3009	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockemhoe	Para. 4.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Support for the three bullet point reasons</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
85	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.10	No
<p>Comment: Please explain to me how the countryside will be protected by "redefining" the Green Belt - the original purpose of which was to do exactly that? Again, the use of words to cover up the fact that more countryside will be built on, including that which was protected by the Green Belt - end of.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that development will be required in the countryside. Chapter 12 outlines approach to protecting the countryside.</p>				
584	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.10	No
<p>Comment: This is stated as a wish to protect the countryside, yet the proposed building is in the Green Belt and the bypass is even partly in a AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development requirement as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it. This means that Green Belt boundaries will need to be revised in some locations. East of Luton is identified as a potential area for development</p>				
519	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.11	Yes
<p>Comment: I entirely support this objective. However, it is unclear how the proposed development looks to satisfy this test. In particular, I note that: a. I cannot see how any development requiring large scale transport infrastructure (particularly roads) is in any way sustainable b. the development is on a greenfield site. This is no doubt more desirable for developers but hardly accords with the regeneration comment c. is the maxim "we had to destroy it to save it"? Otherwise, it's hard to see how the greenfield development contemplated protects the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
1137	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: One of the intentions of including land within the Green Belt is that its boundaries should endure (PPG2, para 2.8). Green Belt boundaries should therefore only be altered reluctantly and for exceptional reasons. The Parish Council accepts that the major urban extensions represent such an exceptional case. However, inner Green Belt boundaries round the villages should for the most part remain untouched, with any 'tidying up' being of a very minor nature. The Core Strategy does not need to 'ensure that the recast Green Belt ... has a defined role': the purposes of Green Belt are fully set out in PPG2 para 1.5 and only once boundaries have been defined should uses of Green Belt land be considered (PPG2, para 1.6).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core strategy identifies need to provide for new housing developments in residual area. This may require Green Belt reviews around the villages.</p>				
1048	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.11	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 4.11 Support/Object/Comment: Support Comments: We support the need for review of Green Belt boundaries for the new urban extensions. In addition, there will be a need to redefine the Green Belt boundaries around the villages to accommodate sensitive amounts of residential development. Para 4.31 suggests that such revisions will be defined through the Site Allocations DPD. We would support this approach to considering smaller scale development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2262	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.11	No
Comment: This will mean taking land from elsewhere further diminishing the supply of agricultural land.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered..				
804	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.11	Yes
Comment: Even though the Green Belt may be recast it does not mitigate the fact that rural land will be destroyed.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review. PPG2 advises for the need for a long term approach to be taken when setting or revising Green Belt boundaries but permits its revision in the future where very special circumstances can be identified.				
802	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.11	Yes
Comment: Support. However the means by which this excellent objective is to be achieved is not given.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission version of Core Strategy to include more detail about this issue.				
JC Reason for Response: Point of clarification				
1740	David Lock Associates	Milton Keynes	Para. 4.11	Yes
Comment: We suggest the addition of the following reference to refer to the recasting of the Green Belt with new boundaries following the provision of land for urban extensions and for the proposed Strategic Employment Sites including the rail freight interchange facility on the site of the former Sundon Quarry.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further consideration of merits of removing land from the Green Belt in this location.				
JC Reason for Response: Core strategy identifies need review Green Belt boundaries.				
3993	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.11	Yes
Comment: Redraft references to recasting the Green Belt to align with PPG2 requirements that boundaries should not be drawn excessively tightly around existing or potential built-up areas or this will constrain future development needs.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Greater clarification of the approach to Green Belt revisions would be helpful				
2819	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.11	No
Comment: The current Greenbelt around Leighton Buzzard was designated to do just that! However, it has already been breached twice (in the late 60's) to allow Leighton to grow in an easterly direction. This is why we have little confidence in any statement about re-casting the greenbelt, and any permanency.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.				
117	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.11	No
Comment: What does this mean? How? Especially if the current green belt is reduced.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission version of Core Strategy to include more detail about this issue.				
JC Reason for Response: Point of clarification				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1284	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.11	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree entirely. The re-cast Green Belt must be sacrosanct for generations to come, and must provide more than just open fields which are the private domain of farmers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPG2 advises for the need for a long term approach to be taken when setting or revising Green Belt boundaries but permits its revision in the future where very special circumstances can be identified.</p>				
1475	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.11	Yes
<p>Comment: The re-cast boundary of the Green Belt should be drawn with its "permanence" in mind. The Green Belt should not be reviewed around only the urban extensions but should include other key development areas. We have in mind Butterfield which is a key successful employment area which will assist with the employment target and is recognised later in Core Strategy. The current boundary of Butterfield is defined by the current planning permission. However beyond that boundary is Green Belt (and not AONB) which needs to be reviewed to enable Butterfield to fulfil its role. In the case of the urban extensions and Butterfield the re-cast boundary should not be drawn tightly.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review. PPG2 advises for the need for a long term approach to be taken when setting or revising Green Belt boundaries but permits its revision in the future where very special circumstances can be identified.</p>				
1195	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: This and 4.10 above seem to seek to agree defined land for development, but not a more comprehensive approach (consistent with the 'green growth area' principle) that seeks to identify land for development and associated, essential green infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 11 outlines approach to Green Infrastructure</p>				
448	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: No urban extensions into Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review.</p>				
447	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: The Green Belt must remain sacrosanct and should be enlarged rather than eroded.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review.</p>				
446	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.11	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree that priority should be given to protecting the countryside from development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
466	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt boundaries should not be negotiable and not be re-drawn to suit development needs. They were established precisely to guard against such development pressures.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review. PPG2 advises for the need for a long term approach to be taken when setting or revising Green Belt boundaries but permits its revision in the future where very special circumstances can be identified.</p>				
984	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: The current Green belt around Leighton Buzzard was designed to do just that! However, it has already been breached twice (in the 70's) to allow Leighton to grow in an easterly direction. This is why we have little confidence in any statement about re-casting the green belt. It's just 'what suits' at the time.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review and PPG2 permits it.</p>				
86	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: Yes, the defined role = no protection afforded by the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPG2 advises for the need for a long term approach to be taken when setting or revising Green Belt boundaries but permits its revision in the future where very special circumstances can be identified.</p>				
585	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.11	No
<p>Comment: This is an aspiration that the re-cast Green Belt boundaries will be respected in the future when the existing Green Belt boundaries have been severely violated - it's hypocritical</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPG2 advises for the need for a long term approach to be taken when setting or revising Green Belt boundaries but permits its revision in the future where very special circumstances can be identified.</p>				
617	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.13	Yes
<p>Comment: I strongly agree with the intentions of the strategy here, but it doesn't deliver on them. Apart from the proposed new station at Lodge Farm the strategy relies on buses to deliver the public transport. This won't work for several reasons. Buses, even with priority measures, are too slow; they can't provide a viable alternative to the car, particularly for longer-distance journeys, and they can't deliver the modal shift you need to relieve the congested road system. And crucially the old railway from Dunstable to Luton may be needed for a section of the East-West Railway and so may not be available for the bus way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A combination of public transport measures are needed.</p>				
1593	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.13	No
<p>Comment: The reference to 'ensuring that private car accessibility is also adequately planned for' is particularly concerning - is this intended to include access to town centres, and employment zones for which Green Travel Plans should be in place? There seems to be some equivocation here in the strategy to secure significant change in transport modal choice.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The LDF needs to provide for both car and non car travel. to ensure appropriate accessibility. Chapter 5 outlines this in more detail.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3834	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.13	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation. However, there is a concern with the assertion that in drafting a sustainable Core Strategy it is relevant to ensure that private car accessibility is also adequately planned for.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The LDF needs to provide for both car and non car travel. to ensure appropriate accessibility. Chapter 5 outlines this in more detail.</p>				
1387	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.13	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Paragraph 4.13 Support/Object/Comment: Comment The inclusion of a Strategic Employment Site at J10a incorporating a Park and Ride allows for the development to be provided with supporting infrastructure that is wholly in accordance with paragraph 4.13.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development is not supported at J10a.</p>				
587	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.13	No
<p>Comment: The east of Luton development is not on the guided bus way route. There is a stated aspiration that the guided bus way extension will be funded by North Herts, but absolutely no commitment to do so. Car access to a bypass will clearly be fine, but car access to both amenity areas in the main conurbation will be fraught, as will car and public transport access to existing and planned employment areas</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included</p>				
1211	Mrs Jill Anderson-Dixon	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Why is the A5-M1 link not mentioned ? It is essential to Dunstable and LB for public transport to improve. It is planned but has been postponed to 2013-214 ( I understand the reasons). It is needed as soon as possible but as usual others know best - there have even been questions in the House about it but no joy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This relates to Public Transport. Chapter 5 outlines approach to Transport Infrastructure in more detail.</p>				
2263	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: Preferred extensions will result in new roads built through green belt land and the park and ride will concrete over more green belt in N Herts in order to serve Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact. New development including the park and ride will serve those in Luton and those travelling to Luton.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1803	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Board generally supports key elements of additional public transport infrastructure identified and welcomes the fact that the 'major new transport schemes' are not included in this paragraph. Implementation of these, and other sustainable transport measures that are not specifically identified, should allow development to take place without the need for new bypasses to the north and east of Luton. The Board does not object to the provision of park and ride sites on roads that are within or adjacent to the Chilterns AONB provided that: the sites proposed are outside the AONB, the designs of the sites and any buildings take account of the context, any buildings are constructed using locally produced building materials, lighting is kept to an absolute minimum and should all be subject to time control so that the tranquility of the AONB is not unduly affected.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the non bypass options and to identify the most appropriate location for Park and Ride		
<p>JC Reason for Response: JC report of 20 March 09 indicated that further work on non-bypass option would be undertaken. Further examination of the location of the Park and Ride sites to be undertaken</p>				
3746	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Support paragraph</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
851	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Improved public transport is key to achieving some of the earlier stated objectives around sustainable integrated communities and minimised carbon emissions</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
139	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: Given that your report states that such a large proportion of car journeys in Luton are only a short distance (i.e. by residents); what real impact can a park and ride scheme have? It sounds very gimmicky. Can you please make sure it will be self-funding before allocating council resources/tax to it.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals and ensure delivery of infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: A combination of public transport measures are needed.</p>				
1603	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: We agree that public transport improvement has to be at the heart of any sustainable development strategy, but unless these improvements are accompanied by positive deterrents to car use we believe the measures proposed in this paragraph will make no more than a marginal impact on traffic volume and congestion.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 5 outlines this in more detail.</p>				
3994	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: We fully support the principle of delivering strategic public transport infrastructure. Support for bullet 2 where feasible, viable and in scale with proposed urban extension areas.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2820	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Two statements here concern Leighton Buzzard - yet neither seems to have been indicated (certainly no enhancement of "radial" routes!). The only route known to be being considered is the Ring Road round the east of Leighton! This is hardly a "radial route" enhancement!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 5 outlines this in more detail.</p>				
840	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: No further radial road developments are needed in LB...particularly not in the East, where effectively the A5 acts as an Eastern Bypass. The previously proposed Eastern Distributor Road would cause considerable environmental and noise pollution for residents living close by and must not be built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: East Leighton Buzzard is identified as the most suitable location for new development around Leighton Buzzard. Transport assessments show the benefit that a road through this development would have on the traffic.</p>				
197	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: No more bus priorities in Luton please - the ones we have cause huge unnecessary congestion. Instead, develop the road system to make more room for everyone. E.g. now the council has cut some trees on the New Bedford Road, make it a dual carriageway all the way</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The relevant transport studies and strategies have informed the required transport options</p>				
549	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Whatever the scale of growth, improved public transport facilities will always be welcome.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
387	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: I support this. As a regular user of public transport in this area I know that there is a room for improvement across the area whatever the scale or location of growth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3835	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
165	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: This paragraph whilst generally correct for areas to the north of the main conurbation, is seriously flawed when referring to the area in the east which is currently in the North Herts District. There is no way at all that the N Herts District LDF can provide effective planning policy for an area which would be effectively bolted on to Luton. The transport problem which I referred to above - that of the main route from this area into Luton (Crawley Green road) being already over-congested - is quite palpably NOT a N Herts planning priority. It is a LUTON problem.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for joint working and delivery with North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Planning of the transport solutions for Luton and those associated with the proposed development to the East of Luton require a joint working approach.</p>				
2221	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Natural England endorses the reasoning given for safeguarding the countryside as stated in paragraph 4.10, and supports the general approach that the Spatial Development Strategy takes e.g. the package of proposals to deliver a strengthened public transport framework outlined in paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15, and the Urban area first principle identified in paragraph 4.17.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1393	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: There is certainly a need for better public transport services, buses especially and indeed why has this idea not been pursued before.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent agrees with need for improved public transport provision</p>				
3308	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: No opportunity has been taken to develop a park-and-ride site to the south of the plan area. The sustainability appraisal and the core strategy have not considered L&amp;G proposal for a park-and-ride on part of their landholding adjacent to M1 junction 10A.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify the status of this allocation.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Local Transport Plan identifies Luton Local Plan includes for a P&amp;R site south of Luton as part of development in that area. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
1388	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Paragraph 4.14 Support/Object/Comment: Object A Park and Ride site at J10a should be included within the fifth bullet point to serve the south of the town and the key gateway to Luton from the M1 J10. This is in accordance with the adopted Local Plan Policy SA1 and Local Transport Plan (para 12.37). This recognises the role that Land at J10A can play in delivering a Park and Ride sites at a key gateway and transport node on the strategic road network in Luton. Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy proposes that the adopted Local Plan Policy SA1 is to safeguarded in respect of land at J10A. This policy makes provision for Park and Ride this facility should be included within the transport strategy and infrastructure provision for the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development is not supported at J10a.</p>				
1481	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the principle of delivering strategic public transport infrastructure to improve accessibility. We therefore support these key elements. Where delivery of this infrastructure is to be enabled by an urban extension then the delivery should not be front loaded but phased to correspond with the delivery of the urban extension. The infrastructure should be feasible, viable and in scale with the proposed extension (or the relevant phase).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Housing and Infrastructure Delivery Strategies to outline phasing and timing of housing and infrastructure delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for this</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1197	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Although para 4.13 mentions the need for alternatives to the private car, and para 4.15 specifically mentions cycling and walking, there is no mention of any specific schemes within 4.14 for walking and cycling (for example, delivering schemes from the Rights of Way Improvement Plans or the Cycle Strategy Refresh), alongside the other transport schemes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 5 outlines approach to Transport in more detail.</p>				
1178	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Public transport schemes should be well designed to located to avoid harm to important habitats and species. concerned over extension to guided bus way that goes through or close to Houghton Regis Quarry CWS containing SSSI - extension requires careful consideration</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further testing of the proposed route of the guided bus way extensions needed</p>				
1463	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: All improvements in public transport are to be applauded. They are costly, however, and a further reason to concentrate development within towns rather than necessitate their extension into the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Transport infrastructure needs to meet needs of as many users as possible.</p>				
769	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: The guided bus way is an excellent idea; it should link the airport with the train station, Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis town centres and extend to Leighton Buzzard's train station. Bus priority lanes should not reduce existing highway capacity. Park and Ride schemes are an excellent idea; especially if properly sited; the one in Oxford should be the model for this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A combination of public transport measures are needed.</p>				
985	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: Two statements concerning Leighton Buzzard - but neither seems to have been indicated (certainly no enhancement of "radial" routes!) since the only route known to be being considered is the Ring Road round the east of Leighton! Hardly a "radial route" enhancement!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Radial routes relate to the roads that currently run out from the town centre.</p>				
3010	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Support. Improved public transport facilities are needed across the area, whatever the scale or location of growth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
87	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.14	No
<p>Comment: Buses pollute more than the modern car - WORK IT OUT. Adding more rail links makes more sense.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A combination of public transport measures are needed.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
588	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.14	Yes
<p>Comment: For east of Luton an extension of the guided bus way is simply an aspiration and relies upon North Herts District Council for its provision</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
577	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.15	No
<p>Comment: "Improved opportunities to walk and cycle" Actually the EOL will reduce those. The destruction of the country road along Lilley Bottom, very well used by cyclists, will deter cyclist and destroy one of the key non-A roads between north and south Hertfordshire. The building over the green belt will destroy the opportunity for current east Luton residents to walk in the countryside without first driving. It appears entirely counterproductive.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: No plans have been included in the Core Strategy relating to the road along Lilley Bottom. The East Luton Bypass will be subject to further consultation.</p>				
520	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.15	Yes
<p>Comment: While these are desirable in principle, how much evidence has been carried out into peoples' propensity to use public transport when they have preferred alternatives? In relation to buses, I note that free travel for the elderly has made the economics of them increasingly unpleasant both for employed users and the subsidising local authorities. We have an aging population.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 5 outlines in more detail the approach to transport and encouraging public transport usage</p>				
522	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.15	No
<p>Comment: At present, a key cycling route is the road along Lilley Bottom: it is the only road that connects north and south Hertfordshire without needing cycle along A roads. The plan appears to be to replace that road with a further A road which will be dangerous and undesirable to cyclists.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: No plans have been included in the Core Strategy relating to the road along Lilley Bottom. The East Luton Bypass will be subject to further consultation.</p>				
699	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.15	No
<p>Comment: Your proposals don't strengthen public transport provision enough to secure a significant modal shift. If the guided bus way is built it will actually make this objective more difficult to achieve.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector. Chapter 5 outlines approach to promoting public transport usage.</p>				
140	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.15	Yes
<p>Comment: Please see my earlier comments re Luton - Dunstable tram link. Regarding buses. 1. Having separate school buses so that people can travel without the turmoil of loud and verbally aggressive school children would encourage greater bus usage. 2. Selling discounted tickets or monthly etc tickets to residents would encourage greater bus usage.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector. Chapter 5 outlines approach to ticketing and other measures to promote bus usage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3996	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.15	Yes
Comment: Support creation of new public transport framework through implementation of key elements such as an extension to the Bus way.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
364	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.15	No
Comment: The lack of thought and positive suggestions for improvements for Leighton Linslade underline that its earmarked only for dumping more houses into a saturated area that is badly served with public transport facilities.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Chapter 5 outlines in more detail the approach to transport				
3836	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.15	Yes
Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/a				
2222	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 4.15	Yes
Comment: Natural England endorses the reasoning given for safeguarding the countryside as stated in paragraph 4.10, and supports the general approach that the Spatial Development Strategy takes e.g. the package of proposals to deliver a strengthened public transport framework outlined in paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15, and the 'urban area first' principle identified in paragraph 4.17.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1389	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.15	No
Comment: Provision of P and R at site J10A in accordance with Local Plan Guided bus way not connected to south of Luton - support extension of guided bus way to south and connect to P and R at Junction 10A, use as P and R for coach services development and infrastructure proposals concentrated to north of Luton - results in imbalance use of P and R side as allocated in Local Plan at Junction 10A as key code as gateway appears good opportunity to deliver such infrastructure				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify the approach to Park and Ride.				
JC Reason for Response: Park and Ride Scheme is proposed in the Local Transport Plan and Luton Local Plan in this location.				
449	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.15	No
Comment: Suspect that Park and Ride schemes are likely to encourage car use. Better to focus on improving rail links.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: A combination of public transport measures are needed.				
572	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: Agree although unclear how EOL fits into "the importance of concentrating new development within existing urban areas"				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS Not all development needs can be met in the urban area.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3747	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: If the eastern bypass were not to happen, the park-and-ride would not be needed either.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify the approach to Park and Ride.				
JC Reason for Response: The Park and Ride in this location is in the Local Transport Plan which predates the East of Luton proposal				
852	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: This is key for me - at the moment the centre of Luton feels like a pretty lifeless and rough place to be. We need to address that by bringing communities into the centre instead of spreading out from the centre.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS and part of this Core Strategy.				
805	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: Support. Urban regeneration is urgently needed.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS and part of this Core Strategy.				
550	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: As stated in the document. This does indeed contribute to sustainable development and regeneration.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
388	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: I support this as it will contribute towards regeneration and ensure sustainable development.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
3837	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1395	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockermhoe	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: This seems a good idea as it would contribute to regeneration and ensure sustainable development as suggested.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1464	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: Yes - develop within existing urban areas. Not on vast swathes of the countryside.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Urban regeneration is a crucial requirement in the MKSMSRS Not all development needs can be met in the urban area.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3011	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.16	Yes
Comment: Support. this does indeed contribute to regeneration and ensures sustainable development.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
590	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.16	No
Comment: Entirely laudable, this objective is not necessarily well served by a bypass that may well help cause a vacuum in the Luton town centre area. It will be easier for new residents to the east of Luton to go to towns other than Luton, using the new bypasses				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: A balanced approach to urban development and transport infrastructure is needed to ensure sustainable and viable regeneration.				
581	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: The sequential development is the better approach. What steps are being taken to ensure that developers do not seek easy profit maximisation by building on greenfield sites prior to the exhaustion of ALL brownfield sites?				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy promotes urban development first but a balance is needed to ensure timely delivery of housing. SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area and allowance is made for on going development in urban area.				
1049	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.17	No
Comment: Considered that in the current economic climate many brownfield sites outlined in the SHLAA will not come forward. The early review of Green Belts around the villages will therefore help maintain a 5 year land supply.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: Housing delivery is a risk factor that will be considered in the Housing Delivery Strategy. This will outline approach to contingency should housing delivery not keep pace with required targets.				
853	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Happy about this, makes total sense to take existing areas first				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
141	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Regarding building housing within existing urban areas. I particularly support this aim. Especially with Luton where manufacturing and factories are on the decline, there is a good supply of brownfield sites to continue to develop in this way. It also benefits from closeness to Town Centre and real alternatives of walking to work and leisure and shorter car journeys (more sustainable).				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development but also seeks to protect employment sites.				
806	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Agree with the principle or using urban areas as a priority or redevelopment. Development in rural areas means permanent loss of rural amenity and the environment.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered in residual area.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3217	DP9	London	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Supports urban first and 60/40 split to 2021 and 40/60 split thereafter to 2031.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
3997	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.17	No
Comment: Redraft the text regarding percentage of development in urban areas by time so that it supports the early delivery of sustainable urban extensions where considered suitable, feasible, viable and deliverable, especially where not reliant on the provision of major new infrastructure.				
JC Response: Partially agree				
Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.				
JC Reason for Response: Phasing of the urban extensions would benefit from clarification.				
733	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: We note and support the prioritisation of an urban concentration strategy within this chapter. This should assist with the regeneration of town centres and should protect and enhance the historic environment provided that adequate consideration is given to the historic environment in both policy and decision making processes. Although we accept in paragraph 4.22 that some amount of large scale urban extension will need to take place to lever in sufficient capital for regeneration purposes, the challenge will be to ensure that urban concentration strategies are not neglected or left lagging behind.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
551	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: I firmly believe a sequential approach to building on previously developed and urban land first, should be adopted.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
389	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: I support this as previously developed and urban land should always be used in preference over undeveloped land.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
3398	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Support principle of accommodating development within the urban area first, but the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has not recognised directly all the development opportunities within existing urban areas. It does not identify land at French's Avenue, Dunstable. The whole site will be available for development by 2015 (see attached letter), existing buildings are obsolete and site is no longer appropriate for industrial use. The location is obsolete due to the distance to transport infrastructure, congestion on the A5 is a major deterrent to business users, no public transport is conveniently available for staff or business visitors, the continued use of the site for employment is detrimental to the amenities of surrounding residential properties. There is little likelihood of finding new tenants and a lack of incentive to redevelop the site for commercial purposes given its location relative to other industrial sites in the area and the proposed sites identified within the urban extensions.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: CS supports urban development but also seeks to protect employment sites. SHLAA identifies all sites which are considered suitable for development. Reviews to the SHLAA will be undertaken.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3838	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.17	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with Strategy</p>				
2224	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 4.17	Yes
<p>Comment: Natural England endorses the reasoning given for safeguarding the countryside as stated in paragraph 4.10, and supports the general approach that the Spatial Development Strategy takes e.g. the package of proposals to deliver a strengthened public transport framework outlined in paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15, and the Urban area first principle identified in paragraph 4.17.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1398	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockermhoe	Para. 4.17	Yes
<p>Comment: It is far better to further develop urban areas. This should be adopted in the first instance.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1859	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 4.17	Yes
<p>Comment: NHDC does not object to the proposed 60% of growth within the existing built-up area to 2021 and 40% in the 10 years thereafter. However, it is suggested that a greater proportion could be accommodated. The preferred strategy has been to focus on 4 large urban extensions. It is suggested that this could be reviewed. For example, an option of 3 large urban extensions together with some small sites could be feasible. The introduction of a tariff system for developer contributions / planning obligations would overcome the expressed concerns regarding payments towards infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further testing and refinement of the development proposals including updating of the SHLAA.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA outlines the potential of housing in the urban area.</p>				
1485	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.17	No
<p>Comment: If we have understood this correctly it is proposed that to 2021, 60% of new residential development is to be in existing urban areas and 40% in SUEs. Thereafter the percentages are reversed. (If we have not understood it then the paragraph needs re-drafting.) However, we can see no justification for this arbitrary apportionment of development. Achieving the rate of development expected will be a challenge in itself (particularly in the currently market) without an arbitrary rationing of development as between existing urban areas and the SUEs (and indeed between the SUEs themselves) as they vie for their part of the prescribed percentages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy will outline approach to ensuring delivery of housing including approach to contingency.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 6 and the SHLAA outline the evidence to justify the deliverability of these indicative figures. PPS12 allows for review of the Core Strategy and outlines approach to contingency.</p>				
452	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.17	Yes
<p>Comment: Completely agree</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
450	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Completely agree.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1468	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Yes - build in towns first and then take as title of the precious green belt as possible.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area.				
3012	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Support. The sequential approach to building on previously-developed land and urban land first should be adopted.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
591	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.17	Yes
Comment: Whilst agreeing with this strategy, we would like to see a justification for the house building numbers that are being planned for each urban area, especially Luton.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area.				
3839	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.18	Yes
Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
30	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.18	Yes
Comment: I am not aware of any new or improved community infrastructure. In fact the last 106 facility incorporated within the Sandhills Development is still not in existence long after the completion of the estate				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Community infrastructure is planned in the next phase of development of the South Leighton Buzzard housing development				
451	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.18	Yes
Comment: Completely agree and town centre densities should be maximised.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Density of development in urban areas should be higher owing to their sustainability but this needs to be balanced other considerations including amongst others design, impact on its setting, parking and commercial viability.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
453	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Consider that the targets for accommodating residential development within existing urban areas are too low. Regeneration can be optimised through higher housing densities in town centres while, as the same time, protecting rural land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs.</p>				
593	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.18	Yes
<p>Comment: No details are given - however Napier Park will not be easily accessible to the east of Luton development, unless the eastern bypass extension is continued underneath the airport, which is a hugely costly and unlikely project</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre submission draft of Core Strategy to address this issue.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Point of clarification of the details of developments within the urban area.</p>				
698	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.19	No
<p>Comment: I have now done some research on the bus way. I didn't appreciate how far the contractual procedures have now advanced. I'm surprised that this scheme has been taken this far without waiting to see the results of the Cambridge guided bus way, which was meant as an experiment, and has already experienced a considerable cost overrun. It's a pity the EWR consultants didn't come up with their southern route a little earlier, as it changes the picture radically in regard to the viability of restoring the railway from Leighton Buzzard to Luton. Their proposed route via Stewartby is far longer and less satisfactory than the route via Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector. East West Rail consortium consulted on a preferred route for the section between the MMLand the ECML. The preferred route that emerged from that work was a route between Stevenage and the south of Luton</p>				
3840	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.19	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1408	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.19	No
<p>Comment: The obvious omission from key new elements of public transport infrastructure are the Park and Ride sites and the ability for these at key gateways to deliver capacity elsewhere on the road network and lock in the benefits for improved public transport facilities and priorities on the key corridors. The provision of a Strategic Employment Site at J10a incorporating a Park and Ride will provide sustainable access to a new employment site and existing employment sites in the area. If combined with other public transport services, including both local, inter-urban and long distance services as transport hub or nodal point, this location will become a key gateway and sustainable transport interchange for Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify the approach to Park and Ride.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Park and Ride in this location is in the Local Transport Plan and Luton Local Plan.</p>				
594	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.19	Yes
<p>Comment: Entirely laudable, but not covered by the firm proposals. The town centre interchange in Luton, which does not form part of this strategic plan but relies on others, has been widely criticised, especially by the east area committee of Luton Borough Council</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Improvements to Luton Town Centre are outlined in Chapter 5.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
586	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed, so why is the development not occurring in the M1 corridor area where there is easy access to road and rail and an environment which is rated lower by the reports? What steps have been taken to fully consider the options for building within the committee's political area and not in NHDC?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Development is proposed to the North of the main conurbation. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assesses all sites considered.</p>				
3748	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: Support paragraph</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
854	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: Happy about this, makes total sense to focus on areas with good infrastructure</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
807	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: I agree with this objective. Clearly for sustainability new housing development must be located close to these improved amenities.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2823	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: It's already exceedingly difficult to get from Leighton (and the surrounding villages) into Dunstable to join the guided bus way - whenever it gets built!</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Bus services connect a number of the villages and Leighton Linslade to Dunstable</p>				
552	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: The idea to utilise existing transport infrastructure in order to support sustainability makes good sense. It is also more economically viable to the tax payer.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
390	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: I support this. It is vital that new development is sited close to good public transport links in order to promote sustainability and to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3841	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.20	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the emphasis placed on the development of sustainable travel modes which highlight the many opportunities for enhancing public transport and other non-car modes within the conurbation.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1400	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.20	Yes
Comment: Any new development should be concentrated near to existing railway stations and extended bus routes to achieve sustainability.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Not all development can be in these locations but the Core Strategy promotes this as far as possible				
1409	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.20	No
Comment: Emphasis on public transport weak in overall terms when compared to provision on new rd infr. emphasis on roads with public transport 2nd - expect it the other way round in sustainable transport strategy concerned with the reliance on strategic infr where delivery in hands of other agencies and funding not secure - test of soundness issue id of new rail infr complex and uncertain - issue of deliverability and likely to place more reliance in highway infr if not delivered P and R site at Junction 10A could provide key nodal point to south of town - linkages to employment sites, existing stations, town centre and combined with guided bus way				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
JC Reason for Response: Approach to transport balances need to provide strategic road infrastructure and public transport				
454	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.20	Yes
Comment: Agree.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
986	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.20	No
Comment: But it's already too difficult to get from Leighton and its surrounding villages into Dunstable to join the guided bus way - whenever it arrives!!				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Bus services connect a number of the villages and Leighton Linslade to Dunstable				
3013	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.20	Yes
Comment: Support. New development should be concentrated near to improved bus routes and existing and potential railway stations in order to achieve sustainability.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
2264	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.21	No
Comment: 'Undeveloped land' implies it can be used for whatever use is chosen for it. This goes against preservation of the natural environment and resources which are valuable.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre submission version of Core Strategy to clarify this issue.				
JC Reason for Response: Point of clarification				
3384	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Para. 4.21	No
Comment: Outcome of Issues and Options Consultation June 2007 confirmed the objection of the majority of respondents to the plans. The great majority of the participants favoured the option which concentrated house building around Luton and not around Leighton Buzzard or any other of the options given. It is clear that the strategy of large scale building around Leighton Buzzard has no support. On this basis the application must be rejected.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Public responses are one stream of evidence to be considered in determining the Strategy.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3999	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.21	Yes
Comment: Support need for urban extensions to deliver housing in accordance with targets set by national and regional policy.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
734	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 4.21	Yes
Comment: The urban extensions require further assessment to add to the findings of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment (ESA) study and these must be considered with regards to adjoining areas of sensitivity, i.e. Chilterns AONB. It is recommended that the yellow triangle to the east of the A6 on the Key Diagram is deleted and more clarity is given regarding the Park and Ride facility. The preferred urban extension to the east of Luton should have a greater evidence base. The ESA does not provide a comprehensive analysis of the sensitivities in this location, particularly for archaeology and the historic landscape. The existence of the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at Putteridge Bury is an important issue here in terms of the urban extension, particularly when a Park and Ride facility and bypass are proposed on the A505.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate the impact of development.				
2271	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 4.21	No
Comment: 32. The urban extensions site development economics study only looks at the economics of the POCD preferred strategic peripheral growth locations. There is no such assessment of other potential locations around the conurbation, including those contained within the issues and options consultation. This information should be available for all locations and form the basis upon which decisions are subsequently made on which growth locations are most suited to meet the needs of the conurbation. The study itself admits that it is indicative and that further work will be required if the findings are not to be subject to challenge. The scale of this work appears significant even for the preferred growth option but would be substantial when extended to all potential peripheral growth locations.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to refine the conclusions of this study.				
JC Reason for Response: The Site Economics Assessment looks at different options for development. Further refinement of the study is needed.				
1758	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 4.21	Yes
Comment: NLC notes the comment regarding "strong advice set out in MKSMSRS" at paragraph 4.21 of the Preferred Options. NLC contends that the MKSMSRS provides clear strategic policy guidance with regard to the approach to the accommodation of new housing in the Luton area, identifying, in particular, discrete areas of search for the necessary green belt review.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Statement of fact.				
467	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.21	Yes
Comment: Agree				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
596	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.21	Yes
<p>Comment: A strategic extension to an existing urban area should benefit the existing residents of the urban area that is being extended. The east of Luton extension benefits none of the existing residents either of the rural villages or of Stopsley and Wigmore areas of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures and measures to deliver the infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All parts of the community will benefit in some way from the developments through provision of housing, new facilities, improved public transport etc. but some will be impacted more than others.</p>				
1050	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.22	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 4.22 Support/Object/Comment: The Council recognise the complexities of delivering large urban extensions in this paragraph. I would respectfully suggest that some contingency sites be included in the villages, such as at Slip End and that such sites are brought forward early in the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy will outline approach to ensuring delivery of housing including approach to contingency.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPS12 requires an approach to contingency.</p>				
2265	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.22	No
<p>Comment: Creation of large scale urban extensions to attract funding and serve Luton and S Beds will be to the detriment of neighbouring N Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be prepared</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Joint Committee will work with North Herts. to ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
2666	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Para. 4.22	Yes
<p>Comment: The Councils recognise the need to achieve a 'critical mass' in new development areas, as proposed for the North Luton location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1718	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 4.22	No
<p>Comment: 'Critical Mass' is not quantified and no convincing explanation why a small number of large extensions is more sustainable than a large number of small extensions. Doubtful whether developer contributions would provide all required infrastructure, let alone attend to existing regeneration needs. Particularly true for east of Luton where there is very little existing, accessible infrastructure. Appears that preference for the urban extensions is based on delivery of major strategic infrastructure, not sustainability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Larger urban extensions are identified to be more sustainable as the infrastructure required is provided on site. They are also more capable of creating communities than small urban extensions</p>				
4000	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.22	Yes
<p>Comment: Support extensions with critical mass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1849	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.22	Yes
Comment: The Water Cycle Study should be mentioned here as a means of good practice. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Findings from WCS will be appropriately referenced in the Pre Submission document				
3505	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 4.22	No
Comment: Contrary to claims in paragraph about not putting unreasonable burdens on existing infrastructure and serving the needs of adjacent urban areas, the proposed East of Luton development will do exactly this, especially the road network. Queries how proposed EoL development will serve the needs of the adjacent urban area.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Ensure completion of IDP				
JC Reason for Response: Joint Committee will work with North Herts. to ensure delivery of infrastructure.				
1234	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 4.22	No
Comment: My clients do not agree with the proposed spatial strategy to create a couple of very large urban extensions as they consider that they will take longer to deliver than a larger number of smaller extensions. The proposed extensions to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis are wholly reliant on the delivery of the A5-M1 link road and associated improvements to the M1 itself. As the recent delays in confirming this infrastructure have demonstrated, given there has to be a substantial increase in the delivery of housing numbers to meet the aims of the MKSMSRS, there is no guarantee that the level of growth anticipated from the urban extensions will be possible in the time frames estimated. In order to secure early delivery of the step change in housing supply required, we would recommend the allocation of a larger number of smaller urban extensions, including my client's site at Beech Road, Dunstable as a more appropriate response (see also response to paragraph 4.4).				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements.				
31	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.22	Yes
Comment: Agreed				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
3309	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.22	No
Comment: There is no evidence base to conclude that non-strategic smaller urban extensions would be less likely to bring forward appropriate amounts of supporting infrastructure. Infrastructure and implementation are not dealt with adequately in the consultation.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Larger urban extensions are identified to be more sustainable as the infrastructure required is provided on site. They are also more capable of creating communities than small urban extensions				
455	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.22	No
Comment: This sounds like urban sprawl. Development should be on brownfield sites.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
597	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.22	No
<p>Comment: Simple mathematics show that even at the high figure of £20,000 per house levy for services that the east of Luton development cannot pay for even the roads that are needed, let alone schools, medical, social facilities etc.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4001	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.23	Yes
<p>Comment: Support early delivery of extensions where such plans are well advanced.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with Strategy</p>				
1486	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.23	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the early delivery of new homes in the SUEs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
598	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.23	No
<p>Comment: A blatant inference of discussions with developers and landowners concerned with east of Luton. Precisely the same could be said of the west of Luton, an area not even being considered here. This smacks of a "convenience" driving planning rather than planning driving strategic development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivery of urban extensions will be complex and require joint working with developers and all stakeholders.</p>				
589	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: I strongly object to the inclusion of EOL here - the technical evidence does not support this (and in fact appears to move in the opposite direction). It appears to be a political decision.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2400	Charles F Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Loss of a substantial area of Green Belt land and associated wildlife habitats e.g. cuckoos is unacceptable and detrimental to the town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.</p>				
2403	Charlotte Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Loss of a substantial area of Green Belt land and associated wildlife habitats e.g. cuckoos is unacceptable and detrimental to the town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2674	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Removing green belt land to accommodate mass housing development cannot be substituted by 'high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Green Belt land performs a particular function as outlined in PPG2. Open space performs a different function.</p>				
2607	Mr Christopher Bartlett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: The use of green belt land is an absolute tragedy, ruining habitats for our native wildlife not to mention the pollution that proposed development will cause.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
1138	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.24	Yes
<p>Comment: For the strategic urban extensions north of Luton, Houghton Regis and Dunstable, no land should be removed from the Green Belt north of the lines of the Luton Northern Bypass or of the A5-M1 Link (Dunstable Northern Bypass).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2266	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Object to the inclusion of urban extension into N Herts. Where is the evidence that decided rural N Herts should be one of the 4 of the 13 preferred options? The new green belt boundaries will not be permanent.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. PPG2 provides basis for Green Belt Reviews.</p>				
3383	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: application is to build on land which is currently designated green belt. Greenbelt review has not yet reported and hence the designation stands and there is no reason to believe it will be changed. The application must be rejected because building cannot take place on green belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Green Belt boundary will be altered through the Core Strategy. Planning applications prior to this will be considered against the advice in PPG2.</p>				
3386	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: The land to the east of Leighton Buzzard is good farming land and has been farmed for hundreds of years. At a time when there is a world food crisis it is irresponsible to build on farming land. There is no certainty looking forward 20-50 years that the UK will be able to rely on importing food from the rest of the world in the quantities it does now. The importance of farming is now being recognised in increased pricing of basic foodstuffs and their raw materials. Good farm land must be retained for farming and not built on. To ensure food for the population in the future the planning application must be rejected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. This will result in the loss of farming land.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
855	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Not happy with the evidence supporting selection of the area in North Herts				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.				
2479	Rebecca Cossburn	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Opposes loss of Green Belt land around LB and the associated impact on wildlife				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.				
2587	Mrs Joan Costello	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: There will be loss of much needed Greenbelt land and the wildlife that inhabits it.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.				
1719	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: No details given of the technical evidence, assessment matrix, weighting or comparison of the 13 potential areas for development. Option 5 (Issues and Options) is the most sustainable option available.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix				
2540	Martin Davey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Development will result in the loss of land that was previously designated as green belt land, with the attendant irreparable damage to wildlife.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.				
1612	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Queries the need for a dedicated Green Belt policy to deal with Green Belt revisions given the advice in the RSS.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy document to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the approach to Green Belt boundary revisions would be helpful				
2824	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Further to previous comment on Greenbelt boundaries, these have already been breached twice as Leighton Buzzard has expanded eastwards towards Eggington. In the 60's both the Meadow Way Estate (and the business park on the southeast of Leighton) and the Planets estate were developed along/to the north of the Hockliffe Road (A4012). It seems that wherever the boundary exists, it sits there only as long as its convenient - and forms no "permanent boundary" whatsoever!				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2369	Edith Griffith	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: The loss of Green Belt land and the effect upon the environment and wildlife habitats will be devastating</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.</p>				
841	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: The green belt to east LB should not be relaxed to accommodate the small number of additional houses now proposed. Focus the green belt boundary discussions around the major conurbations. Why constantly expand small towns, so they cease to be small towns?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Core Strategy does propose majority of growth around the main conurbation. Not all development needs can be met in these locations.</p>				
2387	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Building on Green Belt land will lead to a loss of important wildlife habitats</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2361	Mr & Mrs John Hastwell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: The significant loss of Green Belt land can be ill-afforded if wildlife is to be protected</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.</p>				
2338	Mrs Jean Holmes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt land should be preserved for future generations</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				
1235	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Concerned that large areas of green belt land to be removed from green belt with new boundaries being derived with urban extensions. The environmental sensitivity assessment (ESA) deals with 13 areas identified in the issues and options consultation undertaken in 2007 rather than systematic review of all green belt around conurbation. Query why Beech Road, Dunstable site not included in wider ranging green belt review.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sites that have been promoted through the LDF process have been assessed including Beech Road</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3381	Peter Jardine	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: objects to loss of greenbelt, precious countryside and continued development in beautiful area				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.				
2573	Anne Lathwell	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: We have had enough of unsustainable development in our town. We have seen enough greenbelt land disappear under concrete.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs This includes potential development around Leighton Buzzard				
3862	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Preferred Options document does not reflect the outcome of the public consultation which resulted in support for Option 9 above other options. Concerned that the lack of Area M in the preferred options and the scale of proposed land to be removed from the Green Belt does not accord with the outcome of the consultation. Welcomes the assessment of Area M an alternative site for development and states that the Site Assessment Matrix does not enable direct comparison to be made between sites.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the consultation responses. Further work is needed to test and refine development proposals				
2603	Ms Claire Martin	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: I find it hard to understand how it can be possible to build on green belt land, what's the point of calling it green belt land if it can be built on !				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.				
2621	Mr Robert McAlister	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: The planned housing would be on greenbelt land. The Green Belt was originally created to protect green space between conurbations and to maintain a rural / urban equilibrium. As a matter of principle I object strongly to building on green belt for all the reasons it was originally created.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.				
2773	Mr Robert Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: I am concerned about losing much of the green space that surrounds the town, and the environmental strand this would bring.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2631	Andrea Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: The loss of Green Belt land would inevitably bring about a loss of wildlife at a time when biodiversity is considered more and more important				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on biodiversity.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
1979	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: 12 of the 13 sites considered at the Issues and Options stage are currently designated as Green Belt. The exception is Site A - land west of Linslade in Buckinghamshire. It therefore appears that Green Belt designation has been given low, or even no weight in assessing the merits of the various sites with development potential, perhaps because it was felt that Green belt considerations cancel each other out across the sites (bar 1). NHDC objects strongly to this approach.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Site Assessment Matrix outlines how each of the sites have been evaluated.				
1913	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: 2.1 The Core Strategy: Preferred Options document fails to provide a clear explanation of why the four preferred strategic directions of growth have been selected. The planning system requires this to be a transparent process. Paragraph 4.24 of the document states that they emerged following the Issues and Options stage in 2007 "through a process of assessing technical evidence, completing a site by site assessment matrix and considering feedback from public consultation." For reasons set out below, NHDC does not consider that the selection process has been carried out in a sufficiently comprehensive, detailed or objective manner and consequently, the preferred options are not robust. The Core Strategy is therefore unsound.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.				
1980	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 4.24	Yes
Comment: PPG2 states at paragraph 2.6 that "once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved, it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances." It is of course true that the RSS requires an overall Green Belt review around the Luton conurbation, but this does not in any way take away from the need to show that exceptional circumstances exist in all parts of the periphery. Section 19 (2) of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004 requires local planning authorities to have regard to national policies and advice in preparing Local Development Documents. Thus there is a legal requirement to show how the requirements of PPG2 have been applied in formulating this Core Strategy and the onus of proof is high.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy document to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the approach to Green Belt would be helpful				
2527	Brian Patton	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
Comment: Building vast amount of housing on beautiful greenbelt is criminal.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.				
1760	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 4.24	Yes
Comment: Suggests greater reference to the exceptional circumstances in relation to the Green Belt				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy document to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the approach to Green Belt would be helpful				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2646	Mr Christopher Ree	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: This development is unacceptable as it extends to the use of green belt land and the greensand ridge for housing and access roads with the destruction of wildlife habitats.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
32	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Within the strategy document there is no indication of where the replacement green belt boundaries. The fact that this strategy intends to use green belt land means that the statement referring to permanent green belt boundaries is nonsense, since they will only be permanent until the next tranche of development comes up for consideration</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				
422	Mr Andrew Robson	Hitchin	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: It seems inappropriate to refer to "new permanent Green Belt boundaries" when it is proposed to remove land from existing Green Belt, which was also supposed to be permanent. The meaning of "Green Belt" should be defined and the word "permanent" should not be used if land can subsequently be reclassified.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				
3736	Lorraine Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt land has been designated as such to protect it from unwarranted development. Once developed for housing, the wildlife habitat can never be recovered and future generations will have to deal with the long term repercussions of this. Development of Green Belt will set a precedent for further development on other Green Belt land</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				
2528	Brian Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt land has been designated as such to protect it from unwarranted development. Once developed for housing, the wildlife habitat can never be recovered and future generations will have to deal with the long term repercussions of this. Development of Green Belt will set a precedent for further development on other Green Belt land</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3310	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: There is an over concentration on strategic urban extensions and the assumption they are synonymous with infrastructure provision and sustainable communities (for which there is no evidence) which has led to a failure to consider the wider recommendations of the Employment Land Review (ELR). Land to the south of J10A (identified in the ELR) also requires to be removed from the green belt and allocated as a strategic employment site.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2320	Cindy Sharp	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Large sections of Green Belt will be lost forever and the market town of Leighton Buzzard which is not designed to cope with mass housing developments will be irreversibly changed for the worse</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2756	Stephen Sheppard	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: You also mention the provision of 'further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside,' but you are proposing to take greenbelt designated land to accommodate the Eastern Development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of Fact. Open Space has a different role and function to Green Belt land.</p>				
2284	Mrs Christine Simmonds	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt has always been designated as an area not to built on but it now appears it that this can be altered out of convenience</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				
2474	Jacqui Sparks	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about the loss of Green Belt land and the threat to environment and wildlife</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs.</p>				
2758	Sue Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: You also mention the provision of 'further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside,' but you are proposing to take greenbelt designated land to accommodate the Eastern Development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Statement of Fact. Open Space has a different role and function to Green Belt land.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2681	Sheila Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Why build on green built, which exists as an area not to be built on, when there is brown belt, which exists to be built on, available in towns and cities close to employment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews. SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs.</p>				
2642	Mr Michael Turton	Linslade	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: I reject the proposal to build 2500 houses on green belt to the east of the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2723	Carrie Tyas	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: I drive through the countryside to work and thoroughly enjoy the surroundings and inhabitants of this area, all of which will be under threat if this development of the green belt goes ahead.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development in the countryside has been minimised as far as possible.</p>				
2332	Mr Martin Walker	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development to Leighton Buzzard is on Green Belt land which should be left to prevent coalescence between developments</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				
468	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Such land-grabbing is completely indefensible.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This sets the housing targets that must be delivered..</p>				
987	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Further to previous comment on Green belt boundaries. These have already been breached twice as Leighton Buzzard has expanded eastwards towards Eggington. In the 70's the Meadow Way estate was built (along with the business park on the southeast of Leighton, and then the Planets estate was developed along/to the north of the Hockliffe Road (A4012). It seems that wherever the boundary exists, it sits there only as long as it's convenient - and forms no "permanent boundary" whatsoever!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3014	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Object to inclusion of urban extension in North Herts. The technical evidence does not support this option ahead of others, and the consultation was skewed in favour of people living in Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				
3888	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Para. 4.24	Yes
<p>Comment: Figure two of attached plan indicates the suggested longer term limits for the Green Belt boundary. This represents a contingency approach where by If housing or employment development fails to come forward from other sources (eg East of Luton or infill within urban areas) then Leighton Linslade will have sufficient whiteland;' to provide a replacement should the need arise. It is noted that an even higher level of growth was originally tested as part of transport evidence base and fond to be acceptable in highway terms. Figure 2 indicates long term defensible boundaries in accordance with PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the approach to Green Belt boundary revisions would be helpful</p>				
2428	Andy Wood	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: Once the Green Belt has been lost to build on the eastern side of Leighton Buzzard, it will be gone forever Building on Green Belt should require and overwhelming justification and the benefits must outweigh the costs. There is no evidence that this is the situation in this case.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs This includes potential development around Leighton Buzzard</p>				
2736	G Woodhall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.24	No
<p>Comment: I strongly object to the building of 6000 houses on 850 acres of Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
856	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: As before I am not satisfied with the evidence supporting selection of the area in North Herts</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				
817	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: I object most strongly to this option. It discriminates in favour of those living in Luton &amp; S Beds to the detriment of those living in N Herts. It appears to have no technical merit over and above the other 9 options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
818	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: We are told that the technical evidence for choosing 4 of the thirteen sites has been assessed. I cannot find that assessment or the results of the public consultation on this site-nor is there a link given to another site. Certainly to choose 4 of those 13 to include one which impinges on another county's natural environment would need a detailed comparison with the other sites and that is not given. It implies bias.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				
3457	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.25	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the identification of a further preferred direction of growth to the east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
430	Mr Jeremy Harrold	hARPENDEN	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Herts has its own planning impositions from central government which, if implemented, would disastrously over-congest one of the already most congested counties in England. You are seeking to satisfy the growth obligations for Luton and South Beds by building outside your area! By the same curious logic, presumably you have no objection to Herts satisfying its obligations by building in Luton and Beds? It's a nonsense, isn't it? And this is before consideration of the remorseless wiping-out of precious and finite green-belt land!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
366	Mrs AC Heymans	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Hands off North Herts! Our area has enough problems finding space for new housing demands without having Luton's needs dumped on it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
3291	Hives Planning on behalf of Arnold White Estates Ltd		Para. 4.25	Yes
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy should identify the safeguarded land to the North of Leighton Linlade as shown on Appendix 1 of this representation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals and define a Green Belt boundary.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements.</p>				
2556	Holwell Parish Council	Holwell	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: It is a misplaced assumption that North Herts will either be willing or obliged to assist with proposals by adding them to their LDF.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
553	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.25	No
Comment: I strongly object to any intrusion into North Herts until every other site has been fully investigated with the results published for everyone to see.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix which compares sites.				
391	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
Comment: I object to the inclusion of North Hertfordshire in this document. Not only does the technical evidence not support this option but the public consultation did not include any meetings or displays in North Hertfordshire. If North Hertfordshire is to be considered as an option for growth then Luton and South Bedfordshire council should have made considerably more effort to let the residents of North Hertfordshire know of their plans.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .				
1327	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
Comment: I object to the inclusion of an area of North Herts when the consultation was with the people of Luton and South Bedfordshire. There is no evidence to support this as the preferred option - no arguments or details of the decision process are included in this consultation document.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .				
3787	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.25	Yes
Comment: The Strategy recognises throughout that the EoL housing and bypass proposals are in the North Hertfordshire district "and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land for this development". North Hertfordshire is strongly against this development and so Luton and South Bedfordshire should drop their plans for it.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
3797	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.25	Yes
Comment: The Strategy recognises throughout that the EoL housing and bypass proposals are in the North Hertfordshire district "and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land for this development". North Hertfordshire is strongly against this development and so Luton and South Bedfordshire should drop their plans for it.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
758	Mrs Ann Morton	St. Albans	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the urban extension into another county. Hertfordshire has its own housing allocation to decide where it is best located. Bedfordshire/Luton must not be able to use Hertfordshire land for any of its housing numbers allocation, especially in the case of east of Luton in North Hertfordshire District where it will be inappropriate development of green field Green Belt land. In addition strongly object to any residential development being provided in the flight paths for Luton Airport - both the current and any potential future flight paths areas should be kept free of housing development. Please can we learn from the noise and quality of life issues for residents because housing was built around Heathrow Airport and under its flight paths.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
166	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: To what extent can this consultation influence the LDF being prepared by N Herts District? If it can, then I must unequivocally state my opposition to the preferred strategic direction of growth to the east of Luton currently in N Herts District.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
1402	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: I strongly object to the inclusion of the urban extension in to North Hertfordshire. There is no technical evidence to support this option ahead of others and the public consultation is flawed by being skewed in favour of people living in Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				
2615	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Object to the inclusion of the urban extension in North Herts. The technical evidence does not support this option ahead of the others and the public consultation was flawed by being skewed in favour of people living in Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				
470	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Unacceptable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
456	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt is Green Belt permanently and boundaries should not be re-drawn. Sets a very dangerous precedent and should not be countenanced. South Bedfordshire has no entitlement to land in North Hertfordshire!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
1469	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Or to put it another way: the fourth lies outside out back yard, and despite its obvious enormous landscape value we're going to propose building on land that is lived on by people whose votes we don't need to court. Shameful.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
3015	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: Object to inclusion of urban extension in North Herts. The technical evidence does not support this option ahead of others, and the consultation was skewed in favour of people living in Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. Consultation process has involved neighbouring areas and stakeholders. .</p>				
1374	MR EDMUND WRIGHT	Hitchin	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: The previous section refers to removal of the existing green belt boundary and replacing it with a "new permanent Green Belt boundary" which is more permanent? THIS IS PLAINLY LIES!!! The idea of one council building in the neighbouring councils land to solve a housing problem which can be solved in their county boundaries is obscene. North Herts residents already have to put up with the noise and pollution of Luton airport without losing some of the best landscape to mass housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
600	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.25	No
<p>Comment: North Herts District Council is opposed to this development, so why is it included when it could lead to a massive shortfall in available land for urban extension. The strategy should look elsewhere where there is certainty</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts. and Housing Delivery Strategy will outline approach to contingency.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Contingency is required by PPS12.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1487	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.26	Yes
Comment: We support the SUE to the north of Luton, part of which could deliver development and related benefits early.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
2735	Debbie Adams	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
Comment: Strongly object to the Eastern development of LB due to: Lack of infrastructure; the increase in traffic; the loss of Green Belt land; the impact in the narrow gauge railway; the lack of employment; and building on the flood plain				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure and mitigate impacts.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. New employment and infrastructure is proposed as is protection of the flood plain.				
2733	Mr James Adams	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
Comment: Strongly object to the Eastern development of LB due to: Lack of infrastructure; increase in traffic; the loss of Green Belt land; the impact in the narrow gauge railway; the lack of employment; and building on the flood plain.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure and mitigate impacts.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. New employment and infrastructure is proposed as is protection of the flood plain.				
1212	Mrs Jill Anderson-Dixon	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
Comment: Leighton Buzzard is the largest town in Central Beds (36000) - the reason it lags behind is that it has been left behind - this view means it will lag behind Dunstable( 34600) as it has done for years. Adding Houghton Regis (16940) may make the district bigger - why not push the development for LB especially infrastructure at the same pace?				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed and Core Strategy Plans for this.				
4069	Ms Karen Archer	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
Comment: The weight of opposition to the new development should be taken account of There is very little employment in town so most people have to commute elsewhere Building on floodplain will increase flood risk despite the mitigation measure suggested by developers Despite the improvements to the traffic flow, the roads can only cope with the current amount of traffic and not that generated from further development The station is not located close to the proposed development and is on the Linslade side of the town Green Belt should not be built on				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4058	Mrs Elizabeth Axford	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Insufficient infrastructure Roads and trains are already congested There is a lack of employment in the town following the closure of major firms Building on flood plain is irresponsible Issues concerning the environment and climate change take second place to short-term profit making The heritage railway will be destroyed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2763	Mrs Helen Baker	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Protests against the eastern development of LB; road and rail links are already congested; meant to be a 'cycle-friendly' town; concern expressed over loss of Green Belt and the resulting loss of wildlife; and the main tourist attractions (the narrow gauge railway and the Grand Union Canal) are also affected by these proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade</p>				
4067	Mr Christopher Bartlett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Appalled at the prospect of further development in LB due to: The lack of infrastructure e.g. schools The small town centre and congested road network The fact that to remedy these deficiencies, wildlife and landscape would be affected by new development The impact on the narrow gauge railway The fact that growth on this scale cannot be justified particularly in the face on local opposition</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3876	Mrs Brenda Bigland	Linslade	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The significant increase in population that recent developments have brought, already overwhelms the existing transport infrastructure The market town character of Leighton Buzzard should be preserved Local industry is in decline so people will have to commute elsewhere to work The strength of local feeling against the proposals should be taken into account Housing is not needed as there are many unoccupied properties in the town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2267	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: There appears to be more sensitivity to protecting the surrounding countryside and character of Bedfordshire market towns than N Herts villages</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to protect most important parts of the countryside and protect villages where possible</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3686	Mr Richard Braithwaite	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: The town has seen a lot of housing growth over the years without the necessary supporting infrastructure. Representor was under the impression that housing could not be built on flood plain. Councils should listen to the views of the electorate</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2577	Mr Oliver Burne	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposes the mass development of housing in LB as it is "contrary to his human rights under Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 2008" and the proposed development is also unsustainable and damaging to the health and cohesion of the local community</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
2584	Mr Tony Bushell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard cannot sustain further development particularly as there is insufficient infrastructure to support the huge development that has already been inflicted on the town in recent years</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed and Core Strategy Plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				
2557	Mr Maurice Campbell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Representor registers his objection to any proposed housing development in and around the LB area</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure and mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development.</p>				
700	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: 1. What you're saying here is that as Luton is bigger than Leighton-Linslade it must have bigger urban extensions. I cannot see the logic of this. The minimum size for an urban extension depends on the services already available, and the deficits in the existing development waiting to be made good. In the right circumstances it can be as small as a single neighbourhood of around 1,000-1,500 dwellings. 2. The solution to Leighton-Linslade is not an urban extension but a satellite - say at Cheddington, or Stoke Hammond with a station. How can you propose an eastern extension of Leighton Buzzard and claim it will be sustainable when by your own account it has "less potential to achieve sustainable travel", i.e. it will be largely car-dependent.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development in the form of urban extensions.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2571	Judi Collier	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed development east of LB There have been previous housing developments around the town that are not supported by adequate infrastructure so no further growth should be planned until further facilities are delivered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2565	Mr Neil Collier	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed development east of LB There have been previous housing developments around the town that are not supported by adequate infrastructure so no further growth should be planned until further facilities are delivered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade</p>				
1606	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Whilst appreciating the role of 'critical mass' in delivering supporting employment and community infrastructure, it concerns us that no consideration seems to have been given to the contribution to critical mass already in prospect from Leighton Buzzard's planned for southern urban extension. It seems to us that an explanation needs to be given as to why the southern extension is seen as insufficient to deliver improved employment opportunities and community infrastructure within the town, and why these objectives are considered achievable only through development of yet another urban extension to the east.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals and scope to deliver new employment.</p>				
2737	Mr P Cubbon	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the eastern development of LB Market town of LB cannot accommodate this scale of development due to lack of infrastructure e.g. overcrowded trains; objects to the loss of Green Belt land; objects to the loss of the narrow gauge railway; and draws attention to the protest march that took place in LB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade</p>				
819	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The reason for choosing urban expansion into N Herts in preference to expanding Bedfordshire Market Towns appears to entirely unjustified or justified merely on convenience to S Beds rather than the interests of N Herts inhabitants.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4063	Gerry Daniels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: Promised infrastructure has not been provided with recent housing development in LB There are few job opportunities with the closure of major firms like Liptons The A505-M1 link road is needed for the increased traffic that will be generated by new development Greater development will lead to less natural drainage and therefore a greater risk of flooding</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2721	Sue Dawson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the eastern development of LB New estates eg. Billington Park have already been built without the promised infrastructure; the roads are already busy without further cars; green Belt land will be lost setting a worrying precedent; there is a lack of employment in the town particularly following the closure of major firms e.g. Gossards; and the development is proposed on flood plain Concern expressed about the impact on wildlife. Concern expressed about the impact on the narrow gauge railway</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2722	Peter Dawson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the eastern development of LB New estates eg. Billington Park have already been built without the promised infrastructure; the roads are already busy without further cars; green Belt land will be lost setting a worrying precedent; there is a lack of employment in the town particularly following the closure of major firms e.g. Gossards; and the development is proposed on flood plain Concern expressed about the impact on wildlife. Concern expressed about the impact on the narrow gauge railway</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2500	Mr Paul Dickens	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to eastern development of LB due to: Loss of Green Belt. Loss of wildlife. Damage to the narrow gauge railway. The absence of proper infrastructure to support the development. Building on flood plain. Existing traffic congestion. Lack of local jobs. Lack of capacity on rail service. The level of local opposition to the proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3264	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: PNNH site west of Linslade offer viable alternative to the preferred option sites and would help meet the immediate MKSM housing requirements as well as the requirement in para 88 of the MKSMSRS which requires that construction start on one or more urban extensions by 2009. This would not be possible procedurally for any of the other preferred options considered in the Core Strategy as unlike West Linslade they are all in the Green Belt and current progress on the necessary procedures in such circumstances would preclude the meeting of the MKSMSRS requires timescale. Therefore PNNH object to para 4.27 as it is not reliant upon a Green Belt review and could deliver much needed new homes, jobs, community facilities and improved public transport.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
4065	Mr David Durkin	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Eastern development of LB due to: The loss of GB land and the effect this will have on the quality of the environment The increased risk of flooding due to the development of the flood plain The lack of jobs and infrastructure The traffic congestion which will be worsened with the increase in commuters which is at odds with LB being a cycle friendly town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
4066	Ms Diane Durkin	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Eastern development of LB due to: The loss of GB land and the effect this will have on the quality of the environment The increased risk of flooding due to the development of the flood plain The lack of jobs and infrastructure The traffic congestion which will be worsened with the increase in commuters which is at odds with LB being a cycle friendly town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2825	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: "Where the impact on the surrounding countryside can be mitigated and/or justified". How can this impact be mitigated or justified? There's no evidence of any proposal to mitigate the impact anywhere in the Consultation document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 12 outlines approach to mitigating impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage</p>				
1850	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: Mention water services infrastructure. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Pre Submission version of the Core Strategy will include appropriate references to the Water Infrastructure incorporating the findings of the WCS.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
926	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Southern Leighton has had several thousands of dwellings developed in the south and 1,300 homes are being constructed now. We cannot take any more housing. The proposed eastern development of 2,500 homes on a 'flood plain' and green belt will destroy our town with thousands more cars as new residents seek work outside LB with few employment opportunities. It is already 'standing room only' on our trains to London, with doctors and dentists stretched to the limit. Enough is enough!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed and Core Strategy Plans for this.</p>				
3689	Mrs Shirley Gilbert	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: More housing is not needed in this time of recession when there are many barriers to affordability e.g. the difficulty in obtaining mortgages Traffic congestion makes the town centre difficult to access already The town suffers from a lack of investment in infrastructure and the CS appears to show new facilities as allocations only The new development will also exacerbate the risk of flooding around the brook</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
118	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: How is this decision 'justified' when it is acknowledged that Leighton Buzzard has very limited capacity to improve job provision, is a transport bottle neck, has flood plain and sewerage considerations to be taken into account?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this.</p>				
2446	Paul Gosden	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Appalled at prospect of development on Green Belt on eastern side of LB; Developments at Billington Park and the Sandhills have delivered no additional infrastructure; The development will have an adverse impact on the narrow gauge railway which is the town's main tourist attraction; The site is on the flood plain and flooding is set to be more likely with the changing weather patterns due to climate change; The roads and rail links are already at full capacity and the development is proposed away from the train station on the opposite side of the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
842	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Your comments suggest the east of LB is selected as the only viable site for further expansion in LB. I think the conclusion could equally as well have been that it is not suitable. That area has close proximity to villages, close to flood plain/high flood risk areas, disruptive to the narrow gauge railway...and in conclusion is NOT suitable!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Core Strategy seeks to protect Flood Plain.</p>				
365	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The eastern edge of Leighton Buzzard contains a flood plain identified by the Environment Agency as a significant flood risk. It is wholly inappropriate to extend in this location. Your comments about fewer services and opportunities are correct. The conclusion should therefore be to eliminate Leighton Buzzard completely from your growth proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Core Strategy seeks to protect Flood Plain.</p>				
2437	Janet Harper	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development at LB is inappropriate. Reasons for objection include the loss of GB land. The fact that little infrastructure has been delivered to support the large housing developments at the Sandhills and Billington Park. Lower schools are at or over capacity. The increase in cars will only add to the congestion and make it harder for LB to become a cycle friendly town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2743	Mrs Brenda Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the eastern development of LB Development will affect beautiful landscapes and wildlife and urges JTU to reconsider the identification of this area for housing development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Core Strategy seeks to mitigate impact on landscape..</p>				
2760	Jane Hogg	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly opposes the plans to build on farmland to the east of Tamar Walk in LB; Heath Road to the east of the town is already very congested; there is insufficient infrastructure and the variety of wildlife that lives in this area of countryside will be threatened.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2691	Mr Peter Holmes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to eastern development of LB Town has already seen a massive increase in housing in recent years with no proportional infrastructure; many extra cars will be generated by the new development but only one extra road is proposed; flood plain is to be built on and Green Belt destroyed; commuter trains are at capacity and there is little local employment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade</p>				
3807	Mr Jim Jackson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposes the eastern development of LB due to: Loss of Green belt Building on flood plain No new large employer to provide jobs for new residents Roads cannot cope with additional traffic as there is only one bridge over the river Train station being on the opposite side of town No guarantee that promised infrastructure will be provided - has not been in the past The impact on the narrow gauge railway Lack of police in the town The weight of opinion is against this development and should be listened to</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2740	Mr Chris Janes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposed to the eastern development of Leighton Buzzard due to: Loss of Green Belt; loss of wildlife; adverse impact on the narrow gauge railway Building on flood plain; lack of infrastructure and increase of traffic to a 'cycle-friendly' town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2541	Mr Chris Janes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposition to the eastern development of LB due to: Loss of Green Belt Loss of Wildlife Adverse Impact to the narrow gauge railway Proposed building on flood plain Lack of infrastructure and pressure on existing services Increase in traffic to a 'cycle-friendly' town</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2354	Keith Jennings	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposes development proposed outside the LDF process to the West of Linslade in Aylesbury Vale District; Not directly relevant to this strategy as is not a strategic allocation; However opposes general overdevelopment of Leighton Linslade and welcomes decision of Joint Committee to compromise with a lower target of 2500 homes for Leighton Buzzard</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1886	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: This submission provides both formal objections and representations. It has been prepared by Kirkby and Diamond on behalf of Mr Anthony Kimble, the principal landowner of the proposed site known as West of Linslade Urban Extension. The statement in Para 4.27 with regard to the proposed urban extension east of Leighton Buzzard that "this location to the east of Leighton Buzzard is considered to be the only option around the towns where this could be achieved where the impact on the surrounding countryside can be mitigated and/or justified is strongly challenged.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix</p>				
2381	John Lane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about the Eastern development of Leighton Buzzard. No amount of opposition seems to influence the decision to go ahead with development in this area. Despite the increase in housing in the town in recent years, there has been no corresponding infrastructure. The character of what is a small market town is being destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
4061	Anne Lathwell	Eggington	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: Having lived in the LB area all their lives, the respondent and her family note the changes from a small market town community to a sprawling town particularly since the development of the Billington Park and Sandhills estates. These new estates have no infrastructure. Due to this, the doctors surgeries and road network are already overstretched and crime has increased. Leighton Buzzard cannot sustain any further development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
1287	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Mitigating the effects of any urban extension to the east of Leighton-Linslade is essential, to protect the interests of the environment, major existing stakeholders in the area, and the community as a whole.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3879	Leighton-Linlade Opposes Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Comments that until the Pages Priority development is full, then no further development should be permitted This completed and fully occupied development could then be used as a barometer to gauge what impact these new residents will have on infrastructure New residents will have to commute to major centres to work particularly London - this is very costly A Green Belt site should not be built on - due to the impact on quality of life, the destruction of wildlife habitats and the noise and light pollution</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3820	Mr Neil Lewington	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposes development to east of LB due to: Loss of Green Belt Loss of identity and character of the town Lack of infrastructure Lack of capacity for further traffic due to narrow roads The implications for Heath Road and the village of Heath and Reach of the proposed bypass The fact that the train station is on the other side of town Lack of jobs in the town Building on flood plain The strength of feeling against the development evidenced by the petition</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3671	Mr Robert Longman	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the eastern development of LB due to: The development of Green Belt land which will have an impact on wildlife The impact on the heritage railway The fact that further housing is not required as the development at the Sandhills is not fully occupied and the demand for housing is likely to be lower in the recession The inadequate plans for additional infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2399	Mrs Sandra Madden	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Eastern Development of Leighton Buzzard. Due to the loss of Green Belt land. The potential loss of wildlife. The impact on the narrow gauge railway. The risk of building on flood plain. The lack of infrastructure in the town. The traffic congestion it will cause. The fact that other recent developments e.g.Sandhills are "ugly and ill thought out".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3777	Mr D Marston	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposed to development on Green Belt and floodplain. The development would ultimately lead to the demise of the narrow gauge railway LB currently suffers from extremely poor transport and other infrastructure. There are few employment opportunities in the town so people would have to out-commute using the single crossing over the river.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2738	Ms Claire Martin	Eggington	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposes the eastern development of LB particularly the Green Belt land between LB and Eggington; will destroy LB's market town appeal and the town has already seen large developments at the Sandhills and Billington Park.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this.</p>				
2454	Jennifer Monk	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Protests at the addition of thousands of homes to the east of LB; The town has grown considerably with developments like the Sandhills but no related infrastructure improvements have been delivered; Traffic is still congested even following the improvements particularly at rush hour; and The station car park extension is unsightly and the leisure centre is inadequate for the existing residents of LB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
2490	Mr D G Monk	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to eastern development of LB due to: The fact that LB has taken its share of housing in recent years. The loss of Green Belt land. The development on flood plain. The lack of infrastructure and the fact that promised facilities have not been delivered in the past.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals and seeks to protect the flood plain. and provide new infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4053	Diane Morrison	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard has lost its character and has been overdeveloped already. There is insufficient capacity for more starter homes with no corresponding infrastructure. These houses should be accommodated elsewhere e.g. Milton Keynes</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2660	Mrs Susan Phillips	Linslade	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Representer questions whether advertised exhibition in Leighton Buzzard market took place; Response from JIU officer confirmed that it did, stated hours of operation and commented that stand could have been more visible. Consultation event is a farce and total waste of money anyway as clear that the local community does not want this development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation provides opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the proposals and for their concerns to be raised for consideration by the Joint Committee</p>				
2678	S Phillips	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Does not support development in LB due to: the fact that LB has already seen a high level of recent housing development with no infrastructure provision; all the large scale infrastructure appears to be directed to the main conurbation; lack of potential for jobs growth in the town and the loss of major employers; problems with altering the existing historic road network to accommodate further traffic; and risk of flooding</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2720	Steve Pollott	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Extreme concern expressed about the Eastern development of LB due to: loss of Green Belt; the impact of the narrow gauge railway; the risk of flooding; and traffic congestion.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3765	Mr Alan Redrup	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The development will increase the size LB by 25% and destroy the character of the market town. The loss of GB land will be significant. The proposals are not sustainable as people will have to commute elsewhere to work as insufficient jobs will be created. The existing transport infrastructure is not sufficient - the roads and trains are already at capacity. The proposals will have a catastrophic effect on wildlife. Flood risk will be increased particularly downstream by building on the flood plain. The type of housing proposed is out of keeping with the character of the area. The narrow gauge railway will be destroyed. There is no guarantee that the promised infrastructure will be delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3878	Ruth Sayers	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about potential air pollution with the presence of silica sand quarries and traffic congestion in the vicinity. The existing highway system is inadequate and already faces pressure from existing uses e.g. schools and driving test centre on the narrow Vandyke Road. There is a lack of employment in the town and out-commuting is difficult due to overcrowding. A massive amount of infrastructure would need to be delivered before any building could take place.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3667	Ruth Sayers	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The existing highway system in Leighton Linslade would not cope with the growth as it can't cope with the current level of development. Where will all these people work as unemployment is rising and many large, local companies have gone? The rail system is currently letting down commuters on an almost daily basis. It will need massive infrastructure to put sufficient medical and dental facilities alone in place before and building could think of taking place. The town is already at bursting point with all the development that has been foisted upon us in the last 30 years. It cannot take any more.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this and protection of the flood plain. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2538	Mr Roger Seldon	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the proposed eastern development of LB. The town has seen significant growth at the former RAF Stanbridge site and Billington Park and this has pushed the infrastructure of the town to the limits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2539	Antonia Seldon	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the proposed eastern development of LB The town has seen significant growth at the former RAF Stanbridge site and Billington Park and this has pushed the infrastructure of the town to the limits</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade</p>				
2450	C M Short	Eggington	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the eastern development of LB due to: Loss of Green Belt land; Building of houses on flood plain; The fact that no infrastructure is promised; The lack of employment; The impact on the narrow gauge railway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure and mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. New employment and infrastructure is proposed as is protection of the flood plain.</p>				
2702	Mr A K Silver	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Supports the decision to identify the area east of LB rather than west of Linslade. Contends that the west of the town would not be able to sustain further development because of traffic congestion, narrow highways and oversubscribed schools. Believes LB has already seen enough development at the Sandhills and Billington Park but if housing is required the east of the town is the preferable location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
3662	Mr Andrew Simms	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard has insufficient infrastructure to absorb yet more housing The area around Clipstone Brook is flood plain and this should be protected to safeguard those that already live nearby The heritage railway will also be affected by the new development - this should be treasured The benefits of the road improvements will also be quickly lost by the increased traffic lost by new developments</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this and protection of the flood plain. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2761	Chris Smart	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Does not support proposed development east of Leighton Buzzard The town suffers from a lack of employment which is likely to worsen in the current economic climate and the promised infrastructure improvements were not delivered following development at Sandhills and Billington Park.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure and mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. New employment and infrastructure is proposed as is protection of the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2488	Mr & Mrs G & Barbara Smith	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Object strongly to the Eastern development of LB Infrastructure in town already at capacity e.g. doctors, dentists and schools Leighton Buzzard was a lovely market but has been ruined by all the building</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements.</p>				
2682	Mrs Ena Smith	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the proposals to build to the east of LB due to: Loss of Green Belt and wildlife; The impact on the heritage railway; and Building on the flood plain - the brook has flooded in the past.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Core Strategy seeks to protect Flood Plain.</p>				
3664	Ms Paula Smith	Eggington	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: LB is already very congested and the relief road will make this worse. These proposals will also run contrary to LB's status as a cycle friendly town Not clear where these additional residents will work so this will lead to further out-commuting The will be further risk of flooding as a brook runs through the development site and with more concrete, excess water will be less able to drain away Not clear where the money to fund promised infrastructure is coming from</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Transport Assessment shows the benefit a link road through the East of Leighton Buzzard would have on traffic in the town. Further work to be undertaken to assess development proposals.</p>				
2416	Tim Steward	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the Eastern development of Leighton Buzzard. Insufficient infrastructure to cope with new development. It would be a travesty to destroy Green Belt land and the wildlife that inhabits it. Traffic congestion is already a major problem in the town for at least 4 hours on weekdays. The narrow gauge railway which is an important feature of the town will be destroyed. Building more houses on the flood plain will add to existing problems with flooding. The current shortage of work in the town will be exacerbated by the increased number of people new development will bring.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4068	Mrs Carol Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects strongly to the proposed Eastern development of LB due to: The development of flood plain land The increased congestion The development of Green Belt land The lack of local infrastructure and employment The lack of clarity about how proposed new facilities will be funded The lack of consideration for wildlife The impact on the narrow gauge railway</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3816	Mr Geoffrey Stopford	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade is already largely a commuter/dormitory town and this should not be increased by further development and pressure for jobs There should be no more development on the floodplain as properties on the Planets estate are already at risk The narrow gauge railway will be ruined if it has to travel through these new housing estates rather than open countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3778	Ms Christine Stopford	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade is already largely a commuter/dormitory town and this should not be increased by further development and pressure for jobs There should be no more development on the floodplain as properties on the Planets estate are already at risk The narrow gauge railway will be ruined if it has to travel through these new housing estates rather than open countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
2397	Emma Street	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Disagree that any more housing should be planned for Leighton Buzzard. Leighton Buzzard will lose its small town identity and become a smaller Milton Keynes. The successful improvements to the traffic flow in the town which were achieved by listening to local residents should be seen as a lesson that taking account of the views of the local community works. The loss of Green Belt and the fact that housing will be built on flood plain is also a concern.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals and seeks to protect the flood plain.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2427	Mr Gary Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Opposes the proposed development on the eastern side of Leighton Buzzard; The town is already overcrowded and houses should not be built on Green Belt land; Not clear whether those making the decisions on these plans appreciate the concerns of local residents or whether like the Minister that Mr Selous brought to visit the town, are completely detached from the issues; Once the proposed development has been carried out, it cannot be reversed and the countryside will be lost forever</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. The concerns of the community are understood and the Core strategy seeks to address these where possible.</p>				
1351	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	Yes
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade Town Council notes that the proposed area of expansion to the East of the Parish is the same as the area of growth identified within the Town Council's Big Plan. The Town Council asks that more land should be made available for employment and that housing build issues clearly identified within the Big Plan relating to density, style, quality and sustainability should be clearly addressed by the Joint Committee at the earliest possible opportunity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Employment land is proposed. Further work will be prepared on density, design and sustainability in due course with regard to the Big Plan.</p>				
1357	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The Town Council objects to the phrase "less potential to attract new employment" - facts will indicate that the Town has in the last decade lost many major employers and these need to be replaced. If the town was able to host such major employment concerns in the past it can surely do so again.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that the employment market in Leighton Linslade is more local but has potential to attract new employment. Core Strategy plans for this.</p>				
4047	Ms Kate West	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Pleasant market town character and easy access to the Green Belt will be lost forever The narrow gauge railway would be badly affected The houses would be built on flood plain There is insufficient infrastructure There is little employment in the town with the closure of major firms The roads particularly Vandyke Road which has two schools along it are too narrow to accommodate increased traffic flow</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				
3394	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: In the planning for implementation of the urban extension, it states "the emphasis will be on complementing and safeguarding its character and viability". If that the case, why is there no mention of the important and successful Narrow Gauge Railway. The location of the proposed eastern development to Leighton will directly affect the route of the railway and will remove much of the remaining open landscape view.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact, including the impact on the Narrow Gauge Railway..</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The impact on the Narrow Gauge Railway will be considered in the detailed planning of the proposed development taking account of the importance of open views from the route where possible.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
988	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: "where the impact on the surrounding countryside can be mitigated and/or justified." And just how can this impact be mitigated or justified? I see no evidence of this anywhere in the Consultation document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 12 outlines approach to mitigating impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage</p>				
88	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: The only reason the land to the east of L.B. has been selected, is because it is there. Currently, I can cycle (yes, very green of me) for 10 minutes and be in the countryside from where I live, what this eastern development will ultimately deliver is a housing jungle that will take me at least 30 minutes to cross. The majority of this land is floodplain, which anyone who knows the area will tell you.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Core Strategy seeks to protect Flood Plain.</p>				
2482	Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects strongly to the Eastern development of LB due to: Loss of floodplain Loss of Green Belt Lack of local employment The additional strain on existing inadequate local infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2688	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the eastern development of LB due to: Loss of flood plain; loss of Green Belt; lack of local employment; and additional strain on infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of recent and proposed housing development. New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed and Core Strategy Plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				
4064	Jackie Whittingham	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Eastern development of LB due to: The loss of Green Belt which only serves to make developers huge profits The loss of wildlife habitats The potential loss of the narrow gauge railway which brings tourism to the town The increased risk of flooding The lack of infrastructure and the fact that funding will have to be sought for this before it can be delivered The fact that the affordable housing delivered there will not be affordable for most</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. Further work to be undertaken to test proposals and mitigate impact</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2767	Mrs SL Wilson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Fully support the views of the 'LOUD Action Group'; there is an imbalance of growth to infrastructure; the carbon footprint that each new dwelling will have should be considered; the town has little business enterprise and few job opportunities and the good habitats that have been created for local wildlife will be adversely affected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed.</p>				
2765	Mr C Wilson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: Fully support the views of the 'LOUD Action Group'; there is an imbalance of growth to infrastructure; the carbon footprint that each new dwelling will have should be considered; the town has little business enterprise and few job opportunities and the good habitats that have been created for local wildlife will be adversely affected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed.</p>				
2429	Andy Wood	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.27	No
<p>Comment: After reading the CS PO Document, the representor still remains convinced that development on the eastern side of Leighton Buzzard is inappropriate, disproportionate and unnecessary. The proposal does not take account of the fact that LB has already been subject to significant housing development in recent years. Content that the significant contribution the town has made to regional housing targets has been overlooked. Understood the purpose of development in South Bedfordshire was to help regenerate the main conurbation - not clear how building thousands of houses around LB will assist with this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. It takes account of previous completions and current housing proposals.</p>				
592	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Nowhere is there an objective justification of why this is preferred.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base</p>				
2268	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: The proposed East of Luton urban extension is to be of the larger less sensitive type. The choice and size of this urban extension is not explained or justified in the consultation document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3696	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Preferred option of East of Luton urban extension will be on Green Belt of the highest landscape value. It would visually desecrate ancient dry chalk ridge and destroy the green space used by residents of Luton and Herts for recreation which is inspiring and spiritually renewing for visitors. Would result in loss of identity and chosen life style of established rural communities of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green through the resulting coalescence. Urban fringe problems would be created where at present the topology provides a clear division between urban and rural areas. Loss of productive farmland at time when it is needed. Extra volume of traffic generated will add to serious congestion on N Herts roads and will exacerbate Hitchin bottleneck and gridlock.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
857	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: As before I am not satisfied with the evidence supporting selection of this area in North Herts.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix</p>				
826	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: I object strongly to this proposal. As before this option has not been justified as a preferred location for urban growth.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base</p>				
820	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: I object strongly to this proposal. As before this option has not been justified as a preferred location for urban growth.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base</p>				
2651	Elisbeth Davey	Luton	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about development in North Hertfordshire to the east of Luton; wrong to merge Luton and Hitchin together and lose the treasured countryside in the process; option to the north of Houghton Regis seems preferable; questions whether the option to the East of Luton has been chosen so that North Hertfordshire will have to pay for the infrastructure.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Proposed development will not merge Luton and Hitchin. Infrastructure will be provided by a variety of means. Core Strategy includes development to the North of Houghton Regis.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2653	Laura Davey	Luton	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about development in North Hertfordshire to the east of Luton; wrong to merge Luton and Hitchin together and lose the treasured countryside in the process; option to the north of Houghton Regis seems preferable; and questions whether the option to the East of Luton has been chosen so that North Hertfordshire will have to pay for the infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Proposed development will not merge Luton and Hitchin. Infrastructure will be provided by a variety of means. Core Strategy includes development to the North of Houghton Regis.</p>				
2652	Jennifer Davey	Luton	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about development in North Hertfordshire to the east of Luton; wrong to merge Luton and Hitchin together and lose the treasured countryside in the process; option to the north of Houghton Regis seems preferable; and questions whether the option to the East of Luton has been chosen so that North Hertfordshire will have to pay for the infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Proposed development will not merge Luton and Hitchin. Infrastructure will be provided by a variety of means. Core Strategy includes development to the North of Houghton Regis.</p>				
2649	Ivan Davey	Luton	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about development in North Hertfordshire to the east of Luton; wrong to merge Luton and Hitchin together and lose the treasured countryside in the process; option to the north of Houghton Regis seems preferable; and questions whether the option to the East of Luton has been chosen so that North Hertfordshire will have to pay for the infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Proposed development will not merge Luton and Hitchin. Infrastructure will be provided by a variety of means. Core Strategy includes development to the North of Houghton Regis.</p>				
927	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: North Hertfordshire do not want development of 5,500 dwellings. And Leighton Linlade do not want their quota built east of Leighton. 10,525 people in Leighton Linlade petitioned Parliament and over 800 people marched through the streets stating 'No More Development' in and around the town. We have had our fair share of development to serve the existing population.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton and Leighton Buzzard as an area of search for development.</p>				
2356	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: 78. Ultimately the Core Strategy cannot contain substantive references to development in North Hertfordshire. The County Council is therefore concerned about some of the statements made in the POCD if these were to materialise in any similar form in the ultimately approved Core Strategy. Some examples of current references which are considered inappropriate for reason outlined above include: - Preferred Option CS1 - specifically the inclusion of the reference to development East of Luton and reference to North Hertfordshire. - Key Diagram - the level of detail is inappropriate. This detail should also be removed from any later stages of the document. - Paragraph 4.28, 5.27, 5.29 and 5.32 all contain too much detail e.g. the size of the development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further consideration to be given to the wording to be included in the Pre Submission Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Wording and level of detail has been carefully considered in partnership with North Herts.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
554	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: There is nothing in the consultation document to justify east of Luton's selection.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base				
392	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: I object to this. I can find no explanation or justification as to why the East of Luton has been selected as the preferred location in the consultation document.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base				
70	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: This is in Hertfordshire so hands off! Hertfordshire is already required to provide huge numbers of additional homes, much on the green-belt. This exists to prevent coalescence of towns, yet within the County a steady erosion of the green belt is going to take place at Stevenage, Welwyn Garden City, and Hemel Hempstead with possibility also west of Harlow and north of Bishops Stortford. This is an environmental disaster.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
1328	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: Object. Again you have offered no justification for this being included in the preferred list of options.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base				
1403	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockermhoe	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: I strongly object to this as I cannot find in the consultation document any explanation to justify why East of Luton has been selected as a preferred location.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base				
2616	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: Nowhere in the consultation document does it explain or justify why east of Luton has been selected as a preferred location.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base				
808	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.28	No
Comment: Completely unacceptable				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
457	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: To contemplate "strategic urban extension" within North Hertfordshire is outrageous. It is akin to Middle Eastern countries buying up land in Africa and other parts of the world to feed its rapid and unsustainable population growth. Completely immoral.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
811	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: North Hertfordshire is already under threat from Stevenage and, if the planners have their way, there will be one mega conurbation encompassing Stevenage, Luton and Hitchin, as rural land is swallowed up by houses and roads. The existing Green Belt land must be respected and remain sacrosanct.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
1471	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Why? Where's the evidence that this is a good idea? The West of Luton proposals are fully funded already, include safeguarding measures for villages in the area and even a much-needed football stadium.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including Site Assessment Matrix</p>				
3016	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: Object. Nowhere in the consultation document does it explain or justify why East of Luton has been selected as a preferred location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Some justification is given and more is provided in the evidence base</p>				
601	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.28	No
<p>Comment: The proportion of urban extension envisaged EoL is disproportionate</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of growth is decided upon consideration of the capacity of the location to accommodate the development in relation to the constraints and opportunities that exist.</p>				
1051	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.29	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Para 4.29 Support/Object/Comment: Comment Comments: The supporting text suggests delivery of urban extensions in parallel with the required supporting infrastructure. Given uncertainty over the timescales for delivery of key supporting infrastructure, such as J11A, the A5-M1 Link, the Luton Northern Bypass and other such key infrastructure, it may be prudent to bring forward some smaller sites early in the plan period to ensure the housing requirements can be met and a 5 year supply of housing is achieved.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4002	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.29	Yes
<p>Comment: It should be made very clear that all SUEs are equally important in meeting growth targets and requirements. Clarify and explain 'phasing' to show that urban extensions should not be delayed by delivery of strategic infrastructure elsewhere if not directly connected to them. State the number of sites that will come forward in 2012/13.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Housing chapter deals with this</p>				
1236	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 4.29	No
<p>Comment: My clients are concerned that given the delays that have occurred already in terms of implementation of one or more sustainable urban extensions by 2009, as set out in the MKSMSRS and the delays in the implementation of the A5-M1 link road and new junction 11a that the timescales set out may well not be met. In such circumstances other contingencies must be made to ensure the timely delivery of the step change in housing required. Part of this requirement could be met by my clients' site located at Beech Road, Dunstable. Utility provision has been confirmed to exist to serve any development at the site.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
1759	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 4.29	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph 88 of the MKSMSRS states that the priority for local development documents is to determine quickly the extent and location of the green belt releases, urban extensions, areas of safeguarded land and the phasing of the required urban extensions. The objective of the SRS is to ensure that construction can start at one or more of the urban extensions by 2009. That aspiration is now unattainable and NLC supports the observation at paragraph 4.29 of the Preferred Options that development of the strategic urban extensions will be phased, with development commencing in 2012/13. Given the length of time that will inevitably elapse between the completion of the necessary elements of the LDF and the approval of a planning application to implement the preferred North Luton urban extension, a commencement date of 2012/13 is apposite.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing and Infrastructure Delivery Strategy sections of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on existing evidence base. Further work is needed to identify the phasing and funding of key infrastructure.</p>				
1489	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.29	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the release of the SUEs as they are all important in meeting the growth targets. Apart from natural lead times we see no reason to impose a "not before" date. The delivery of supporting infrastructure should be in parallel (where feasible) but should not be front-loaded.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing and Infrastructure Delivery Strategy sections of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on existing evidence base. Further work is needed to identify the phasing and funding of key infrastructure.</p>				
603	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.29	No
<p>Comment: The supporting infrastructure is unaffordable. The Luton northern bypass is not supported by the Highways Agency</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options is based on existing evidence base. Further work is needed to identify the funding of key infrastructure.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1139	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.30	No
<p>Comment: We note that the precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy. We have three comments on this. Firstly, there needs to be an additional stage of public consultation on these boundaries before they are finalised for the Submission DPD. To leap straight from 'key-diagram' depiction on a very small-scale map to precisely defined boundaries in one go is too much and, if nothing else, is likely to lead to many objections at the Submission stage. Secondly, it should be clearly stated as a guiding principle under the section on Strategic Urban Extensions (paras 4.21-30) that the urban extension north of Luton will not encroach on the designated AONB. This is suggested in para 12.9 but ought to be included here. Thirdly, it should also be clearly stated as a guiding principle that the urban extensions north of Luton and Houghton Regis will not extend north of the line of the Luton Northern Bypass.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.		
JC Reason for Response:	The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.			
2269	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.30	No
<p>Comment: Not acceptable to defer boundaries definition to the submission stage. Need to see the boundaries in order to have an informed opinion.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.		
JC Reason for Response:	The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.			
3218	DP9	London	Para. 4.30	No
<p>Comment: In preparing the draft Submission Core Strategy it is important that the Joint Technical team have regard to the guidance at paragraph 4.4 and 4.5 of PPS12 and in particular it is essential that the Core Strategy makes clear spatial choices about where development should go in broad terms</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.		
JC Reason for Response:	PPS12 allows for Strategic Allocations to be made.			
555	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.30	No
<p>Comment: A clearer definition of the boundaries are now required in order to determine the full impact of each proposed location.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.		
JC Reason for Response:	The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.			
393	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.30	No
<p>Comment: This isn't good enough. Boundaries need to be seen now so that the impact of each proposed location is clearer.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.		
JC Reason for Response:	The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.			
1329	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 4.30	No
<p>Comment: The submission stage is too late to detail the boundaries of the proposed location - the public need to see these now, at consultation stage in order to make an informed analysis of the plans.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.		
JC Reason for Response:	The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1404	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.30	No
Comment: I would very much like to know where the proposed boundaries are likely to be in order to be able to assess the impact of each proposed location.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.				
JC Reason for Response: The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.				
3311	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.30	No
Comment: There are concerns about the relationship between the objectives of the proposals and the consultation outside the plan area and the decision making structures and technical work required, and their impact on the soundness of the preferred option core strategy.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
3361	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Para. 4.30	Yes
Comment: The provision in this paragraph is a welcomed way of seeking to move the process forward quickly. Plans to be produced within the Core Strategy should be of a scale and provide sufficient detail so that once adopted, the boundaries are clear an allow master planning to take place without the need for further debate over which areas of land lie inside or outside the extension area.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
459	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.30	No
Comment: UNACCEPTABLE				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: This approach will help to clarify boundaries.				
3017	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.30	No
Comment: Need to clearly identify the boundaries now in order to assess the impact of each proposed location.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: The CS DPD and Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.				
JC Reason for Response: The precise boundaries of the strategic urban extensions will be defined in the Submission version of the Core Strategy to provide greater certainty.				
1140	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.31	No
Comment: There appears to be some discrepancy between the seven rural settlements shown on the Key Diagram as having €the potential to accommodate some development' and the list of only five in Preferred Option CS6. We accept that those villages which have acceptable levels of local services may have to accommodate some minor development in order to contribute towards the allocations which have to be made outside the urban areas and strategic urban extensions. However, this should not compromise the individual identities and characters of the villages concerned. It should literally be €small-scale' and any revisions to Green Belt boundaries should be minimal in order that the original intentions of designating Green Belt land be retained. There seems to us to be little point in defining a Green Belt if, as soon as its boundaries become inconvenient, they are altered.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1055	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.31	No
<p>Comment: How have the villages on the Key Diagram been selected? The Key Diagram identifies 7 villages that are suitable for future small scale development while Preferred Option CS6 only includes 5 and excludes Slip End. Considered that Slip End would score highly in sustainability terms and should be included within the policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Identification of villages reflects their exclusion from the Green Belt and their scale and sustainability.</p>				
701	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.31	No
<p>Comment: These villages have no prospects of decent public transport and should not be allowed to grow. It's actually difficult to find villages suitable for growth in your study area because it's so tightly drawn. To find suitable places you need to look further north, for example to Harlington and Westoning (with a station). In both cases you could allow the village to grow on its own side of the railway and create a new village of similar size on the other side, and the two can share facilities such as a health centre and a supermarket.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This encourages urban extensions to main towns and limited growth in residual area.</p>				
1613	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 4.31	No
<p>Comment: Concerns over redefining greenbelt boundaries, extensions are not possible in South Bedfordshire area but are in North Hertfordshire area, also in line with MKSM SRS.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the approach to Green Belt boundary revisions would be helpful</p>				
1309	Templeview Developments Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.31	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the inclusion of the explanation as to the process by which the East of England Plan residual housing allocation will be met (i.e. through the Green Belt review). We remain unsure as to the scope of the Site Allocations DPD and whether this will cover the definition of the urban growth locations as well as the rural growth locations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Site Allocations DPD will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
1199	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.31	No
<p>Comment: Heath and Reach is identified as a rural settlement capable of supporting additional growth. It is already effectively attached to Leighton Linlade, and with the proposed eastern development will be likely to lose its rural village character - the character and identity of all rural settlements identified for growth should be adequately protected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for this</p>				
1337	Toddington Estates Ltd	Cambridge	Para. 4.31	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the principle of some further development in identified rural settlements. Additional development on the edge of Toddington would be appropriate and could secure a tangible community benefit in the form of an extension to the Glebe facilities. The necessary small scale review of the Green Belt boundary would be justifiable in this instance.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Core Strategy identifies Toddington as a location for limited development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
471	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.31	No
<p>Comment: No re-drawing of Green Belt, no development within Green Belt and no expansion to existing villages. All development to be confined to brownfield town centre sites. Rural (including village) expansion is not sustainable, creates additional motor vehicle miles and pollution.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This encourages urban extensions to main towns and limited growth in residual area.</p>				
2270	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.32	No
<p>Comment: The proposals disregard appropriate agreed regulations regarding development on Green Belt land which have been in place for decades.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This Para advises that the principles of Green Belt in PPG2 will be upheld.</p>				
460	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.32	No
<p>Comment: Development is Green Belt is NEVER acceptable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This requires growth and Green Belt reviews.</p>				
472	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.32	No
<p>Comment: NO development is "appropriate" in Green Belt countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This requires growth and Green Belt reviews.</p>				
1732	Bloor Homes	Derbyshire	Para. 4.33	Yes
<p>Comment: Contingency plans to deal with any possible delays in the delivery of growth should be added to the Core Strategy to ensure that it will be regarded as 'sound'. An appropriate contingency plan would involve the release of selected sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD where a shortfall in the housing trajectory is identified in the Annual Monitoring Report, in accordance with the advice in PPS3 paragraphs 60-67.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Housing delivery is a risk factor that will be considered in the Housing Delivery Strategy. This will outline approach to contingency should housing delivery not keep pace with required targets.</p>				
1237	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 4.33	No
<p>Comment: Whilst it is noted that the Joint Committee are committed to reacting swiftly in the event that delivery is delayed with alternative contingencies, we are concerned that, given the length of time it has taken to reach the current stage, and the lack of specified alternatives, such contingencies will take longer to implement and hence delivery of the required housing further delayed. The Submission Version Core Strategy must contain more details on the possible alternative strategies.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
33	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.33	No
Comment: I am afraid that this all sounds like weasel words. There is no teeth to ensure that the plan / strategy is adhered too				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: Delivery will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements				
1129	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.34	No
Comment: 5 the bullet-point: The words 'of a scale appropriate to their existing form and character' are weak on their own. They should be strengthened to refer additionally to 'safeguarding the separate identity and individual character' of the rural settlements.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Clarification of this in the Spatial Principles would be helpful				
1614	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.34	No
Comment: Cannot agree with the concept of 'a further strategic urban extension to the East of Luton'. In our submission at the Issues and Options stage, we demonstrated how modifications to Option 5 could enable the housing growth targets to be met without recourse to expansion east of west of Luton. Also, whilst our submission did include an urban extension at Leighton Buzzard, this was confined to the brownfield quarry land area at the north east edge of the town and was for 2000 homes only. We cannot agree with any larger eastern extension at Leighton Buzzard, involving a push into green fields and into land south of Vandyke Road.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
1590	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 4.34	Yes
Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Considered to be in conformity				
3382	Peter Jardine	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.34	No
Comment: suggests that a bigger Aylesbury and better Luton will contribute far more to reduction of housing shortage and they both have existing infrastructure.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy plans for development around Luton.				
1288	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.34	Yes
Comment: Overall agreement, subject to safeguards for those potentially affected by the developments.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.				
JC Reason for Response: CS and subsequent LDF documents will seek to minimise impact				
1313	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.34	Yes
Comment: Object to Spatial Development Principles and relevant supporting text in Section 4 - Please see separately submitted documentation.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
167	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 4.34	No
<p>Comment: As a long-term resident of east Luton, and a beneficiary of the rural areas surrounding Cockernhoe, Tea Green and Mangrove Green, including my daughter being a pupil of the most excellent Cockernhoe school, under no circumstances do I support the seeking of a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1200	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.34	No
<p>Comment: The spatial development principles state that priority will be given to the main conurbation before Leighton Buzzard and Linslade, especially in the period up to 2012. Is this realistic? With schemes coming forward (e.g. E of Leighton) and the current economic conditions likely to keep future schemes 'on hold' for some time yet, is this a realistic expectation?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Housing delivery is a risk factor that will be considered in the Housing Delivery Strategy. This will outline approach to contingency should housing delivery not keep pace with required targets.</p>				
827	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Para. 4.34	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the principle 'Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework' as it proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts when alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2947	Ms Margaret Woods	Lilley	Para. 4.34	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton proposal, the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the East Luton Bypass as it does not adhere to the vision and key principles outlined in the Strategy notably the protection of landscape and biodiversity, improvement of image of Luton, and preservation of villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3344	Mr Stephen Allen	Eggington	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Greater emphasis is needed on development to go in the existing conurbation, including hundreds of empty homes. Leighton Linslade already has an infrastructure Deficit from previous development. The JPC has no power to force other government agencies (eg NHS) to improve infrastructure. The Committee also has no power to implement development in North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: CS delivery strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts. and infrastructure provision</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
595	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: For the reasons set out above I object. In essence, it appears to be a flawed decision based on political grounds when there are more appropriate sites available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
1682	Anglian Water Services Limited	Peterborough	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the Core strategy in principal. Anglian Water will be in a better position to comment further when sites exact are clearly identified for all the proposed urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
158	Aylesbury Vale District Council	Aylesbury	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: The Spatial Development principles do not confirm the location of development at Leighton Linslade in terms of the direction of housing growth to the east. This should mirror the statements made for the other allocations in North Hertfordshire, Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis, all of which specify the location of development/urban extensions. Whilst the easterly direction of growth is stated in the pre-text within the Preferred Options Core Strategy and shown within the Key Diagram (although this is somewhat confusingly shown as a €'not preferred'), the development principle should be reworded to specify the location of development East of Leighton Buzzard and Linslade. If this text was amended to state a strategic urban extension be provided to the East of Leighton Buzzard and Linslade, this authority would support the spatial development principles, which locates development in the most appropriate locations according to the evidence available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Adds clarity</p>				
176	Dr Steve Barley	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the principle 'Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework' as it proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts when alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3346	Mr Peter Barracough	Eaton Bray	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Generally support but object to 'developing new rural settlements' (see enclosed comments). Would prefer no more growth in the S E, but if must have it, broadly support the spatial development principles and preferred option, except for plans to develop rural settlements. I live in Eaton Bray, on the edge of the green belt and as such is at risk of development. Can think of no good reason why my village should be developed or expanded. I live here precisely because it is a small quiet village in a beautiful location. Eaton Bray is large enough already and any further expansion would completely ruin the character of the village. I do not want Eaton Bray to become a small town. I find the statement: 'Small scale reviews of the green belt boundary on the edge of rural settlements may be required to enable such development to proceed' disturbing. This is the thin end of the wedge. If such adjustments can be made once, they can be made again. The green belt should be sacred and expanded not reduced.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified a need for housing in residual area. CS plans for this.</p>				
3329	Barton Willmore on behalf of CBRE Investors		Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the emphasis on maximising the potential of existing urban areas to accommodate new development.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1960	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Development to the east of Luton will increase demand for health services in Luton, yet S106 funding will remain in North Herts. This will have a major impact on existing services. This also applies to other developments elsewhere on the borders of Luton. S106 funding needs to follow the patient (and the location of their GP) rather than where their house is. Are there plans to review political boundaries? Community-based health support services will need to be accessible and enhanced to meet the mental health needs of the new communities. Pre-development discussions with the Trust will be essential to effective service provision for developing communities.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this		
<p>JC Reason for Response: There are no plans to amend the political boundaries. Cross boundary agreements on service provision will be needed in the planning for and financing of services.</p>				
1685	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Support principle of urban first but concerned that this and the reliance on large urban extensions will not meet the housing targets. Also considers that the proposal to develop in North Herts could prevent delivery. Proposes that smaller sites would be more deliverable.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Housing delivery is a risk factor that will be considered in the Housing Delivery Strategy. This will outline approach to contingency should housing delivery not keep pace with required targets.</p>				
15	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: the best countryside is located to the East of Luton not the West. The infrastructure is best developed in the West and not the East. So why develop in North Herts?</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1056	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Spatial Development Principles Yes/No: Yes Comments: I support the Spatial Development Principles as set out in the document. Whilst recognising that priority will be given to the reuse of Previously Developed Land and with the majority of growth being delivered through strategic urban extensions, small scale Green Belt releases adjoining the rural settlements can play an important role in delivering dwellings early in the plan period as they are not encumbered by high existing use values (in the case of PDL) or requirements for delivery of strategic infrastructure (in the case of urban extensions).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2272	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Do not support these principles: query method used to assess urban extension in N Herts and lack of explanation/justification new Green Belt boundaries will not be permanent Size of proposed development East of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
2667	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposal to focus development to the north of the conurbation (and to a lesser extent to the east, on the North Herts boundary) is realistic and practical. The major thrust of new development in the borough and surrounding areas should be a significant extension on the north of the Luton-Dunstable conurbation with more limited expansion at Leighton Buzzard. New development in other settlements should be limited to very modest infilling and rounding-off, designed to preserve their existing character. Even a relatively modest scale of development allocated to the existing villages and settlements would tend to overpower their existing character and change their nature and distinct identities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1941	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Growth in rural settlements should help to sustain viable rural communities. The focus on spatial issues and physical infrastructure is at the expense of addressing the social, environmental impact, health and well-being, safety and other people-issues. Provide a clear statement that provides a framework for development based on the principle of planning to develop and support communities, not simply physical infrastructure. Recognise that the manner in which localities are set-out will have a major impact on health, well-being and community safety. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Greater amplification of the impact of this on social and environmental issues could be included where appropriate but is focus of Core Strategy must be on addressing the spatial location of development and the infrastructure needs.</p>				
702	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Considers that growth should be focused in proximity to interurban transport whether brownfield or greenfield and therefore supports area around "aspirational" train station but considers that this should be viewed as essential.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Proximity to high quality public transport is important. Core Strategy plans for this.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3600	Ellie Clarke	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the principle to seek an urban extension to the East of Luton as it proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts when alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Luton area for significant housing growth and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Site Assessment Matrix assessed other locations. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3347	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Support the principle of providing Strategic Urban Extensions north of Luton and north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis. Where it proposes that alternative locations be brought forward the would clearly be a conflict with the MKSMSRS which gives specific guidance on the location of a review of the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Principles and locations for development accords with the MKSMSRS</p>				
219	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: I strongly disagree with the proposal to build on Hertfordshire land. I do agree with protecting the countryside but how are you acknowledging this very important Spatial Development Principle when you are intending to ignore that aspect completely by building on Hertfordshire countryside?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
848	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Because the Principles include "a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District". This is not acceptable to me and I cannot therefore say that I support the Principles. Other options need to be reconsidered - I understand that 13 other locations had been identified but have seen no evidence that they have been considered properly.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
274	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection noted but no justification given.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1517	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: If the need for additional housing was known about, why was the Butterfield business park development alongside the A505 and the North Herts boundary permitted? Did Luton BC believe that it would be easier to expand outside their boundary if 'housing' was used as the justification?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
3259	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: PNNH believes that the spatial development principles do not provide robust, sound and comprehensive template to guide development due to the location of the preferred urban extensions and exclusion of land west of LL. Believes specifically the preferred extensions are inextricably linked to road infrastructure that requires significant public investment and will not be ready until 2016. Would like to know who will be developing the sites given the current economic climate and infrastructure costs. Believes decision on preferred options was taken without considering evidence base or merits and constraints of sites contrary to PPS3 and was therefore not properly informed. Essential part of development principles should be to establish vision and future role of Green Belt in conjunction with assessment of development options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1173	Ms Joan Drage	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Because they encroach onto the North Herts countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1170	Ms Joan Drage	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: The area east of Luton should be kept as countryside. A handful of housing could be accommodated but not the thousands of homes planned.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1248	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: They will be impossible to implement without major change.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including preparation of delivery strategies.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Significant effort and resources will be required to deliver these principles</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
919	Mr Colin Dye	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the principle to 'Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework'. It proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts. North Herts already has its own housing quotas to fulfil and 'dumping' additional housing in North Herts from an outside County surely makes a mockery of the whole Regional planning process. Surely alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds and if such sites cannot be found then such a failure should be notified to the Regional Planning Authority for their advice and not hidden by encroaching on an adjacent Counties obligations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
1967	Eaton Bray Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2781	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Where is this urban extension to Leighton Linlade? We can't support something that is worryingly unspecified.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Adds clarity</p>				
1851	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Provision of water services infrastructure for each development area must be achievable (see Water Cycle Study). (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to consider findings</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Water Cycle Study addresses this</p>				
928	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: But not for Leighton Linlade, as LL has had 'more than it's fair share' of development and already contributed some 4,000 dwellings to the MKSMSRS figures.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade.</p>				
3211	Mr Freddie Gee	Harpenden	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: There is no democratic reason why Bedfordshire development should be forced upon Hertfordshire without detailed discussion and agreement with Hertfordshire County Council.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. North Herts. District Council have observer status on the Joint Committee and officers are engaged in the process</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
119	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Reasons already given. The eastern development in Leighton Buzzard will destroy the character of the town, and leave us with a dormitory-style, housing estate which will only add further congestion to roads, overwhelm the limited services available, put stress on things like the flood plains, have people commuting out of the area to work, and destroy the quality of life enjoyed in an historical market town. I contend that there is nothing in the plan or principles which states which items of 'infrastructure' will be provided to enable the proposed eastern housing conglomeration to be a sustainable, self-sufficient community.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade.</p>				
242	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Although I agree with the first bullet point; the Main Conurbation is the logical centre for growth in the area, I disagree with the third. The Core Strategy contains little detail on employment opportunities for the proposed Leighton Buzzard urban extension, notes that current local employment opportunities are less than might be expected but seeks to meet a demand for housing. Taken together this means the inhabitants of the urban extension will have to commute to/from their place of employment. In practice this will mean the Main Conurbation, Milton Keynes or London. That being the case, an urban extension to the West of the town would be sensible, taking advantage of the recently constructed roads that by-pass Leighton-Linslade. I note that such an application has recently been rejected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to add clarity regarding the employment.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection to east of Leighton Buzzard is noted as is the objection to the limited detail on employment.</p>				
843	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Expansion to East of LB is not appropriate (reasons given in above comments)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
2709	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection noted but no justification given.</p>				
2451	Harpenden Town Council	Harpenden	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Q1. Do you support the Spatial Development Principles? Yes, the Town Council support the principles in the document. It is noted that the major focus of development does not immediately effect the Harpenden Area. It is particularly commendable that the strategic growth is focused on existing conurbations with the capacity to accommodate increased housing. It is also pleasing to note that the Joint Committee are mindful of the responsibility to protect the Countryside and therefore limit any development outside of the proposed locations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1736	Holmes Antill	Loughborough	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: Supports the Principles which are firmly based on regional and sub-regional principles and policies.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
2552	Holwell Parish Council	Holwell	Q. 3	No
Comment: Making proposals in another county, with no substantive liaison with the relevant county or district councils is inappropriate to the development of a working partnership. The Joint Committee contained not one representation of Hertfordshire County Council or North Herts District Council.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council have observer status on the Joint Committee and officers are engaged in the process				
2396	Mr Peter Hunt	Luton	Q. 3	No
Comment: The principles are not principles at all. They state objectives like "maximising the potential of the existing urban areas", and "limit development outside these locations". The strategy then includes exceptions on a random basis. We know Government is the driving force behind these plans and LAs have to fulfil them. The LDD are trying to make compliance sound plausible. It doesn't. There is no excuse to use someone else's land because they have run out of their own. If Luton has no further land to meet Government requirements it should tell them that, not expand into nearby counties that has been designated as Green Belt. If South Beds (Central Beds) are happy for Luton, Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard to be one huge Greater Luton conurbation, so be it, but there's no excuse for expanding into N Herts when they don't want it. Specifically the strategy needs to add the words, 'Deliver growth in rural communities and other locations, to the extent that they are approved by local people as being appropriate'.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures and measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. It also identified a need for housing in residual area.				
198	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 3	No
Comment: 1) Give them a name that means something in Plain English 2) No more growth in South East England at all				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
1128	Mr Norman Jones	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: I support the principles subject to some provisos: I would emphasise that any development in North Hertfordshire needs to be planned through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework. I would emphasise that development in this area should only be started once any associated infrastructure into Luton is developed. Hence I would not expect it to be the first area to be developed, I would also emphasise that brownfield sites in the existing urban areas should be developed first.				
JC Response: Partially agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Delivery of housing and infrastructure will need to be phased appropriately taking account of sustainability and cost factors				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
556	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: I firmly believe the powers that be have not thought this out thoroughly. The overall strategy makes sense but not at the expense of ruining Britain's heritage. The vast areas of beautiful countryside can never be recovered unlike some run down urban locations I am unable to mention in this document. I would also consult the Joint Technical Unit's own study as carried out by an independent planning consultancy. The document not 'yet' made available to the public states the area to the east of Luton as 'INAPPROPRIATE'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review as not all development could be met in the urban areas. LUC report recommends that in landscape terms development in part of the area to the East of Luton is not recommended.</p>				
395	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Absolutely not. Get rid of the option to expand into North Hertfordshire for the reasons I've already given.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2724	Kings Walden Parish Council	Royston	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton extension has not been allocated through North Hertfordshire District Council. This Green Belt area has not been chosen or considered appropriate for any of the 400,000 extra homes required in Hertfordshire. It is difficult to reconcile the proposed development east of Luton (or even consider it as an option) with the Committee's vision and principles for the protection of countryside and heritage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
1885	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Principal landowner of proposed site for urban extension, West of Linslade. Do not believe that spatial development principles provide a robust, sound and comprehensive template to guide development of urban extensions for following reasons: reliant on delivery of major transport infrastructure with lack of funding; lack of clarity regarding who will be delivering the necessary infrastructure; preferred options were decided on without proper consideration of merits, suitability or constraints of sites and lack of evidence base. Site West of LL is a viable option which is not reliant on Green Belt review, delivery of significant infrastructure and can readily fulfil requirements of MKSMSRS.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence. Housing delivery is a risk factor that will be considered in the Housing Delivery Strategy. This will outline approach to contingency should housing delivery not keep pace with required targets. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3399	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: The principle of maximising the potential of existing urban areas is supported provided such development is given priority over the development of strategic urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1290	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: The existing conurbation is better suited to large increases in population. Elsewhere, developments must be proportionate to their environment.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1330	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
Comment: Delete - further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
1796	London Luton Airport Consultative Committee	Luton	Q. 3	No
Comment: Urban extension to the east of Luton is totally unacceptable as future residents are very likely to suffer from aircraft noise. The fall-back option of additional development at Caddington and Slip End is also totally unacceptable as this is currently overflowed by aircraft travelling to and from the airport.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Impact of noise has been considered in the appraisal of the options.				
1315	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 3	No
Comment: Object to Spatial Development Principles and relevant supporting text in Section 4 - Please see separately submitted documentation.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence				
2077	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: Executive supports principles because they accord with Government, Regional and Sub Regional spatial policy, with emphasis on maximising development and regeneration potential of higher order urban areas through sequential phasing; maximising reuse and recycling of previously developed land. Rural development should only accommodate growth sufficient to meet local needs. Principles acknowledge that in intermediate to longer term greenfield land will need to be released for development as urban extensions to accommodate necessary scale of growth. Each preferred option is identified, including east of Leighton Linslade. Approach will maximise delivery of sustainable pattern of development. Principles will provide certainty for developers & stakeholders to aid land provision and planning contributions needed to make schemes viable. Strategy states need to identify contingency plans if weaknesses in delivery emerge; phasing of strategy will support AMS and mechanisms to ensure progress in delivery is maintained.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1920	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Growth in rural settlements should help to sustain viable rural communities. The focus on spatial issues and physical infrastructure is at the expense of addressing the social, environmental impact, health and well-being, safety and other people-issues. Provide a clear statement that provides a framework for development based on the principle of planning to develop and support communities, not simply physical infrastructure. Recognise that the manner in which localities are set-out will have a major impact on health, well-being and community safety. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The LDF can contribute to achieving some of these through its influence of the location of new development and infrastructure. Core Strategy does this.</p>				
914	Mrs Margaret Marshall	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: I DO NOT support the spatial development principles which seek a further strategic urban extension to the East of Luton, mainly in N. Hertfordshire District to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework - it means an unjustifiable urban development on green belt in North Herts. Alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
3379	Mr Harry Maughan	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Yes, with provisos on sustainability ensured via infrastructure provision: Whatever the economic situation ahead, South Bedfordshire (and almost anywhere will continue to grow, if erratically - with a rise in population. The potential for the natural South Bedfordshire Corridor are that due to its' proximity to the M1, emerging Outer M25, new M1 Junction 11a, the WCML and ECML rail routes and London Luton Airport - it will attract very large population gain. What must be provided is adequate infrastructure to balance the existing towns infilling (heavy on brownfield sites) and the Outskirts developments. The infrastructure process must be lead by genius multimodal transport provision. N.B. 43000 new homes 2001 - 2031 has been reduced by Eastern Region to 41700.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including preparation of an infrastructure delivery strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Significant effort and resources will be required to deliver the infrastructure needed</p>				
248	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: It is an extraordinary arrogance to plan to develop Luton outside the boundaries of Bedfordshire. We choose to live in North Herts because of its rural character, and natural beauty. We don't want more congestion, pollution and noise from roads or (in particular) the airport. The impact is bad enough as it is. The countryside between Hitchin and Luton is particularly beautiful, and has its own rural economy that is longstanding and no less important than that of Luton. How dare you think you can ride roughshod over that. It is outrageous.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
759	Mrs Ann Morton	St. Albans	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the strategic urban extension into another county. Hertfordshire has its own housing allocation to decide where it is best located. Bedfordshire/Luton must not be able to use Hertfordshire land for any of its housing numbers allocation, especially in the case of east of Luton in North Hertfordshire District where it will be inappropriate development of green field Green Belt land. In addition strongly object to any residential development being provided in the flight paths for Luton Airport - both the current and any potential future flight paths areas should be kept free of housing development. Please can we learn from the noise and quality of life issues for residents because housing was built around Heathrow Airport and under its flight paths.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
168	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Most of the principles I DO support, since they are eminently sensible. I do not however support a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework. It is for this reason, I have voted no.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection to east of Luton noted</p>				
3332	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the provision of two strategic c urban extensions to the north of the conurbation and to deliver growth in identified rural settlements.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1406	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: I cannot possibly support any development that involves building on rural areas that will be lost for ever.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified need for development in residual area.</p>				
504	Dr John Noble	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: However, the proposal does none of these.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection noted but no justification given.</p>				
3377	Anonymous	Leighton Linlade	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Disagrees with the CSPO on grounds of housing and employment locations, types and quantities, transport provision/commuting/congestion, damage too and loss of Green Belt and Countryside, cross boundary working.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3363	Ms Sheila Page	Luton	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Support with reservations. Agree most new development should be within urban areas but disagree with low estimates of how much. No real evidence that amount of new housing outside existing urban areas must be as much as stated and unclear how much this will be. Document too vague, says most would be in existing urban areas. The CS (e.g. 4.21 and 6.10) simply repeats 'Not all development is needed...can be delivered within existing urban areas.' 6.6 confirms people prefer maximising brownfield land and minimising development in greenbelt through high density development in urban areas. Others concerned about strain on open spaces and 'high density development currently being delivered'. Should look for alternative high density development (low rise terraces) even if acute demand for family housing in Luton. 6.35 inconsistent on type of future households, suggests increase in older population but also new households will be mostly people in 20s &amp; 30s only requiring easy access to urban services &amp; employment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including SHLAA which addresses the potential for housing in the urban areas. Further work to be undertaken to consider how the different housing needs are met.</p>				
1761	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the Principles and the policy framework which follows the guidance provided by the MKSMSRS.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3345	Mr David Pilcher	Bedford	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: 1. Extending urban areas would seem to take better advantage of existing amenities. 2. Protecting the countryside is so needed for our general wellbeing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
349	DR JANE RANSOM	Pirton	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the principle 'seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in N. Herts District, to be planned for through the N Herts Local Development Framework' because it proposes urban development on good arable land in an unspoilt green belt in N.Herts. There are alternative sites available on brownfield sites in Luton, plus large areas of substandard housing that could be modified and used.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs.</p>				
34	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: In principle. It seems sensible to extend existing large urban areas, with their superior, albeit stretched, infrastructure rather than scatter development. However, I believe that later in the document it is suggested that the development at Leighton Buzzard will be sooner rather than later.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
421	Mr Andrew Robson	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: It seems inappropriate to refer to "new permanent Green Belt boundaries" when it is proposed to remove land from existing Green Belt, which was also supposed to be permanent. The meaning of "Green Belt" should be defined and the word "permanent" should not be used if land can subsequently be reclassified.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact. Green Belt boundary to be defined in accordance with advice in PPG2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
540	Mrs Margaret Rollason	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: NO, I do NOT support the principle " Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, MAINLY IN NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework" It proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts when alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
181	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the principle 'Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework' as it proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts when alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
1529	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Considers that East of Luton urban extension should not be included owing to its location in North Herts. Considers that East of Leighton Buzzard should be 4,500 homes to maximise potential for exemplar low carbon development and potential to support new infrastructure and sustainable travel. Objects to North Luton bypass owing to impact on AONB and need to test non bypass options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments, environmental sensitivity assessment and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
713	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: The Houghton Regis Development Consortium (HRDC) broadly supports the Joint Committee's strategic approach to development in Southern Bedfordshire in the period up to 2031. In particular, it welcomes the recognition that provision needs to be made for two strategic urban extensions to the north of the Luton / Dunstable / Houghton Regis Conurbation area. HRDC's ability to facilitate the delivery of the Joint Committee's vision, in a sustainable and timely way, is expanded upon in response to various policies and accompanying text set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2136	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: The proposed urban extension site East of Luton lies outside the area covered by the expert technical advice. The estimated development costs will rise and erode the projected 15% profit.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Technical Evidence appraises East of Luton area. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2135	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
Comment: The proposed development site East of Luton is outside the 'Green Growth Area'.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
1338	Toddington Estates Ltd	Cambridge	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: As set out previously we support some limited development in identified rural settlements, in particular Toddington.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
832	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
Comment: No. I do not support the principle 'Seek a further strategic urban extension to the east of Luton, mainly in North Hertfordshire District, to be planned for through the North Hertfordshire Local Development Framework' as it proposes unjustifiable urban development on unspoilt green belt in North Herts when alternative sites exist elsewhere within Luton and South Beds.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.				
2005	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: Growth in rural settlements should help to sustain viable rural communities.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
461	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
Comment: For the reasons set out above.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Objection noted.				
809	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
Comment: No land grabbing from North Hertfordshire				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
473	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 3	No
Comment: NO. No development on existing Green Belt land or villages and no development in North Hertfordshire.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure. Site Allocations DPD to				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified need for Green Belt review, identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and requires development in residual areas				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3461	Warden Hill Residents Association	Luton	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: With reference to the "Core Strategy: Preferred Options Document" dated April 2009 and the anticipated effect it will have on the Warden Hill area of Luton this Association supports the Spatial Development Principles.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1359	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: The Town Council supports the principle but has concerns as to whether the stated timeline is realistic</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
1352	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 3	Yes
<p>Comment: Please refer to the Town Council's Big Plan - a document that involved over 2,500 resident setting the objectives for the Parish for the next ten years</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1473	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: No - why build in North Hertfordshire when there's a far better proposal relating to the West of Luton? That in itself contradicts the idea that the countryside is being protected. There's no evidence for the N Herts proposals...</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
770	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: The strategic urban extensions are not required and will place strain existing infrastructure to breaking point. I do not believe that adequate upgrades will take place to infrastructure (roads, water, electricity, etc. - Luton already suffers power distribution problems). Look harder; there's plenty of opportunity for urban redevelopment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and shows that there is insufficient land to meet the development requirements.</p>				
774	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 3	No
<p>Comment: Urban expansion is not required; especially not the Green Belt area east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraises urban potential and shows that there is insufficient land to meet the development requirements.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
989	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 3	No
Comment: Where is the "further strategic urban extension" to Leighton-Linslade to be provided? I can't support something which is not yet specified!				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Adds clarity				
2550	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
Comment: Object to strategic urban extension East of Luton: Area is outstanding landscape similar to Chilterns AONB Area adjacent to Luton airport with associated aircraft noise and risk of aircraft accident Unacceptable impact on existing road network unless proposed road improvements go ahead. Assumption that developer will make no contribution to road infrastructure costs and full cost will have to be met by public funds				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
1098	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 3	No
Comment: Objects to East of Luton owing to landscape quality, aircraft noise and risk of accident, impact on road network without significant improvements which are not considered to be unviable without public funding.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based in evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments, environmental sensitivity assessment and site economic assessments. . Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
604	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 3	Yes
Comment: Answer YES. The spatial development principles are sound - the conclusions drawn are unsound				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
462	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.35	No
Comment: Population growth and development are never "sustainable". It is disingenuous to pretend otherwise.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
1141	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 4.36	No
Comment: Mention of cycling and walking promotion rural settlements - stronger emphasis on retaining an enhancing rural character and identity				
JC Response: Partially agree				
Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Clarification of this in the Spatial Principles would be helpful				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1058	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: "Development in Rural Settlements" is particularly relevant to Luton Hoo Estate. Policy states that a limited scale of development will be supported in rural areas in or on the edge of rural settlements currently excluded from the Green Belt; that development will be sympathetic; that subsequent development plan documents will specifically identify such opportunities across the growth area. Such settlements are identified on the Key Diagram and include Slip End. We will be making representations in support of a small scale Green Belt release to the South East of Slip End to support the Site Allocations DPD. Preferred Option CS6 should be reviewed to include Slip End for the reasons described within our representations on that policy. Greater clarity should be provided as to which DPD will identify Green Belt release and further allocations of land. Para 4.31 suggests this will be delivered through the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS6 states that development will be focussed on the 5 villages listed but does not exclude development in Slip End</p>				
1805	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Board objects to Policy CS1 as it refers to new development being served by 'major new transport schemes' whilst this does not feature as part of the building blocks of the spatial strategy. This para should be amended by deleting this reference and replacing it with text referring to the key elements of additional public transport and sustainable transport measures already been referred to in para 4.14. Board welcomes need to ensure delivery of appropriate infrastructure and welcomes the identification of green infrastructure here. Development in rural areas mentioned at various points and in CS1. Board does not object to identification of some settlements with the potential to accommodate some development provided that all such development is outside the AONB and its setting and is appropriately designed and constructed. Board would be particularly interested in any plans for the settlements of Barton, Caddington and Slip End and is also interested in possible development in Toddington and Eaton Bray.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including delivery of sites. Infrastructure Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
712	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: In consistencies in focus on centres (Leighton Buzzard) is noted. The production of master plans noted and the involvement of English Heritage in the master planning process is requested, with a reference to Luton as a focus for this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required urban extensions.</p>				
208	Church Commissioners for England	c/o Agent	Para. 4.36	Yes
<p>Comment: The policy makes provision for a number of urban extensions adjoining the main conurbation and Leighton-Linslade. In order to achieve these, significant Green Belt alterations are required, as noted in the accompanying text to the policy. Development is also directed to land in existing urban areas and in rural settlements excluded from the Green Belt. The policy refers to the fact that minor Green Belt alterations may be required around these rural settlements in order to accommodate development. We believe that the Policy should also allow for minor Green Belt alterations to be made in appropriate locations around the existing urban areas. It is generally far more sustainable for alterations to be made around the urban areas than the rural settlements.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Greater clarification of the approach to Green Belt revisions would be helpful</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
735	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Preferred Option CS1: Spatial Development Strategy The recognition given to the character of places within this draft policy is inconsistent, with more focus given to safeguarding the character, townscape and landscape of Leighton Linlade/Buzzard than other places within the Growth Area. We note that the policy also proposes master plans for the four main town centres of the Growth Area, which seems a sensible approach to coordinate development. English Heritage would welcome involvement in the preparation of these master plans. The relationship between a new master plan and the existing Luton Town Centre Development Framework needs to be clarified (see comments on Chapter 9 below).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Character and townscape is important for each of the towns.</p>				
243	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: In referring to the proposed urban extension to the East of Leighton Buzzard, the second bullet point refers to employment opportunities without giving any detail. The Core Strategy is very short on detail regarding what the new inhabitants of urban Leighton Buzzard will actually do; without this aspect being resolved the urban extension will only add to the current congestion &amp; overcrowding on the local transport network. Reference is made to the preparation of 'Master Plans' to be prepared for the various town centres, 'to accommodate significant new development'. I challenge the assumption that such development is achievable without destroying the character of the town centre, a quality that is noted elsewhere in the strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS outlines approach to employment and infrastructure provision. Greater detail will be provided in the Pre Submission version and subsequent documents. Town centre master plans will have regard to the character of the towns.</p>				
1239	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Support principle of strategic urban extensions but object to preferred options to the north of the conurbation due to reliance on implementation of A5-M1 link road and associated M1 improvements, and because EoL is outside JC's administrative area and their direct control. If Secretary of State does not support EoL it will require alternatives within JC's jurisdiction and will delay growth required by MKSMSRS. JC should focus development on own area and include site at Beech Road, Dunstable. Site can be delivered now with no issues such as biodiversity, landscape, major infrastructure provision and can be serviced by utilities. It is well located to urban area and can deliver 350 to 400 dwellings and be southern gateway to Dunstable. It does not lie within an important part of the green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including delivery of sites. Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Housing delivery to be considered through preparation of a Housing Delivery Strategy.</p>				
1314	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.36	Yes
<p>Comment: Object to Spatial Development Principles and relevant supporting text in Section 4 - Please see separately submitted documentation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3312	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: The building blocks need to include provision for additional strategic employment sites not within strategic urban extensions including Sundon Quarry and L&amp;G land south west of J10A. New development in the open countryside outside proposed urban extension or strategic employment sites needs to be strictly controlled in accordance to green belt national policy. The Wigmore site is likely to be dependant upon the east of Luton extension to fund the tunnel to the site and the uncertainty around North Hertfordshire's core strategy must question whether a site within NHDC area can be brought forward. Therefore, the emphasis on increasing and diversifying employment opportunities in urban extensions needs to be extended to include land south west of J10A.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Luton and South Bedfordshire Employment Land Review (2008) concludes that new employment allocations should be considered as part of any urban extension proposed. The study considered Sundon Quarry but pointed out its SSSI constraint and considered land at Junction 10A but noted that it falls outside the MKSMSRS area of search.</p>				
355	Sport England	Bedford	Para. 4.36	Yes
<p>Comment: The preferred option is supported with respect to the reference made to ensuring that the proposed urban extensions make provision for the delivery of the appropriate levels of supporting social, community, leisure, cultural and green infrastructure, both to serve the urban extensions and the wider growth area. This should help ensure that community sports facility provision is made to support the additional needs generated by the urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1410	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Support Luton priority but not the priority given to existing urban areas over SUE. Once SUE in LDF should not be regarded as green field but as part of urban fabric. If SUE not accelerated then the housing/employment targets will not be met and wider regeneration not be realised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Infrastructure delivery to be considered through preparation of a Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.</p>				
1497	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: We support Luton's priority over the other grow locations. We do not support priority given to existing urban areas over the SUEs. Once the SUE's are in the LDF then they should not be regards as "green field" but treated as part of the urban fabric just as much as undeveloped (or redevelopment) sites in the urban area. If development of the SUE's is not accelerated then the strategic housing and employment targets will not be met and the wider benefit for Luton will not be realised as soon as possible.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Strategy seeks to maximise urban development potential in the initial plan period. Phasing of housing delivery to be clarified in Housing Delivery Strategy.</p>				
1201	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Should be specific mention of promotion of cycling and walking, supporting the 'green growth area'. The 'Development of Rural Settlements' section should place a strong emphasis on retaining and enhancing rural character and identity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the importance of character of villages in the Spatial Principles would be helpful</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
474	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Satellite towns missing from strategy - omission has resulted in too much emphasis being put on urban extensions. "Key transport routes and nodal points" is not clear enough. With the possible exception of Houghton Regis town centre, residential and high trip-generating development should be located within walking distance of interurban transport</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. The housing targets must be met in residual areas. Evidence shows that new road infrastructure is needed.</p>				
374	Mr Andrew Weber	Knebworth	Para. 4.36	No
<p>Comment: Once again this makes it sound as if North Hertfordshire District Council welcomes your intention to build on its green belt. But it emphatically does not. Hopefully the North Hertfordshire District Local Development Framework (presumably prepared by North Hertfordshire District Council) will make this very clear.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Joint Committee will work with North Herts. to ensure delivery if the Core Strategy is found to be sound by the Inspectorate.</p>				
3250	Barton Willmore	Reading	Para. 4.37	No
<p>Comment: The Council's use of the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Employment Review from January 2008 does not represent the most up to date evidence on employment land, given that the economic downturn has been at its peak since the latter part of 2008. The Review may provide a misconstrued picture of the situation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Employment land study remains relatively up to date. Updates and further assessments will be undertaken in the future in accordance with the evidence and monitoring needs of the LDF.</p>				
4005	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.37	Yes
<p>Comment: We seek clarity over bullet 3, though support the principle of developer contributions where they are feasible, viable and meet all tests of Circular 5/05.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further clarity to be provided in Core Strategy Pre Submission document</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS2 outlines approach</p>				
1853	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.37	Yes
<p>Comment: List water companies here. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Adds clarity</p>				
3863	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.37	No
<p>Comment: The CS does not contain a cohesive Delivery Strategy. References of deliverability are scattered throughout the document, particularly in relation to each of the Core Strategy Policy Themes, but there is no overall assessment of whether or not the Spatial Development Strategy is indeed achievable. No evidence has been provided as to resources or deliverability of a number of major strategic proposals: Major road schemes, major public transport schemes, community infrastructure, sports and leisure provision (in LT Football Club), Carbon Off-set fund, Strategic flood defences and Green Infrastructure. The Council has produced no evidence to support contention that sufficient margins exist for the private sector to meet its own development costs as well as make any meaningful contribution to address the deficit in strategic infrastructure established by the CS. The evidence strongly suggests that the Growth Areas do not have the capacity to meet the resource deficit inherent in the Core Strategy proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Delivery Strategy to be prepared</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A more comprehensive Delivery Strategy to be prepared</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3829	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 4.37	No
<p>Comment: The DTZ report does not allow the Joint Committee to reach a conclusion that any of the proposed urban extension options are viable, because the report does not contain sufficient information. The main undermining matters are: Exclusion of strategic transportation costs Lack of variation in the underlying assumptions: the study simply demonstrates that if all other values and costs are even (which the model assumes) and if major transport costs are mostly excluded (which the model assumes) larger developer sites will tend to have higher margins of profit than smaller ones. The study's model has been re-run on the basis of 2006 values which represented the highest values the residential market has ever reached. Simply ignoring market fluctuations and testing schemes on the basis of unlikely high residential values is not sufficiently rigorous approach.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken on delivery to inform the Delivery Strategy for the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: DTZ study provides some information about viability. Further work needed</p>				
35	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.37	No
<p>Comment: The important element of this is working in partnership with the relevant authorities, not against them. Particularly, the existing water and sewerage infrastructure is already under pressure but the plan has no proposal for dealing with this before rather than after development. Again the Environment Agency is often overruled regarding development in flood plains. again past experience is that improvements to transport infrastructure happen after the event. Surely finance for these improvements should ensure that they are available before new developments are released for use</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Water Cycle Study addresses this</p>				
220	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.38	No
<p>Comment: Other designation such as GI should be shown not just AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee cannot allocate development in North Herts. but may recommend it as part of its Core Strategy to accord with the advice in the RSS.</p>				
4006	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.39	No
<p>Comment: Associated infrastructure should not be identified on the key diagram. EoL is capable of delivering 3,500 dwellings without the need for major off-site highway infrastructure or relief roads and such roads should not be shown until a comprehensive evidence base is available to justify it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including delivery of sites. Infrastructure Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1854	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.39	No
<p>Comment: Mention floodplains as well as important watercourses. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Adds clarity</p>				
1204	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.39	No
<p>Comment: Whilst it is suggested that the diagram shows key environmental capital, such as the Chilterns AONB, actually only the AONB is shown. Should other designations, or the Green Infrastructure network, be shown? (appreciate this is illustrated later).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Key Diagram needs to be legible</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1499	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.40	No
Comment: We would wish to see Butterfield employment area added as an existing employment site to expand and designated a Strategic Employment Site.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Key Diagram needs to be legible				
736	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 4.41	No
Comment: Key Diagram in addition to the deletion of the yellow triangle to the east of the A6 as part of the preferred urban extension (see comments above), we would also welcome the inclusion of Registered Historic Park and Garden data. The diagram would then portray a nationally recognised designation and demonstrate the importance of the landscape to the south and east of Luton around Luton Hoo and Putteridge Bury respectively. We appreciate that for reasons of scale and clarity, it is probably inappropriate to show data for listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas within the Key Diagram.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Key Diagram needs to be legible				
369	Mrs AC Heymans	Hitchin	Para. 4.41	No
Comment: This diagram shows huge inroads into North Herts. This is an area of outstanding natural beauty and rural villages. Luton cannot be allowed to sprawl over it.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.				
1208	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.41	No
Comment: The diagram illustrates areas that are "Urban extension - Not preferred" - this is very weak and could result in development occurring in these areas instead of preferred areas, if circumstances dictate. Should they not be called something else, with supporting text to say that they had been considered but are not appropriate in this period? Otherwise the door is left open.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Key Diagram to be amended in relation to contingency sites.				
JC Reason for Response: The term "not preferred" is appropriate at this stage until further testing is undertaken to consider need for contingency sites.				
2597	2nd Stopsley Guide Company	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Area used for walking and cycling activities by Girl Guides and Brownies Destruction of Green Belt, productive farm land and adjacent to AONB destroying peace and quiet of area Increase in traffic and noise pollution Other options available such is West of Luton scheme on lower grade Green Belt land				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which covers East of Luton. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3959	Mr Philip Acreman	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for East of Luton do not conform to the Core Strategy Vision to be known as the Green Growth Area. Land Use Consultants stated the development in the area is not recommended. The proposal will also swallow up attractive villages which is also contrary to the Vision as well as destroying Iron Age and Roman sites of national importance. Has a bat survey been commissioned? The roads are already congested. There are more suitable areas for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
1223	Mr P Adams	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Proposals to build 5,500 houses to the East of Luton are ludicrous as it would result in a population increase of at least 20,000 people along with a similar increase in the number of vehicles. Luton is a town without any sensible bypasses and extending into Hertfordshire would not solve the problem. People already drive through Lilley to avoid Luton. The area should be safeguarded for the benefit of future generations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Bypasses will help to reduce congestion in the urban area and the traffic through the villages. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3275	RL Adams	Wheathampstead	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is enormous capacity for growth within Luton. See the development plan of Birmingham utilising skyscraper techniques etc. It is quite possible that the demolition of the ex-Vauxhall GM site will provide vast acres of space within the Borough. The land west of Luton towards Leighton Buzzard is largely empty, and small controlled village growth would not impact on the landscape. This is South/West Beds/ Bucks responsibility. The land in Hertfordshire is characterised by areas of outstanding natural beauty. These must not be lost. Why hasn't Vauxhall Way been developed northwards into Bedfordshire as was the original plan.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Land to the West of Luton has been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and it will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. The evidence indicates that to meet the regional housing requirements the Core Strategy needs to allocate urban extensions. The re-use of previously developed land is a key aim of the Core Strategy. However, the Vauxhall site has not been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy process and it is identified within the Employment Land Review as a site which should not be released for other uses.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2506	MP Adams	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am appalled that Luton and South Beds Councillors have chosen land in North Herts a preferred location to build 5,500 houses. It does make me wonder if any person has actually viewed this area physically. To increase the population by 25,000 and vehicles by a vast amount in an area that is at capacity is total madness. Basically introducing an extra 5,000 people into the Luton area would be too many. It is obvious the Government, and the elected councillors have not done their research properly. I do hope they all come to their senses before it is too late.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and infrastructure based on population projections. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2507	Diana Adams	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am very concerned of the proposed intention of Luton and South Bedfordshire Council to recommend development of 5,500 houses in the Green Belt area of Hertfordshire. Luton is a town lacking in any sensible roads which traffic only crawls along at present. This proposal should be withdrawn.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Additional transport Infrastructure is needed and planned for. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3022	Rawela Adamson	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the east of Luton owing to its impact on the landscape and the wildlife, the loss of recreation land for people in Luton and the villages, and the impact on Lilley Bottom. Suggests that surely there is an alternative that does not have such an adverse impact. Questions who will be paying for the roads and assumes it to be the people who oppose the development. Asks that careful consideration is made before the final decision is reached.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3889	R Aknai	Knebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed spatial development strategy due to the following reasons Hertfordshire cannot be expected to accommodate part of Bedfordshire's allocation as well as its own. The area of land earmarked in this proposal is a huge area of beautiful countryside, with a valuable diversity of wildlife enjoyed by many local residents as well as external visitors. This development could potentially put another 10,000 vehicles on the roads in what is already a very congested county. Congestion will not be resolved by building bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3854	R Aknai	Knebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Hertfordshire cannot be expected to accommodate part of Bedfordshire's allocation as well as its own. The area of land earmarked in this proposal is a huge area of beautiful countryside, with a valuable diversity of wildlife enjoyed by many local residents as well as external visitors. This development could potentially put another 10,000 vehicles on the roads in what is already a very congested county. Congestion will not be resolved by building bypasses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3891	K Aknai	Knebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed spatial development strategy due to the following reasons Hertfordshire cannot be expected to accommodate part of Bedfordshire's allocation as well as its own. The area of land earmarked in this proposal is a huge area of beautiful countryside, with a valuable diversity of wildlife enjoyed by many local residents as well as external visitors. This development could potentially put another 10,000 vehicles on the roads in what is already a very congested county. Congestion will not be resolved by building bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2680	David and Anne Alban	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: untenable increases in noise and pollution Rural belt of land is indispensable buffer between Luton and Chilterns AONB Cost of proposed development, lack of viability and sustainability Alternative locations should be considered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including water infrastructure capacity and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3969	Cadie Albertini	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The area subject of development forms part of what is the most beautiful and unspoilt area of North Herts If development is allowed, the area between Luton, Hitchin and Stevenage will become one big conurbation Impact on AONB Development proposed outside Luton and South Beds jurisdiction Local residents against the proposed development The countryside of this area must be preserved for all out future benefits</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3972	Thomas Albertini	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The area subject of development forms part of what is the most beautiful and unspoilt area of North Herts If development is allowed, the area between Luton, Hitchin and Stevenage will become one big conurbation Impact on AONB Development proposed outside Luton and South Beds jurisdiction Local residents against the proposed development The countryside of this area must be preserved for all out future benefits</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton) . The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2670	Mrs Joanne Aldridge	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: proposed bypass through an AONB is directly against government policy and there are two more suitable routes Detrimental to headwaters, which would endanger wildlife and reverse cleanest rivers for 100 years Loss of Lilley Bottom valley which is most beautiful in Hertfordshire to urban housing Putteridge Park provides excellent boundary which would be reduced by proposed developed Other places available for development Loss of irreplaceable grade 1 farm land Loss of green belt and sustaining of wildlife</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2944	Trevor M Aldrige	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Heavy impact on Chilterns AONB. Maintenance and protection of AONB from urban incursion is a priority planning policy. A new road through the AONB with high volumes of traffic will reduce its value in giving rural access to established communities and visitors. Once the AONB has been compromised, its advantages to the population and environment are irreplaceable. Housing expansion options to the south of Luton should be investigated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2967	Bagg Alison	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Green Belt should not be assigned for such use. Traffic to east of Luton is already at breaking point and no consideration has been given to effect on Hitchin. If proposed development and bypass go ahead, result will be even more traffic on A505 with catastrophic effects on Hitchin's already chronic traffic congestion. Bypass will make it easier to get to Hitchin than Luton. Where is the study to show effects on Hitchin's infrastructure? Core Strategy has ignored effect on Hitchin or the compound impact when extensions to Stevenage West are included. Development is not supported by N Herts DC. How did 13 possible expansion areas become 4? Object to decisions made in an area by people not elected or appointed by residents of that area. Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without members of Committee having technical analyses.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3341	Mr Stephen Allen	Eggington	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The text includes the need to deliver regeneration of the South Bedfordshire Growth Area. Historically Luton/Houghton Regis/Dunstable are the only areas in need of regeneration. Infrastructure should be given to these areas with the associated development. Leighton Linlade does not need the housing growth or the "regeneration" label.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Leighton Linlade does not have the same needs as the main conurbation. However, it does have housing and infrastructure needs and is a sustainable location for some development to meet the East of England Plan requirements. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard proposed in the Core Strategy reflects this.			
3817	David and Julie Allen	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We have already endured the loss of greenbelt land with the quarrying and other excavation between Vandyke Road and Coteheld Drive. The total lack of infrastructure should be addressed before any further development can commence. There has been no improvement for local schools or healthcare and ambulance service. The town already struggles with the amount of traffic on poorly maintained roads. More improvement for local jobs as we have lost a number of high profile companies in the last few years.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Developer contributions have and will continue to be made to infrastructure provision. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
929	Mr Stephen Amos	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL for the following reasons: NHDC does not support development. Infrastructure is financially non-viable, the development will over stretch social facilities, will not assist in regeneration. Bypasses will not solve traffic problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Traffic east of Luton already at breaking point; EoL will increase traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Will destroy beautiful landscape adjacent to AONB and destroy wildlife habitat. Inappropriate to build on Green Belt land meant to prevent urban sprawl and forming natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land is invaluable recreational facility. Development will cause loss of hamlets and villages destroying their character. Whitwell has traffic congestions problems. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Project not viable in current recession. Existing sites in Hertfordshire remain unfinished due to lack of investment and potential buyers. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment, and environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2467	JW Amos	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton proposal as it would destroy the Lilley Bottom valley area, one of the most naturally beautiful parts of Hertfordshire. We are not told which of the other preferred options would similarly ruin Green Belt areas or how many studies have been carried out before these options were selected. Clearly there are viable areas to the North and West of Luton that do not have comparable beauty. There would be an increased risk of flooding if open fields and wooded areas are paved over. Kimpton has suffered badly from flooding in the past and the East of Luton development would increase this risk enormously. Surely access roads and tunnels would involve negotiations with Luton Airport which if agreed would most likely result in disproportionately high compensation costs to the owners. Has this been investigated and the costs included in the proposal?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Shape Your Future Website contains all the evidence studies that have been prepared to inform the Preferred Options Document, including Water Cycle Study, transport and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions.</p>				
2468	Joan Amoss	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The East of Luton preferred option will destroy areas of Green Belt that are of outstanding natural beauty. How has this site been chosen and how could Green Belt land in North Herts be selected in the first place? More development in this area will inevitably result in regular flooding. How will you recompense the victims of flooding caused by this development? Where is the financial viability study and how have the proposals been evaluated without it?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3033	Dr Linda Anderson	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to its impact on the landscape and its location in North Herts as well as the loss of recreation land for horse riding and hiking.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to retain recreation spaces and green linkages.</p>				
3227	Ms Jo Andrew	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton would result on building 5,500 houses in the green belt in Hertfordshire and impact on wildlife in the area. The additional traffic generated would affect road safety forcing more people to use cars and generate more traffic. Building on this scale, close to the airport will question how to protect air quality for people. North Hertfordshire does not support the proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
599	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is insufficient justification for including EOL: it will result in the destruction of green belt and grade 1 agricultural land. It will also reduce leisure options for people currently living in east Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence, including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including preservation of recreation areas.</p>				
3075	Emma Andrews	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is the least suitable of all possible sites. It falls within green belt land and was rated grade 1 in environmental reports, is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and provides habitats for many species and many people enjoy the area for its amenity value. The housing development would swallow up the villages in the area and the character of North Hertfordshire damaged. The road infrastructure needed would destroy the character of the country lanes. The proposal seems to rely on developers funding which would result on the level infrastructure required not being met or its cost being reflected in property pricing. Consideration should be given to the area around Slip End and Caddington.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3873	Mrs Jenny Anness	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and 'Black Route' option for the following reasons: Contradicts own Core Strategy principles to provide an attractive place to live and visit and a good quality of life. Own quality of life as a Lilley resident will be deprived by ripping up large areas of greenbelt land as walking in the area provides recreation, quality of life and is therapeutic. Lilley is a haven from Luton town centre providing quality of life in a peaceful sedate village. Options for development in other areas exist which should be chosen.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation spaces.</p>				
3875	Charlie Anness	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and 'black route' highways option for the following reasons: The land is Green Belt with a high sensitivity rating. Land Use Consultants recommended against development due to sensitivity of landscape. Proposed highway will run through an AONB. Government policy says AONB should be protected whenever possible and the highway will change the vista forever, however sensitively it is done. No landscape with a highway running through it would be awarded AONB status. There are alternative sites available, such as west of M1 on lower grade green belt land with roads in place and no need to tunnel under the airport, no interference with any AONB land and the chance to build a football stadium close to the M1. Should reconsider West of Luton site as preferred site.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2772	Mrs Jenny Anness	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Regarding the proposed Luton Northern Bypass and the proposed housing development in North Herts. Your proposals contradict your own Core Strategy principals... you aim to provide an attractive place to live and visit and a good quality of life... But by ripping up vast swathes of green belt land you will immediately be depriving me, a Lilley resident, of a large chunk of my quality of life. Our village is a haven from the hustle and bustle of Luton Town centre where I work. My quality of life is returning home to peaceful, sedate village life. You have options for development in other areas, please choose those above North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Its needs cannot be met without some impact on the countryside. Preferred Options based on existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work needed to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3874	Mr Paul Anness	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and 'Black Route' option for the following reasons: Five species on the RSPB Red List have bred in the proposed area. A variety of rare birds could disappear from the area if proposed developments go ahead. Should re-think plans and consider an alternative less wild life sensitive area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on wildlife.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3932	Anonymous	not given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object against development east of Luton. We came here for the wide, open spaces, green environment and a healthier place to raise children. We can walk and cycle through country lanes, away from dangerous traffic and toxic fumes. We should preserve the countryside, not destroy it. Instead look to areas within the town that need developing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
969	Anonymous	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Do not want the future of our village changed. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. No supporting financial impact analysis to test proposals. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure.</p>				
3933	Anonymous	not given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Wildlife habitats will be destroyed by development east of Luton. The selection process to arrive at the preferred urban extensions is flawed as all the original options have not been investigated equally. The consultants assessed the land as sensitivity level 1 and that, 'development on this land is not recommended'. This report has been ignored. Local roads will not be able to cope with the extra cars and delivery vehicles. The West of Luton option was not considered by the JPC.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding.</p>				
3924	Anonymous	not given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We do not want any more houses built on the eastern side of Leighton Buzzard. We are sick and tired of being treated like muck. Get the roads and pavements amended. Our roads are congested enough and we have no infrastructure whatsoever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3122	David Ansell	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2659	T W Archer	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose to building 5500 homes on Green Belt to the east of Luton It would make traffic on the A505 much worse</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
1972	Arlesey Town Council	Arlesey	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The strategy will have no impact on the town of Arlesey</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3957	J Arnold	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Should not expand into North Hertfordshire and beautiful Green Belt countryside. There are other options within Bedfordshire which should be used rather than allowing Luton to sprawl into Hertfordshire. A bypass should not be built in N Herts as this would add to congestion on the A505 and Hitchin which is already coping with more than enough traffic. No consideration has been given to the knock on effect for Hitchin and N Herts.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4043	Mr GA Ashcroft	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The importance and expansion of the airport is the real reason that Luton says that they need 5,000 houses east of Luton. It is questionable whether airports will be allowed to expand in the future due to global warming. It will become more important for populations to be sited closer to work and nearer to stations so that the use of carbon is diminished. The population that they propose to house in the east of Luton is much further away from both stations in Luton and the centre of Luton. The area is a beautiful part of the Chilterns which is visited by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. An alternate site, closer to the airport station would be Luton Hoo Estate which I consider a much better place to house the large expanding population of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consideration of employment opportunities is made when considering the location of urban extensions</p>				
3074	Anthony Ashplant	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton falls outside the Joint Committee's area of responsibility and North Hertfordshire District Council has no plans to allocate the urban extension. There is no infrastructure nor space for infrastructure to support 5000 odd houses and the proposed industrial buildings. It will impact on the environment with more countryside concreted over with nowhere for rain and sewage to be disposed of.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence, including assessment of water infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3705	Association of North Thames Amenity Societies	Herford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development. Independent consultants stated there are significant constraints which make the place inappropriate for development. These could not be protected meaningfully by mitigation measures. Herts CC is the highway authority for the area and it can't assumed they can meet the requirements of the transport needs. No technical feasibility study or environmental impact assessment has been made. Proposed bypasses will have serious implications for traffic loadings, congestion and undermine any commitment to increasing public transport use. Hitchin traffic conditions will deteriorate. Believe that the site not properly considered in the Water Cycle Strategy. The economic assessment has not considered serious risks which would impact strongly on viability of site and indicate it is not suitable for a major housing development. Selection of this area was made by those with no responsibility for this area therefore the decision making process is lacking in democratic accountability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
911	Miss Helen Astridge	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: This plan would swallow up the North Hertfordshire villages of Cockerhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green and bury vast areas of farmland under new development. The unique beauty of the dry chalk valley of Lilley Bottom would be lost forever. It's not just the nearby villages who will suffer. A wide area of North Hertfordshire will be affected as the inevitable congestion from extra traffic, adding to the existing bottlenecks, funnelling from the two bypasses and the new housing, spreads into Hitchin and further across the District. Bedfordshire authorities should either meet their own targets within their own boundaries, or say they can't do it!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment transport, infrastructure of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2433	Mr & Mrs C Atkins	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to development East of Luton owing to Green Belt designation and the impact on the quality of life for many people. States that the development and destruction of the countryside in the last 40 years is nothing short of criminal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1569	Ms Maureen Atkins	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the scale of the housing growth and the need for the growth in this area given the beautiful countryside. Suggests that development would be better located in the north of England rather than the South East. Questions what the impact will be on food resources and water resources as a result of this development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search to deliver the amount of development it requires in the region. The Core Strategy will not debate whether East of England's housing requirement should be accommodated elsewhere. That would be for debate during the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy. □</p>				
3544	Mr and Mrs Atkinson	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We strongly object to the east of Luton proposal. These are important areas for wildlife and also a designated AONB. The road structure in this area will not cope with increased traffic. Wildlife such as Red Kites would have their habitats severely reduced.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Land to the East of Luton is not AONB. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3171	L Auduley	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: 5,500 home on the eastern side of Luton would destroy the beauty of the area which is enjoyed by many. Other alternatives need to be made in a suitable area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3934	Irene Auerbach	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL development because: this is history repeating itself, same as proposals for Stevenage West. Water situation in Lilley Bottom is precarious. Villages already suffer from planes going to Luton airport. No one will want to live and work near airport; developers won't be able to sell their houses. Will destroy beautiful open country, a green lung essential to inhabitants of Luton as well as Hitchin and Stevenage. Don't want Luton, Hitchin, Letchworth and Stevenage to grow into one giant conurbation with no green buffers. Haven't learnt lesson of widening M25 - schemes to alleviate congestion end up with more traffic growth. Should aim to reduce individual car use and encourage use of public transport. Bypasses contradict this. Only slightly positive feature is the park and ride scheme from A505. Quality of life for those moving to area will be poor and countryside will be devastated for nothing. Should consider WoL without water problems and not affected by wind and noise from airport so badly</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The first stage of the Water Cycle Study supported the preparation of the Preferred Options and the second stage (soon to be finalised) together with other work prepared since the preferred options will provide further information on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures which will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
159	Aylesbury Vale District Council	Aylesbury	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support allocation in Spatial Development Strategy of a smaller urban extension to east of LL and therefore also support allocation shown within Key Diagram. However, suggest that key diagram should be visually improved to 1) show locations of development within Joint Committee planning area 2) be clearer with larger map, scale and key 3) omit 'not preferred' options to avoid confusion. It would be more effective to make reference to 'Issues and Options' document rather than repeating it in Key Diagram. Key Diagram should clearly show Spatial Options that are being taken forward in Preferred Options document. Text in Delivery and Monitoring should refer specifically to joint working between adjoining LAs in relation to development of preferred option and taking forward to delivery. There has been good cross-boundary work to date, which is likely to continue and will be required in delivering urban extensions, especially in N Herts. Joint working between authorities should be referenced in CS document</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Greater clarification would be helpful</p>				
1391	Miss Marie Bacon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL because: Land is Green Belt, supposed to prevent urban sprawl. One of the objectives is to use sites excluded from green belt. Land is an invaluable recreation facility, providing a beautiful haven from concrete of Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets and villages destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis. A number of "brown field" sites exist within Luton's borders, in the Stopsley area, and a number remain derelict, whilst speculative developers hold off due to recession. Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will overstretch social facilities. NHDC does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Convenient for Bloor Homes but not backed up by jobs, services or any real analysis of potential inhabitants or what people want.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3222	Adrian Bagg	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Not all options have been adequately explored - this was an easy option. No adequate plans to address necessary improvements in infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3637	R Bailey	Ipswich	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I protest against the East of Luton development. A small amount of new houses in each of the affected villages would be acceptable but to be surrounded by 5,500 houses is a terrible infringement to the area as it is presently. I understand that builders have bought up the land. I would suggest that they sell the land that they probably bought on the back of somebody's nod. The main problem is the proposed size of the scheme, why can't it be limited to 500 and spread around a bit. There would be massive traffic problems from a large development which could not be avoided. Where will all the rainfall go rather than soaking into the fields?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate run off from the new development.</p>				
3124	Christine Bailey	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3121	Christine Bailey	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3117	Christine Bailey	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3127	Robert Bailey	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4046	Diane Bailey	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton proposal as it would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to an AONB. The development in the Green Belt would not assist in the much needed regeneration of the conurbation. The infrastructure in the area cannot support a development of this size. The roads are already congested.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will bring together the commitment of those involved in provision, funding and maintenance of infrastructure (including transport) who would have assessed the most appropriate and deliverable schemes. This will be tested at the Examination in Public.</p>				
1534	Sue Baker	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: How can one local authority propose any building on another local authority's (North Herts) land when the latter local authority (North Herts) does not support it? If I wanted to extend my house, it would not be reasonable to build any extension on my neighbour's land - the same principle should apply here.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: When drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are an essential element for the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
3446	L F Baker	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write to register my objections to the East of Luton development. As beautiful green belt land this land was designated by Parliament as a spot for the leisure and recreation of local citizens. The development will destroy or blight several picturesque villages protected by the above, and will completely desecrate the outstanding beauty of Lilley Valley Bottom. The development will overwork local services, the overstretched road system, schools and hospitals. It is not supported by the Highways Agency or North Herts District Council. The draft Core Strategy was issued without detailed financial analysis or a sustainability investigation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3900	Ms Alison Balfour-Lynn	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development, associates industrial sites, 'park and ride' schemes and northern and eastern bypasses for the following reasons: The area is in countryside that is some of the most wild and beautiful in Hertfordshire and is contiguous with the Chilterns AONB. Lilley Bottom valley is an unspoilt habitat for numerous rare and endangered species which would go if the development goes ahead. The area is criss-crossed with footpaths and bridleways providing unsurpassed amenity for local people, people from Luton and surrounding villages which would all go. Will not assist in much needed regeneration for Luton as new bypasses will divert visitors away from town centre depressing retail trade and will generate huge volumes of traffic on outskirts and clog up A505 more, pushing traffic problems back to already crowded Hitchin. Countryside once lost cannot be recovered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2829	Mrs Jean Banks	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton would detrimentally affect the Green belt and the beautiful countryside. The options to the north and east of Luton are more suitable as there are two rail lines in the area and better use of bus links and cycle route to the smaller villages encouraging people to live and work in the locality.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options includes development to the north of Luton and Houghton Regis as well as East of Luton. This is based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
953	C K Banks	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2865	Kate Bantick	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton falls within North Hertfordshire and cannot be allocated by this draft Core Strategy. The proposal to the east of Luton will be contrary to the draft Core Strategy intention to create attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life (section 11). It is also contrary to the strategy's vision to be known as a Green Growth Area and recognised for its attractive rural villages. The proposal is in Green Belt land rated with the highest sensitivity level. It would also have an effect on the biodiversity of the area including bats and farmland birds. The villages would be absorbed by the scheme, losing their identities and destroying the rural communities. The proposal fails to address the impact of the increase of traffic as a result of this development. The Joint Committee could choose land to the West of Luton as another option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3727	Mr J J Barber	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Protest strongly against the east of Luton proposals. Green Belt land and AONB are a premium and everything should be done to protect them for us and future generations. The suggestion of using these areas for housing is ludicrous. I'm sure there are other areas that could become the preferred option. Stopsley village, the A505 and Hitchin are grid locked at peak times and it would be utter madness to make this worse with extra cars on then roads. The people who put forward this stupid idea live outside the North Hertfordshire area so what has it got to do with them? Let them build houses, roads, etc. in their own back yards and see how they like it. It is a wonderful thing to live the village life, waking up to the birds singing and watching various types of wildlife on my doorstep. If the development came, all that would be lost forever. None of us want to become part of the Luton sprawl; we are and always will be proud to be part of North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3043	Karen S Barden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development, Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3055	Miss Danielle Jenna Barden	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3053	Mr James Michael Barden	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3068	Miss Machaela Leanne Barden	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3061	Mr Mark Andrew Barden	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3049	Mrs Tina Susan Barden	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
3057	Mrs Patricia May Barden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3051	Mrs Christine Barden	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. <input type="checkbox"/>Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p>				
3063	Mr Matthew James Barden	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3059	Mr Michael John Barden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3065	Mr Michael Richard Barden	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the EoL development and the Luton Northern &amp; Eastern Bypasses owing to: Its impact which will not help with the image of Luton or people's quality of life contrary to the aspirations in Ch 11 of the CS; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts territory who oppose the development; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme which is for 5,500 homes, requires no public funding, is on lower grade Green Belt, roads are not on farmland and incorporates L TFC stadium. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
177	Dr Steve Barley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the diagram, as it proposes huge expansion east of Luton in North Herts that ruins the character of the region and the beauty of the villages in it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3658	Faye Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Transport infrastructure is inadequate for current traffic demand and traffic will be intolerable with proposed development and a new commercial park. Little regard has been paid to the independent Environmental Assessment which clearly stated that Lilley Bottom is not suitable for development and don't understand why expert advice is being ignored. Alternative proposals such as West of Luton were discounted prematurely. Any proposal should be looked at that will save beautiful Green Belt by thousands and provides a government and country recommended buffer between communities. The opportunity to consult fairly and fully with North Herts residents, particularly those in the threatened area was discarded which renders the consultation flawed and unfair.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Consultation has been undertaken to the East of Luton and in North Herts. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3161	Sue Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The increase in road transport usage by 5,500 houses and new commercial park will extend the already gridlocked highways. Little regard has been paid to the Independent Environmental Assessment which states that Lilley Bottom is a sensitivity area designated Grade 1 and not suitable for development. An alternative proposal to the west of Luton has been discarded prematurely. Other proposals which will save the green belt should be considered. The opportunity to fairly and fully consult North Herts. residents and those living in the threatened area was discarded.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. The Delivery Plan will also take into account a range of contingency scenarios to provide flexibility to the strategy. □Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and it will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3989	Gemma Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: ID 326586 Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The transport infrastructure is currently totally inadequate to satisfy the current road traffic demand. The proposed additions and extensions to the guided bus way are totally inadequate, and unworkable The enormous increase in road transport usage by 5500 houses will create a totally intolerable and will extend the, already gridlocked highways, particularly in peak periods. The Independent Environmental Assessment clearly states that Lilley bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding beauty and is designated Grade 1, not suitable for development There are alternative proposals, for example, to the west of Luton.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3008	Holly Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed EoL owing to the infrastructure being totally inadequate to satisfy current traffic demand and demand that would arise from the proposed development. States that the additions to the guided busway are inadequate and unworkable. States that little regard has been paid to the Environmental Assessment which states that Lilley Bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding beauty and is designated Grade 1 (not suitable for development). Questions why this advice has been ignored. States that there are alternative proposals, for example, to the west of Luton which the consultee contends have not been fully considered and discounted prematurely. Suggests that it is not too late to give consideration to fair proposals. States that the opportunity to consult in North Hertfordshire was discarded and must render the consultation as flawed. Suggests a radical rethink on what is best for the residents and future economic stability of the area is needed.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Consultation has been undertaken. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2872	David Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Consultee objects to East of Luton development owing to impact on transport infrastructure, impact on Lilley Bottom and impact on the Green Belt. Also considers that there are alternative proposals (e.g. West of Luton). Consultee considers that the transport infrastructure is currently totally inadequate to satisfy current road traffic demand and states that the proposed additions and extensions to the guided busway are inadequate and unworkable. States that little regard has been given to the Independent Environmental Assessment which clearly stated that Lilley Bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding beauty and is not suitable for development. Questions why this expert advice has been ignored. States that the proposal to the West of Luton has been discounted prematurely. States that the opportunity to consult fairly and fully with North Herts residents and those who reside in the threatened area was discarded.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure			
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Consultation has been undertaken in East of Luton and North Herts. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
4050	Natalie Barnard	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: An alternate site, closer to the airport station would be Luton Hoo Estate which I consider a much better place to house the large expanding population of Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.			
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will set out the infrastructure needed to deliver the identified growth in the strategy. The Delivery Plan will bring together the commitment of those involved in provision, funding and maintenance of infrastructure (including transport) who would have assessed the most appropriate and deliverable schemes. This will be tested at the Examination in Public. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. tested at the examination in public.			
2918	Mrs Xonia Barnard	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Transport infrastructure insufficient to meet current demands. Proposed additions, extensions and guided busway are inadequate and unworkable. Proposed development and new commercial park will make roads intolerable. Little regard has been paid to the Independent Environment Assessment commissioned at public expense which clearly states that Lilley Bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding beauty, designated Grade 1 and not suitable for development. Alternative proposals eg West of Luton have been discounted prematurely. It's never too late to give fair consideration to proposals that will save green belt enjoyed by thousands of people which is also a buffer. Opportunity to consult fairly and fully with N Herts residents was discarded, therefore consultation was flawed and unfair. Needs radical re-think of what is best for residents, future economic stability of the area and the countryside.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.			
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Consultation will continue through the pre-submission stage prior to the examination in public allowing for further engagement. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1343	Mr Jim Barr	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Mainly the resulting loss of beautiful Green Belt land, especially the threatened areas Landscape Grade 1 countryside which it is of the utmost importance to protect, if only for its great agricultural value. I do not believe that there is appropriate justification for including East of Luton as a strategic urban extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3349	Mr Peter Barraclough	Eaton Bray	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Generally, but I object to 'developing new rural settlements' (see enclosed comments). I would prefer no more growth in the South East, but if we must have it, I broadly support the spatial development principles and the preferred option, with the exception of the plans for developing rural settlements. I live in the village of Eaton Bray which is on the edge of the green belt and as such is at risk of development. I can think of no good reason why my village should be developed or expanded. I live here precisely because it is a small quiet village in a beautiful location. Eaton Bray is large enough already and any further expansion would completely ruin the character of the village. I do not want Eaton Bray to become a small town. I find the statement: 'Small scale reviews of the green belt boundary on the edge of rural settlements may be required to enable such development to proceed' disturbing. The green belt should be sacred and expanded not reduced.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified need for housing development in residual area at a limited scale. Its requirements must be met. Eaton Bray is a sustainable rural location capable of supporting limited new housing development.</p>				
3301	Barret LLOYD Davis Associates on behalf of Woodstock Estates Limited, The Trustees of the Sambrooke Trust and The Cole family		Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support development tin rural areas and confirm that they will be able to deliver homes in Caddington within the plan period on land to the northwest of Caddington as per drawings 1 and 2 of the representation document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add comment ID3301 and its supporting documentation to the evidence building to the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support for the development in rural areas and in particular at Caddington is noted. However, the identification of rural sites will be undertaken as part of the Site Allocations DPD rather than the Core Strategy.</p>				
2893	Mr A J Barrett	Tea Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose plans to build in Hertfordshire's green belt, this intrusion should not be allowed. All the new occupiers will be between the villages to the east of Luton and the airport, suffering the effects of aircraft noise and strong smells of aviation fuel. The fields are highly productive and will in the future be required for food production. More suitable grounds such as the Vauxhall site must be found.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of airport noise. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2934	Margaret Barrett	Tea Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Why must Luton expand into the beautiful countryside of Hertfordshire? The Green Belt is supposed to divide towns, giving people countryside to explore and relax in and fields for growing food. I oppose the proposal to build 5,500 houses in the area near an airport. If a plane crashes, so many people could be killed. What happens to the traffic from the new bypass when it reaches Hitchin? There are now tail-backs along the dual carriageway in the morning - it would not ease this traffic. How can you say the provision of green spaces should make towns and villages more attractive when you are taking all the greenery away?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2026	Noel Barry	Not Known	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The new plan for roads and housing would cut through country side which is designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty-warden and galley hills. The added volume of traffic directed through this area would make driving in north Luton nearly impossible. The destruction of one of the only natural walking areas around Luton would be a disaster. The lack of consultation over this very serious is Perhaps residents are not important enough and developers and there money shout louder. I OBJECT to any such plan to develop the warden hill area and its natural beauty destruction.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3116	Miss Caroline Barry	No post town	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Luton has few areas of recreation which are accessible to all and allow recreation and relaxation in the countryside. One such area is designated as an AONB. I object strongly to any transport or housing development in this area which should be preserved for the residents to enjoy. I object to building thousands of homes outside of the current boundaries of Luton town. The infrastructure planned would be of no benefit to current residents and will make traffic problems in the Luton area worse as the plans will take traffic from the A505, A5 and M1 and direct this through North East Luton. I object to the lack of consultation in respect of the above, the secretive way it has been handled and the overall lack of transparency.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the SCI. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2034	Melanie Barry	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects owing to impact on the landscape including the AONB and impact on this area of countryside which is used for recreation and relaxation. Objects to road infrastructure proposals and contends this will not benefit the area but make traffic worse. Objects to the lack of consultation and lack of transparency.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment, environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Consultation has been undertaken in East of Luton and North Herts. as part of the preparation of this Preferred Options document.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3208	Ms C Barry	LUTON	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The reason for providing 43,000 homes is not explained, and if based upon predictions made before the economic upheaval which started in Autumn 2008, are likely to be out of date, inaccurate and misleading. The focus should be on brownfield sites before 'strategic urban extensions'. Similarly, the large number of jobs come to the area is a figure that has no explanation and is highly unrealistic. In addition, the Joint Committee chose not to consult the National Association of AONB's or its parent body Natural England.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will not debate the means by which Government allocates national and regional figures. Natural England was consulted - see comment 2171. Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review needed. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2650	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to new development due to insufficient transport infrastructure and impact on the capacity of existing roads Comments that it is unclear how the employment needs of these additional residents will be addressed Concern regarding flood risk impact of the historic narrow gauge railway Loss of Green Belt Concern over impact on community infrastructure particularly health facilities I question the fact that you see a need to 'provide a range of residential development opportunities to meet the majority of the new housing need of Leighton Buzzard and Linslade to 2031', bearing in mind the unemployment that exists and the current development of mass housing that is taking place.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2099	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to new development due to insufficient transport infrastructure and impact on the capacity of existing roads Comments that it is unclear how the employment needs of these additional residents will be addressed Concern regarding flood risk impact of the historic narrow gauge railway Loss of Green Belt Concern over impact on community infrastructure particularly health facilities</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3669	Feroga Bartlett	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development. Will destroy a unique, beautiful irreplaceable area of countryside which should be protected as Green Belt, provides a natural barrier to urban sprawl and opportunity for town dwellers to enjoy the countryside. It'll destroy endangered species, woods, other wildlife and destroy the villages. Building should be on brownfield sites or infill in towns and villages. Area is very important for leisure and its loss would be detrimental to quality of life. Would like to know why this area was chosen and others were rejected. Don't accept there's a need for so many houses with so many vacant properties in Luton. Many traffic problems, especially on the A505/A602 and these would get worse with the development. Non-bypass option studies should have been completed prior to decisions taken. Current infrastructure cannot support the housing increase and additional housing will necessitate additional road and social/community infrastructure. There is no financial viability study.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including examination of non bypass options.</p>				
3328	Barton Willmore on behalf of CBRE Investors		Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the approach which places emphasis on the consideration of brown field sites within Dunstable and Luton in the first instance. Employment, sites should be reviewed to ascertain whether they are still required for that purpose. However, the Employment Land Review (January 2008) does not represent the most up to date evidence on employment land, given that the economic downturn has been at its peak since the latter part of 2008 and as such a review prior that may provide a misconstrued picture of the situation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome the support for the re-use of brown field sites. The Preferred Options are based on the evaluating of evidence available at the time and next stages of the Core Strategy will refine the evidence and proposals.</p>				
1073	Alison Beasey	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1064	Todd Beasey - Webb	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure and delivery partners. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1068	Brett Beasey - Webb	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1961	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Concern over focussing development in existing areas of high density and limited green space provision. The effect of the environment on health and mental well-being must be considered in the design of new communities and their effect on existing populations.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This excludes development on green space</p>				
1686	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: In part. Due to potential difficulties of bringing forward one or more of the preferred urban extensions; in order to ensure a continuous 5 year supply there is a need to have a solution involving a series of sites and having 'reserve' housing locations, in order to compensate for any of the preferred urban extensions that may not come forward or do not deliver the target number of dwellings in the required timeframe. In the current economic climate it is necessary to take a realistic view on the viability of developments (particularly forming part of the urban extensions), and the level of financial contributions that they can make towards town centre regeneration projects.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. Delivery of housing is risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements <input type="checkbox"/></p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2478	MAC Bell	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Loss of green belt Traffic increase Not supported by N Herts District Council				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2608	Tim Bailey Beng	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Loss of villages' character and identity Loss of wildlife Spoilt views of Lilley Bottom Valley Smaller pockets of development rather than large scale Large scale developments do not benefit people or environment, only the developer Quality of life will be significantly affected Local exhibition gave impression that council cared about Green Belt so why is this option being considered? No reasonable explanation was given by council representatives.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
3070	Julia Berrie	Northampton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
893	D Berry	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
892	Mrs Christina Berry	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3167	Jacinthe Betts	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land east of Luton falls within the green belt and it has been proposed without thorough research of alternative land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2747	W Beyeler	Holwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Land grabbing by one authority from another to meet its housing targets makes a mockery of the local authority system and democratic principles. Loss of Green Belt opening floodgates to urban sprawl. Rural character devastated. Major environmental effect on Hitchin through increased traffic. Necessary road infrastructure is lacking. An environmental study has not been done, heightening concerns that proposal has not been thought through properly. Bedfordshire should seek alternative sites within own boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure and delivery partners.</p>				
3978	Mark Bickerdike	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons It will destroy a huge area of green belt land It will destroy farmlands and swallow up villages It will have a huge impact on the wider area in terms of extra traffic and greater pressure on the region's infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1059	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the lack of clarity about how the rural settlements have been identified and contends that Skip End is well placed to accommodate some development (details in original comment)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Villages have been identified owing to the exclusion from the Green Belt or owing to their relative sustainability. This includes Slip End</p>				
3917	Alexander Bierrum	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write to make plain my objections to the East of Luton proposal. Firstly, this proposal requires the destruction of land in an area of outstanding natural beauty as well as the desecration of Green Belt. Secondly there is no infrastructure to support this proposed development. Thirdly, the requirement to build seems to be under an initiative based on a projection of population growth which is unlikely to occur and an assumption of affordability which the present economic situation has destroyed. Finally, it is neither fair nor reasonable that part of Bedfordshire's housing burden should be implemented in a neighbouring county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3577	Alan Bifield	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: This is an ill conceived development proposal which would spoil the natural countryside and wildlife. The land is Green Belt and should not be built on. The traffic congestion that this development would cause to Hitchin, Luton and surrounding villages would be terrible. Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green would be lost.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2627	Mrs V C J Binns	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Green belt land is there to prevent urban sprawl Land is for recreation and valuable Villages will be ruined Traffic east of Luton is at breaking point, hospitals and schools will be overstretched Highways Agency doesn't support Luton northern bypass, so how will it be funded? Document was issued without proper detailed financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation Not supported by NHDC How can 13 potential areas of expansion be reduced to 4? Joint planning committee took a decision without technical analyses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3472	Mrs Carol Bird	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed east of Luton development for the following reasons: It is an area of outstanding beauty and green belt land. Impact on wildlife and domestic animals. Area is well used from people in towns who like views and fresh air. Important to protect green heritage and diverse wildlife. There must be some brown field sites to develop first.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain important recreation areas and green spaces.</p>			
3663	Mrs Elizabeth Bithrey	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: North Herts roads cannot absorb the additional traffic which would be generated particularly as it will be building 9000 homes in the Stevenage area. The two bypasses will not ease the congestion problem but will attract significant additional amounts of long distance traffic. Will destroy a spectacular piece of Green Belt adjoining the Chilterns AONB, negatively impacting on biodiversity. Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe, Tea Green and Lilley will be swallowed up by urban sprawl and lose their distinctive rural character and way of life. Concerned about funding for development and its impact on Herts budgets, community services and charges. Significant addition to air and noise pollution will be generated. No explanation for why this location is deemed more suitable than others within Bedfordshire when it is actually the least suitable.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			
3661	Mr William Douglas Bithrey	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: North Herts roads cannot absorb the additional traffic which would be generated particularly as it will be building 9000 homes in the Stevenage area. The two bypasses will not ease the congestion problem but will attract significant additional amounts of long distance traffic. Will destroy a spectacular piece of Green Belt adjoining the Chilterns AONB, negatively impacting on biodiversity. Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe, Tea Green and Lilley will be swallowed up by urban sprawl and lose their distinctive rural character and way of life. Concerned about funding for development and its impact on Herts budgets, community services and charges. Significant addition to air and noise pollution will be generated. No explanation for why this location is deemed more suitable than others within Bedfordshire when it is actually the least suitable.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3651	William Stephen Bithrey	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We are writing to protest against planned East of Luton development. The infrastructure such as water, electricity and sewerage etc would need total re-creation. The area also relies on surrounding fields to absorb heavy rainfall - with a significant risk of flooding were they to be built over. It will also result in unsustainable levels of traffic from Luton to Baldock. Thirdly, the location is an area of spectacular beauty. It is co-dependent on the adjacent AONB. Development of this location would therefore conflict with both central Government policies and the Core Strategy Preferred Option CS15 to preserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure (including water infrastructure) and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate run off.			
3960	J Blake	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development due to impact on Green Belt which government has promised to protect. Since the area was designated for housing hundreds of flats &amp; houses have been built in Luton. Notes that several more are planned for and if GM pull out of Luton, another large site will be available for industrial and housing development. Houses built near the airport will need extra noise protection adding to the cost. Lilley Bottom is a dried up river bed and a few years ago the whole road flooded to Whitwell. Building on this land will reduce area for water drainage and if the climate gets warmer the need for water in the SE will not be met. Have already lost large area of green belt land at Butterfield, and hotel looks like a prison block coming from Hitchin. What guarantees are there that such buildings would not be added to the proposed development? We need all the arable farm land we have for future food shortages and losing valuable agricultural land will only add to problems in the future.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.			
3773	Barbara U Blight	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Audacious of Luton and S Beds Council to build their quota of housing in Hertfordshire, destroying a beautiful area and the villages. More suitable and environmentally friendly alternative sites in Luton and Bedfordshire have not been fully explored. Proposals smack of 'Nimbyism'. Wonders what sort of people would deliberately turn areas like Cockerhoe, Mangrove Green, Tea Green, Lilley Bottom, Breachwood Green and Putteridgebury into concrete jungles with possible risk of flooding throughout the area. The houses, plus bypasses and areas of employment would mean huge losses of Green Belt, increased volumes of traffic on rat runs through countryside. Would like fairer more sensible proposals.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of flooding, employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3753	Adrian R Blight	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Audacious of Luton and S Beds Council to build their quota of housing in Hertfordshire, destroying a beautiful area and the villages. More suitable and environmentally friendly alternative sites in Luton and Bedfordshire have not been fully explored. Proposals smack of 'Nimbyism'. Wonders what sort of people would deliberately turn areas like Cockermhoe, Mangrove Green, Tea Green, Lilley Bottom, Breachwood Green and Putteridgebury into concrete jungles with possible risk of flooding throughout the area. The houses, plus bypasses and areas of employment would mean huge losses of Green Belt, increased volumes of traffic on rat runs through countryside. Would like fairer more sensible proposals.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
2692	Brian S Blight	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: audacity of Luton and S Beds council to suggest building their quota of houses in Hertfordshire destruction of beautiful countryside and villages incensed that more suitable and environmentally friendly sites in Luton and Bedfordshire not fully explored Smacks of 'Nimbyism' Deliberately turning villages into concrete jungles with possible risk of flooding surrounding areas Huge loss of Green Belt Increased traffic and rat running through countryside</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
1731	Bloor Homes	Derbyshire	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Our view remains that although the scale of growth required in Luton and Southern Bedfordshire requires that a significant proportion of new housing development is achieved through major sustainable urban extensions, smaller scale urban extensions are also needed to ensure a constant supply of deliverable sites. We therefore object to Policy CS1 set out in the consultation document as we do not consider that the exclusion of smaller scale urban extensions from the 'Building Blocks of the Spatial Strategy' is justified in the circumstances. The Core Strategy should not preclude the release of smaller scale urban extensions which can make a valuable contribution to the mix and distribution of new housing sites. We do however support the identification of Toddington as a rural settlement with the potential to accommodate growth during the plan period.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2579	Carolyn Boringdon	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Inappropriate to build on designated Green Belt Loss of recreational space Villages engulfed Further traffic congestion and chaos on roads making access to services difficult Strategy issued without proper financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation Proposal not supported by N Herts DC Area is habitat for wildlife</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2750	Boringdon	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. The land is designated Green Belt and is inappropriate for this sort of development. An impact analysis and sustainability investigation has not been done. N Herts DC does not support proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3194	Mrs J M Bottrill	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: If the Green Belt is now built on the surrounding areas will be swallowed by buildings. This may become another sprawling estate with not enough facilities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3001	Karl Bottrill	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to its impact on the Green Belt which the consultee identifies has many benefits for people including access to the countryside, habitat for plants, animals and wildlife, cleaner air and water, better land use of areas within bordering cities. States that the additional traffic would prevent them from walking their child to nursery which would force them to drive and put more strain on the roads. Also states that the development would require them to drive to access the countryside. Questions how development on this scale close to the airport will help protect air quality and the impact that it would have on the wildlife whose habitat would be lost. Also questions how the infrastructure will be paid for. States that the Highways Agency do not support the proposed Luton Northern Bypass and supposes that this is because they do not think that it will impact on easing the congestion in this proposed development area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2822	Dr Caroline Bowes-Lyon	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It is not possible to build thousands of houses in the designated area on an appropriate scale, or protect the countryside. These aims are inconsistent and will change the character of a small, fragile area of countryside. If east of Luton plans go ahead, it will have a most deleterious effect on the natural environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The scale of development proposed will impact on the countryside. Mitigation measures will be needed to minimise this impact</p>				
2273	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to CS1 Loss of Green Belt and high quality land Insufficient justification for choice of East of Luton site Protection/preservation of countryside within urban extensions not addressed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2274	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The diagram is extremely schematic and gives little useful information with regard to N Herts proposals by not including N Herts villages</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Key Diagram needs to be legible</p>				
3443	Mr Jarleth Boyle	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton falls in an area of outstanding natural beauty in North Hertfordshire. I know the traffic problems that occur in Stopsley, on a day to day basis. So why add more? What about schools, medical facilities and shops, and how will the new ring road be paid for? There are lots of brown field sites that could be developed within the boundaries of Luton, so why build on our vital green areas, our green lungs. North Herts Council are totally against the development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2605	Mark Boyle	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: - no building on countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2641	Patrick Boyle	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Oppose development on sensitive and beautiful landscape Increased traffic congestion on small roads and serious road infrastructure problems Must be more sensible location to build houses, located closer to main roads which could accommodate traffic generated by large development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3257	Robin Bracey	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is designated green belt and of important natural beauty. Lilley Bottom would be changed forever and the flora and fauna destroyed. The River Mimram would be polluted and perhaps damaged. The knock on effect on villages and countryside outside the area would be far reaching. Existing infrastructure is at capacity and will not be able to cope with the proposal. There has not been a proper financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation to test the proposals and the Committee has not been presented with the technical analysis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3256	E Bracey	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The green belt land is of importance to us where for those living there or just visiting. The negative effect of the proposal to the east of Luton would be irreparable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing.</p>				
2375	Christine Bradbury	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concern over the loss of Green Belt land Concern over building on flood plain Concern over the lack of infrastructure Concern over the lack of jobs following the closure of major firms in Leighton Buzzard Concern over more traffic congestion Concern that the rail service is will not be able to cope with increased passenger numbers and is too expensive</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1444	Mr PHC Brader	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Is dismayed at the possibility of a large housing development to the east of Luton, reported in Lilley Village Voice. Accepts there is a need for housing in this part of England but does not understand why it is being considered to be built in the greenbelt. There must be suitable brownfield sites around Luton where this could be undertaken with minimal disruption and without blighting the landscape.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2568	Judith Brader	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: How on earth any right minded person can possibly believe that they have a right to decimate an area, the quality of which is on a par with any area of outstanding natural beauty. Walkers in their numbers, from Luton and surrounding areas, pass through the beautiful countryside with their dogs, children and picnics etc. It is a proven fact that fresh air and exercise is the best way to keeping healthy. The second most concerning aspect about your stupid idea is: what about the traffic? Are you aware for instance that a car journey from Lilley to Parkway station which used to take 10 minutes now takes 30 minutes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including how to maintain high levels of recreation space.</p>				
3389	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Development will have an adverse impact on environmental impact. There will be a degradation in quality of life for Leighton Buzzard and villages from loss of farm land which separates villages from conurbation, increased traffic flows, increased demand on local facilities, new roads included in development, increased population numbers, increase in crime. New building will bring greater risk of flooding. Leighton Buzzard is small market town with a centre which is not adequate to support existing population. Town already overdeveloped.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
3695	Phillipe Bradley	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Protest about development in the beautiful countryside of Lilley Bottom. The wildlife and local people will suffer as the area of natural beauty will be lost forever to concrete for generations to come. We have too many cars, lorries and vans as it is, driving through our villages which are not in Bedfordshire but Hertfordshire. Use brownfield sites and repair all the empty houses but do not build on our beautiful land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation spaces.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1371	Mr Clive Bradley	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is a conservation area and an AONB. The land is Green Belt, beautiful countryside and comprises a number of small rural villages. No justification for development to satisfy Luton. Houses should be built on the old Vauxhall site and areas north and west of Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Land to the east of Luton has no national landscape designations. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3701	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL urban extension owing to impact on countryside, our heritage to pass on to future generations. Concerned that Committee promotes vision of a 'Green Growth Area' and says green space and infrastructure will be provided (CS14) while prepared to destroy these very attributes which are already there. Para 12.5 offers tree planting and preservation of key views and para 12.7 talks of respect for distinctive landscape and topography and yet the Core Strategy promotes plans to rip up ancient woods and ruin existing views. Committee's principles are restricted to Luton and S Beds territory and are not being applied to N Herts. CS15 states that countryside and landscape will be protected, conserved and enhanced according to findings of the Landscape Assessment 2007 and Environmental Sensitivity Assessment 2008 but which are meaningless as the latter states that land east of Luton is not considered appropriate for development. Committee should reconsider all the evidence and remove EoL option.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation spaces.			
2172	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development of land East of Luton. Proposal cannot legally be part of Core Strategy.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.			
3441	Miss Mary Brenchley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I protest in the strongest possible terms against Luton and Central Beds Councils expanding Luton into one of the most beautiful areas of Hertfordshire. You have no right whatever to commit this outrageous crime.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3546	Catherine Bresnan	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the development East of Luton. I very much hope that the quality of life and attractiveness of this area will not be destroyed. I am encouraged by the Vision but the proposals seem to contradict this. What provision is being made to protect the Iron Age and Roman sites? I am concerned that the congestion levels in and out of Hitchin will be unacceptable. Are there existing sites within Luton that could be built on?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Core Strategy proposes development between M1 and A5. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2042	Mrs Dorothy Brinklow	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposal to build 40,000 houses in South Bedfordshire. Open countryside is part of our heritage and should be protected for future generations. Closure of M1 due to accident brings gridlock to local roads, particularly A5. Extra traffic from houses will add to problems and create new ones. Employment needs consideration as many large manufacturers have moved away and Vauxhall is under threat. Concerned about capacity of Luton and Dunstable hospital to deal with increased population and about schools which are over subscribed. Will ask Central Beds Council to oppose new development and at least get number greatly reduced as area could not cope with this development in present circumstances.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3975	Nick Brooke	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy Housing reallocation consider to be NIMBYISM Housing pressure coming from asylum seekers and illegal immigration</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy cannot debate national immigration policy</p>				
3799	David Brooker	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the scale of the proposed East of Luton development. Object to a Core Strategy that ignores the effect on Hitchin and its chronic traffic congestion and already over-stretched infrastructure. Object to the Joint Planning Committee taking decisions with no regard for the views of residents east of Luton, particularly those living in N Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Consultation has been undertaken and review of the consultation responses will be undertaken in taking forward the plan. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3800	Vicki Brooker	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the scale of the proposed East of Luton development. Object to a Core Strategy that ignores the effect on Hitchin and its chronic traffic congestion and already over-stretched infrastructure. Object to the Joint Planning Committee taking decisions with no regard for the views of residents east of Luton, particularly those living in N Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Consultation has been undertaken and review of the consultation responses will be undertaken in taking forward the plan. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2882	Peter Brown	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Questions why Luton and Central Beds Councils are keen to extend Luton when there is room in Bedfordshire to meet the development needs including: land to the north of Luton (out towards Streatley and Lower Sundon), this would have easier access to the A6 and M1. land north west of Luton between Houghton Regis and Leighton Buzzard. This area has the advantage of being close to the M1, A5 and A505. States that North Herts has its own development problems without more expansion from neighbouring areas with the problems of infrastructure, schools, etc. States that the roads in north Hertfordshire have great difficulty in coping with the volume of traffic now without even thinking of future developments</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed to deliver the amount of development required regionally. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2182	Mr Stuart Brown	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land to the East of Luton is designated as Green Belt. The proposed development would engulf villages such as Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green. The development is not supported by North Herts Council in whose area the land is situated. It is not clear how 13 areas became just 4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1442	Victor Brownjohn	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Against building so many houses in the countryside to the East of Luton. Empty homes, brownfield land and sub-standard dwellings should all continue to be explored before further encroachment on the Green Belt is allowed. Need to withstand pressure from developers. Smaller houses are also needed in areas where workers are employed. Control of traffic is not obtained but building more roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS1 prioritises the reuse of Brownfield land but the evidence shows that urban extensions are needed to deliver the amount of development identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy which justifies the release of Green Belt land for this purpose. The Strategy deals with the provision of housing for all needs under policy CS8 and the provision of road infrastructure under CS3 and CS4.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2484	Anna Bruce	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton Bedfordshire should not have rights over what happens in Hertfordshire Increase in traffic, impact on children using lanes Loss of green belt Loss of rural life Impact on villages</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1144	Mr Reginald Bunker	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1116	Ms Margaret Bunker	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Major infrastructure required for such a development. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Object as Core Strategy been issued without a proper detailed financial analysis being issued.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1115	Mr Dale Bunker	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Major infrastructure required for such a development. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Object as Core Strategy been issued without a proper detailed financial analysis being issued.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
3660	J W Burden	Holwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl and is being eroded in other areas eg west of Stevenage. Land is of high scenic and landscape value and agricultural quality. Area provides habitat for a range of wildlife. Would have an overwhelming effect on the rural character and beauty of villages. No environmental impact study has been made and it is unlikely that the development is sustainable in terms of traffic and impact on local transport infrastructure. Would lead to more congestion on A505 A602 &amp; central Hitchin. The proposed bypass and housing would encourage further erosion of the Green Belt with infilling and more major road building. Lack of initial consultation and joint planning with N Herts DC and Herts CC who object to the proposals. Proposals appear to be an opportunist 'land grab' by Luton &amp; Central Beds authorities in an attempt to deflect the problems of high housing targets away from Luton &amp; South Beds. Should consider other options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Consultation has been undertaken to the East of Luton and in North Herts. North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2576	Mollie A Burden	Holwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton and bypass east of Luton: Land is designated Green Belt and is being eroded in other areas Land is of high scenic, landscape and agricultural value Land provides habitat for wildlife Proposal would have negative effect on rural character and villages through increased traffic, pollution, vandalism and other environmental impacts of urban development No environmental impact study Development not sustainable due to traffic generation, further congestion and impact on local transport infrastructure Erosion of Green Belt Lack of initial consultation and joint planning with N Herts DC and Herts CC both of which object to the proposals Represents an opportunist 'land grab' in an attempt to deflect problems of housing targets away from Luton &amp; S Beds</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3613	J W Burden	Holwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl and is being eroded in other areas eg west of Stevenage. The land is of high scenic and landscape value and agricultural quality. Area provides habitat for a range of wildlife. Would have an overwhelming effect on the rural character and beauty of villages. No environmental impact study has been made and it is unlikely that the development is sustainable in terms of traffic and impact on local transport infrastructure. Would lead to more congestion on A505 A602 &amp; central Hitchin. Proposed bypass and housing would encourage further erosion of the Green Belt with infilling and more major road building. Lack of initial consultation and joint planning with N Herts DC and Herts CC who object to the proposals. Proposals appear to be an opportunist 'land grab' by Luton &amp; Central Beds authorities in an attempt to deflect the problems of high housing targets away from Luton &amp; South Beds. Should consider other options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Consultation was undertaken on initial options and North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3425	Paul Burdon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land to the East of Luton is Green Belt in North Hertfordshire and is of particular natural beauty. The extra traffic will cause even more congestion on local roads. The proposed bypasses will not ease congestion in the existing town centres but will destroy much more countryside. A sensible approach would be to look at land over towards the M1 motorway as I would expect that most people would want to commute. The countryside to the East of Luton supports a wide diversity of flora and fauna, which would be devastated by the loss of such natural habitat. Life would become intolerable without extra infrastructure and services.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed to deliver the amount of development required regionally. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3648	Mrs Sharon Burdon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Acknowledges requirement for new housing. Other options are available which have not been properly considered or equally researched. North Herts DC has not been properly consulted and are not party to the decision making process and do not support the proposal. Area is beautiful countryside. Wildlife, flora and fauna will be devastated and is irreplaceable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3961	Mrs Diane Burleigh	Pirton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons As demand for Housing comes from Luton and S Beds, Housing development should also be allocated within this 2 borders Green Belt should be the last area to be considered for development, not the preferred option. The designated AONB will be damaged as a result of the development The preferred option is a extremely premature decision, and open to challenge in the courts</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
2152	Mr Peter Burnage	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1560	Mr Richard Burnip	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposal of 40,000 new homes for north of Houghton Regis because: - the traffic in Toddington is already very busy at peak times and parking in the village is already at capacity, a huge new development will make this worse; - local rail infrastructure will not cope, nearest station is Harlington which has a small number of staff, a car park which is at capacity and cannot handle an increase in demand; - traffic passing through Tebworth (5,000 per day) is not local traffic but people cutting through from the A5 to the M1 compromising the peace and safety of Tebworth; - loss of large area of greenbelt would be detrimental to trees, wildlife and quality of air and life in villages encroached; - local schools and hospitals are already busy and unsure of how 40,000 families will be accommodated. Do not see justification for such a new development in view of the overall detrimental impact it will have on the area, nor how such a development could claim to be sustainable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3535	Rhoda Burns	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the development East of Luton for the following reasons: - The area is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB - Lilley Bottom is an outstanding Chalk valley - The area is inhabited by a diverse range of fauna and flora - Small villages like Cockerhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green will be destroyed. - The present road system cannot cope with more traffic - How were the decisions made to go from 13 possible sites to just 4? - The bypass is not supported by the Highways Agency. - There will be a loss of amenity for Luton residents. - There is no beneficial effect for North Herts - How can Bedfordshire justify using land that is in Hertfordshire?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessments of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2546	Mr Robert Burns	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: overspill into neighbouring county's land Green Belt should not be built on Area adjacent to Chilterns AONB Lilley Bottom is an outstanding chalk valley Destruction of small villages Loss of boundary preventing Luton urban sprawl Infrastructure cannot cope with more development Not supported by N Herts DC Negative impact on wildlife Loss of amenity for Luton residents No benefit for N Herts - extra traffic and pollution Not financially viable and not properly costed Decision process flawed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2759	L Burt	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Negative consequences for countryside - farming, wildlife, beauty, recreation. Area important to people in villages and Luton. Traffic situation, particularly into Stopsley would get worse, with more CO2 emissions. Would change the whole face of the area. Area is an important area of great beauty.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3690	Mrs J Burton	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land down to Lilley Bottom is very beautiful and we would lose a wonderful, natural resource forever. It would be better to build on the old Vauxhall site or between the M1 and Caddington as these are much closer to the town centre, M1 and train line. East of Luton is a long way from the town and travel will become more difficult for us all.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3761	Steven Burton	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the spatial Development Strategy and Key Diagram due to the following reasons; Traffic to the East of Luton is already at braking point Draft Core Strategy has totally ignored the effect on Hitchin and its traffic and other infrastructure The Development to the East of Luton is not backed by North Hertfordshire District council, in whose area is situated Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3760	Steven Burton	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the spatial Development Strategy and Key Diagram due to the following reasons; Traffic to the East of Luton is already at braking point Draft Core Strategy has totally ignored the effect on Hitchin and its traffic and other infrastructure The Development to the East of Luton is not backed by North Hertfordshire District council, in whose area is situated Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3173	Andrew Burton	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Any elongation of the Luton/Dunstable conurbation to the east is the wrong thing to do from the perspective of local communications. If there has to be new development then the obvious thing to do so extend the town to the north or south because those areas have better communications, and are much closer to the town centre. In addition, the area is greenbelt land and the area between Lilley Bottom and Luton a lovely piece of chalk escarpment countryside with arable land and oak woodlands which would be a loss if developed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to maintain key green linkages.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and accessibility analysis as well as environmental sensitivity testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2380	Ms Lucy Burton	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the development of such a scale to the East of Luton due to the impact on the wildlife and the loss of countryside for recreation. Asks that nothing gets built on the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3188	Violetta Burton	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is green belt and enjoyed by many for recreation. The proposal would over stretch existing road, social and community infrastructure. There is no detail financial impact analysis supporting the strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure and delivery partners.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3986	Lara Burton	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I D 326601 Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The proposed development will take place on green belt land in North Hertfordshire. The landscape and countryside within the proposed area for development is currently used by many residents and visitors, and will, as a result, be affected by the housing development. Wildlife species will be seriously affected by the development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1159	Ryan Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3133	Ryan Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Moved to countryside to get away from urban sprawl and does not want future of village changed. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3132	Mr Graham Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Moved to countryside to get away from urban sprawl and does not want future of village changed. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1157	Christopher Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1158	Mrs Evelyn Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3130	Mrs Evelyn Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Lilley Bottom and the AONB are important for personal recreation. The development would have no benefit for N Herts residents and would be a drastic loss of beautiful countryside. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land. People of Lilley do not support the proposal as it will blight countryside and they do not want to become part of Luton sprawl.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3131	Christopher Bush	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Moved to countryside to get away from urban sprawl and does not want future of village changed. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1086	M J Byrne	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton bypasses. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Requires financially unviable infrastructure.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1091	A Byrne	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton bypasses. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Requires financially unviable infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2978	Mr Paul Cacchioli	Walkern	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to a development of such scale to the east of Luton. The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl of Luton. The proposal would engulf hamlets and villages in the area and have a major impact of quality of life. The infrastructure needed for the proposal is financially non-viable. North Hertfordshire District Council does not support the proposal. More appropriate options such as use of brown field sites and regeneration and refurbishment of areas of Luton appear to have been dismissed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2980	Mrs Kirsteen Cacchioli	Walkern	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to a development of such scale to the east of Luton. The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl of Luton. The proposal would engulf hamlets and villages in the area and have a major impact of quality of life. The infrastructure needed for the proposal is financially non-viable. North Hertfordshire District Council does not support the proposal. More appropriate options such as use of brown field sites and regeneration and refurbishment of areas of Luton appear to have been dismissed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2668	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the Strategy and exclusion of West of Luton owing to their impact on the villages and the scale of infrastructure required as well as impact on the AONB. Considers that development to the West of Luton would not provide appropriate interconnected communities owing to the M1 separating the site from the urban area with only limited access points. Contends that the proposal to the West of Luton appears financially dependent on a resurgent football club and national sports training facility and spectator venue. Transport connections would be difficult, with motorway crossing points under pressure by cars and the M1 would become a congested local distributor. Commercial and business development around Stockwood Park would add to traffic problems and spoil the Park and wider landscape. Considers that the other locations would enable new localities to be created at both Luton-Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard, which would generate their own character and be sufficiently large to create mixed communities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required beyond further testing of options and development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options considers that development to the West of Luton is not a preferred location.</p>				
2481	John Callard	St Albans	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed urban extensions East of Luton member of CPRE - Hertfordshire Society</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3040	Mrs P Camfield	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development, Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3004	Ms Maria Cann	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton as well as the East Luton Bypass (black route) owing to inadequate infrastructure, the impact of increased congestion and the impact on the wildlife and farmland, including red kites, deer and bats. Also objects owing to its location on the Green Belt and the impact that it would have on the villages, including their public houses which benefit from people visiting the area to enjoy the Chilterns extension. States that other options exist to meet this development which should be seriously considered. Questions why this is a preferred location for development when North Herts objects to the housing and proposed bypass. Has concerns over the costs of the proposed development and the additional funding that maybe required.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
2520	David Cannon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Democratic deficit Insufficient consultation Oppose development on Chilterns AONB against consultant's report Loss of Green Belt Negative impact on villages More traffic problems Overburdening of services</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport, accessibility and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development pro</p>				
3614	Miss Karen Cant	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am extremely angry that Luton and Central Beds Councils are making decisions to invade North Herts. Surely as a resident of North Herts I have a right to stop planning applications from another Council invading my space. The area should stay as Green belt.  Where will you draw the line?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3410	JS Carlina	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to Leighton Buzzard Eastern Development as considers it is unsustainable because of lack of infrastructure, lack of employment opportunities; loss of greenbelt and development on floodplain.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Account has been taken of recent completions in Leighton Linlade. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3408	KS Carlinae	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to Leighton Buzzard Eastern Development as considers it is unsustainable because of lack of infrastructure, lack of employment opportunities; loss of greenbelt and development on floodplain.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Account has been taken of recent completions in Leighton Linslade. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
3598	Mrs Gay Carpenter	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL development because: Other options are available which do not ruin green belt or destroy villages. Herts is the leading county for footpaths and this part of N Herts has ancient green ways. A beautiful part of the county bordering on an AONB will be ruined. We are concerned about green issues and the choice to build a fast road and thousands of houses is madness. The area is valuable to many people who take air and exercise. Concern for water table. During recent prolonged rainfall a river appeared below Luton airport creating deep lakes and threatening Kimpton. A river also appeared from Lilley down to Whitwell. More building will mean less open country to absorb rainfall. Believe that the causes for the need to build thousands of houses should be identified on a plan. Recent court ruling was in favour of Herts CC and St Albans DC who opposed the East of England plan and the threat to green belt land. Suggest you reconsider plans and look at brown field sites and existing housing stock.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4048	Michael Carpenter	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area is a beautiful part of the Chilterns which is visited by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken on cross referencing key elements of cross cutting policies which directly affect the overall strategy (E.g. Climate change and green infrastructure).</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy and supporting studies address the impact of growth and the climate change agenda. Nevertheless clearer cross referencing between the different sections of the strategy (e.g. Section 10 Adapting to Climate Change) may illustrate better the cross cutting work involved in the preparation of the overall strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3586	John Carter	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register my objection to a development of such a scale to the east of Luton. Traffic in the area is already at breaking point and no consideration has been given to the impact on Hitchin. The proposal if not supported by NHDC in whose area it is situated. We need to know how 13 expansion areas became just 4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3339	Cemex UK Prop. & Trenport Inv. Ltd	Not given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the omission of land west of Dunstable which comprises part of Area E identified at the Issues and Options Stage. The evidence for the proposed scale of certain urban extensions is questionable: landscape constraints and identities of affected settlements casts doubts on land to the east of Luton; land control, viability and physical constraints make the accommodation of 7,000 homes to the north of Houghton Regis uncertain; and the location of 2,500 dwellings at Leighton-Linslade considering the amount of housing commitments there and its secondary role to the main conurbation is far from robust. The recognition of the area's accessibility and its suitability for more limited development is welcomed but evidence does not justify the choice or scale of certain sites. The omission of land to the north west of Dunstable seems to be driven by a view that only large areas can accommodate sustainable urban extensions. This has no foundation in national or regional policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to refine the development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options document is based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to refine and test development proposals.</p>				
1942	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The LSPs support measures for sustainable transport. There is concern over the effectiveness of the Luton-Dunstable guided bus way, how transport infrastructure will be delivered and whether it will deliver the expected benefits. Include the 'provision of further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside' to proposals relating to Luton. State the need for community safety incorporating the 'secure by design' standards. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Pre Submission version of the Core Strategy will include appropriate references to open space and design. Delivery Strategy will outline approach to delivering infrastructure.</p>				
2411	Chalgrave Parish Council	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The threat of using greenbelt land to build on and the perceived inevitability of having to do so by those proposing mass development is of great concern. The whole point of the green belt was to limit expansion up to the boundary and to create a greenbelt between urban settlement.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review to meet the housing needs based on evidence that the scale of housing could not be met in the urban areas. The SHLAA confirms this.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2483	Mrs EJ Chandler	Little Wymondley	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development - destruction of Chilterns AONB				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. No housing development proposed in Chilterns AONB. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
1110	Mrs M Chandler	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. No supporting financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
935	Mr Clive Chandler	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: This is designated Green Belt land in North Hertfordshire which forms a natural barrier to the urban sprawl that is Luton and Dunstable. Green Belt is intended to be permanent. The Green belt villages of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green will be swallowed up by the housing proposal. The increased logistical and transport issues have been totally ignored. In particular the traffic bottlenecks of Luton and Hitchin, medical and educational needs.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment, and environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
943	Mrs Joanna Chapman	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
862	Mrs Christina Chapman	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3552	Ravi Chauhan	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: My objection to the east of Luton scheme is based on three counts: - negative impact on a designated AONB - negative impact on some rare species of wildlife - Increase in traffic congestion and knock-on air quality degradation</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The land to the East of Luton south of the A505 is not classified as AONB. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3578	Mr A M Chick	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development and northern bypass due to impact on villages, landscape, Green Belt and wildlife. No comparative assessment for alternative options provided. Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass. How will this and other infrastructure be funded? A highway running through an AONB conflicts with government policy. Land Use Consultants concluded that development is not recommended in Lilley Bottom. Other options would have a lower impact and use existing road infrastructure and do not require public funding. N Herts do not support the development. No validation to support an Eastern bypass which is sufficient to compensate for the harm it will cause to the green belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area. Demolition of the area East of Luton and the bypass directly contradicts with the vision to protect conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB. Congestion around the A505 will only be exacerbated. Improved public transport infrastructure is required.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1806	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Board objects to the following elements of the key diagram: - proposed Luton Northern Bypass linking the M1 to A505 and beyond the A505 to the south particularly those sections that are within the AONB and its setting within both Central Bedfordshire and North Hertfordshire - the urban extension to the north of Luton and particularly those elements that are within the AONB and its setting (west and east of A6) - urban extension to south of A505 particularly that part adjacent to and within the setting of the AONB - park and ride site on the A505 as it appears that this would be within the AONB</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate the impact on the AONB.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence and had regard to the impact on the AONB. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1804	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: SUE's are initially considered in para 4.21 to 4.30. Whilst accepting that the key diagram cannot be completely accurate, the Board objects to those parts of the proposed urban extensions that are identified and located within the Chilterns AONB (to the north of Luton and east of A6) as this fails to satisfy the requirements set out in the MKSMSRS, does not meet the tests set out in PPS7 and would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The Board also objects to the lack of recognition given to the proximity of the AONB to most of the sites to the north and east of Luton and the fact that development should also conserve and enhance the setting of the AONB. This will be vitally important in connection with design and materials for any development that abuts the AONB.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Adds clarity</p>				
715	Mr Oliver Christopherson	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Please see my comments on 4.38 and previous paragraphs. I am not keen on the northern bypass road as it can only attract yet more traffic onto the A505, but I can see the need for it, even if the East-West Railway takes some of the freight by rail. But the eastern by-pass is silly - there's already an adequate road from Stopsley to the airport; why do you need another?</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: East of Luton Bypass will provide congestion relief and improve the accessibility of the area.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3165	Mrs D Churchill	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The east of Luton area prevents Luton's further urban sprawl. The development requires extensive infrastructure and the proposal would engulf and blight existing villages. The development is not supported by North Herts District Council and there is a query on how 13 possible expansion areas in the Issues and Options document became 4. There is no proper financial impact analysis accompanying the Core Strategy and the Joint Planning Committee took decisions without members seen the technical analysis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3455	K Claridge	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the proposal to develop 5,500 houses to the East of Luton. The Green Belt is there to protect villages from building and is the lungs of Luton. There are far more suitable areas to build on. Slip End and Caddington areas are already linked to main roads and wouldn't need the same amount of development. I also have concerns about the wildlife and woodlands.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3926	Mrs J Clark	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Urban development to happen in a county (North Herts) outside Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee jurisdiction Not supported by North Herts Hitchin and N.H. have not even been consulted The boundary that prevents the Luton sprawl will be lost</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3930	E J Clark	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: How can you approve the East of Luton scheme when you have not asked the people it is going to effect the most i.e. the people of Lilley, Mangrove, Cockernhoe, Tea Green and indirectly Stopsley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Adequate public consultation took place during the Issues and Options and Preferred Options stages of the Core Strategy. There will be further consultation engagement as part of the pre-submission stage prior to Examination in Public.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
962	Miss Michelle Clarke	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3601	Ellie Clarke	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the diagram as it proposes huge expansion east of Luton in North Herts that ruins the character of the region and the beauty of the villages in it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3856	Philip Claxton	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development; northern bypass and eastern bypass for the following reasons: The area is of outstanding natural beauty, not suitable for a development this size. It is in direct conflict with the Core Strategy's own principles and vision to provide attractive places to live and a good quality of life especially for residents of Mangrove Green and Cockernhoe who will be engulfed. As a resident of Mangrove Green my choice to live in a rural village will be compromised. The roads in the area are already congested and the A505 will become totally gridlocked. North Herts are against the development and don't understand why Luton and S Beds want to destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty, engulf two villages, village community and the green belt surrounding several other villages. Other areas could be developed such as the Vauxhall plant site. There is ex student accommodation sitting empty that could be developed. Should consider better alternatives that are available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3584	Mrs S M Clay	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Leighton Buzzard Eastern Development due to: Loss of Greenbelt land and wildlife Loss of National Heritage Railway Threat of flooding to thousands of homes Lack of infrastructure and employment impact of thousands of new cars in a designated, cycle-friendly town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2126	Clipstone Farm	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The provision of an urban extension to the east of Leighton Linlade is supported. However allocation of 2,500 homes should be increased because: - There are serious technical problems with the proposed urban extension to the East of Luton. Furthermore, NHDC do not support the proposals - The Core Strategy proposes that a substantial number of dwellings are to be provided as flats in existing urban areas. These schemes are unlikely to come forward in the next 5 years given the current economic climate. Also question whether these developments can provide the housing numbers suggested while also providing supporting infrastructure. The allocation to the east of Leighton Linlade should therefore be increased to around 5,000 dwellings.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Delivery of housing is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
1242	Joanne Close	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Moved to the area 14 years ago and actively sought a house on the edge of the Green Belt in order to bring a young family up whilst enjoying the wonderful countryside. Hard pushed to find more beautiful countryside anywhere in the UK. Many of the species in the area are surely protected. Building 5,500 homes would obliterate this and add to the already congested roads in Wigmore and Stopsley. The few areas of natural beauty surrounding Luton should be preserved.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3749	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. NHDC does not support the development east of Luton. We all need to know how the 13 possible expansion areas became just 4. North Hertfordshire is already suffering from accepting several thousand homes as part of the West of Stevenage development, in addition to its own allocation. If such developments keep expanding in the future, ribbon development will occur all the way along the A505 and A602 until Stevenage and Luton link-up with disastrous effects on the very high quality countryside, agriculture, environment/ pollution and the character of towns and villages. No account seems to have been taken of the very restricted quantity of water available in this area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure (including water infrastructure) and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3919	Sarah Cluer	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It will need a lot of ancillaries such as schools, shops to support it which means steamrolling over significant and beautiful areas that are designated Green Belt. Villages would be overwhelmed and lost their identities like Stopsley, once an independent village, now a characterless suburb. Bypasses would add to traffic congestion and pollution and disfigure large areas that have been part of the landscape for centuries. Acknowledge the need for more houses but should seriously consider better and far less controversial locations and options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1677	Codicote Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to 5,500 houses on green belt land in Hertfordshire. Development to east of Luton is not the most sustainable way to expand Luton. There are better locations. Area is of natural beauty, high landscape status and is agricultural land. New bypass at Lilley Bottom will destroy local character and one of the most attractive areas of countryside. Landscape quality is on a par with CAONB on other side of A505</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2988	Mr Roy Cole	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to its impact on the countryside and increased levels of congestion citing Haying Drive as already dangerous. Also states that no thought has been given to the impact on local services, hospitals and fire services.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2942	Steven Cole	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development. Damaging effect on Stopsley and its residents. Traffic already bad. Consultation process has been travesty with nobody listening to local people. Impact on emergency services and traffic. Few jobs in town therefore a huge development will become problematic. Loss of countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The consultation process will continue through the pre-submission consultation stage and finally the Examination in Public of the Core Strategy providing wide and open debate on the proposals to their adoption.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2938	Rosanne Cole	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. I can't believe that we could possibly lose the natural beauty of some very beautiful greenbelt, never to be replaced and lost forever. I use public transport going to and from work and the traffic and congestion most mornings is horrendous from Hayling Drive to the town centre. I have to make sure I catch a bus an hour and a half before I start work just to make sure I am in the town centre for 9 o'clock. I spend most mornings sat on Crawley Green Road or on the A505 trying to get to work. Traffic is just bumper-to-bumper. The impact of such development to the fire services is undeniably ludicrous, not to mention hospital services. I have lived in Luton for 37 years and feel that all voices should be listened to when it comes to such large developments and in this instance councillors and committees were snidey and devious in their handling and processing of this matter; the very parties I have voted for in the past - unbelievable - I feel so let down.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				
3666	Mick Collins	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Area is beautiful Green Belt. Would threaten biodiversity in the area, and engulf villages of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green which would lose their distinctive character and rural community life. Need to balance housing with carbon efficiency particularly in an area which borders on the Chilterns AONB. This would require a commitment to costly energy efficient housing and there is nothing in current documents to show that this exists. Object to the potential significant increase in air and noise pollution. Traffic congestion towards Hitchin is already bad and would increase intolerably and would not be alleviated by the proposed bypasses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
878	Miss C Common	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass with destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
876	Mrs J Common	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
875	Mr J Common	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
874	Mr R Common	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
877	Miss E Common	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3893	Mrs Valerie Conetta	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The Draft Core strategy has totally ignored the effect on Hitchin, its traffic and residents The Draft Core Strategy omitted to consult with the North Herts District Council in whose area it is situated Beautiful Green Belt land is included among the future expansion areas The Joint Planning Committee have taken decisions without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3827	Mrs Deborah Connolly	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register fierce objections to the proposals to build numerous houses in the area which will swallow up Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green among other areas. While the houses are being built in Hertfordshire, the impact will mainly be felt in Bedfordshire. The increased traffic problems, not to mention the problems from the social housing areas, will have a huge detrimental effect on the area. Bedfordshire will no doubt have to have an increase in police numbers to deal with associated problems, which will effect our council tax payments. Why should we have to pay for Hertfordshire causing us problems? A very nice way for Hertfordshire to fulfil their housing problems on the cheap!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1541	Mr A C T Connolly	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Countryside should be incorporated into AONB and protected for future generations, not built on. Such massive development will destroy existing landscape and visual character, denying people opportunity for recreation and healthy outdoor activities. There are other ways of providing homes for people rather than destroying the rural environment - fully utilise existing properties/empty houses, converting buildings to accommodation where infrastructure already exists in urban areas, brownfield land and derelict sites in towns together with good low cost and carbon public transport. these need to be fully examined. Proposals appear to be an incentive for opportunistic house builders for easy financial gain at the expense of the public's enjoyment of the landscape, free from congestion and pollution. With global climate change and current continuing economic downturn the need for land for food production becomes increasingly important. Disregarding future generations needs by pursuing this proposal is foolhardy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Hertfordshire have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment, and environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3348	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the principles of the spatial strategy although it does not contain enough detail on the urban extensions. The submission Core Strategy should outline site boundaries and indicate the location of the urban extensions on a proposals map incorporating land for future built development and land required for green infrastructure. This would allow the successful delivery of an urban extension to the north of Luton. The optimal approach is the preparation of masterplanned green infrastructure strategies for each urban extension. These should incorporate all land uses forming part of the urban extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Greater clarification of the boundaries to the proposed development would be helpful.</p>				
2426	Dr P J Constable	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton proposal because: - Whilst there maybe a minor element of low cost housing, it seems as though the development is driven by politics and profitability. - The area of outstanding beauty is enjoyed by local residents and visitors. To replace this with an urban development would be an irrevocable disaster. - With a burgeoning world population and the impending effects of global warming, it is important to retain the limited productive agricultural land we have in this country.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. There is a need to plan for the delivery of the housing figures outlined in the RSS.</p>				
3935	Christine Cook	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write to protest about the proposed development to the east of Leighton Buzzard. As well as the main concerns such as lack of infrastructure and new roads, loss of green belt and our national heritage bridleway, I should like to know where all these new people are going to work! It is standing room only on the trains, doctors surgeries are overcrowded, as are the shops and schools.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3154	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt, would engulf the hamlet of Mangrove Green and other villages, impact on landscape and biodiversity, road infrastructure is not financially viable will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from and whether there would be sufficient employment to sustain expansion of this size, and if not people will have to commute, adding to congestion and pollution. Object to a Draft Core Strategy that has been issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support the development. How did 13 possible expansion areas become 4, including Green Belt land? Objects to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses. Would like to know why JPC thinks it is alright to damage countryside not in their county.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
858	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I can't support this due to the impact on the green belt. I don't feel that the area in North Herts was properly selected from the other available options. This area is too important to lose in terms of it's recreational, environmental and agricultural value.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
221	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: See my comments to 4.38 - i.e. you are showing an unfair representation of your plan in that you are advertising what you wish to do in Bedfordshire whilst really you are intent on despoiling Hertfordshire without owning up to it but using little legend on diagrams to quietly mention your true proposals.</p>				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: See comments for ID No.220</p>				
3176	Mr Darren Cope	Bendish	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is beautiful countryside designated green belt. Hamlets and villages will be lost traffic made worse in Lilley and Whitehall, in particular.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure analysis and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3852	Miss Anne E Cosgrove	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development, northern bypass and eastern bypass for the following reasons: The area is of outstanding natural beauty, not suitable for a development this size. It is in direct conflict with the Core Strategy's own principles and vision to provide attractive places to live and a good quality of life especially for residents of Mangrove Green and Cockernhoe who will be engulfed. As a resident of Mangrove Green my choice to live in a rural village will be compromised. The roads in the area are already congested and the A505 will become totally gridlocked. North Herts are against the development and don't understand why Luton and S Beds want to destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty, engulf two villages, village community and the green belt surrounding several other villages. Other areas could be developed such as the Vauxhall plant site. There is ex student accommodation sitting empty that could be developed. Should consider better alternatives that are available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2950	Peter Cousins	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton development. It seems that Green Belt and AONB are merely conventions to be subverted. Plenty of brownfield sites in Luton to develop before developing in countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Although the strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land, the evidence shows that to deliver the regional housing requirement the strategy needs to allocate urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires.</p>				
1184	Mr Lewis Guy Cox	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton as cannot comprehend how destroying the countryside in an area of natural beauty can be best option available for bypass and 5,500 new homes. No significant impacts to the countryside or environment if any of the other options were selected. The preferred option will tear up and destroy green belt land. The other options use brownfield land in areas that are already urban and developed. The proposed bypass will also increase traffic congestion in the adjoining rural roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1256	Laurie Cox	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It is incomprehensible that the preferred option East of Luton should be the only one of the options to involve tearing up green belt land in an area of natural beauty to build a bypass. The other three options would be more appropriate. It makes no sense to build housing in an area of the countryside where there is insufficient infrastructure to support them. Hitchin High Schools are already over-subscribed. Studies have shown that bypass schemes increase the number of traffic fatalities. A bypass wouldn't reduce congestion and journey times. Lessons should be learnt from previous schemes. It is inappropriate for the Joint Committee to plan for housing and a bypass in Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1716	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Chapter 4 does not adequately explain or justify CS1. Need to show how the four preferred urban extensions have emerged from MKSMSRS and Core Strategy Issues and Options. Reads like the preferred solution was thought of first and the evidence was made to fit. Agree with approach of developing urban areas first. Object to urban extension to the east of Luton. No discussion of consequences of Green Belt review and different purposes of the Green Belt. East of Luton, development of the Green Belt is contrary to Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 which seeks to avoid the coalescence of neighbouring settlements. It is not clear as to the exact size and location of the urban extension to the east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Greater clarification of the boundaries to the proposed development would be helpful. SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix appraise potential for development in the urban area and the other potential urban extensions.</p>				
2899	C C Cranwell	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed incursion into Hertfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3095	James Cree	Norwich	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands there are proposals to develop East of Luton and considers this a great shame as it is a particularly beautiful area. Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3078	Ailsa Cree	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Acknowledges obligation to find homes for expanding population but should be done responsibly and consider long term impact. To do this, we need space and areas of outstanding natural beauty with fresh air which will allow us to relax, reflect and find solace in a fast world. Objects to the East Luton development as well as the Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: it not helping with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people, the advice in the LUC assessment, lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area, its location within North Herts territory and impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3097	Sheila Cree	Norwich	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3101	Douglas Cree	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3077	Edward Cree	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Acknowledges obligation to find homes for expanding population but should be done responsibly and consider long term impact. To do this, we need space and areas of outstanding natural beauty with fresh air which will allow us to relax, reflect and find solace in a fast world. Objects to the East Luton development as well as the Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: it not helping with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people, the advice in the LUC assessment, lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area, its location within North Herts territory and impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3099	Frederick Cree	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3089	Caroline Cree	Norwich	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands there are proposals to develop East of Luton and considers this a great shame as it is a particularly beautiful area. Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3360	Mrs Jane Creese	Shefford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I Object to development East of Luton. I am a horse rider and walker, and frequently ride over the area where this travesty proposal is taking place. I was always under the impression that Green Belt could not be built on. I cannot believe that there are no other areas other than Green Belt where this building atrocity could go. Please, please do not let this happen? Stop it now?</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. PPG2 permits a review of the Green Belt. The Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3606	Peter Crossley	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I protest most strongly about the proposed development which will ruin a large area of Hertfordshire Green Belt. You could build on the long term car park at Slip End or on the Vauxhall Site. A bypass is needed between the A1 and the M1 around Leitchworth and Hitchin not around the proposed development.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2098	Mr P Cubbon	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Eastern development of Leighton Buzzard due to its impact on the historic character of the town and on road and rail transport infrastructure; Loss of green belt land; Increased flood risk from house building on existing flood plains and threat to Leighton Buzzard narrow gauge railway</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Recently developed and proposed housing accounted for in this decision. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on narrow gauge railway and deliver the necessary infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2925	D J Cullum	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development. Will create more serious traffic problems in Hitchin and surrounding villages. Will devastate Green Belt. Countryside is an enormous amenity for people of Hertfordshire and Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4057	Victoria Cummins	Not known	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reason: The area in question is one of outstanding natural beauty and to build on it would be an act of desecration.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2218	N J Curly	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton urban extension: better options available eg West of Luton or Luton itself Loss of Green Belt Negative impact on Chilterns AONB Historical importance of site Land is in N Herts who do not support it</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p>				
2581	Marjorie Cushing	Tea Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development Countryside surrounding villages is the most beautiful in Hertfordshire and should remain so Alternative available - scrub land around Caddington, easily linked to Luton, M1 airport and railway and central for access to the three counties and London Destruction of wildlife</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3549	Hazel Cussens	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is one of outstanding natural beauty. It is one of the most beautiful scenic landscapes in England. It is rich in wild flowers and wildlife. It is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. The area is designated Green Belt which are intended to be permanent. The villages of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green will be swallowed up. The roads are already overcrowded. Where are the people coming into the area going to find jobs. Other options for urban extensions should be properly evaluated. There are many brown field sites in Luton that could be built on.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Employment land is proposed as part of the Core Strategy. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1969	Dacorum Borough Council	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: We do not want to see significant growth of Caddington or Slip End, which will increase traffic on the Markyate-Slip End Road or lead to development pressures in the adjoining Dacorum countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Site Allocations DPD to identify development opportunities in the residual area</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans to avoid this</p>				
3629	Stephen Daff	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to location in North Herts not Bedfordshire, loss of Green belt, impact on rural communities and quality of life. Consultation with affected local parishes and communities was poor or non-existent and they are not represented on Joint Committee and were not given a chance to lobby. Ignoring advice of Land Use Consultants regarding archaeological sensitivity and inappropriateness of place for development. Need for an East of Luton Corridor is untested and uncoted. Increased traffic on A505 has not been considered and there is already a bottleneck going into Hitchin. People living east of Luton already suffer traffic congestion. There are other more suitable sites such as Bush Wood. An urban extension north of Houghton Regis would put a green buffer zone around Chalton and the only objection is that it wouldn't pay for the East of Luton Corridor. Both N Herts DC and Herts CC are against the EoL proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3422	Vernon Daghish	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I agree with thousands who oppose this crazy idea of one county nicking another's land. When the Vauxhall site eventually closes they could build thousands of homes there. In the winter I go beating on three estates and that will be affected, another county pastime that council officials fail to understand.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. The Delivery Plan will also take into account a range of contingency scenarios to provide flexibility to the strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> The Employment Land Review recommends retaining the Vauxhall site in employment use. Nevertheless, if the Vauxhall site were to become available it would be tested through the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD and not this Core Strategy.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2910	Ms Laura Dale	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development. No consideration taken on how plans will affect current home owners and families. Survey saying want to keep building out of green field areas has been ignored. Road suggestions will create more pollution and they can barely accommodate users as is with quiet road becoming a through road. Village atmosphere and environment will be destroyed and new houses will lack village character. Land to be built on is steep and this means it will not be used to its best advantage which is for wildlife and local plant life. Wildlife will be destroyed or reduced to minimum. The new development will need large new infrastructure, with an eastern extension through Lilley Bottom and is financially problematic in the current economic climate. Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern Bypass. Areas around Caddington are more worthwhile developing. North Herts DC and Herts CC both object strongly to proposal. How did 13 possible expansion areas become 4?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
2976	Alison Darke	Offley	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Scheme is in direct conflict with Core Strategy's own principles and vision. Area is green belt and should remain so. Land Use Consultants said development was not recommended. Rural villages would be wiped out. People attracted to walks on the Chilterns will no longer visit, taking business away from local public houses which are an essential part of village life. Wildlife, including rare red kites, deer and bats and farmland would be adversely affected or wiped out. The proposal for the infrastructure is inadequate and would cause congestion with Hitchin gridlocked. N Herts is against the housing and bypass. Better option is Vauxhall Way. Budget will spiral and additional funding required. Do Councillors with a vested interest abstain from choosing the areas? Much better alternatives exist.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3428	Sheila Darton	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to Leighton Buzzard Eastern Development as queries how the town can cope with another large development; how the health care facilities will be able to cope with an already over stretched service, how the town will cope with yet more cars coming into the town with limited parking, where are all people going to find work as all of the major employers in the town have gone, the provision of infrastructure (schools, and leisure facilities), the future of the narrow gage railway, building houses on the floodplain and loss of the green fields and belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1369	GW Davey	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton extension because: - land is green belt and part of natural beauty, alternative areas in Bedfordshire are not; - the development would lead to increased traffic for the local area and the money should be used on improving rail communication to the airport; - the countryside on the edges of the Chilterns is hilly and would prove more difficult for building and would interfere with an area which acts as a natural area for water catchments; - uncertain where additional water supplies and other resources would be obtained to make provisions for the new development; - employment opportunities in this area are limited for incomers; - the area proposed for development is an EoL area; - a decision taken to recommend development in Hertfordshire by a local authority in Bedfordshire reduces the democratic accountability of those making the proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport, water cycle study and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3559	J Davey	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. The appointed advisors concluded that given the high sensitivity of the landscape, development is not recommended so why go against these advisors? Have had enough expansion in this area with threats of airport expansion and a housing estate built on the Bedfordshire borders and extra noise from the airport. Purchased property because it is in Green Belt and will be surrounded by houses and a road going past but traffic hits the airport way and comes to a standstill. Extra traffic will make this worse. Several extremely attractive villages will be absorbed and countryside lost forever. Wildlife that comes into garden will disappear. Affect on Mangrove Green, Tea Green Cockernhoe and Lilley are mentioned in the literature but not Wandon End which I feel would be affected quite badly. Joint Committee does have other choices such as West Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3563	Killick David	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am writing to object to the East of Luton proposal for the following reasons: - development of Green Belt directly contravenes advice and direction from the Government and the EU - The block of flats and unused land at the junction of Airport Hill and the current Eastern Bypass have remained boarded up and unused for at least 9 years. Current vacant lots like this should be used. - The old Vauxhall motors site is suitable for housing as is Power Court and the old bus station - Extra traffic would cause a severe bottleneck - removal of food producing land - No is no need for more employment space when business parks such as Capability Green are half empty. - What about preservation of wildlife, additional water supply, sewage, new schools, health care, policing, rubbish disposal etc. - The Environment Sensitivity Statement advises that development should not take place.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1741	David Lock Associates	Milton Keynes	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: We seek the inclusion of a specific notation on the Key Diagram for a Rail Freight Interchange facility located on the site of the former Sundon Quarry. We also seek the realignment of the notation for the proposed Strategic Employment Site so that it also extends to the east of the proposed Junction 11a.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the inclusion of Sundon Quarry would be useful</p>				
3647	Ivor Davies	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: In Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts, there are 5 stated purposes of land included within the green belt: 1. To check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. 2. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. How can we encroach on green belt land and indeed over the County boundary into Hertfordshire be justified in any situation, the area is already under the threat of Luton Airport and the west of Stevenage developments. Many small villages will be swallowed up, with a loss of farmland and recreational areas, as well as the erosion of buffer environmental zones, with an increase of noise and pollution due to the infrastructure works and completed development, which will affect the whole region.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3979	Jackie Davies	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development due to: land is in Herts and should fall under East of England plan. NHDC and HCC against proposal; Land is Green Belt designed to stop rural communities and villages being engulfed by urban sprawl as mentioned in CS. Will engulf Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and severely affect Breachwood Green, Lilley, Tea Green in contradiction to plan; Non controlling council should not be able to change a status; Area is AONB with wildlife that'll disappear. Loss of woodland and essential wildlife habitat. Disruption to Herts countryside from moving HPG pipelines; local road infrastructure already under pressure. Bypasses will add to traffic problem, not alleviate it and Eastern bypass will be too expensive. Housing targets unrealistic. Herts CC recently challenged similar development successfully and Luton and S Beds should consider same. Hard to see that environmental studies led to this as best option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2365	E C Davies	St Albans	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development includes building in Lilley Bottom which is one of the most attractive areas in the North Herts/South Beds region. Whilst there are calls for more housing it seems unnecessary to absorb so much attractive countryside. Building on land between Luton Airport and Breachwood Green is unacceptable due to aircraft noise. In addition, rail, road and water capacity are under strain already.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing.</p>				
3711	Jackie Davies	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land falls completely within Hertfordshire, not Bedfordshire and should fall under the East of England development plan. NHDC and HCC are totally against any development in this area. Contrary to the use of green belt to prevent small communities being engulfed by urban sprawl (mentioned in the Core Strategy), Mangrove Green and Cockernhoe will be completely engulfed, while Breachwood Green, Lilley and Tea Green will be severely affected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1518	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: This is a unilateral strategy that has not been developed in conjunction with the other local government organisations which are directly affected by it. Hertfordshire has its own allocation of houses but chose not to do so in this area as it is strategic green belt. This is another attempt by Luton BC to expand into North Herts and reduce the quality of life of North Herts residents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Hertfordshire have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment, and environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2995	Pam and M Davies	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to development to the East of Luton owing to its location in North Hertfordshire as well as its impact on the landscape (notably the chalk valley of Lilly Bottom), and the impact on the villages and hamlets of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green. Also objects to the loss of countryside enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders throughout Herts and Beds and vast areas of productive farmland that would result. Concerned also about the loss of fauna and flora and the loss of opportunity to enjoy this with relatives. States that the development would cause more congestion on the already over crowded roads surrounding Hitchin. Acknowledges that the houses are needed but states that Beds Council should build in Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3469	John Davies	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development due to impact on Green Belt, landscape, villages, impact on Lilley Bottom, recreation space, impact on wildlife. No amount of mitigation measures can provide any meaningful protection of historic environment. Assumptions made about N Herts DC's ability to incorporate additional infrastructure into own emerging LDF. No technical feasibility study or environmental impact assessment done. Proposed development and associated bypasses will have serious implications for traffic and congestion beyond Luton &amp; South Beds boundaries. No adequate investigation or feasibility study into provision of water or the effect on the chalk aquifer. The area covered by preliminary studies did not include the proposed development area and groundwater Source Protection Zones have not been adequately taken into account. Disputes claim that the site has good potential for infiltration as no data has been gathered and the presence of SPZs indicates complex and expensive infiltration arrangements.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3949	Jessica Davis	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. We must stop destroying historic buildings, landmarks and Green Belt; building ugly concrete monstrosities. The development and bypass will permanently destroy an AONB, wildlife and landscape from our planet. It is offensive that the housing for Luton and South Beds is being proposed for Hertfordshire. There are brown field sites within Luton where services are already in place. Any development in NW Hertfordshire would adversely affect its status on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and wildlife, especially deer. Such developments contradict LBC's own policy ENV1. The surrounding infrastructure would be unable to cope with the increase in traffic, promoting health and safety risks and creating rat runs through country lanes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
2156	Jessica Davis	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2153	Issabel Davis	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development East of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2154	Helen Davis	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3910	Mrs A L Dawes	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons House development to occur in designated Green Belt Land Impact on the rural environs of the villages of Mangrove Green and Cockerhoe and make them part of Luton The proposed development would damage and degrade an existing AONB Better development alternatives are available within Bedfordshire without seeking to build upon land which is within the boundary of Hertfordshire				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.				
JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
2103	Mr & Mrs Heather & Anthony De Lacey	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
Comment: Loss of Green Belt land Loss of important wildlife habitats Concern over flood risk The burden on existing infrastructure The impact on the narrow gauge railway				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.				
1566	Mrs Margaret Denny	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
Comment: Objects to proposed development E of Leighton Buzzard because: it's a historic town surrounded by Green Belt; huge amount of housing in last 30 years but no increase in infrastructure provision despite promises of local council and developers; net loss of employment; will increase pressure on local jobs, transport network; health services and schools now overstretched and no new schools for recent development; facilities promised but not delivered whilst more development is allowed. Put infrastructure in place before development goes ahead; traffic on roads and in town unacceptable levels; town not designed for existing traffic; L Linslade is a country town, should be surrounded by countryside, not concrete. Danger of merging with Aylesbury to the west if development is allowed.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding to ensure deliverability. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3928	A Dickinson	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Having lived and farmed in close proximity to Lilley Bottom Road I am very much aware of the beauty of the area and the land quality. The whole area is of outstanding natural beauty and this must be retained for the benefit of future generations. It is an area that will flood readily in adverse conditions. Luton Council fail to listen and take into consideration the objections which are raised from residents of North Herts and also Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3902	Mrs Margaret Dickinson	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Impact on the beautiful scenery in Hertfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2586	Margaret Dines	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: More development erodes countryside, necessitates more roads, leading to more cars and more pollution. Green areas are needed and proposal will destroy beautiful part of county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
972	Michael Dines	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL because: Land is Green Belt, forms natural eastern boundary to Luton and supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is an invaluable recreational facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets and blight villages. Negative effect on woodland, lives and movements of animals, particularly herds of deer. No detailed analysis of alternatives. North Herts District Council does not support development. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Possible benefits of northern bypass are not proven. Bypasses will benefit those outside Luton, rather than those in Luton. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will the infrastructure be funded? Development will over stretch retail, hospitals and educational facilities. Century Park requires adequate transport infrastructure to be in place. All proposals do not consider available brown field land or incorporate the plans for the Vauxhall site. No supporting financial impact analysis</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2585	John Dines	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: More development erodes countryside, necessitates more roads, leading to more cars and more pollution. Green areas are needed and proposal will destroy beautiful part of county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3528	Mrs Sheila A Dixon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the East of Luton development as this is an area of outstanding beauty. Not only would this destroy the area but would generate a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton that is already congested. The natural habitat would be destroyed causing more pollution and endangering our bird and mammals population.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3752	M Dobbs	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object the spatial Development Strategy on the following grounds; Other options for urban extensions identified in the Core Strategy that would have less impact on the environment. Development to impact on Grade 1 Green Belt Land. The proposed development will be part of the cause for the loss of villages as a result of the urban sprawl. Northern Bypass route cutting through an area of the Chilterns AONB, considered a significant asset for the area. Rural character of Lilley to be lost as a result of the Northern Bypass development impact. Luton Airport has not got potential growth, consequently, it does not require a supporting industrial area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. PPG2 provides basis for Green Belt Reviews.</p>				
3486	Malcolm Docwra	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Protest against explosion of development in Leighton Buzzard. The roads around the town are already at saturation point several hours a day, turning side streets into rat runs and endangering children. Recent developments have been ill-conceived and lacking in expected infrastructure. Housing on the north of Clipstone brook will deliberately encourage flooding. The proposed development will do nothing for the character of the town, which has been eroded almost beyond redemption in the past 25 years.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3998	Neil and Karin Dodds	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to the East of Luton proposals. This is Green Belt land and is a precious resource for North Herts both economically as farm land and as a beautiful, peaceful area for all to enjoy. It would destroy a unique area and create traffic congestion problems.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2764	Lesley Dollin	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development. Other areas are mentioned in the Core Strategy which have not been given equal evaluation. Area is designated as Green Belt and should not be developed but protected. Local villages would be swallowed up, disappearing under urban sprawl unlike other proposed areas. Lilley Bottom, wildlife and a valued amenity would disappear forever. The Northern Bypass would cut through an AONB, destroying it at great loss to the area and would not solve the traffic problems within Luton. The infrastructure cannot support the proposal and the development cannot support the cost of putting in it place, so the cost will fall on others, including Luton. Hertfordshire has its own housing quota to fulfil and the houses would not count towards Hertfordshire's allocation. There are suitable brownfield sites within Luton. Luton Airport does not require an additional service road, it is adequately served by the M1-Airport Link. Additional traffic would bring enormous problems to the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2922	William Dollin	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There are options areas other than Area L mentioned in the Core Strategy which have not received the same evaluation as Area L and that would cause less impact on the environment such as land to the West of Luton. Area L is green belt with a high landscape value (Grade 1) and should be protected at all costs. The villages of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green would disappear Lack of infrastructure to support 5,500 dwellings would mean additional vehicles in the area and the development would not be able to finance the requirements for all road, social and community infrastructure Hertfordshire should not shoulder Bedfordshire's burden of 5,500 houses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure..</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2903	Denise Dollin	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There are options areas other than Area L mentioned in the Core Strategy which have not received the same evaluation as Area L and that would cause less impact on the environment such as land to the West of Luton. Area L is green belt with a high landscape value (Grade 1) and should be protected at all costs. The villages of Cockerthoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green would disappear Lack of infrastructure to support 5,500 dwellings would mean additional vehicles in the area and the development would not be able to finance the requirements for all road, social and community infrastructure Hertfordshire should not shoulder Bedfordshire's burden of 5,500 houses</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	Site Assessment Matrix outlines how each of the sites have been evaluated. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis as well as employment land needs.			
3149	Patrick Donlea	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt which is intended to be permanent and forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerthoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A major development requires extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for eastern and northern bypasses which is financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. The draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became 4, including beautiful Green Belt land. Objects to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule, delivery commitments and viability of the proposals. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.			
3148	Susan Donlea	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt which is intended to be permanent and forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerthoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A major development requires extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for eastern and northern bypasses which is financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. The draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became 4, including beautiful Green Belt land. Objects to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 sites. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3881	David Dorman	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development for the following reasons: Live in Mangrove Green and enjoy the unspoilt beauty. Development will ruin countryside and wildlife forever. Invasion of Green Belt land, non-viable, uncostered, ill thought out infrastructure requirements. Bypass across Lilley Bottom with attendant rise in traffic. People would prefer good quality accommodation closer to the centre of Luton with good access to transport, M1 and town centre facilities rather than being stuck in an ill thought out development in the countryside. There are many brownfield sites in Luton that should be exploited fully before encroaching on the Green Belt. Planning Committee in one area should not try to impose building plans on a neighbouring separate area as this is cynical, underhand and undemocratic. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial impact analysis to test the proposals. Joint Planning Committee took decisions without members of the Committee having technical analyses.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1564	Ms Jane Dorman	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to 5,500 homes in N Herts Green Belt because: impact on beautiful, irreplaceable area of Herts green belt countryside, diversity of wildlife and flora in area; Queries whether JC members have walked and appreciated its beautiful paths woodlands and seen the deer, hares, many rare birds and acres of blue bell carpeted woodland and other beautiful natural sights in area; sheer impracticality of required infrastructure and the extent of the heavily congested routes either side of the proposed area. Queries how bypass proposals do anything but aggravate the existing problems. Considers that brownfield sites within Luton and around the airport should be used and house building should be concentrated within the town and within the county of Bedfordshire where the Joint Committee's electoral responsibilities lie. the Draft Core Strategy has been issued without proper, detailed financial impact analysis to test proposals and without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding.</p>				
3220	DP9	London	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the location of the 3 urban extensions in Central Bedfordshire and the urban first principle.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3267	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects owing to the exclusion of West of Linslade and the reliance on urban extensions which have significant infrastructure requirements. Contentds that the decision on the preferred options was taken without sufficient evidence and without consideration of the merits or otherwise of any site. Identifies that the Core Strategy must allow for delivery of the sustainable urban extensions to meet housing targets, particularly if the Core Strategy Preferred Options fail to prove their availability and deliverability within the timescales.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1250	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It would be impossible to dump all the mass housing in these areas without affecting anything! It does not make sense!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The scale of the development proposed in the East of England Plan and its Review will have an impact on this area. The Core Strategy seeks to ensure that the positive impacts are delivered and the negative impacts mitigated.</p>				
1456	Sir and Lady Maurice Drake	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We strongly object to large-scale urban extensions to the east of Luton and invasion of beautiful Hertfordshire countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix . Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3966	D Drew	Dunstable	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL due to: in direct conflict with CS principles and vision; on Green Belt land and against LUC's advice; several attractive villages will be absorbed; N bypass will dissect Chilterns AONB and make Lilley unattractive even if no houses built on AONB. Support for 'Black Route' is from people living in Inner Route who don't want bypass near them; contradicts 11.4 supporting biodiversity; landscape is important nationally; Bats in area and rare birds; historically, culturally and archaeologically important area; propels in N Herts and CS cannot allocate land; N Herts against development. Other more suitable options available on lower grade green belt and needing no public funding; full orbital detrimental to Luton town centre. Alternative is to widen Vauxhall Way, linking to M1. Did Councillors with vested interest abstain from voting? Assumptions made regarding traffic. N Herts would have to fund infrastructure eg schools which is wrong.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3485	Drivers Jonas	London	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: USS supports Preferred Option CS1 as it will focus new development within existing urban areas and include an urban extension to Dunstable. USS notes that priority will be given to the main conurbation to the east of the Growth Area, and urges the Joint Committee to ensure that future development should support the town centres and surrounding areas, and that additional retail floorspace will not have a detrimental impact on the existing retail provision.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree			
Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this				
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
3274	Drivers Jonas for and on behalf of Universities Superannuation Scheme		Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd (USS) owns the White Lion Retail Park in Dunstable. Supports CS1 as it will focus new development within existing urban areas and include an urban extension to Dunstable. Notes priority given to the conurbation to the east of the Growth Area and urges the Joint Committee to ensure that future development supports town centres and surrounding areas and that additional retail floor space will not have a detrimental impact on existing retail provision.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree			
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
3587	Mr Patrick Dyer	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Would cover a vast area of beautiful countryside and is situated in Green Belt which is set up to protect against urban sprawl. The proposed Luton bypass through Lilley Bottom is inappropriate as is the proposal to construct a new employment area towards Breachwood Green. Proposals will create enormous increase in traffic and problems such as flooding due to covering of natural springs and run off. Will ruin a beautiful area, with small villages such as Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green being swamped and losing their identities. Will be to the detriment of residents in the area as well as people who use the countryside including Luton residents. Proposals come from a county with no jurisdiction over the land affected. Other available options should have been considered more seriously. This area should be removed from the list of options.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3593	Mrs Patricia Dyer	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Would cover a vast area of beautiful countryside and is situated in Green Belt which is set up to protect against urban sprawl. The proposed Luton bypass through Lilley Bottom is inappropriate as is the proposal to construct a new employment area towards Breachwood Green. Proposals will create enormous increase in traffic and problems such as flooding due to covering of natural springs and run off. Will ruin a beautiful area, with small villages such as Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green being swamped and losing their identities. Will be to the detriment of residents in the area as well as people who use the countryside including Luton residents. Proposals come from a county with no jurisdiction over the land affected. Other available options should have been considered more seriously. This area should be removed from the list of options.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2486	John Earl	Knebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the implementation of the East of Luton plans due to the massive adverse impact on areas of outstanding natural beauty and the absence of a sufficiently thorough planning process given the scale and impact of the proposals. Less damaging opportunities have not been developed or considered. I utilise Lilley Bottom and the surrounding areas for cycling and rambling often and know that implementation of the proposals would devastate some of our most scenic and environmentally important countryside. Some of the details of the proposed link road run counter to national policy in respect of routes through areas of outstanding natural beauty.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1576	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Preferred Option CS1 identifies a focus on urban areas for growth, but also recognises that in order to accommodate the scale of growth aspired to in the RSS and MKSMSRS a number of sustainable urban extensions will be required. Critically, whilst three of these lie within the control of this core strategy, the fourth is in North Hertfordshire and there is no indication as to whether they are supportive of this policy approach. This is clearly a significant issue and will need to be resolved through a positive approach to joint working if the preferred option is to be deliverable.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: Delivery Strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: A positive approach to joint working is needed if the preferred option is to be deliverable</p>				
1655	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with green infrastructure?</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 11</p>				
1637	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with culture and leisure?</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 8</p>				
1602	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The document does address the growth needs with the administrative areas of Luton and South Bedfordshire including new infrastructure. However, the treatment of allocations, including infrastructure, to North Hertfordshire District, without a joint approach being taken, does not accord with the spirit of the MKSM or with policy SS8 of the East of England Plan. In reviewing the strategy, the allocations in North Hertfordshire were considered as assumptions rather than as firm allocations.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: Delivery Strategy will outline procedure for delivery in North Herts.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1649	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Are any major transport generators covered by appropriate policies?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is indicating general agreement with strategy				
1617	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Is there a policy dealing with the green belt? Local policy should protect the integrity of the green belt and enhance the character of the urban fringe. The green belt revision around Luton is not included in policy SS4 because reviews were highlighted in the Milton Keynes and South Midlands sub-regional Strategy. This included two areas - west of Dunstable to the A6 in the north and east and south east of Luton. Housing allocations to 2021 were included and reviewed during the preparation of the East of England Plan. The panel report on the East of England Plan identified the potential for compensatory green belt extensions for the Luton (para. 4.24). However, the Secretary of State noted that all of rural South Bedfordshire is already greenbelt and that no extension was required (GO-East (2006) page 15). The adopted East of England Plan notes that the previous structure plan provides a sound basis for redefining boundaries (para.3.34). This policy included extension to the boundary in North Hertfordshire.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy document to address this				
JC Reason for Response: Clarification of the approach to Green Belt boundary revisions would be helpful				
1622	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Is the East of England Plan employment target met? Regional policy on employment around Luton is limited. Policy E1 sets a target for this area of 23,000 jobs between 2001 and 2021; the document supports and continues this approach. The preferred policies allocate a strategic employment site east of Luton in the district of North Hertfordshire. The MKSM strategy refers to the growth of Luton airport and the East of England Plan refers to the need to make provision for direct and indirect employment.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy plans to meet regional targets				
1629	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Is the East of England Plan housing target met? Is there a 15 year plan for housing delivery? The growth of Luton within the boundary of North Hertfordshire was envisaged when the MKSM strategy and the East of England plan were developed. Growth rates to 2021 were identified by the MKSM strategy but precise numbers for each district were not identified. The East of England Plan does not identify the number of homes allocated to the North Hertfordshire part of the resultant Luton growth and excludes this growth from their allocation in policy H1.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy plans to meet regional targets				
1592	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy plans to deliver sustainable development				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1663	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Is the achievement of a high quality built environment addressed?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Approach to achieving high quality design is covered largely in National Guidance and advice. Local advice will be provided in Urban Design SPD.				
1661	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Are conservation and enhancement of the historic environment addressed?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Chapter 12 outlines approach to mitigating impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage				
1607	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Is there a policy to address regeneration? Is there a clear retail hierarchy? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Regeneration is a key principle that runs through the document and is particularly covered in Chapter 8.				
4003	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Demonstrate that a robust evidence base has been published, supporting the expansion of east of Luton. State the specific criteria to be considered in planning for the implementation of the east of Luton SUE. Provide further information and detail on infrastructure needs and costs, phasing, funding sources and responsibilities for delivery. EoL is supported by RSS policy PPS7, €Strategic reviews of the green belt in north Hertfordshire. Clarify the text on the implementation of urban extensions regarding employment opportunities by including reference to existing major employment sites. The policy should also be re-worded to require levels of employment that are bespoke to each development, given its site-specific circumstances. We are encouraged that NHDC will be planning the extension east of Luton and assume that the joint/ cross-border working arrangements will ensure consistency between Core Strategies.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Support for policy CS1 is welcomed. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage which will contain sufficient detail to be able to test their deliverability within the plan period. All the proposals including land to the East of Luton will continue to be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal.				
1356	Mr Roger Eastwood	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Strongly objects to the East of Luton extension which is on green belt land. Houses are not required as plenty of empty properties that could be used instead. There are brownfield sites in Luton that could be used without resorting to the destruction of the countryside. Development would lead to increased traffic and negative environmental impacts. Development would put pressure on local social and community infrastructure resources including commuter seats on trains into London. Development would lead to loss of villages in Hertfordshire and the destruction of the countryside. The plan is ill thought and appalling and should be abandoned.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3224	Mr Roger Eastwood	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed Northern and Eastern Luton bypasses being built on Hertfordshire Green Belt and parts of an AONB. This is outdated thinking, environmental vandalism and thought this sort of planning was a thing of the past. New road routes generate new traffic journeys and any new roads would fill up with new traffic, and there would have to be a Luton bypass like Newbury. Increased air pollution and huge volumes of traffic from M1 would be dumped on A505 to Hitchin. There are existing roads that are adequate for traffic eg Vauxhall Way and recently widened approach from the South. Destruction of Hertfordshire countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the transport assessments and site viability assessments. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3044	Miss Gemma Eastwood	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development, Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1968	Eaton Bray Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2110	Edlesborough Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strategy, vision and objectives driven by need to build more houses rather than other way round. Overall strategy lacks ambition, no control over deliverables except housing. Plan requires development on Green Belt, allowing urban sprawl instead of considering options for housing provision in existing urban landscape. Redevelop and regenerate existing urban areas before extensions. LB has employment problems so hold off extensions. Developing urban areas first will benefit new busway. Limiting parking provision will not work. No real commitment to public transport or inducements to limit private car use. 'Affordable' not defined. What proportion of new houses will be social? New houses exceed new jobs being created. How many jobs for LB to support new homes? Build houses to support job growth, not vice versa. Low amount of renewable energy in area is recognised and likely to remain so, an opportunity has been missed. Limited or no ambition to provide energy efficient homes</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing and Infrastructure Delivery Strategy to be prepared. Pre Submission Core Strategy to address in more detail approach to public transport, jobs and climate change.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Pre Submission document needs to include greater amplification of the approach to delivery, particularly of infrastructure and housing. National guidance provides significant advice on climate change and a local approach is being developed. Chapter 5 outlines a broad range of public transport measures. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2975	Tim Edwards	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to build in excess of 5,500 houses on the eastern side of Luton along with a traffic bypass. A large area of Greenbelt and the character of the neighbouring villages would be lost as Luton spills over into North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
4278	Jane E Edwards		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East Luton development, Northern Bypass (Black Route) and Eastern Bypass owing to: Impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to Chapter 11; Contrary to advice in LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Lack of consideration to historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts territory who oppose the development; its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme which is for 5,500 homes, requires no public funding, is on lower grade Green Belt, roads are not on farmland and incorporates LTFC stadium. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible. It is not possible to accommodate all the development needed into existing urban areas.</p>				
2782	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Key Diagram is a travesty of the facts, ignoring the rural communities around Leighton Linnsdale.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Impact on the rural communities around Leighton Linnsdale has been considered</p>				
3692	A Eggleton	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land to the east of Luton is Greenbelt land designated AOB. Thousands of Stopsley residents use the area to go walking and cycling whilst taking in what can only be described as breathtaking views and enjoying the peace and healthy exercise. Withdraw the outrageous proposals and give full and fair consideration to all the other options. The existing road structure is clogged-up on a daily basis and these proposals will turn the road structure into total chaos.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation spaces.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3951	John Elliott	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register my opposition to proposals to develop the area east of Luton. the landscape of Lilley Bottom and around is one of the most attractive areas of Herts and Beds and current proposals would wreck the peace of this valuable resource.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
1852	Environment Agency		Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The urban extension to Leighton Buzzard should emphasise reduction of flood risk from the Clipstone Brook, in line with the Great Ouse Catchment Flood Management Plan. Consider allocation of land uses (especially employment) to prevent pollution of sensitive groundwater quality. Refer to the EA Groundwater Protection Policy. Mention water services infrastructure and flood risk- drainage in last bullet of 'implementing urban extensions'. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: Ensure flood risk is appropriately mitigated</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS will ensure development is accommodated whilst minimising exacerbating the risk of flooding. All mitigation measures will be deployed to this effect.</p>				
3622	Janet Evans	Baldock	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The development east of Luton would destroy a vast tract of beautiful Hertfordshire Green Belt and choke roads for miles around. It is incredible that unelected officials are able to override the views of Hertfordshire Councillors, not to mention the people of North Herts. There are plenty of areas where building could take place in Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1570	Mr and Mrs Gary Evans	Hockliffe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East of Leighton Buzzard expansion. South of Leighton Buzzard has already suffered massive housing development over the recent years with little or none of the promised additional infrastructure or public services. This historical market town is struggling to cope and cannot sustain any further large-scale development. Green belt land must be preserved for the present and future generations. The land in question is a wildlife haven, home to many animals and birds and the loss of such habitat would be horrific. Large areas of green and beautiful countryside which surrounds Leighton Buzzard and its villages will vanish forever. Leighton Buzzard is only 15 minutes from Milton Keynes and these proposals would combine to almost completely erode the green belt between Leighton Buzzard and Hockliffe.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Account has been taken of recent completions in Leighton Linslade. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain and gap between Leighton Linslade and neighbouring settlements.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3435	Alan Evans	Baldock	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The East of Luton invasion would destroy a vast tract of beautiful Hertfordshire Green Belt and choke roads for miles around. I find it almost incredible that unlected officials are able to over ride the views of Hertfordshire Councillors. A council which tries to meet its housing targets at the expense of residents of an area to whom it is not accountable is using tactics redolent of those of the former Soviet Union. There are plenty of areas where building could take place in Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2643	Elaine Evans	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Loss of Green Belt Destruction of villages Increases in traffic Detrimental effect on countryside Lowering standard of living</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2684	Simon Evans	Baldock	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: green buffer between Hitchin and Luton will become urban sprawl Destruction of Hertfordshire Green Belt Traffic congestion Undemocratic behaviour by Bedfordshire councillors Plenty of areas available to meet targets</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage</p>				
3144	Ellen M Everett	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton preventing further urban sprawl. It will engulf hamlets and impact on villages. It will require extensive infrastructure, hence the proposals for the northern and eastern bypasses which would destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. The Highways Agency does not support the northern bypass so how will this be funded? The Draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial impacts to test the proposals. Pleased that N Herts DC does not support the proposal and like them is mystified as to how 13 possible expansion areas become just 4, including beautiful Green Belt land? As a long term resident of Breachwood Green has no wish to see area urbanised. Area provides much needed recreational space valued by Lutonians as well as locals. Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3147	David Everett	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton preventing further urban sprawl. It will engulf hamlets and impact on villages. It will require extensive infrastructure, hence the proposals for the northern and eastern bypasses which would destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. The Highways Agency does not support the northern bypass so how will this be funded? The Draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial impacts to test the proposals. Pleased that N Herts DC does not support the proposal and like them is mystified as to how 13 possible expansion areas become just 4, including beautiful Green Belt land? As a long term resident of Breachwood Green has no wish to see area urbanised. Area provides much needed recreational space valued by Lutonians as well as locals. Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3706	Keith Ewington	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. The land falls completely within Hertfordshire, not Bedfordshire and should fall under the East of England development plan. NHDC and HCC are totally against any development in this area. Contrary to the use of green belt to prevent small communities being engulfed by urban sprawl (mentioned in the Core Strategy), Mangrove Green and Cockernhoe will be completely engulfed, while Breachwood Green, Lilley and Tea Green will be severely affected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3988	Keith Ewington	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development due to: land is in Herts and should fall under East of England plan. NHDC and HCC against proposal; Land is Green Belt designed to stop rural communities and villages being engulfed by urban sprawl as mentioned in CS. Will engulf Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and severely affect Breachwood Green, Lilley, Tea Green in contradiction to plan; Non controlling council should not be able to change a status; Area is AONB with wildlife that'll disappear. Loss of woodland and essential wildlife habitat. Disruption to Herts countryside from moving HPG pipelines; local road infrastructure already under pressure. Bypasses will add to traffic problem, not alleviate it and Eastern bypass will be too expensive. Housing targets unrealistic. Herts CC recently challenged similar development successfully and Luton and S Beds should consider same. Hard to see that environmental studies led to this as best option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: In drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2901	Mr M A Fairey	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposed incursion into Hertfordshire				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2900	L Fairey	Hatfield	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposed incursion into Hertfordshire				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2902	Mrs M J Fairey	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposed incursion into Hertfordshire				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3655	Dawn Farey	Offley	Q. 4	No
Comment: We are writing to protest against planned East of Luton development. The infrastructure such as water, electricity and sewerage etc would need total re-creation. The area also relies on surrounding fields to absorb heavy rainfall - with a significant risk of flooding were they to be built over. It will also result in unsustainable levels of traffic from Luton to Baldock. Thirdly, the location is an area of spectacular beauty. It is co-dependent on the adjacent AONB. Development of this location would therefore conflict with both central Government policies and the Core Strategy Preferred Option CS15 to preserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure (including water infrastructure) and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate run off.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3234	Leslie Farley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal will build on green belt land destroying a large area of Hertfordshire's countryside and villages. If this development goes ahead the dwellings should be counted against Hertfordshire's targets.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3091	Anne Faulkner	Spalding	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands there are proposals to develop East of Luton and considers this a great shame as it is a particularly beautiful area. Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3093	Mr Derek Faulkner	Spalding	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Understands there are proposals to develop East of Luton and considers this a great shame as it is a particularly beautiful area. Understands proposal is against policy because: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people; is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts territory; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3556	Brian and Jennifer Feaver	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Committee's proposals East of Luton would destroy an area of prime countryside the size of 20,000 football pitches. There is clearly insufficient infrastructure to support the plans. The road system is already close to gridlock and there is also a water shortage, not to mention the fact that the sewage would need to be catered for. There should be sufficient brown field sites to negate the need to erode the remaining Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport as well as community and water infrastructure. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions in this area. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2102	Mr Sean Felstead	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the impact new development in Leighton Buzzard has on surrounding villages Existing infrastructure cannot cope with further development Objects to any loss of Green Belt land</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
3159	Christopher Fenn	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the East of Luton is green belt land and borders an area of AONB. It would impact on village identity and create excessive traffic. The proposal does not consider the knock on effect of crime on villages neither the many areas of brownfield land available. The proposal falls outside the administrative county boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2647	Kim Fenn	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Wrong to develop in Green Belt Vital to protect Lilley Bottom as an area of outstanding beauty Vital to keep villages intact Would create excessive traffic, damaging residents and environment Essential not to lose area which is used and enjoyed by people on daily basis Proposed link road will go through AONB and damage wildlife Should use alternative road identified on east of Luton linking into Round Green Crime in Luton would migrate to villages Should develop brownfield sites in Luton Chosen as 'easy' option, but proposals poorly thought out and strategy flawed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3145	Caroline Ferris-Brown	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton preventing urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development this size will be disastrous for the land which will be lost for good. The area is full of wildlife and protected species, beautiful trees and landscape. A major development requires extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for eastern and northern bypasses which is financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. The draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became 4, including beautiful Green Belt land. Loss of wildlife.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2880	D C Finch	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Questions the right that Bedfordshire County Council have to consider building outside their allocated boundaries, particularly given the brown field sites there are in Bedfordshire County. States that it is the duty and obligation of the Joint Committee to exhaust these sites before encroaching on Green Belt land. States that the area proposed for development in the Green Belt is an area of outstanding beauty and contains many wildlife species native to the area whose habitat would be destroyed by the development. Identifies the congestion problems on the A505 en route to Hitchin. Suggests that the Joint Committee rethink the decision to develop East of Luton and look within Bedfordshire to meet its development needs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2465	Mrs L J Finch	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to its Green Belt designation and its known outstanding beauty and wildlife. Questions why Green Belt land is being used when there is brownfield land that is available for all this housing, bypasses and park ride. Also objects to the impact that the development will have on peoples lives.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2884	Mr PC Fish	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed attack on countryside around Lilley Bottom (East of Luton proposal). Impact on wildlife, some of which are protected species. Other sites in Luton are available. Detrimental affect on village life.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2883	Mrs JA Fish	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed attack on countryside around Lilley Bottom (East of Luton proposal). Impact on wildlife, some of which are protected species. Other sites in Luton are available. Detrimental affect on village life.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1573	Ruth Fisher	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton urban extension because of lack of water. If the development goes ahead there will be water rationing in the area within a very short time.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The findings of the Water Cycle study do not highlight major issues with water in this area. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1367	EJ Fisher	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East of Luton extension for housing on green belt and the Luton by-pass proposals because: - the green belt was established to maintain spaces between the urban areas, it should remain sacrosanct as originally intended; - transport links from the east of Luton to the town centre are already overloaded and any new housing will increase the overload. The proposed by-passes are irrelevant and it will not take traffic to and from the town centre. - sewage from the proposed housing will have to be pumped - will they be able to cope with the increased volume; - the introduction of these extra people to the area will exacerbate unemployment problems in Luton, south Beds and north Herts; - don't understand how Luton Borough and Central Beds can proposed this development outside their own area where it is unwanted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing as well as assessment of water infrastructure capacity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3945	Mrs S Fitt	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I most strongly object to the proposal to build 5,500 houses East of Luton along with two bypasses. Several extremely attractive villages would be absorbed with this scheme. The Core Strategy includes large areas of outstanding natural beauty which is a significant asset for the area. Has a bat survey been commissioned? There are also Iron Age and Roman sites of national importance. North Herts are firmly against the proposals so why are Luton and South Beds persisting with it? The A505 is already congested and Hitchin already gridlocked at peak hours. There is also a Green Belt that is supposed to be protected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
896	Angela Fleckney	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
899	Kevin Fleckney	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
898	Mrs Joan Fleckney	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3038	Mr and Mrs Fletcher	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Luton Northern Bypass and the development to the North of Luton owing to the impact on the landscape and the impact on Streatley as well as the impact on the infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1251	Mr AM Flint	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the East of Luton is Green Belt and forms the natural boundary of Luton, a town that already sprawls over a large area. The land is used by many residents in the east of Luton as a recreation area. Too many parts of the countryside are being concreted over and ruined. Traffic is already terrible, particularly Crawley Green Road and the route through the airport and Kimpton Road. Hospitals, schools and the airport cannot stand anymore traffic disruption. Development is not supported by North Herts District Council. There is a need to know how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 and included this beautiful Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3143	Mr AM Flint	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and the issuing of the Draft Core Strategy for the following reasons: The land is Green Belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton which already sprawls over a large area. The land is used by many east of Luton residents for recreation and too much beautiful countryside is being concreted and ruined. Traffic to the east of Luton is already bad and cannot handle any more. Not only road, but other infrastructure will be overstretched. Luton airport, a valuable resource for Luton cannot handle any more traffic disruption. N Herts DC does not support the proposal. How did 13 possible expansion areas become just 4, including beautiful Green Belt land?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2432	Mrs PA Flury	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton Preferred Option in North Hertfordshire. The River Mimram has flooded before and caused a great deal of hardship. The character of Lillie Bottom will be destroyed and one of the most attractive areas of countryside would be lost forever. It is unjustifiable to lose a large area of Green Belt and destroy the small villages of Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2384	Lindsey Ford	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton development because: - The proposed infrastructure is non-viable - Empty homes should be rebuilt or refurbished as they are closer to amenities, transport etc - Thousands of new homes are being rejected by housing associations as they are not of a high enough standard. There are as many as 100,000 unsold new build homes in the UK - this could be another such case. - Estates adjacent to the proposed development already have a number of factories and offices empty so the proposed employment provision is not needed. - The proposal to the west of Luton has not been properly considered. - The development to the East of Luton is not supported by North Herts Council - The land is designated as Green Belt and forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3758	Helen Ford	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for development east of Luton will swamp the hamlets of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight Lilley, Tea Green, Wandon End and Offley and eventually affect Darley Hall and Breachwood Green. This beautiful part of Hertfordshire (missing AONB status only as an oversight) is used by many people including residents of Luton, ramblers, cyclists and naturalists. There is an abundance of wildlife including a herd of fallow deer, rare red kites and ancient woodland with bluebells and blossom. It is also a major cereal crop producer; especially important in the light of a critical world shortage. I object to these ill conceived proposals that have clearly been put forward without proper regard for more suitable alternatives. Green Belt land should be built on only when no alternatives are available. This is clearly not the case as far as this development is concerned.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				
3754	Mr Ralph Ford	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for development east of Luton will swamp the hamlets of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight Lilley, Tea Green, Wandon End and Offley and eventually affect Darley Hall and Breachwood Green. The proposal is a cynical attempt to avoid the responsibilities and electoral implications of meeting housing targets by annexing land in an adjoining county and to justify the long standing desire for a northern bypass. I was dismayed by the manner in which these proposals were bulldozed through without the alternative schemes being put forward for debate or discussion, despite their obvious advantages regarding accessibility to existing infrastructure. Green Belt land should be built on only when no alternatives are available. This is clearly not the case and I urge you to reject this ill considered proposal.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3551	Gerald Ford	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is one of outstanding natural beauty. It is one of the most beautiful scenic landscapes in England. It is rich in wild flowers and wildlife. It is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. The area is designated Green Belt which are intended to be permanent. The villages of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green will be swallowed up. The roads are already overcrowded. Where are the people coming into the area going to find jobs. Other options for urban extensions should be properly evaluated. There are many brown field sites in Luton that could be built on.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Employment land is proposed as part of the Core Strategy. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3199	Mr Ralph Ford	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is a beautiful green belt area. Land Use Consultants advised against development on the proposed scale due to the area's strong character and high quality. They conclude that large of tall developments which would impinge on the distinctive chalk valley landscape of Lilley Bottom Valley should be avoided. They also recommend the conservation of the network of sunken narrow lanes and associated hedges. A proposal such as this cannot be considered without having funding in place.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate the impact of development based on the advice in the LUC report where practical.</p>				
3025	J Ford	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to the impact of the development on: the current levels of congestion, especially along Stockingstone Road, Crawley Green Road and Putteridge Road the wildlife including red kites, deer and monkjacks the school at Cockernhoe Feels that the plans have been developed without the Joint Committee doing its homework. Questions what is meant by "affordable housing" and how many young people will be able to afford to buy these houses who are on minimum wage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Affordable housing will be provided as guidance in PPS3.</p>				
2915	Mrs Gina Foulker	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the east of Luton is of particular natural beauty as well as of wildlife and amenity value. Look at the independent environmental assessment. The proposal will introduce yet more traffic. Revisit brownfield land, converting and re-using of buildings within your own boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3575	P Fountaine	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose Leighton Buzzard eastern development incurring the loss of Green Belt land which is an important habitat for various species of wildlife. People who enjoy riding on the NATIONAL HERITAGE RAILWAY are able to head into lovely countryside which is most enjoyable, relaxing and pleasurable and relieves stress. These benefits cannot be measured in monetary terms, which seems this development is all about, the old adage and promise of infrastructure fools no one, Billington Park, Sandhills are great examples. Development on flood plains could spell disaster for the future and global warming. Because of the employment situation, most people will be commuters, adding chaos to an already congested road system. The credit crunch has proved that these houses are not needed; we only have to survey the ones standing empty at this time.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: Test and refine development proposals</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Evidence studies provide basis for preferred options including the Site Assessment Matrix. PPG2 provides basis for Green Belt Reviews. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3973	Roger Fox	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The proposed area for development constitutes an AONB Proposed development made outside council's jurisdiction The proposed development would greatly degrade the standard life of everyone living in Hertfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3529	Mr and Mrs John Fraser	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support proposal for development east of LL. Clients support the allocation of 2,500 houses to the east of the town but believe that the number of houses to be provided could be increased, for two principle reasons. Firstly, we understand that there are serious problems associated with the proposed allocation of 5,500 houses to the east of Luton. Secondly, we note that the Core Strategy proposes a substantial number of dwellings to be provided within the existing urban areas as flats and apartments. Given the current housing market we take the view that it is unrealistic to expect these high density schemes to come forward as suggested by the Housing Trajectory, over the next four to five years. Furthermore, we would question whether these developments can provide the necessary infrastructure. In our view, all of these facilities could be provided in a balanced fashion to the east of Leighton Buzzard and suggest that the allocation for this Strategic Urban Extension could be increased to around 5,000 houses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure. Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Housing delivery is a risk factor that the Core Strategy will need to address through a Housing Delivery Strategy.</p>				
2125	Mr and Mrs John Fraser	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The provision of an urban extension to the east of Leighton Linslade is supported. However allocation of 2,500 home should be increased because: - There are serious technical problems with the proposed urban extension to the East of Luton. Furthermore, NHDC do not support the proposals - The Core Strategy proposes that a substantial number of dwellings are to be provided as flats in existing urban areas. These schemes are unlikely to come forward in the next 5 years given the current economic climate. Also question whether these developments can provide the housing numbers suggested while also providing supporting infrastructure. The allocation to the east of Leighton Linslade should therefore be increased to around 5,000 dwellings.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Delivery of housing is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2873	Master Toby Fraser-Moore	Lilley	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposal to build 5,500 new houses on the green belt in Hertfordshire				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2421	Mrs Freeman	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Strongly object to Bedfordshire's plans to build at least 5,500 new homes in Hertfordshire which will encroach on the Green Belt and small villages. Pollution from traffic would increase alarmingly and would affect the health and well being of people living in the vicinity.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2930	Robert and Rosemary Freeman	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development. Beautiful area must be preserved for future generations. No more invasion of the Green Belt.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
2457	Mr F M French	Hitchen	Q. 4	No
Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to numerous disadvantages of the scheme and the affect on people who don't have a commercial interest in it including: desecration of the countryside and village life, looming shortages of power and water, destruction of wildlife and increased traffic. Identifies that the small narrow lanes are already deadly rat-run in the rush hours and bypasses will not absorb the extra volume of traffic. Also identifies that Hitchin and the A505 are congested during rush hours and questions where the Hitchin bypass is.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3163	Lady Rosemary French	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Adverse effects of population increase in the area, increased traffic volumes, loss of flora and fauna and the English way of Life. Hertfordshire County Council and he NHDC are opposed to Bedfordshire's expansionist ambitions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3487	Mrs Sally Frost	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and road for the following reasons: It is an area of outstanding natural beauty, wonderful farmland, green belt and Hertfordshire. It would devastate the local wildlife and their habitat would be destroyed by noise and pollution. Live and work in this beautiful countryside and do not want to see it destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3492	D Frost	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and road for the following reasons: It is an area of outstanding natural beauty, wonderful farmland, green belt and Hertfordshire. It would devastate the local wildlife and their habitat would be destroyed by noise and pollution. Live and work in this beautiful countryside and do not want to see it destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3494	Master R Frost	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and road for the following reasons: It is an area of outstanding natural beauty, wonderful farmland, green belt and Hertfordshire. It would devastate the local wildlife and their habitat would be destroyed by noise and pollution. Live and work in this beautiful countryside and do not want to see it destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3493	T Frost	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and road for the following reasons: It is an area of outstanding natural beauty, wonderful farmland, green belt and Hertfordshire. It would devastate the local wildlife and their habitat would be destroyed by noise and pollution. Live and work in this beautiful countryside and do not want to see it destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2870	M Froster	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose proposals of Bedfordshire and Luton councils to develop within Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1397	Caroline Gallagher	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose the building of 5,500 homes East of Luton because: Hertfordshire have their own quota to fill and should not have to fulfil Luton/Bedfordshire's quota. Wildlife such as White Deer and Red Kites should be protected. Pollution and congestion. Crawley Green Road is already very busy Who are the houses for, no-one is buying them. The Green Belt was developed to protect countryside and it can't be legal to overrule it Luton Councillors have selected land in another county so as to avoid the development of areas that they live in Many people use the area for walking and cycling and it is crucial that it stays that way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
871	Mr and Mrs Games	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Bypass will benefit those outside the town more than Luton residents. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3181	Mr and Mrs R Gardner	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is Green Belt Land grade 1. Development would decimate village life in the area's villages and hamlets and would result on increased traffic, competition for jobs and increased demand on all local social and community infrastructure. Areas such as Chalk Hill and Lilley Bottom already suffer from flooding. There is no financial impact analysis to test the proposals and there is a question on how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3439	Mrs Rita Gardner	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I dread the thought of the hedgerows being uprooted and the loss of Green Belt, which are the town's lungs. The narrow gauge railway, a National Heritage Railway and much needed asset that brings visitors from across the world, would be destroyed by the houses. Building on flood plains endangers existing and future housing. Please listen to the local residents and leave us our beautiful countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3892	D R Garrett	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It is in Green Belt land and in North Hertfordshire and Luton Borough Council have no right to consider these proposals. North Hertfordshire is becoming a dumping ground. Luton can build whatever they like on their side of the fence. There will be massive estates everywhere.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
930	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Regeneration and areas of deprivation were identified in Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis NOT Leighton Linlade. A misguided Liberal Town Council asked for Leighton Linlade to be included in the MKSMSRS growth area, but the general population in the towns did (and do not) want more growth. Large scale development will be completely unsustainable for the towns. There will never be enough employment created in LB for the occupants of 2,500 new dwellings. We are already now constructing 1,300 dwellings in the south of LB, but with no increased employment opportunities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. This Core Strategy cannot debate national and regional housing figures which have already been established. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3209	Mr Freddie Gee	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is no democratic reason why Bedfordshire development should be forced upon Hertfordshire without detailed discussion and agreement with Hertfordshire County Council.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2894	Abby Gee	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Fields and woods used for recreation will be destroyed. It does not seem fair that Luton can plan to build in North Hertfordshire without finding more suitable sites in Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3776	Mandy Gee	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and northern bypass for the following reasons: Would destroy a large area of beautiful countryside and infringe on Green Belt Has considerably higher environmental impact than other areas under consideration which were discounted without a full appraisal. Bypass passed through the Chilterns AONB and has no merit over any options closer to Luton other than to serve the proposed development and it has a very high environmental impact. It is unclear why this option has been chosen over others particularly when the 'no bypass' option has not been fully investigated. Luton and South Beds should not be considering schemes in North Herts without completely exhausting those within their own boundary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3774	Ms Lucy Gee	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the building of houses near Lilley Bottom and a new road near Lilley. Object to destruction of fields and woods in the area and loss of wildlife habitat. Believes there are better places to build the road. Unfair for people in Luton to plan development in N Herts without finding more suitable places in Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3775	Simon Gee	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and northern bypass for the following reasons: Would destroy a large area of beautiful countryside and infringe on Green Belt. Has considerably higher environmental impact than other areas under consideration which were discounted without a full appraisal. Bypass passed through the Chilterns AONB and has no merit over any options closer to Luton other than to serve the proposed development and it has a very high environmental impact. The bypass should provide environmental benefit by reducing congestion and pollution within the centre of Luton and removing commuter traffic from country roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1117	Miss R Gillborn	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Object as Core Strategy been issued without a proper detailed financial analysis being issued.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1081	Miss S Gillborn	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion area Core Strategy issued without proper detailed financial impacts analysis to test proposals</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1038	Professor D Gillborn	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1119	Mrs D Gillborn	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Object as Core Strategy been issued without a proper detailed financial analysis being issued.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2445	Locke Gilmour	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton owing to its designation as Green Belt and the loss of recreational land for the residents in Luton and North Herts as well as the impact on the amenity of hamlets and villages of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green, Tea Green and Lilley. Object to the impact on Lilley Bottom as well as the traffic to the east of Luton and in Whitwell. How will the infrastructure be funded given that the Highways Agency does not support the building of the Luton Northern Bypass?</p>				
<p>Object to the Draft Core strategy being issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis or sustainability investigation to test the proposals. The Joint Committee should have known before it issued the Draft Core Strategy how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 and include the Green Belt land to the east of Luton and should have been presented with the technical analyses.</p>				
<p>The proposal is not supported by NHDC despite a disingenuous statement in the summary document to the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
965	George Gilmour	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. No supporting financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
873	Bea Gilmour	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. No detailed financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation Character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
872	Mrs Nicola Gilmour	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1093	Mr D Godfrey	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Requires financially unviable infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3654	Mrs I Godleman	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Will ruin beautiful green belt and AONB and Lilley Bottom. No regard impact on Hitchin traffic or increased congestion and its adverse impact on the environment. AONB is protected by Government policy and other options are available so should be protecting space around Luton. Land Use Consultants recommended against developing in area which they rated highly sensitive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
120	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Other reasons already given. Supports smaller urban extension to the East of Leighton Buzzard. Suggests that the Key Diagram be revised to be more clear along with text about the non preferred options to clarify the change since the Issues and Options Paper. Suggests that greater reference is made to Joint Working between Local Authorities, especially with North Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: See comments for ID Nos. 116-119 &amp; 121</p>				
3449	Peter Goodwin	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the East of Luton development owing to the impact on the landscape, villages and hamlets as well as AONB. The selection of the four preferred options is inconsistent with the supporting evidence. It could be concluded that the proposed East of Luton urban extension because a significant proportion of development could be provided in a manner which would not have any electoral impact on Luton politicians. The economical case for the preferred option has not been made in the Core Strategy. The northern bypass will pass through an AONB. The existence of new roads would attract additional traffic. Both roads would discharge onto the A505 at Lilley and increase congestion in Hitchin. The whole area is within designated green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3453	Vivienne Goodwin	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the East of Luton development owing to the impact on the landscape, villages and villages as well as AONB. The selection of the four preferred options is inconsistent with the supporting evidence. It could be concluded that the proposed East of Luton urban extension because a significant proportion of development could be provided in a manner which would not have any electoral impact on Luton politicians. The economical case for the preferred option has not been made in the Core Strategy. The northern bypass will pass through an AONB. The existence of new roads would attract additional traffic. Both roads would discharge onto the A505 at Lilley and increase congestion in Hitchin. The whole area is within designated green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure and delivery partners. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3955	K Gorton	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Leighton Buzzard because: It will require building on Green Belt land and although green linkages to the countryside are mentioned, countryside will be built on. Attraction of Leighton Buzzard is its rural position and that it can just about cope with recent developments. The number of new homes constitutes a large community that should not be considered an add on to a market town. Leighton Buzzard is already congested and infrastructure will not handle more traffic. There is no work for people in Leighton Buzzard at present so new people will need to commute, causing problems with parking at the station. Public transport has been promised but has been promised before when Sandhills was left out on a limb before being added to the bus system. Must consider traffic filtering out onto A5 via Hockliffe that becomes more congested as it heads towards Dunstable. Leighton Buzzard needs a boost, but to its status as a market town, not as the most congested commuter town in Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
2463	Mr T G Gradwell Smith	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to EoL development. Considers proposal not implementable owing to: level &amp; scale of infrastructure requiring vast public funding, massive improvements; local roads already congested, unable to cope at peak times without 10,000 more vehicles bringing traffic chaos, hindering road safety. Local services eg schools already overstretched, need refurbishing, would not cope with extra numbers. Hospitals, GP surgeries already full, patient care will suffer. Local amenities eg sports facilities, local shops not suitable, cannot sustain extra numbers. Bypass will destroy Green Belt land and require extensive funding &amp; engineering to tunnel beneath airport. Luton would incur huge costs to support this development providing services for Herts residents without reward. Emergency services already over stretched. Massive impact on wildlife, destroyed forever. Development would impact on the amenity of my family Suggests empty properties in the town be regenerated and refurbished before open land is developed on</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3178	Mrs J Gradwell-Smith	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The east of Luton proposal does not make any provision for building new schools nor GP surgeries which are both currently at full capacity, current sport facilities and children's play areas are not suitable and emergency services are under resourced. It would result in a grid lock of local road networks and reduce road safety. The impact of the development on local wildlife would destroy it forever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Additional details of infrastructure requirements to be outlined in the Core Strategy Pre Submission document. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3112	Mr T Gradwell-Smith	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton proposal is not supported by infrastructure. Local roads are already congested and could not cope with a further ten thousand vehicles. Local services and facilities are overstretched and unable to cope with extra numbers and Luton would incur on huge costs to support the development. This is an area of local amenity and wildlife which would be destroyed for ever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3950	Celia Grafflin	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: re: development East of Luton. Luton is a town hideously damaged in the past by unsympathetic development and complete indifference to the fate of a once homogenous small town. The only 'saleable' feature of Luton is the easy access to areas of outstanding natural beauty which the assurance of the green belt was meant to maintain.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				
2777	Sir Alexander Graham	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose the expansion of Luton into the Lilley Bottom Valley. An expansion into another administrative area goes in the face of all democratic decisions. Voters in Hertfordshire have not sanction on the councillors in Bedfordshire nor on the East of England Regional authority. The expansion would increase of traffic into rural lanes. There are concerns with the water situation in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: When drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are an essential element for the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. The findings of the Water Cycle study do not highlight major issues with water in this area. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1372	Mr Alan MK Gray	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Saddened by the fact that Luton and Central Beds Joint Committee appear to be imbued with 'Prescott Mindset' regarding the proposed preferred location East of Luton. There are available alternative option within their own area. Encroachment into North Herts is unacceptable from a professional, environmental and designated area of natural beauty viewpoint.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1249	Ms Elaine M Gray	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Core Strategy Preferred Options being implemented. Objects to the East of Luton preferred urban extension. Suggests there is land within Luton that could be utilised including vacant properties which could provide housing without destroying villages in North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2198	J Grayson	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton development. The consultants have said that the landscape in this area should not be altered. The proposal will destroy 3 villages, the infrastructure is unaffordable. In addition the Green Belt will be destroyed forever and wildlife will be lost.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
907	Mrs A M Green	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Lilley Bottom valley is an area of outstanding natural beauty. Query whether full environmental evaluation conducted and presented to Councillors. Query whether areas north and west of Luton considered fully and why they were not favourable. Nearby villages will be severely affected by traffic. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1549	Mrs Carolyn Green	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development at north of Houghton Regis, this development of 40,000 houses will bring the development very close to Chalgrave Parish. These houses are not needed for local people but will bring in more commuters with more congestion on the roads and already stretched rail services. There will be no increase in employment for local or even new people. More schools and hospital services are not included in the proposals but would be needed. Does the Green Belt no longer have any meaning - it is this areas that is supposed to be protected from this sort of development. This development will seriously alter our countryside.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2412	Mr K M Green	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to development to the East of Luton owing to its impact on the countryside, the wildlife, the villages and hamlets of Tea Green, Mangrove Green, Cockermhoe and Lilley as well as the impact on the traffic and other effects on the surrounding village communities. States that the Draft Core Strategy does not say whether the other options to develop land to the North and West of Luton have been considered or has been issued with a proper financial impacts analysis to test the proposals. Also states that North Herts District Council are totally against the proposals and questions whether a full evaluation of the environmental damage which the plans will cause have been made and made clear to all the Councillors of Luton Borough Council and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3944	Miss F E Green	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons To carry out an urban development in an area that belongs to North Herts To the proposed link to Luton airport</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3670	Mr Ken Green	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Core Strategy not exploring if the houses should be built. Suggests that the starting point should be what the growth in population and jobs might realistically then decide how many houses we need. Does not consider that the scale is needed and policy is ill advised and illogical. Questions who will live in the houses and where the employment will come from. Objects to Central Government and Central Bedfordshire ignoring the pleas of local people and Parish Councils. Questions the approach to sustainability stating that the present density is hardly sustainable. Objects to the level of congestion particularly on Bidwell Hill and through the A5 Chalk Cutting and the over capacity train services. Objects to the plan showing a swathe of houses in this area to be built even before the A5 M1 link road. Asks Central Bedfordshire as a new authority to make their mark and to do all they can to convince Central Government that this is not a wise plan.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessments of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3581	Belinda Greenshaw	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Will encroach on boundaries and create a conurbation. Bedfordshire needs to make up its quota of housing stock but not at North Herts expense and the council ought to consider alternative options. Proposed urban sprawl risks destroying character of hamlets and villages like Lilley and Tea Green. Villages like Whitwell already experience traffic congestion, and with the proposed development this will get worse and Highways Agency are sure to have objections. Higher levels of traffic on the A505 and other roads would create havoc and increased accidents. Site is a long way from services like schools and hospitals. Do not believe Bedfordshire is planning to grow in the right way. It seems that council's strategy to protect their natural environment, green spaces, transport and congestion is at the expense of N Herts. MP for Hitchin and Harpenden, M Peter Lilley speaks on behalf of the people against the proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
905	S W Greetnam	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3266	Mr Frank Griffin	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object strongly to the imposition of 40,000 plus houses in our area. This number is not needed locally and will cause severe congestion/out commuting and loss of our Green Belt. It is very obvious to all concerned that the current overload of the whole infrastructure combined with massive over development will not be a sustainable community as predicted by the Government.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Its requirements must be delivered. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, notably refining approach to infrastructure delivery.</p>				
3981	Kate Griffiths	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Opposed to East of Luton proposal because: - It is an area of high landscape value and is adjacent to the AONB. - It is designated as Green Belt. - Other options have not been properly evaluated. In addition, there are plenty of brownfield sites in Luton - The bypasses will funnel traffic along the A505 towards Hitchin which is already heavily congested. - The housing development cannot fund the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2917	Mrs E Grosvenor	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to expanding Luton towards Hitchin on vital green belt land which separates the towns. Object to expanding on another county to the detriment of the quality of life of those living in Hitchin and its surrounding villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3467	K Grosvenor	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed east of Luton development: Destruction of vital and beautiful green belt Urban sprawl Decimation of villages</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3177	Miss Lindsey Guise	Bendish	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is beautiful countryside designated green belt. Hamlets and villages will be lost traffic made worse in Lilley and Whitehall, in particular.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure analysis and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3649	Dr David Gunn	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal for East of Luton should be rejected for two good reasons: - it is green belt - it is not only on another Council's land, it is in another county!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3239	GVA Grimley Ltd for and on behalf of AXA Reim		Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the recognition of both the land to the north of Houghton Regis and north of Luton as preferred urban extensions. If there is a shortfall of land for urban extension as identified by the DTZ Study, area J could be integrated into the urban extension to deliver a larger sustainable urban extension. The JTU should consider this in the next stage of the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support for urban extensions to the north of Houghton Regis and north of Luton is welcomed. The submission stage of the Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan which will bring together the deliverability of the proposals, their associated infrastructure and a level of contingencies sufficiently robust to allow for the flexibility required by Government to responded to changes of circumstance during the lifetime of the strategy. The contingencies will be outlined as work progresses towards submission.</p>				
3213	Mrs M Gyenge	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is designated green belt and falls within Hertfordshire. People in Luton and Hertfordshire will be without a very valuable asset if the countryside is lost.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure analysis and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
949	Maria Haden	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
950	Stuart Haden	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 sites. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3818	Julie Hadlington	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Totally object to the outrageous plans for eastern Leighton Buzzard. It will result in the loss of precious greenbelt land, wildlife and the heritage railway. Building on the flood plain will threaten my house from potential flooding. Where will all the cars go as there is absolutely no infrastructure planned? I want my town to remain a small market town. There are very few jobs in the area - where will they all work? Object to high-density housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. Core Strategy plans for new employment in the urban extension. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3141	Ann Hagman	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Traffic to the east of Luton and Hitchin is already at breaking point and roads are incapable of taking more traffic, especially the A505. No consideration has been given or a study made of the effect of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages, road and other infrastructure given that the bypass will make it easier for residents of the development to get to Hitchin. N Herts DC does not support the proposal. How did 13 possible expansion areas become just 4, including beautiful Green Belt land? Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses. The views of east of Luton residents and other affected people should be properly considered. Bedfordshire should built houses in their own county and not steal Hertfordshire's land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3857	S A Haines	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object most strongly to the proposals for East of Luton. During the weekends my family use the countryside to go walking and cycling whilst taking in what can only be described as breath taking views and enjoying the peace and healthy exercise. The existing road structure in the area at present is clogged up on a daily basis with the large volumes of traffic at peak periods.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including retention of recreation space.</p>				
3437	Ms Jennifer Haines	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to Leighton Buzzard Eastern Development because; it will be built on designated green belt land, concreting over greenbelt will increase risk of flooding, promises of infrastructure cannot be relied upon as they have already been broken in South Leighton Buzzard, insufficient local employment in Leighton Buzzard, without local employment in Leighton to sustain population people will have to commute elsewhere, insufficient health care facilities</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
4042	Mr K Haines	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land to the east of Luton is Greenbelt land designated AOB. Thousands of Stopsley residents use the area to go walking and cycling whilst taking in what can only be described as breathtaking views and enjoying the peace and healthy exercise. Withdraw the outrageous proposals and give full and fair consideration to all the other options. The existing road structure is clogged-up on a daily basis and these proposals will turn the road structure into total chaos.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3164	Mrs L J Haines	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: The east of Luton proposal would result on large volumes of houses of green belt land designated AONB				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Land to the east of Luton south of the A505 is not AONB. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3898	Gerald Hale	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Existing road network is inadequate to cope with additional volume of traffic and infrastructure is not in place to accommodate east of Luton. Area is Green Belt and should remain so. Should not be permitted to swallow up an area of natural beauty with an unnecessary urban extension. Would like to know reason for choosing East of Luton for 5,500 houses.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
2469	Mrs TL Hall	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to East of Luton preferred option proposal as it is an area of Green Belt land of exceptional beauty and should not be used to be developed when there are brownfield sites waiting to be used. No consideration seems to have been given to the increase in traffic in this area. As a resident of Stopsley, I am aware of the congestion at times and can only imagine complete bottleneck developing with the additional houses. Where is the infrastructure of roads, schools and medical facilities? I would like my grandchildren to enjoy the natural countryside and the small villages that this proposal will swallow up.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding.				
2971	Dr Michael J Hall	Cumbria	Q. 4	No
Comment: The area to the east of Luton might be defiled by houses and bypass to the detriment of the special countryside and wildlife of the area.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis and transport analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2149	Mr Keith Hallam	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to development east of Luton				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
844	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
Comment: Expansion to the East of LB is not appropriate for the reasons given above.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3180	Debbie Hampson	Wingfield	Q. 4	No
Comment: The local area suffers from lack of jobs and services, poor commuting and water shortages. Concreting over land designated as green belt to built houses the area cannot support cannot be a reasonable solution.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of water infrastructure, transport analysis and employment land needs. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3527	Barbara Hanlon	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
Comment: Houses near to Clipstone Brook experience difficulty obtaining insurance. Further housing will increase the chance of our house flooding. The Greenbelt supports local farming, supplying local products to local people, supporting local communities and natural wildlife. The new people will have to travel out of Leighton Linslade to work. The new Sandhills estate has narrow roads and cars parked all over the place because they need to travel out of town for work. The narrow gauge railway will be affected and this is a great tourist attraction to our town.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on flood plain and Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as mitigation of flooding.				
897	Astrid Hansen	Henlow	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2025	Jack Hare	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Please do not build houses in or around Lilley as this would spoil the countryside in terms of a place to walk, grow up in and learn things. Also, new houses would generate lots of traffic, making it unsafe for children to play outside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No housing development is proposed in and immediately surrounding village of Lilley.</p>				
3460	Mrs Tina Hare	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development in the Lilley area. This is an unjustifiable loss of a large area of Green Belt land, increasing traffic, overall amount of people, etc, hence destroying the beauty of the area. I would like to point out that when buying my house in Lilley we were under the impression that Green Belt land could never be built on, which confirmed our decision to purchase our house and live a happy life in the countryside. All its attributes would be destroyed due to the loss of Green Belt land and having more housing and increased traffic leads to possible danger, defeating the objective of bringing up my child in the country. Rethink this proposal as it would have such a BAD impact all around.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
3459	Mr Jerry Hare	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed east of Luton development: Moved to Lilley from Hitchin to benefit from country life. Unjustifiable loss of green belt and destruction of beautiful area Understood that green belt land would never be built on when bought house Increase in traffic, leading to possible danger and increase in amount of people Attributes of living in the country and green belt would be destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2710	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: How will 'building within the urban areas first' be delivered? The Government has repeatedly rejected calls by groups such as BCPC for clear rules allowing planners to insist that brown field sites are developed first. Brown land remediation is always more expensive and difficult than a virgin site with good access. In the absence of rules, developers will go for the easier options first. The Joint Committee have not taken on board the thinking behind the Design Strategy of the CC Board re: the AONB and incorporated a preferred design delivery strategy. Sympathetic development would be better if the strategy expanded the delivery and monitoring policies via a Design Document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to clarify approach to achieving Brownfield land development.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS7 outlines the approach to maintaining housing delivery and promoting Brownfield development. Urban Design SPD remains a potential document to be prepared in the LDS which could have regard to the CC Board advice.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2453	Harpenden Town Council	Harpenden	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Q2. Do you support the approach of Preferred Option CS1 - Spatial development Strategy? Yes, the Town Council support the approach of Preferred Option CS1. It is noted that supporting infrastructure has been taken into consideration at this stage which is important to the sustainability of any proposed new housing and employment schemes. It also appreciated that building in areas of Green Belt is to be resisted, thus not compromising many strategic gaps and areas of outstanding natural beauty.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
879	Mrs Julie Harper	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2898	Mr D M Harris	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL development and Black Route owing to impact on landscape, villages, wildlife, AONB, quality of life. Is in direct conflict with CS principles &amp; vision. Support for the 'Black Route' reflects the number of people living in the 'Inner Route' who want the bypass as far away as possible and cannot be seen as a vote for the desecration of the AONB. Area is of historical, cultural and archaeological importance including Iron Age and Roman sites. Objects owing to its location in N Herts.. Considers there are other options available that require no public funding on lower grade Green Belt whereas the EoL scheme will require significant additional funding beyond existing budgets. A full orbital road around Luton would be to the detriment of the town centre. An alternative to congestion would be widening Vauxhall Way, linking into M1 via new airport roads and avoiding the extravagance of 'cut and cover' tunnels in the AONB. Would like to know if Councillors with a vested interest abstain from voting</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2852	Miss Emily Harris	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose the building of houses in the countryside because o the loss of views, fauna, wildlife and quality of life.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2896	Mrs HL Harris	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development. Consider to be in direct conflict with Core Strategy principles and vision. Objects to its impact on the Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity and villages. Objects to the 'Black Route' northern bypass as will dissect the Chilterns AONB, a significant asset to the area and make Lilley unattractive even if no houses are built on AONB land. States that support for the 'Black Route' reflects the number of people living in the 'Inner Route' who want the bypass as far away as possible. Identified that the EoL housing and bypass proposals are in N Herts and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land for this. N Herts is against this development. Suggests there are other options available that require no public funding and are on lower grade Green Belt whereas the EoL scheme will require significant additional funding beyond existing budgets. A full orbital road around Luton would be to the detriment of the town centre. An alternative to congestion would be widening Vauxhall Way.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2891	Miss S Harris	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development. Consider to be in direct conflict with Core Strategy principles and vision. Objects to its impact on the Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity and villages. Objects to the 'Black Route' northern bypass as will dissect the Chilterns AONB, a significant asset to the area and make Lilley unattractive even if no houses are built on AONB land. States that support for the 'Black Route' reflects the number of people living in the 'Inner Route' who want the bypass as far away as possible. Identified that the EoL housing and bypass proposals are in N Herts and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land for this. N Herts is against this development. Suggests there are other options available that require no public funding and are on lower grade Green Belt whereas the EoL scheme will require significant additional funding beyond existing budgets. A full orbital road around Luton would be to the detriment of the town centre. An alternative to congestion would be widening Vauxhall Way.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2644	Roger and Sara Harrison	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Concerned about increase in traffic Have 20 years to achieve targets so time to revise attitude to high rise buildings Should build high rise developments on brown field sites first</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Strategy aims to maximise the potential of existing urban areas with a variety of housing types and provide strategic urban extensions beyond 2012 to supply the housing required in the Regional Spatial Strategy. The evidence indicates that to provide for the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate of urban extensions. Policy CS7 provides the context in which housing will be managed and monitored allowing for revisions on commencements and delivery rates depending on housing completions both in Brownfield and green field land.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3518	George Harrison	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EOL, Northern and Eastern Bypasses owing to impact on Green Belt, AONB, wildlife and villages. Considers it will not offer a good quality of life is contrary to the Vision. Land Use Consultants did not recommend for development. States that the support for the 'Black route' merely reflects the greater number of people living around the 'Inner Route' who want the bypass as far away as possible. North Herts are against the development. There is already congestion along the A505 and a new development will exacerbate this. Other options are available for example the West of Luton scheme and widening of Vauxhall Way and would not need huge funding</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2104	Prof. David Hawkrige	Heath and Reach	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strategy fails to take account of climate change - no strategies for CO2 reduction, eco-housing, wind farms, renewable energy, etc. Regional housing targets are unrealistic - CPRE research shows increased housing supply has very little effect on house prices. Strategy is contrary to PPG2: Green Belts; both the reasons for and uses of such land. Spatial principles are not supported - Bullet 1 should be employed indefinitely, Bullets 3 and 5 need more detailed criteria and justification. Concern over deficiencies in infrastructure particularly transport Concern that housing growth will not match employment growth</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. The justification of regional and national figures is not to be debated in this Core Strategy. Aspects of the strategy such as Climate Change which affect the entire strategy area are covered in the cross cutting sections of the Core Strategy. See Section 10 - Adapting to and Mitigating Climate Change. Although the strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land, the evidence show that to deliver the regional housing requirement the strategy needs to allocate urban extensions. The development principles are further developed within policy CS1 and cross cutting sections dealing with housing and employment (sections 6&amp;7). The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule.</p>				
3693	J Head	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposals for 5500 houses to the East of Luton as well as a bypass. This will destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to a designated AONB. This development in the Green Belt will not assist the regeneration of the conurbation. It would generate a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be attracted away from the town centre by the proposed outer bypass. This is an ill-conceived development proposal</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3812	David Healey	Darley Hall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons: Limited research with regards to the possible development options, North Hertfordshire District Council have not been properly consulted, Environmental impacts as a result of housing development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3203	J N C Healey	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal will expand into Hertfordshire countryside, building on their green belt. Hertfordshire is already one of the most overpopulated counties in the south east while expansion can take place in other areas around Luton and Bedfordshire at less cost of quality of life.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence . Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3823	Nicola Healey	Darley Hall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons: Limited research with regards to the possible development options North Hertfordshire District Council have not been properly consulted Environmental impacts as a result of housing development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3499	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Opposed to proposed EoL development. Believes Caddington (Bushwood) would be more suitable for development. Land South or West of Luton would not involve going through already congested areas to get to central facilities. N Herts is against the proposal, contrary to the CS which states that North Herts District Local Development Plan will progress the proposed EoL development. There is an emphasis in the document on Sustainable Development but cannot see how EoL will be sustainable unless another railway station, shopping centre and new hospital are built and providing lots of jobs and services locally otherwise residents will have to travel through already overcrowded areas. Many people in Stopsley resent fact that it is no longer a village and now part of large conurbation and prefer to shop in Hitchin or Luton, which is what residents of proposed EoL development will do, in which case should build houses elsewhere. There is acute traffic congestion and Stopsley cannot cope with additional traffic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2908	Mrs J Heath	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Extending the town to the east will create urban sprawl, cause the town centre to be non central and desecrate the best landscape in this part of the country which CS15 intends to preserve. The building of warehouses and business will desecrate the area. The chosen option conflicts with Land Use Consultant's report which states that given the area's grade 1 sensitivity it is not considered appropriate for development. This is not an area that North Hertfordshire District Council sees fit to accommodate extra houses and Luton should not invade another's administrative area. There are no comparisons between the preferred option and the other sites and there is no evidence to support the choice of option. Thus, the Core Strategy is flawed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2854	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Heath and Reach, as a rural settlement with only a small green belt area between the village and Leighton Buzzard could end up being merged with the town if the green belt is not clearly protected from any potential "recasting" and roll back as this area could provide useful infill opportunities for a developer, particularly as an extension of any Eastern development scheme. The village will "defend the Green Belt" and keep the parish's strong identity" as stated in the Heath and Reach Parish Plan. Heath and Reach cannot accommodate any growth unlike other rural communities such as Hockliffe - it neither has the land nor the infrastructure available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Core Strategy Pre Submission document to provide new Green Belt boundary.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preserving the setting of Heath and Reach and the "gap" between it and Leighton Linlade is an important consideration in the review of the Green Belt Boundary. The Pre Submission Core Strategy will provide a new Green Belt boundary</p>				
904	Mrs J S Henney	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
900	Celeste Henney	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2105	Henry H Bletsoe & Son	Kettering	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support on behalf of landowners in the east of Leighton Buzzard area (Clipstone Farm) Consider that the allocation to the East of Leighton Buzzard should be increased from 2500 to 5000 homes because of issues over the deliverability of the East of Luton proposals in a different local authority area and because it is unlikely that high density schemes proposed for urban areas will be capable of delivering housing growth</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which tests the deliverability of sites in the urban area and urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3702	Hertfordshire Gardens Trust	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposals for East of Luton development, eastern bypass, northern bypass and a park and ride station adjacent to A505 for the following reasons: Proposals would have a deleterious effect on Putteridge Bury and its setting which is a Hertfordshire landscape registered Grade II on English Heritage's Register of parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. Planning Policy Statement 15 says that planning authorities should protect registered parks and gardens and confirms that the effect on a registered park or garden and its setting is a material consideration in assessing an application. Luton Borough Council's current Local Plan Section 5.10 states that Putteridge Bury is a park that should be protected. Policy ENV1 says that planning permission should not be granted for a development that will have a detrimental effect upon the historic character and environmental quality of Registered Parks and Gardens and their settings.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact, including how to protect Putteridge Bury.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Impact on Putteridge Bury would be given significant consideration in the planning of the proposed development in accordance with current national and local policies.</p>				
2355	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: 78. Ultimately the Core Strategy cannot contain substantive references to development in North Hertfordshire. The County Council is therefore concerned about some of the statements made in the POCD if these were to materialise in any similar form in the ultimately approved Core Strategy. Some examples of current references which are considered inappropriate for reason outlined above include: - Preferred Option CS1 - specifically the inclusion of the reference to development East of Luton and reference to North Hertfordshire. - Key Diagram - the level of detail is inappropriate. This detail should also be removed from any later stages of the document. - Paragraph 4.28, 5.27, 5.29 and 5.32 all contain too much detail e.g. the size of the development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Wording in the Pre Submission version will be carefully considered.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The information in this document helps to inform the consultation process. This information was agreed with North Herts.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2347	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the development to the East of Luton and the lack of transparency for the selection of the preferred sites and lack of assessment of the alternative sites. Objects to the impact on the landscape and agrees with the ESA conclusion. Objects to the lack of assessment of the impact on rural settlements to the East of Luton and the compliance with PPG2 as a result of the coalescence this development would create. Objects to the lack of appropriate assessment of Site M, particularly in relation to transport compared to Site L. Is strongly of the view that land to the east of Luton within Hertfordshire is of such a quality, particularly when compared to other options around the greater conurbation, that it should not be identified as a potential location for strategic scale peripheral growth</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2252	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: 28. The County Council understands there is an as yet undetermined planning application for 4,400 dwellings and a range of other development/uses to the east of Leighton Linlade. East of Leighton Linlade is a preferred location for strategic growth within the POCD but only for a scale of development including 2,500 dwellings. The County Council makes no judgement upon the acceptability of the 4,400 dwelling proposal but the fact remains that it is an extant planning proposal and as such is surprised there is no reference to this alternative scale of growth proposed at this location within the POCD or supporting information. Were this scale of growth considered to be acceptable at this location this would clearly have significant implications for the scale of peripheral growth required elsewhere around the greater conurbation. The potential increased capacity of this location is an issue which needs to be taken forward to inform the next stage in the Core Strategy process.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Clarification to be provided in supporting technical studies.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Clarification over this issue would be helpful</p>				
2122	Hertfordshire County Council	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: In my capacity as County Councillor for Hitchin Rural (covering all the areas for your 'proposed' building of 5500 dwellings), I object in the strongest possible terms. Hertfordshire has enough problems fulfilling it's own quota of houses without other authorities adding to this. I support the arguments of both Lilley Parish Council and Kings Walden Parish Council. I can't state enough, that most of the area concerned is Grade 1, the highest level of natural beauty. The infrastructure is a major area of concern and would appear to have had scant consideration. It would appear little consideration has been given to building the housing requirement within your own boundaries. It is a very sorry episode and I'm totally against it.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2351	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Luton Airport 76. The POCD contains no strategic guidance on the future growth of the airport and its likely employment, infrastructure and other requirements. The Local Development Scheme does not appear to contain any proposals for an Area Action Plan covering the airport. The County Council suggests that the need for a policy framework for the airport and how that might be provided, including the potential role of the Core Strategy, should be given further consideration in advance of the next stage of the Core Strategy preparation and to inform the examination.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Further detail regarding the future planning framework for the airport is appropriate</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2969	Sally Hewitt	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land between Luton Airport, Tea Green, Lilley and Stopsley is of significant natural beauty and of great amenity value. If it were to be developed it would be destroyed while there are other areas surrounding Luton more suitable for development. It seems that the alternatives have not been properly considered. The land lies within the green belt which intended to be permanent. Traffic generated by the proposal would add to the already congested roads and junctions in Hitchin and Stevenage as well as the county lanes and village roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage</p>				
2906	D R Hilder	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Loss of green belt and countryside enjoyed by North Herts and Luton residents alike Hertfordshire should not have to suffer the intrusion of a neighbours development Additional vehicle traffic would place strain on country lanes A study commissioned by Luton recognised the area as highly sensitive (grade 1) and did not recommend it for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3191	Denise Hilder	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is green belt and used for recreation. The development would result on the disappearance of traditional villages and the suffering of food and space pressures by wildlife. The consultation did not counted on the people who live in the Hertfordshire. North Hertfordshire District Council does not support this proposal contrary to suggestions on pages 2 and 3 of the Core Strategy. I cannot see employment sites and a new eastern bypass road related to the proposal identified in the Core Strategy. There is a question over ignoring commissioned advice noting that North Herts. proposal was the worst possible choice of the 4 options for environmental reasons and the grounds under which 9 other sites have been rejected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation has been undertaken in North Herts. The role of North Herts. is suitably addressed in the document. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3580	Susan Hillier	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The charm of the market town, local industry and sense of community is mostly lost and the town has simply become a large housing area. The new development will make this worse. The Greenbelt at Broomhills Farm is a wildlife haven supporting a diverse range of species. Leighton has plenty of urban development so the retention of green space must be a priority in any plan. If our narrow gauge railway goes too, it will be a great shame as where else can you find its like? Once it goes, we will never get it back. More people, less green space, busier roads - not a happy prospect. No thanks.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3976	Laura Hinksman	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Roads are already gridlocked and the road from Stopsley to Luton is so bad it will not cope with an extra 11,000 cars. Lack of infrastructure in the area, with few schools and existing schools are oversubscribed. No real positive effects. Countryside is an area of natural outstanding beauty, with a lot of woodland, wildlife and archaeological sites. There are protected bird species and deer in Lilley Bottom and worry about effect on them. Question whether the proposal would need financial incentives and support and the impact of this on local service charges. There would be no benefit for impacted communities, only traffic, more pollution and threat to wildlife. Should consider Slip End where there is a lot of waste ground and near the M1 and would have less impact on wildlife, people and traffic. People of Luton and surrounding villages do not want development on Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3210	Laura Hinksman	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposals east of Luton. Travelling into Luton in the morning is grid lock almost all the way. Roads from Stopsley to Luton wouldn't cope with 11,000 more cars. I can't imagine how the traffic will be if these plans go ahead. The location lacks infrastructure. There are few, over-subscribed schools in the area. I can't see any positive effects. The countryside has natural outstanding beauty, woodland, wildlife and archaeological sites. To build on this land is criminal. There are protected birds (barn owls and red kites) and deer living around Lilley Bottom. I am worried that this will have an effect on them. Would this require financial incentives and support? What impact would it have on our local service charges? Would this project benefit the impacted communities? I can only see more traffic, pollution and a threat to wildlife! Have you considered Slip End? There is a lot of waste ground and near the M1 would have less impact on wildlife and people. The traffic problem would be better too.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
3687	Mr Malcom Hinksman	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development, Northern and Eastern Bypasses owing to conflict with Core Strategy's principles and vision, impact on traffic along A505 into Hitchin, impact on villages and landscape, location of area in Hertfordshire no Bedfordshire, effect on wildlife, noise and pollution. Notes that Land Use Consultants have advised against the development and notes that it forms part of the Chilterns Agricultural Landscape known to be important for national priority farmland bird species. Government policy is to protect AONB so why is the area being considered? There are archaeological sites. What provision has been made if the bypass construction has to be stopped if any significant finds are made? The EoL scheme ignores the Core Strategy's own caveats and 'the people' who do not want it. West of Luton would be much better as it needs no public funding, is not an AONB and the roads infrastructure is better. The rationale behind the concept of a full orbital road around Luton needs to be questioned.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3568	Laura Hinksman	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am totally against the proposal to build 5,500 new houses in this area. The traffic is already at gridlock in the morning. The location also has a lack of infrastructure such as schools. The countryside is of natural outstanding beauty. Would this project have any benefits for the impacted communities? Have you considered the area at Slip End? It is near the M1 and there is a lot of waste ground there.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2436	Hitchin & Harpenden Liberal Democrats	Welwyn Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objections regarding procedure and impact of proposed development. Concerned about way JC prioritised Area L despite clear opposition from NHDC and HCC, lack of transparency and presentation of documents online which were difficult to access. No discussion of knock on effect of development on other areas in N Herts or competing access to scarce infrastructure. Impact on landscape value grossly underrepresented relative to consultants' conclusions. Impact will be impossible to mitigate and will be blight on present and future populations. Will destroy Green Belt Grade 1 landscape. Serious concerns regarding groundwater and aquifer recharge. Lack of EIA regarding transport infrastructure proposals. SA does not include Area L so question how it could be included as a priority area without an assessment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport, accessibility and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals</p>				
3283	Hives Planning on behalf of Arnold White Estates Ltd		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Support a larger scale development to the east of LL. The inclusion of land to the EoL would make the Core Strategy unsound. The ability of land to the north of Luton and land to the north of Houghton Regis to make an additional contribution depends on major road proposals which have yet to be fully programmed and funded. The identification of land to the east and north east of Leighton Linlade is supported in principle but the suggested capacity in CS6 of 2500 dwellings should be increased to at least 4,400. This will improve the critical mass to further improve delivery of infrastructure and services. The site area, alteration of Green Belt boundaries and infrastructure proposals have been tested and found acceptable. Green belt boundary at southern LL should be revised to allow for land at Pulford Corner to be included within the settlement envelope. The proposal to the east of Leighton Linlade reflects PPS25 guidance and is compatible with the Environment Agency alleviation scheme for the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: <input type="checkbox"/> Support for land to the east of Leighton Linlade is welcomed. The Preferred Options are based on evaluation of exiting evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix which compares the sites. The deliverability of the proposals will be further developed through the preparation of a Delivery Plan which will bring together their deliverability, associated infrastructure and a level of contingencies sufficiently robust to allow for the flexibility required by Government to responded to changes of circumstance during the lifetime of the strategy. The contingencies will be outlined as work progresses towards submission.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3279	Hives Planning on behalf of Arnold White Estates Ltd		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The east of Luton proposal has unilaterally been declared as a preferred option . It is not a viable urban extension and should be deleted and its capacity redistributed. It lies within North Hertfordshire District Council boundaries which do not support the proposal. It is not effective, deliverable or based on evidence (fails PPS12 tests). The evidence base sets strong landscape objections to the proposal. The new roads and transport infrastructure to support the proposal would be essential but are not in the programme and the implications of non-delivery have not been investigated. If the Core Strategy were to be found unsound the ability of the growth area to attract Government funding (GAF, CIF) would be significantly affected. The rejection of some of the original options, including West of Leighton Linlade, is supported. Some limited expansion of the larger rural settlements is supported, but the list should include Heath and Reach which is identified as one of the main rural settlements.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Amend Policy CS6 to add the villages of Slip End and Heath and Reach		
JC Reason for Response:	The support for the rejection of West of Leighton Linlade and the limited expansion of the larger rural settlements is welcomed. Policy CS1 cover Heath and Reach as illustrated in the Key Diagram. However, there is an omission in Policy CS6 which should be amended. <input type="checkbox"/> The Preferred Options are based on evaluation of exiting evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix which compares the sites. The deliverability of the proposals will be further developed through the preparation of a Delivery Plan to accompany the submission stage of the Core Strategy.			
3280	Hives Planning on behalf of Arnold White Estates Ltd		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to the north of Houghton Regis with regards to delivery. Major road schemes are required as pre-requisites but the arrangements for delivery do not seem assured and there is no clear linkage between infrastructure schemes and the relevant urban extension</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure..			
3282	Hives Planning on behalf of Arnold White Estates Ltd		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to the north of Luton with regards to delivery. Major road schemes are required as pre-requisites but the arrangements for delivery do not seem assured and there is no clear linkage between infrastructure schemes and the relevant urban extension</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure..			
2596	Daphne Hobbs	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Building on Hertfordshire Green Belt land is outrageous Building on top grade agricultural land wrong What are the other options? Much of the land is "Crown Property"</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including water infrastructure capacity and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3804	Mr J A Hobman	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Not legitimate to gain planning consents outside normal remit. See no reason to incorporate Herfordshire villages into a greater Luton borough. The land is Green Belt and should be reserved as green space separating Luton, St Albans, Hatfield, Welwyn GC, Stevenage and Hitchin. Impact on infrastructure and there is no inducement for Herfordshire ratepayers to subsidise services for Luton. Any proposed improvement must not include a bypass which will encourage further urban development perhaps as far as Great Offley, Breachwood Green, Bendish, Kimpton and possibly Bafford and Harpenden. Concerned about affect on villages which will be engulfed and Whitwell and Codicote in terms of increased traffic. Development will detract from tranquil rural life that the residents of villages in the area have chosen as a lifestyle and will result in an unbearable life leading to a mass exodus from these villages.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3801	Mrs M E Hobman	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Not legitimate to gain planning consents outside normal remit. See no reason to incorporate Herfordshire villages into a greater Luton borough. The land is Green Belt and should be reserved as green space separating Luton, St Albans, Hatfield, Welwyn GC, Stevenage and Hitchin. Impact on infrastructure and there is no inducement for Herfordshire ratepayers to subsidise services for Luton. Any proposed improvement must not include a bypass which will encourage further urban development perhaps as far as Great Offley, Breachwood Green, Bendish, Kimpton and possibly Bafford and Harpenden. Concerned about affect on villages which will be engulfed and Whitwell and Codicote in terms of increased traffic. Development will detract from tranquil rural life that the residents of villages in the area have chosen as a lifestyle and will result in an unbearable life leading to a mass exodus from these villages.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3803	Mr R A Hobman	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Not legitimate to gain planning consents outside normal remit. See no reason to incorporate Herfordshire villages into a greater Luton borough. The land is Green Belt and should be reserved as green space separating Luton, St Albans, Hatfield, Welwyn GC, Stevenage and Hitchin. Impact on infrastructure and there is no inducement for Herfordshire ratepayers to subsidise services for Luton. Any proposed improvement must not include a bypass which will encourage further urban development perhaps as far as Great Offley, Breachwood Green, Bendish, Kimpton and possibly Bafford and Harpenden. Concerned about affect on villages which will be engulfed and Whitwell and Codicote in terms of increased traffic. Development will detract from tranquil rural life that the residents of villages in the area have chosen as a lifestyle and will result in an unbearable life leading to a mass exodus from these villages.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3805	Mr T R Hobman	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Not legitimate to gain planning consents outside normal remit. See no reason to incorporate Hertfordshire villages such as Lilley, Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green, Tea Green, Breachwood Green and St Peters Green into a greater Luton borough. The land is Green Belt and should be reserved as green space separating Luton, St Albans, Hatfield, Welwyn GC, Stevenage and Hitchin. There will be a heavy load on infrastructure such as water, sewerage, electricity, gas and transport and there is no inducement for Hertfordshire ratepayers to subsidise above services for Luton. Any proposed improvement must not include a bypass which will encourage further urban development perhaps as far as Great Offley, Breachwood Green, Bendish, Kimpton and possibly Bafford and Harpenden. Concerned about the loss forever of an AONB, replacing rolling hills with concrete wasteland, the resident herd of deer and traffic trying to squeeze onto already congested roads.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1971	Hockliffe Parish Council	Eaton Bray	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Hockliffe suffers from traffic congestion, especially when the M1 is closed, leading to traffic noise, pollution and other adverse impacts. The (already late) A5-M1-A6 link road needs to be delivered before large volumes of new housing exacerbate current problems. During the Local Plan development, much of Hockliffe was removed from the Green Belt to provide for additional development with the agreement that a firm line would be drawn to prevent further erosion of the Green Belt. Green Belt to the east and west of Hockliffe is essential as 'green lungs'. We object to the vast erosion of Green Belt to the east of Leighton Buzzard that will increase traffic congestion (to the M1). Development east of Leighton Buzzard will adversely affect the character, appearance and setting of the Historic Conservation Area that is the location of the earliest reference to Hockliffe We are pleased to note that Brownfield sites will be developed before Green sites.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The A5-M1 link is needed to relieve congestion and is being progressed by the Joint Committee and the HA. Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Transport assessments have been undertaken. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposal.</p>				
3555	Steven Hodges	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register my views on the proposal for East of Luton - The 1 million empty homes need to be brought back into use before the green belt is attacked; - The adverse impact of noise from Luton Airport on people - Issues surrounding a development such as this being in two administrative areas.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as noise. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions in this area. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2519	Michael R Holden	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: loss of green belt process undemocratic cost and viability of scheme - no financial viability study</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2518	Edwina Holden	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: increase in traffic congestion services and road infrastructure not adequate to cope with additional development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Infrastructure Delivery Plan to be prepared</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Additional infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy Plans for this.</p>				
3858	Bruce Holdroyd	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development, northern and eastern bypasses due to location in AONB, not suitable for a development this size. It is in direct conflict with the Core Strategy's own principles and vision to provide attractive places to live and a good quality of life especially for residents of villages who will be engulfed. Impact on wildlife, especially bats. Would like to see a bat survey commissioned to see what roosts may be impacted. The roads in the area are already congested and the A505 will become totally gridlocked. North Herts are against the development. Don't understand why Luton and S Beds want to destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty, engulf two villages, village community and the green belt surrounding several other villages. Brown field sites should be developed before destroying green belt land and the wildlife and rural life of existing village residents who have chosen not to live in a sprawling housing development. Should consider better alternatives that are available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1737	Holmes Antill	Loughborough	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: We believe that Preferred Option CS1 is right to confirm that the spatial strategy "...will be achieved through the allocation of a balanced portfolio of suitably located land comprising an appropriate mix of: Land in existing urban areas; Strategic urban extensions; and Sites in rural settlements excluded from the Green Belt of a scale appropriate to the settlement concerned. This portfolio will meet the needs of both existing and new communities and contribute to the sustainability of the area. It will include large scale mixed use developments and will be served by major new transport schemes...". As part of that balanced portfolio we support the preferred strategic urban extension east of Luton which has the potential to deliver high quality growth contributing to and being served by new social, physical and green infrastructure, partly to support London Luton Airport. A priority now for all parties is to evaluate further the issues associated with (as CS1 puts it) "Implementing the Urban Extensions".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2511	JM Holmes-Walker	St Albans	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Bedfordshire building homes in Hertfordshire Incorrect that Luton and S Beds proposals will be taken forward in N Hertfordshire Core Strategy Hertfordshire residents were not consulted on proposals Consultant's report advising against development has been ignored</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2553	Holwell Parish Council	Holwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: 5,500 new dwellings to the east of Luton is in no way sympathetic to the scale and character of the area, as required in the text regarding development in rural settlements.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The approach to development in rural settlements applies only to those outside of the urban extension areas</p>				
3819	June Horne	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the current allocation of houses in the local area. The number envisaged would cause more problems for the local roads, doctors, schools, hospitals and other services. There is not enough money in the pot for all the changes needed to make Central Bedfordshire a more user-friendly local government. Where are the jobs for the workers? A hold on the expansion at Luton Airport and no Vauxhall? The jobs need to relate to the local skills. The loss of Green Belt is not acceptable; when we were assured that no Green Belt would be affected. In the current financial climate, who would pay for the houses and who would be liable to afford them? More social housing than private would stretch resources from local providers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2040	Houghton Regis Allotments and Leisure Gardeners Association	Not Known	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Please include provision of Allotments in all current a future development plans in Houghton Regis. The national Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners Limited describe allotment Gardening as offering health, social and environmental benefits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision of allotments will be made as outlined in the approach to Green Infrastructure</p>				
1813	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The use of 'urban extension-not preferred' suggests that building outside the boundary of the bypasses is still an option. This terminology should be removed. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a consultation on the Preferred Options. Further testing of options is required.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2955	Mr Chris Howe	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton development owing to impact on the countryside which is contrary to the vision of green growth area and desire for access to well managed green infrastructure and surrounding countryside, as well as its location beyond the existing Luton and Bedfordshire boundary. Suggests that rather than build on green field sites should rejuvenate the centre of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment as well as environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2524	Mr Allan Howes	Darley Hall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Local council (Herts) opposed to plans Study commissioned by Luton concluded development is not recommended Existing brownfield sites eg Vauxhall should be considered to support industrial planning strategies Strategy cannot be considered without support of N Herts DC Full impact on services and infrastructure need to be considered by technical group and examples given Would like confirmation of Luton Airport's support and that option will prevent all future expansion plans Would like confirmation that other options eg Caddington are being given higher priority Destruction of countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Joint approach needed with North Herts. to deliver the proposed development.</p>				
2079	Ms Victoria Howlett	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Not supported by North Hertfordshire District Council No evidence on how the 13 areas became 4 preferred options</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the process of site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
2687	J A Hughes	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Luton building in another county's territory (east of Luton), the countryside would be covered in buildings and the existing infrastructure cannot cope with the added pressures. Villages of Mangrove Green, Tea Green and Cockerhoe would be ensconced by development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3922	Mrs Sue Humphey	Tea Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Is on green belt land which is as attractive as AONB and provides beauty and recreation for people of Luton and surrounding villages. Live in Tea Green and feel that along with Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green it will be subsumed into Luton and lose its unique identity. Other less scenic areas around Luton should be considered before concreting over attractive villages, woodlands and beautiful landscapes. Would lose wildlife. Traffic is already bad and the bypasses would draw more traffic into the area causing more congestion in the lanes around the airport and on the A505 into Hitchin. A new dual carriageway would form a new edge for Luton, leading to more infill housing. There is a large amount of unused land in Luton. Could widen the existing ring road and old Vauxhall land could be used for housing. Should also reconsider Slip End/Caddington as it is less attractive and nearer transport links.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
2602	Mrs Susan Humphry	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: encroachment into countryside and natural heritage development should remain within Luton Airport area countryside provides recreation and necessary for spiritual well being need to maintain agricultural land any development in countryside should be sensitive expansion of villages, not engulfing them should have a review of available brownfield sites reports so far have not been accurate in their assessments, underestimating urban capacity available</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
2986	Miss Patricia Humphreys	Cockerhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development as well as the Northern Bypass (Black Route) and Eastern Bypass Consultee acknowledges the need for affordable housing but believes more strongly in the value and benefit of natural beauty which would be lost forever. States that there are alternative to east of Luton including the West of Luton scheme which would provide the required homes on lower grade, does not interfere with farmland and the AONB and requires no public funding. The proposed scheme also uses existing B roads and allows for a stadium for L TFC. Questions why housing is proposed in North Hertfordshire for Luton as NHDC is firmly against the proposals. Also questions why the conclusions from the LUC consultants report which states that development is not recommended. States that the East Luton development will do more damage than good.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2398	Mr Peter Hunt	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Expansion to the south is restrained by the airport and Luton Hoo. To the SW and the North are AONB's. Slip end and Caddington are overflowed by aircraft from and to Luton Airport so do not make ideal locations for housing. There are few restraints along the valley to Leighton Buzzard and the proposed new roads make east/west travel easier. If the bus way were extended towards Leighton Buzzard (of course the old railway would have been ideal) then transport other than cars could be facilitated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development along the A505 would not be sustainable or financially viable.</p>				
2937	Mrs D Hunt	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and Northern Bypass. The Black Route would devastate the Chilterns AONB and which is against government policy. The Black Route would intersect 4 Public Rights of Way and quite likely extinguish them. Do not understand purpose of the new road as no new housing is proposed east of A6. Park and Ride would be a better solution and would assist with congestion in Luton town centre. Query why housing is being looked at in an Area of Great Landscape Value. There is an alternative option in West of Luton that would have less environmental impact. There were 12 other options for urban extensions identified but these have not been properly evaluated in comparison with EoL proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2610	Ian Hunt	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass: Loss of green belt Villages will lose identities and be swamped by the development Destruction of Lilley Bottom, an area of outstanding natural beauty Increased traffic congestion Bypass will destroy environmental landscape forever</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis.</p>				
3128	Mark Hunter	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3129	Karen Hunter	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4041	Rose Huxtable	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Plans by Bedfordshire councillors to destroy a huge area of Hertfordshire Green Belt Land. The development plan will swallow up villages and destroy farmland. The development plan will have an impact on the wider area from extra traffic, funnelling through Hitchin and jamming rat runs. The Plan constitutes an invasion across country borders into an area of prime countryside enjoyed by Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire residents Green Belt Land needs to be protected</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3237	Carole Huxtable	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton including homes, infrastructure and a bypass would destroy a huge area of Hertfordshire's Green Belt land, swallow up villages, destroy farmland, create extra traffic funnelling through Hitchin and jamming at run rats</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence, including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity assessment. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
952	Christopher Hyde	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
908	Ickleford Parish Council	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Parish Council is totally against any form of development infringing into North Hertfordshire. Any requirement for development should be contained within your own area/ boundary. North Herts does not have the infrastructure to cope with such an intrusion. Quality of life in villages in close proximity to the Bedfordshire Boundary would be totally swamped and destroyed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3226	Ickleford Parish Council	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Appreciate need for additional housing but Parish Council is against any development that infringes on North Hertfordshire, particularly the areas detailed in the plan. Any development should be contained within Bedfordshire boundary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3263	Indigo Planning for and on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Retail Study update by White Young Green states that there is no potential to accommodate any new retail floorspace at Sundown Park, and that the Sainsbury's store at Bramingham Park is substantially overtrading but there is limited capacity to expand this site. Disagree with WYG's assertion that there is limited capacity to expand the Bramingham Park site. Sainsbury's proposals to expand the store have progressed through a public exhibition held at the store in March 2009. Happy to discuss aspirations in context of emerging LDF. The Bramingham Park site adjoins a mix of other uses (public house, church, school, petrol station, small parade of 3 shops) which would reinforce the role of this site as a designated District Centre. Considers Bramingham Park should be allocated as a District Centre to serve the North of Luton growth area as it is a sustainable and logical solution to planning for retail and service provision for the urban expansion area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Approach to District Centres would help to clarify this point</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3475	Paul Irish	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development. Loss of identity for villages. Lack of consideration given to transport requirements for the development. The proposed bypass will not alleviate the traffic problem. Factual inaccuracy to say that the east of Luton development will be allocated through N Herts District Core Strategy as N Herts DC and Herts CC have emphatically stated that this is not the case. People in Hertfordshire villages are badly informed of meetings unlike Bedfordshire residents who are then better enabled to raise objections. Analysis of 'consideration' questions on 'Shape Your Future' website shows that the main concerns for respondents is the green belt, protecting the natural environment and traffic congestion. These considerations have not been taken into account when selecting this site. Other location options should be fully and openly considered with selection criteria clearly documented to allow an opportunity for fair comment.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
2101	Mr Philip Irving	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Opposed to new development due to effect on biodiversity/landscape and heritage features Concern over the impact on the historic narrow gauge railway specifically Concern over flood risk Concern over the lack of employment opportunities in the town following closure of large firms</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on landscape/biodiversity and narrow gauge railway as well as deliver the necessary infrastructure and employment.			
2191	Ivinghoe Council	Ivinghoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to urban extension East of Leighton Buzzard</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3066	Mrs F A Ivory	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write to object strongly to the east of Luton preferred option proposal for the building of 5,500 houses and a traffic bypass. I have many reasons for this objection of which some are as follows. The destruction of an area of Green Belt which is as beautiful as the adjacent which is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The increase in noise and pollution which is already unacceptable caused by the existing level of traffic on the A505. This is Hertfordshire. Luton is crossing county boundaries and this should not be allowed. Wildlife and their habitats should be protected. Small communities will be swallowed up There are far more suitable areas which could be considered, for example the Vauxhall brownfield site. The area is used for walking, cycling, horse riding and other country pursuits. It is a great recreational area.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3920	N R Ivory	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write to object most strongly to the East of Luton proposals which would destroy the quality of life of many who reside within the small communities, the recreational facilities it offers to others and wildlife habitats. The area does not have the infrastructure that would be needed for such a development. Both Vauxhall brownfield site and Caddington to the A6 have better road networks in existence already and would not destroy such a beautiful landscape. I cannot help but feel that other options have not been considered seriously.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3694	Mrs P A Jack	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. It is an area of natural beauty and it would be sacrifice to destroy it. I thought the Greenbelt was supposed to be protected. We all need the countryside for the good of our health and minds, please don't take it from us. Find other places such as brown field sites.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1574	Mrs PA Jackson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects against the Leighton Buzzard Eastern Development due to: - loss of green belt and wildlife; - houses would be built on floodplain which would threaten thousands of homes; - if no more infrastructure is undertaken which has not been the case in the past housing estates, it will not be viable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding.</p>				
2388	Mr C Jackson	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Outraged that Luton, Bedfordshire could be spilling into rural Hertfordshire on land that is Green Belt. The area of development also appears to cross over the A505 into the AONB which must be totally wrong. In addition, the proposed ring road will pass within yards of Lilley village.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2379	Mrs SJ Jacobs	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Kimpton area is delightful spot of rural Hertfordshire and should not be developed. It is wrong of a local authority which is not even in Hertfordshire to contemplate this. There must be brownfield sites in Luton which could be utilised such as the car works and the area around the airport road access.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: When drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3963	Sheila M James	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Spatial Development Strategy due impact on Green Belt, Lilley bottom, villages and hamlets, wildlife and countryside. Objects to the loss of recreation space, substantial increases in traffic on the A505 and on the surrounding rural roads. Objects to the lack completed studies of the " No -by-pass" option and the Draft Core Strategy being issued without a proper detailed financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation or information on how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4. Contends that the housing development alone can not fund all the necessary infrastructure. Notes that the development to the East of Luton is not supported by NHDC. Suggest there are better ways of providing home for people, like urban regeneration. The preferred Northern by-pass will affect AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
3153	Christopher G James	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development, eastern &amp; northern bypasses because: Traffic East of Luton already at breaking point, no thought given to effect on Hitchin. bypass will cause even more traffic using A505 with disastrous effects on Hitchin's chronic traffic congestion. Residents will go to Hitchin not Luton. Need a study of what the effects will be on Hitchin's infrastructure. The land is designated Green Belt. Concerned that the urban sprawl will make its way all the way to Hitchin with Green Belt disappearing. It would engulf hamlets and blight villages. Queries the financial viability of the Luton northern bypass as the Highways Agency does not support it and there will be no funds. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom and Chilterns AONB. N Herts DC does not support proposals. How did 13 expansion areas become 4? Object to Joint Planning Committee members taking decisions without technical analyses. Views of east of Luton residents should be considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3380	Peter Jardine	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: object to East of Leighton Buzzard as object to loss of greenbelt; object to danger to Narrow Gauge Railway, object to loss of countryside, object to increase in traffic, object to continued development in beautiful area. suggests a bigger Aylesbury and better Luton will contribute more to reduction in housing shortage as they both have existing infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires for this area. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy will need to allocate urban extensions within the regional spatial strategy areas of search.</p>				
2476	Thomas E Jardine	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton Loss of green belt can develop other areas N Herts do not want this implication that N Herts will comply is misleading suggests a fait accompli</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure. Approach to working with North Herts. to be outlined in the Delivery Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2762	E Jarman	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development, eastern and northern bypasses. Other areas, which have not been given equal evaluation are available and would have less environmental impact eg West of Luton. The area has a high landscape value. Loss of wildlife, character of area, villages, green belt. Impact on quality of life of local residents and those that use it for recreation. Northern bypass would destroy AONB and would not solve Luton's traffic problems. Infrastructure insufficient for proposal, development will not pay for what is needed and cost will fall on others, including Luton. Hertfordshire has own quota of housing to fulfil and the housing would not count towards its allocation. M1 - Airport Link adequate for access to Airport so an Eastern Bypass is not necessary. Additional traffic will cause huge problems at either end of A505 at Hitchin and Stopsley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2031	Melanie Jarra	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects owing to impact on the landscape including the AONB and impact on this area of countryside which is used for recreation and relaxation. Objects to road infrastructure proposals and contends this will not benefit the area but make traffic worse. Objects to the lack of consultation and lack of transparency.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment, environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Consultation has been undertaken in East of Luton and North Herts. as part of the preparation of this Preferred Options document.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2037	Liam Jarra	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects owing to impact on the landscape including the AONB and impact on this area of countryside which is used for recreation and relaxation. Objects to road infrastructure proposals and contends this will not benefit the area but make traffic worse. Objects to the lack of consultation and lack of transparency.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment, environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Consultation has been undertaken in East of Luton and North Herts. as part of the preparation of this Preferred Options document.</p>				
3883	E Jarvis	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass for the following reasons: Acknowledge need for affordable homes but needs should be met without destroying the countryside. Would completely destroy villages of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and a considerable area of Green Belt. Should not squander treasure of natural beauty and rural peace. Noise and pollution. Petrol supply is not inexhaustible and we should learn to do without some of its benefits rather than lose beauty and peace we have inherited. Request that it should be properly considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2683	Colin J Jarvis	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The are proposed for development is of Luton is an area of fantastic natural beauty Water levels are too low to support 5,500 homes Vauxhall site may soon be available, put the houses there</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including water infrastructure capacity and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2598	William Jay	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Destruction of wildlife habitats Pollution from building Visual pollution of green countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2599	Neil Jay	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Live in village in centre of proposed development Area is an AONB Cats and wildlife corridors will destroy countryside and wildlife Green Belt is there for a reason At weekends, hundreds of people, mostly from Luton are enjoying the countryside Planning committee voted it through without considering the other 13 options 7 people voted through something not even in their county which will affect many lives West of Luton site contained everything required including easily accessible football ground - why was this site discounted before the planning meeting?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p>				
2480	Jennifer Jay	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton proposed development: will surround village (Cockernhoe) loss of green belt negative impact on wildlife should choose a different site</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3082	Mrs E A Jefferies	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land to the East of Luton is not part of Bedfordshire. Has due and fair consideration been given to other proposed sites that are actually in Bedfordshire? I am ashamed that our Council could support a proposal that will destroy the beautiful countryside and villages that those living in the East of Luton are privileged to enjoy. The planned destruction of agricultural land, wildlife and trees is unthinkable: as is the violation of Mangrove, Cockernhoe, Tea Green and Lilley Bottom.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to mitigate impact and retain recreation areas.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3474	Alison Jeffers	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Opposed to east of Luton development. These plans will take over and destroy some of Herts' most attractive countryside and must be abandoned. Herts is one of the most crowded counties in the south-east, especially the Luton-Stevenage-Hitchin, Letchworth and Baldock conurbations. The Green Belt is needed by all of us. We must not lose precious countryside and farming land for ever. Luton is one of the most aesthetically challenged, badly designed towns, yet these plans will only add to an already monstrous wart on the Chilterns. If expansion of Luton is essential, there are other areas with less cost to the overall quality of life for all of us. Traffic will increase, particularly in Hitchin where there is already a bottle-neck on the A505 and A602. This leads to increased traffic in villages using lanes as rat runs to avoid the main roads. That volume will increase to the detriment of road standards, which are the responsibility of Hertfordshire highways, and also to the quality of life of village residents.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3207	John Richardson	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is a question over the basis on which 5,500 homes for Bedfordshire can be built in North Hertfordshire. The Green Belt must be protected for the amenity of those in east Luton as well as North Hertfordshire. No thought has been given to the infrastructure needed and the chronic chaos on the A505/A602 at Hitchin. The proposal is poorly conceived in terms of planning and finance and opposed by North Herts. District Council.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence . Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
199	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The conurbation is quite big enough already and needs massive investment just to stand still. No more development in the South East of England.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Luton area for significant housing growth and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment, and environmental sensitivity assessment. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2491	Mr Allan Johnson	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton extension Loss of green belt and AONB. Negative impact on wildlife. More road accidents. Increased traffic. Lack of thorough research. Lack of suitability as per Environment Sensitivity Assessment report.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2492	Mrs Jackie Johnson	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton extension Loss of green belt and AONB. Negative impact on wildlife. More road accidents. Increased traffic. Lack of thorough research. Lack of suitability as per Environment Sensitivity Assessment report.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3118	Andrew Johnstone	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3196	Alison Jolley	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal will mean the loss of so much of North Hertfordshire's countryside with no support of North Herts. District Council. Although the strategic urban extension within North Herts, gives only an outline, it seems that the villages of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green could be swallowed up by the building of 5,500 new homes. Insufficient regard has been taken of the impact of the expansion on local road usage and increase in congestion. Proper consideration should be given to all the options to show there are no better alternatives.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2994	Mr Allan Jones	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal would deny people the right to enjoy healthy outdoor activity and recreational pursuits that the countryside provides. In addition, having land available for food production close to population centres is increasingly important.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including retention of recreation space.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2190	Mr Allan Jones	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The countryside to the East of Luton is used by many people for recreation purposes. Better use should be made of existing properties and empty homes and concentrating development within existing urban areas where infrastructure already exists. Having land available for food close to population centres could be important in the future. Once lost the land cannot be regained.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including retention of recreation space.</p>				
3447	Gary Jones	Darley Hall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: This was an undemocratic decision. The residents of these areas, and North Herts District Council, were not consulted or involved from the outset. This particular option would mean the loss of valuable farmland, the swamping of three lovely villages with housing estates plus the decimation of beautiful green belt land of outstanding natural beauty in exchange for commercial warehousing. It would also mean the destruction of the wide variety of wild life.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Consultation undertaken in North Herts. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2945	Mrs Jennifer H Jones	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Luton and S Beds do not control the land. Luton and S Beds imposing their will on people outside their area. Luton and S Beds take immense revenue from Luton airport while planes fly over N Herts disturbing residents sleep. Airport causes more disturbance to people from N Herts than those who benefit from Airport taxes. N Herts is gridlocked and infrastructure cannot absorb more people and traffic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Management of the airport is beyond the scope of this consultation. Preferred Options based on existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. Further work needed to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1130	Mr Norman Jones	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I accept the general principles to the Spatial Strategy as noted in my Question 3 comments but find the plans for the area in North Hertfordshire too vague at present. I accept given the government demand to plan for extra housing the scope around Luton is limited and to fulfil the imposed targets development in the North Herts area may be needed but detailed plans of the capacity without damaging the environment are needed. (via the North Herts LDF). This should clearly not be the first area to be developed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further detail would be helpful to provide greater certainty.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2846	Dick Jones	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the scale of development proposed to the east of Luton. The land is designated Green belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton, preventing further urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight other villages like Tea Green and Lilley. The draft Core Strategy has been issued without a detailed financial impacts analysis and has been presented to the Joint Planning Committee for decision without technical analyses. 'Bushwood Master plan: A Vision for Luton West' provides a viable alternative to east of Luton. It is not supported by North Hertfordshire District Council.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2143	Dr D W Jones-Baker	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection noted</p>				
3139	Susan Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton preventing urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A major development requires extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for eastern and northern bypasses which is financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. The draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became 4, including beautiful Green Belt land. Loss of wildlife.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 sites. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
557	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I strongly object as there is no justification in destroying Green Belt landscape classified as grade (1) when other areas are more sustainable to development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3088	Niall Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am writing to express my unhappiness at the possibilities that builders will build lots of houses on the fields than my friends and I love so much. I am very scared that all the wildlife will have no where to live and be forced to live in areas they are not used to. My school often takes the class to the woodlands so we can view and research lots of animals. I have seen some spectacular wildlife and I don't want it to vanish even if it's for money it's not worth it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2142	Mr David Keast	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Urban extensions should be to the west or north of Luton, in Bedfordshire, not in Hertfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2920	Mrs Christine Keating	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Loss of Green Belt and wildlife and outstanding and picturesque landscape. N Herts DC is opposed to development contrary to impression in Core Strategy. West of Luton is a better option and brownfield sites in Luton and Bedfordshire. Impact of traffic on Hitchin. A505 is already busy. Villages would lose their character.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1546	Mr John Keech	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the north of Houghton Regis. It will destroy picturesque views and absorb green belt that the country can ill afford. There is insufficient infrastructure, utilities, hospitals and schools to support this number of houses and it will cause serious congestion. This is not sustainable and investment in areas of regeneration would be much more suited to this size of development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1833	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: KEOLG regards the findings of the Preferred Options Core Strategy of dubious value as a whole. The MKSM requires a stipulated population for the Luton part of the sub-region. 1 of the 4 preferred options (east of Luton) is almost entirely outside Bedfordshire. The principal transport routes run north/south, in all logic, the urban extensions should be located along these routes or between them, not to the east or west which exacerbates the transport problems. When the geographical terrain and a lack of adequate infrastructure is included in Area L, East of Luton cannot be justified and is illogical.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development.</p>				
1833	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Core Strategy proposals and some of the policy documents/evidence studies used to justify its contents are potentially flawed. No synopsis of evidence given, except Site Assessment Matrix. 4 large extensions chosen in favour of several smaller ones on grounds of critical mass, a method which is ill defined concept. Aim of document is to provide a Luton bypass at expense of AONB, Green Belt, villages, hamlets and fails communities east of Luton. EoL preferred option is outside administrative area and opposed by NHDC. Cannot identify scale/boundary of proposed EoL extension. Any development at Lilley Bottom is inappropriate. CS uses terminology, obscure reasoning and complex statistical analysis and evidence studies contradicting its content to confuse laymen.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission document will continue to refine wording and readability of CS suitable for layman.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the East of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards their submission. The Sustainability Appraisal of subsequent Core Strategy stages will bring together the appraisal of the sites in the Site Matrix Assessment and wider sustainability issues of the preferred options. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1833	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Economic Analysis is over simplified in terms of costing, not taking into account geographic terrain or features between site options. Note various clauses in the supporting study which point to lack of financial viability of EoL proposal (details included in original response). The unfinished nature of study suggests preferences are premature and difficult for JC to justify its preferred options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy seeks to balance economic, social and environmental sustainability and is subject to ongoing SA.</p>				
1833	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Sustainability makes some recommendations concerning "a spread of urban extensions", "urban extensions F, G, H and I (not L)", "Avoid development on sites of biodiversity importance" and ""minimal loss of high grade agricultural topsoil", which do not appear to have any relative importance attached to them, thus performance scores have not been weighted, therefore influencing the SA.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy seeks to balance economic, social and environmental sustainability and is subject to ongoing SA.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1833	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Site Assessment Matrix does not directly compare the 13 urban extension sites, a review of the east of Luton site matrix suggests a certain selectivity and over simplification may have been applied to some assessment factors/conclusions/score and the absence of a ranking and a direct comparison between sites renders the report data difficult to review objectively. KEOLG recognise a scoring matrix is not necessarily the best method, but an overt and understandable comparison between possible sites is missing - as such this is a serious omission.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the consultation responses. Further work is needed to test and refine development proposals</p>				
2472	Mr Con Kelly	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: brownfield sites should be developed first, whatever the cost greenfield sites should not be a first option for developers traffic congestion</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for development of Brownfield sites first but Greenfield sites will be needed to meet the housing requirements at the rate required in the East of England Plan.</p>				
3886	James and Jennifer Kelly	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Road and infrastructure in the area will not take increase in volume of traffic and people. Congestion at back of Vauxhall and Stockingstone Road as it is gridlocked most of the time. More suitable area would be land around M1 between Junctions 10 to 12, and would be ideal with proposed 11a junction. It will be a disaster for Luton. Green Belt is too valuable to be destroyed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Core Strategy proposes urban extensions around Junction 11a on land to the North of Houghton Regis and North of Luton. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2473	Kay Kelly	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: brownfield sites should be developed first, whatever the cost greenfield sites should not be a first option for developers traffic congestion</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Housing Delivery Strategy to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for development of Brownfield sites first but Greenfield sites will be needed to meet the housing requirements at the rate required in the East of England Plan.</p>				
3547	David Kendall	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area between Lilley and Tea Green is of quite exceptional value in terms of environment and landscape. There are obvious alternatives: the land immediately south of Luton, between the A6129 and the A6/M1; and the land between the M1 and A5. Both options are closer to the town centre. the reason for choosing the east of Luton area should be made public straight away.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
396	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is not enough justification for including East of Luton as a strategic urban extension. The loss to the Green Belt and countryside is far too high a price to pay for this. Much of this land is classified as Landscape Grade 1 and is of high agricultural value.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3925	Anne Kerrell-Vaughan	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development on Green Belt land. Green Belt land is sacrosanct and should remain so as once lost it is gone forever. Country towns must not be turned into urban jungles, not just for amenity reasons but for physical and mental health, safety and crime prevention. English countryside is one of our greatest assets for both local people and tourists.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3906	John Keys	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: For East of Leighton Buzzard, the emphasis will be on "complementing and safeguarding its character and viability". If that is the case, why is there no mention of the very important and successful tourist attraction, the Narrow Gauge Railway? The proposed Development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove the remaining open landscape views. You mention "further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside", but you are proposing to take greenbelt to accommodate the Eastern Development. This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents. You have also been considering development West Linslade in Valley Farm Area and Stoke Road. This would introduce 1100 more unsustainable homes and further gridlock. Enough is Too Much already! Our Town is falling apart at the seams!! A huge infrastructure deficit has built up in Leighton Linslade and until this position is rectified, no new developments should be considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2181	Mrs Jackie Kiff	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Green Belt land should be protected. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Luton to develop. Wildlife will be lost and the countryside is used by many for recreation. North Herts should not provide land for Bedfordshire development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2487	Kim Killick	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development Destruction of AONB and Green Belt Development on Green Belt land contravenes Government and EU direction and advice Should consider vacant lots in Luton, eg Vauxhall Motors site, Power Court and old bus station Shouldn't extend Arndale Centre which is currently 1/3 empty Traffic congestion in Putteridge Bay area Removing food producing land contradicts 'green' policies Do not need more business parks when existing ones are not fully occupied Negative impact on wildlife Strain on infrastructure - expect Hertfordshire to finance services and infrastructure Environment Sensitivity Assessment advised against development Both Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire constituents will be disadvantaged</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3465	Kimpton Parish Council	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: - The selection of the 4 proposed urban extensions from the 13 possible development sites is unclear and lacks any transparency. - Development East of Luton is against green belt policy and would have a catastrophic impact upon the villages in North H</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Site Assessment Matrix outlines how each of the sites have been evaluated. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis.</p>				
3822	P King	Shenley Hill Road	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I strongly object to plans for housing both sides of Vandyke Road. This would increase traffic, danger to school children and traffic jams. Leighton Buzzard already is grid locked at weekends. The loss of Greenbelt land will cause hardship to wildlife and destroy the national heritage railway. We do not need any more homes, particularly built on a flood plain, which will increase the risk of flooding to thousands of homes. There are already plenty of unsold houses in Leighton Linlade. The doctors' surgeries have too many patients and where are the children going to school? Promises have been made about infrastructure but where is the money coming from?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2707	Jean King	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton, Northern Bypass and Eastern Bypass (Black Route). There are other options for urban expansion identified which would have less impact on the environment eg West of Luton which have not been given the same evaluation. Development will be on green belt contrary to Section 11.4. Loss of valuable wildlife habitat and beautiful recreation land. Villages will lose their identities and is in direct contravention of national green belt policy. Chilterns AONB is a significant asset as stated in Section 12.1 which must be conserved. The Northern bypass will cut through this whilst 'no bypass' options are available. Northern bypass will be close to Lilley resulting in noise and air pollution for the village. Luton Airport does not require an additional access road. Proposed development will not provide for the cost of necessary infrastructure. Traffic impact on Hitchin and Stopsley. Why should Hertfordshire have to absorb Bedfordshire's housing allocation?</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including consultation on the Northern Bypass and assessment of the impact of development proposals. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2697	David King	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development: other areas are mentioned in the Core Strategy that would have far less impact on the environment but have not received equal evaluation eg West of Luton. Villages would be lost to urbanisation as has happened in other areas of Luton. This contravenes national green belt policy. There will be irretrievable loss of Landscape Grade 1 around Lilley Bottom and wildlife and its habitat, which should be protected. The Northern bypass would cut through Chilterns AONB and destroy it, and would not solve Luton's traffic problems. It is unfair for Hertfordshire to share Bedfordshire's allocation of housing, the houses would not count towards Hertfordshire's total. The development will not support the required infrastructure. Has a financial viability survey been carried out? The economic burden will fall on Hertfordshire taxpayers.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3968	V V Kingham	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Loss of Green belt Loss of villages communities as they will become part of a vast part of urban sprawl Loss of Lilley Bottom Risk of flooding Services in N.Herts will become even more stretched Traffic congestion on local roads</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1544	Mrs Deborah Kingham	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development north of Houghton Regis on the following grounds: - the proposed area is protected green belt; - the impact of the proposed development will be devastating to an area of particularly beautiful countryside; - area already suffers from traffic congestion and the proposed development will make it worse; - a development of this size will require substantial additional infrastructure in terms of health, education and local transport, which do not seem to be considered in the plans. This proposed development does not meet the requirements for sustainability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2725	Kings Walden Parish Council	Royston	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: How has the EoL Preferred option come about? Strategy is flawed as there are no comparisons or justifications for this site compared with the others. Seems this option was put forward outside of the Committee's knowledge or remit and is a deliberate avoidance of democratic responsibility as members of the JC are not answerable to the electorate of the threatened area. The LUC Report (Dec 2008) states, 'There are significant constraints such that it is not considered appropriate for development to take place' (a copy of this is attached). The area is of the most attractive landscape without equal elsewhere in the local environment; being Green Belt, of 'high landscape value', adjacent to CAONB, comprised of undulating topography, woodlands, parkland, high-grade agricultural land, small hamlets and narrow, winding, sunken lanes with high hedges. What is being 'preferred' by the Joint Committee is an appalling destruction and desecration of a distinctive and beautiful area of countryside appreciated by everyone.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1887	Kirkby and Diamond		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: CS1 is not in accordance with MKSMSRS para 88 and RSS. The Preferred Options north and east of Luton and north of Dunstable/Houghton Regis are explicitly linked to the implementation of proposed strategic road links and significant infrastructure. These are at various stages of planning with some without funding. East of Linslade extension unlikely to provide Distributor Road due to reduction from the 4,400 units in the application to 2,500 in the Strategy. IDP states Extensions require delivery from 2012 and new infrastructure will be required by 2011. This target is unrealistic given that only the A5-M1 link has committed funding, whilst the Northern Bypass has no funding Eastern Bypass and Eastern Leighton Distributor Road are subject to testing. The Strategy must allow delivery of other sustainable extensions to meet targets if the Preferred Options fail to prove their deliverability within these timescales. West of Leighton Linslade is one option not reliant on the funding of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence indicates that the 'preferred' locations for strategic urban extensions are capable of being delivered within timescales necessary to enable the timely delivery of the RSS whilst also securing sought after local regeneration objectives</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3047	L Kuwakah	Milton Keynes	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development, Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3048	L Kuwakah	Milton Keynes	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage qualities of the area as well as the impact on Lilley. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be include			
3871	Mr Greg Laing	Knebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to meet Luton and Beds housing quota by building on 10,000 hectares, almost 40 square miles of countryside is the latest and largest chunk in the piecemeal suburbanisation of a once attractive county. Not only will this proposal wipe long established village communities off the face of the map and destroy a vast area of valuable farmland, the knock-on impact for surrounding villages and towns is appalling. A huge increase in road traffic and congestion would occur along with the loss of high quality rural environment beneficial to all people in the area.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The proposed development will not involve the development of 10,000 hectares. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3571	Parish Priest Michael Lambert	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to express my total disagreement with what is being proposed , on several grounds: - The land is actually in North Herts and no consultation has been undertaken with either the County Council or NHDC. - There is no reference to the effects on Hitchin - The land is Green Belt - When the west of Stevenage plan is brought into action we would be faced with urban sprawl which would include Stevenage!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Consultation has taken place in North Herts. and North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
960	W Lambert	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
944	Nora Lancashire	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
2703	Sheila Lancaster	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development extending into Hertfordshire green belt</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3400	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 4	Yes
Comment: Subject to existing urban areas being given priority over the development of strategic urban extensions.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for this				
3691	S J Landsborough	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed East of Luton "Preferred Option" for building housing and a bypass to the east of Luton. It obliterates an area of great beauty next to an AONB and there is no reason put forward to support this option. There are other options and no justification for choosing this one over them. The already horrendous traffic problems on this side of Luton will be exacerbated by the ill-conceived plan.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3947	Charlotte Langeveld	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to development east of Luton. We must stop destroying historic buildings, landmarks and Green Belt; building ugly concrete monstrosities. The development and bypass will permanently destroy an AONB, wildlife and landscape from our planet. It is offensive that the housing for Luton and South Beds is being proposed for Hertfordshire. There are brown field sites within Luton where services are already in place. Any development in NW Hertfordshire would adversely affect its status on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and wildlife, especially deer. Such developments contradict LBC's own policy ENV1. The surrounding infrastructure would be unable to cope with the increase in traffic, promoting health and safety risks and creating rat runs through country lanes.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.				
JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.				
2719	Jasmine Langeveld	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass. Upset by proposed destruction of green belt. Development and bypass would permanently destroy AONB and wildlife. Offensive for Luton and Bedfordshire's housing quota to be in Hertfordshire. Plenty of brownfield sites available in Luton that should be considered, with infrastructure already in place. Putteridge Bury Estate/Offley is an area of outstanding natural beauty, with Park and Garden registered with English Heritage. Any development would adversely affect the wildlife, contradicting Luton's own policy ENV1. Development would have high impact on existing residents, road, services and environment and change the character of the area. Noise, light and litter generated by proposal will affect and kill wildlife. Surrounding infrastructure insufficient to accommodate increasing traffic leading to severe health and safety risk to existing residents, general public and wildlife. Rat runs through country lanes.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2158	Jasmine Langeveld	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2157	Charlotte Langeveld	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2155	Richard J Langeveld	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3958	Dr G Langley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons A huge area of Hertfordshire Green Belt land will be destroyed Invasion across county borders into an area of classic countryside The development plan will increase congestion, and destroy farmland More pressure on Greenfields as a result of building a by-pass				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.				
JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.				
891	Mrs L Langridge	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
964	Lyn Larman	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2886	Mr FC Larsen	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass. Luton and Central Beds are planning to meet their housing targets by building in Hertfordshire countryside, which has its own housing targets and is the most densely populated county in the country. Proposal would destroy countryside next to designated AONB, in green belt, which is a natural barrier to urban sprawl and is meant to be permanent. Villages would be swallowed up and valuable farmland destroyed for ever. Would generate a huge amount of traffic on edge of Luton and which would not be attracted away from the town by proposed bypass. No consideration given to enormous increase in traffic and effect on Hitchin. Development not supported by N Herts DC and the bypass is not supported by the Highways Agency.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2885	Mr FC Larsen	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass. Luton and Central Beds are planning to meet their housing targets by building in Hertfordshire countryside, which has its own housing targets and is the most densely populated county in the country. Proposal would destroy countryside next to designated AONB, in green belt, which is a natural barrier to urban sprawl and is meant to be permanent. Villages would be swallowed up and valuable farmland destroyed for ever. Would generate a huge amount of traffic on edge of Luton and which would not be attracted away from the town by proposed bypass. No consideration given to enormous increase in traffic and effect on Hitchin. Development not supported by N Herts DC and the bypass is not supported by the Highways Agency.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3553	Rosemary Last	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I have read the strategy and do not believe that the case for expansion in Hertfordshire is made emphatically. I do not feel other areas have been fully investigated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2931	Simon R B Leadbeater	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development. Triangle of countryside between Stevenage, Luton and WG City is under threat from developments and will be increasingly squeezed until no Herts countryside will exist except as urban &amp; suburban parks. Countryside is vital for biodiversity. Development will hasten extinction of species such as Turtle Doves &amp; Cuckoos through loss of habitat. Increased CO2 emissions from new homes and more transport will outweigh any benefits. Scale of human displacements will dwarf any benefits of providing affordable housing adding to climate change and the displacement of millions of people worldwide. The bypass is clearly designed to aid the airport's expansion. Impact of aviation on the environment means there should be less of it and encouraging road traffic to the airport is worse. In the context of climate change crisis building on high quality countryside will exacerbate crisis and is irresponsible. If the developments go ahead, it will sound the death knell for N Herts' countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3261	Ita C Leaver	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton would destroy a large area of countryside designated as Landscape Conservation Area. Small villages would be swallowed up along farmland. It would result on the loss of Green Belt and impact on the live of residents and farmers. There is a query over whether Bedfordshire Councils can encroach on the Hertfordshire countryside. Brown field sites in Bedfordshire should be explored for expansion.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1292	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Development to the east of Leighton-Linslade should be concentrated to the south of Clipstone Brook, otherwise this contradicts the strategy's requirements for environmental protection (Section 12).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3806	David J Lester	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed east of Luton development and bypass for the following reasons: It is an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to an AONB and will destroy what has been carefully preserved for future generations. Will have a devastating affect on the wildlife. Development in the Green Belt will not assist in regeneration of the conurbation but will generate a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton. There are other options but it is not clear why EoL is a preferred option when so much would be destroyed and little or nothing gained except increased traffic and the resentment of residents in the surrounding area including Luton. Outrageous to consider a proposal involving expansion into Herfordshire that N Herts DC has no powers to stop.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3808	Nicola J M Lester	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed east of Luton development and bypass for the following reasons: It is an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to an AONB and will destroy what has been carefully preserved for future generations. Will have a devastating affect on the wildlife. Development in the Green Belt will not assist in regeneration of the conurbation but will generate a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton. There are other options but it is not clear why EoL is a preferred option when so much would be destroyed and little or nothing gained except increased traffic and the resentment of residents in the surrounding area including Luton. Outrageous to consider a proposal involving expansion into Herfordshire that N Herts DC has no powers to stop.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3152	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EOL development because: Land designated Green Belt, loss of recreational amenity, it will engulf hamlets and blight villages, impact on farmland and the character of Lilley Bottom. Traffic to East of Luton already at breaking point. Substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. No consideration has been given to traffic increase and no indication as to how it will be funded. Object to a Draft Core Strategy that was issued without proper financial impact analysis or sustainability investigation to test the proposals. Technical evidence does not support this option ahead of others and no explanation or justification is given in the document. The preferred 'Black Route' will go through the Chilterns AONB conflicting with Government policy and running through Lilley Bottom which is of high landscape importance. It conflicts with CS15. The proposed eastern section of Northern bypass and eastern Bypass should be deleted.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1331	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object. Considering the mass destruction of the countryside and green belt land connected with the East of Luton development proposal - you have provided no evidence to support this as a necessary course of action.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. .</p>				
4279	B J Liberty		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East Luton development, Northern Bypass (Black Route) and Eastern Bypass owing to: Impact which will not improve image of Luton or quality of life of people contrary to Chapter 11; Contrary to advice in LUC assessment which concludes development not recommended in Area L1; Lack of consideration to historic importance which is a material consideration; Location in North Herts who oppose the development; Impact on existing congestion. Other options exist including West of Luton which is for 5,500 homes, requires no public funding, on lower grade Green Belt, roads are not on farmland and incorporates LTFC. Alternatively redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing to meet the needs of single people, older people and would prevent urban sprawl and need for roads. Better to put life back into Luton along with housing, introducing a vibrant new culture of coffee shops and restaurants and create a place people want to live in and visit. Look at how Hitchin has started to re-invent itself.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible. It is not possible to accommodate all the development needed into existing urban areas.</p>				
2964	Mr and Mrs Terry and Kathy Lingham	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to the east of Leighton Buzzard. Out town already struggles with a mammoth building programme which is having a detrimental effect on every aspect of our community's life: overcrowding, traffic, safety, wildlife to name a few.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Recently developed and proposed housing accounted for in this decision. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2030	Helen & Henry Little	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We write in response to the proposed housing development north of Houghton Regis between the A505 and A5120. We would like to take this opportunity to object very strongly to this development. It would be a tragedy to see this small breathing space ruined for ever, the impact on nature and wildlife would be huge. Also, anyone who has had to drive through Houghton Regis or down the A5 in the morning or evening rush hour (spending most of their time in jams) will be appalled at the thought of more traffic. The area just can not sustain any more people, cars or houses! It will be just one more area of rural Bedfordshire gone forever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment, environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3085	David A Livingstone	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the development of such scale to the east of Luton which appear to have ignored the five purposes of the area's green belt designation. The proposal would result on the loss of amenity, engulf the villages and hamlets in the area and Putteridge Bury manor house, greater congestion and safety issues for pupils and staff of the existing schools in the area and over stretch road and community infrastructure. The proposal is not supported by North Hertfordshire District Council in which area is situated. The document needs to explain how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4. Object to the draft core strategy that has been issued without a financial impact analysis to test the proposals. Brown field sites should be considered such as the unused car parks of Vauxhall motors which could be consolidated with the Napier Park. Alternatively, the Slip End/Markyate area has been proposed by one builder.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1166	Mrs JA Livingstone	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the development to the East of Luton due to the scale of the proposed development and Green Belt considerations, loss of recreation space, impact on infrastructure and landscape, the location of Putteridge. Suggests use of land at Caddington and Slip End for development which is proposed by a builder as well as more development in urban area. Contends that it has not been proven that a Luton northern bypass and eastern extension will help Luton. Highways Agency does not support Luton north bypass. The Core Strategy being issued without a proper financial analysis being issued to test the proposals. North Herts Council does not support the development to the east of Luton in whose land the development is situated. Queries how decision can be taken without the members of the Joint Planning Committee having been presented with the technical analysis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3183	Julie Livingstone	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is green belt and of as much value as the adjacent AONB. The development would place demands on already over stretched services and facilities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3542	MS Lloyd	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The development to the East of Luton will decimate our loved countryside around Lilley and Offley and will cause an unacceptable increase in traffic to our country lanes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2771	Laura Lloyd	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development owing to impact on Green belt, archaeological sites, biodiversity contrary to CS15. Object to absorption of villages destroying village based community life and rural economy. Green Belts are intended to be permanent, changed only if no alternative. No satisfactory explanation or justification for choice of EoL. Further information is needed on alternatives. Boundaries will only be determined at submission stage, precluding a proper assessment of real impact of each proposed option. No explanation of how growth will be balanced with carbon efficiency targets. Noise pollution also needs consideration. No consideration given to traffic implications. Alternative location with more suitable transport infrastructure should be considered. Site is not financially viable, as it will need huge investment. No documents of financial forecasts or funding sources or financial impact on both local authorities' budgets. Lack of proper democratic process and no meaningful consultation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1545	Mrs S K Lloyd	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Recommendations to build 5,500 homes in Hertfordshire without NHDC's permission is totally unacceptable. Why has this area been earmarked rather than an area in Bedfordshire? Which areas of Bedfordshire were reviewed? This area is as good if not better than the adjacent Chilterns AONB, why are Bedfordshire proposing concreting over it? 3 small villages will be swallowed up (Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green), is this acceptable to you? The areas' infrastructure is insufficient, how will it be financed or are North Herts residents to pay for it? What would be the impact on existing residents? Why does NHDC not know about statements in the Summary document (page 6) concerning the preferred urban extension in North Herts and the intention to provide/plan for it in the NHDC Core Strategy, please explain?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
1556	Lesley Lodge	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Luton Northern Bypass and housing to be built between the bypass and the Luton boundary will clearly impact disproportionately on all of Streatley and cause considerable disruption to the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3111	Mrs Louise Lomax	Darley Hall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development to the east of Luton will have a major impact on the lifestyle we have chosen to live in the Hertfordshire green belt. The country lanes are struggling with the traffic and the proposed new road system will scar our green belt further. Why is building in Hertfordshire by Bedfordshire being considered?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2106	London Luton Airport	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the lack of reference to the airport in the Core strategy which could lead to a Policy vacuum. Suggests changes to the vision and inclusion of a specific policy or amendment to CS which states that support for the safeguarding of the operations of the airport and outlining need to prepare a master plan to bring forward its growth in accordance with the Air Transport White Paper</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further detail regarding the future planning framework for the airport is appropriate</p>				
1797	London Luton Airport Consultative Committee	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The strategy does not acknowledge the implications of the Government's Air Transport White Paper (2003) that supports the maximum use of a single, full-length runway based on the current alignment. The current runway is 2,160m and could grow to 3,000m. London Luton Airport Operations Ltd will soon be creating a master plan and any urban extension to the east of Luton could constrain an airport development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further detail regarding the future planning framework for the airport is appropriate</p>				
3864	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The strategic extension N of Luton is not an inherently sustainable location. Despite the extension of the busway to the north of Luton, the proposals for public transport accessibility are woeful compared to the proposals for vehicular access direct to an orbital by-pass and the M1. The proposal shows both the northern bypass and part of the development area extending into AONB. The continuation of the northern bypass eastwards infringes on the AONB and even with a tunnel, noise and pollution will effect a SSSI. Without incursion into the AONB, it is difficult to see that sufficient land exists to deliver the housing and employment requirements. Even without encroachment into the AONB, the development nevertheless affects an area of high landscape and environmental quality. There are few opportunities to establish genuine and meaningful connectivity compounding the proposed growth area as car based dormitory settlement. It performs poorly when tested against the objectives of the MKSM Subregional Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The North of Luton is identified in the MKSMSRS as an area of search. Its inclusion is based on the evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3861	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to lack of clarification of how option 8 from Issues and Options went on to become the Preferred option as it performed relatively poorly in the Sustainability Appraisal process. The SA advises "the preferred option should be a combination of some of the options presented in the Core Strategy Issues and Options. The input of the SA in the evolution of the Core Strategy to date has been limited. There is no clear link between the spatial strategy selected and the results of the SA on the Issues and Options. The Halcrow SA results have been ignored, whilst the WYG work is at an early stage, and no significant conclusions are reached. Officers selected the Growth Areas for the Preferred Options in advance of any results from the Sustainability Appraisal, and in advance of the receipt of key matters from Evidence Base. This failure to support the selected Preferred Options drives to the heart of the "soundness" of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further SA work will be undertaken to test and refine the Core Strategy Preparation.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The SA advised on key principles for the distribution and location of development which has informed the preferred options. Further SA work will be undertaken to test and refine the Core Strategy Preparation.</p>				
3855	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Bushwood, Luton West is an appropriate location for delivering a significant proportion of the growth required and can do so in a manner that maximises the benefits of growth to the wider community. There's a set of evidence documents supporting this proposal attached to this representation. In addition there are a number of comments regarding the evidence supporting the CS which are relevant to land to the west of Luton. Contends that there are a number of studies which show a discrepancy between each other and what the Core Strategy Says including the Land Use Consultants (LUC) Landscape Character Assessment and the Beds CC Environmental Sensitivity Assessment as well as the Employment Land Study and the Sustainability Appraisal. Advises that own landscape assessment for the area south-west of Luton is consistent with the findings of the original LUC Character Assessment and provides detailed evidence on how the development in this area could be integrated into the landscape, with no effect on the AONB.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3851	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The EoL proposal is undeliverable because it is not supported by N Herts and because there is no substantive evidence demonstrating the deliverability of either an eastern bypass or a tunnel under Luton Airport to connect the eastern corridor. The proposal would have a significant adverse impact on a high quality and sensitive landscape to the east of Luton. The proposal would result in a substantial and unnecessary loss of Green Belt and a significant settlement coalescence. The proposal cannot be satisfactorily served by public transport and will encourage induced traffic generation and will result in significant adverse effects within the eastern areas of Luton and further afield in Hitchin and neighbouring areas. Whilst North Herts Core Strategy does not preclude eastward expansion of Luton if that can be shown necessary, it makes clear that any such extension should not breach the key landscape threshold formed by the Breachwood Green ridge therefore it is incompatible with the N Herts CS.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence gathered over period of time including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1316	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Key Diagram and relevant supporting text in Section 4 - Please see separately submitted documentation.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Pre Submission version of the Core Strategy will include appropriate references to open space and design. Delivery Strategy will outline approach to delivering infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3868	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The strategic extension to the north of Houghton Regis has potential to provide a mixed-use urban extension. However, there are concerns with the scale of the proposed development and whether it is achievable within the Plan period given the number of constraints in relation to area F. Historic evidence shows that on average large scale mixed-use sites cannot deliver more than around 330 units/annum over the course of their entire build out period. If housing completions were to start on Area G in 2012/13 the development would need to achieve an average of almost 390 units per annum to deliver 7,00 units by 2031, the highest rate ever achieved in the East of England. Area G will be affected by competition from adjacent strategic development allocations which is likely to slow the rate of delivery. There is also little evidence that completions will begin in 2012/13 given to the completion of the A5-M1 link road and the typical 5 years needed to move form an outline planning application to first completions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1903	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Lacks detail on how different aspects of Strategy join up, overall impact. Little consistency between principles and preferred options. Strategy based on 20th C thinking - emphasis on bypasses as a priority with downside brushed aside. Scale of development in each location too great. Scale of EoL unacceptable - impact on Green Belt, villages, conflicts with own policy to deliver appropriately scaled growth in rural settlements. Town cramming – loss of green space, wildlife, unacceptable affect on people. Concerned about blanket policy to maximise potential of existing urban areas to accommodate new development". Town needs green lungs. Employment, infrastructure must be integral to planned housing, create new communities, climate friendly travel, health, education, green spaces from the start. Housing must not be an excuse for Luton ring road. Too much reliance on guided busway which isn't a practical alternative to cars and cannot provide "sea change in public transport" that MKSM Inspectors said is required.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS needs to take balanced approach to delivering the growth requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence and consideration of the contribution the Strategy as a whole makes to achieving the principles and objectives. Further work to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2080	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: A public transport led approach will also facilitate demand management and traffic calming measures to promote modal shift in urban extensions - recognising that in future, Government finance and developer contributions will increasingly need to demonstrate how improvements tackle modal shift and transport innovation. A separate Integrated Development Programme (IDP) sets out sources of funding in a programme that can be related to the critical phasing and implementation of schemes and investments to deliver the spatial development strategy. Furthermore, both the Borough and Central Bedfordshire are progressing SPDs on developer contributions through Section 106 contributions, which will be complementary in their overall approach. Site-specific contributions are likely to reflect the needs of individual sites, whilst funding through formulae (or other approaches) may help to tackle the needs of the wider conurbation via a possible Community Infrastructure Levy or some other arrangements.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2080	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: LBC supports approach and emphasis on regenerating Luton Town Centre; strategic employment land provision; community facilities, cultural development for whole community; accessibility via public transport - bus/rail, Luton town centre facilities; strategic Park &amp; Ride sites; extending guided Busway, connecting Luton to new extensions, development, employment sites; highway infrastructure improvements, reducing congestion; using extensions to enhance sustainability of area and regeneration e.g. Marsh Farm. A public transport, walking and cycling led approach to help achieve an integrated, sustainable development pattern by promoting modal shift, minimising over reliance on costly road infrastructure as enabler of development. Orbital road capacity improvements with public transport benefits from reduced traffic. Emphasis on public transport providing innovative opportunities to increase accessibility via mixed use developments linking with transport interchange facilities, minimising need for the private car.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action Required		
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
2455	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Wishes to record his strong objection to the East of Luton Preferred Options proposal. Is objecting to having macro level of housing targets imposed on the area by national &amp; regional authorities and the Joint Committee of Bedfordshire Councillors making recommendations for Hertfordshire. Proposals to build on Green Belt Land make a mockery of the entire Green Belt Policy. We need more housing, but the scale and location of development should be down to local people to debate and decide. Doesn't believe reasonable alternatives have been adequately considered.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response: Beyond the scope of this consultation to alter the Planning System. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence . Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
1921	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The LSPs support measures for sustainable transport. There is concern over the effectiveness of the Luton-Dunstable guided bus way, how transport infrastructure will be delivered and whether it will deliver the expected benefits. Include the 'provision of further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside' to proposals relating to Luton. State the need for community safety incorporating the 'secure by design' standards. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this		
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Pre Submission version of the Core Strategy will include appropriate references to open space and design. Delivery Strategy will outline approach to delivering infrastructure.				
3583	Fergus Lyon	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I would like to object strongly to the proposed development east of Luton. This will damage the countryside through building on the Green Belt and increasing traffic. This development will not only damage the quality of life but will also damage the range of businesses that rely on the countryside.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4052	Heather and Vaughan Mabbett	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The East of Luton proposal will be harmful to the rural character of this part of Hertfordshire by increasing the Luton sprawl. The expanding airport has already eaten into this area. The development would be detrimental to the villages in the area as well as wildlife. The proposed development flies in the face of Green Belt policy. There must be a considerable amount of brownfield sites available.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>			
2862	Andy MacFarlane	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton will be contrary to the draft Core Strategy intention to create attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life ( section 11) and better options are available such as West of Luton or alternatively using urban capacity within Luton. The proposal is in Green Belt land rated sensitivity level 1 and include Iron Age and Roman sites likely to be of national importance. There is congestion primarily along the A505, the addition of 5,500 houses and up to 8,000 additional cars would make it worse.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			
3608	Ina Machen	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development East of Luton is massive in a county that has already been heavily urbanised over the last century. Herts is one of the most congested counties in the UK and the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on Hitchin and the surrounding villages. No mention has been made regarding the impact on Hitchin. There will be even more traffic on the A505 and greater congestion in Hitchin. The development is not supported by NHDC.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			
3617	John Machen	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Development on Green Belt and green field sites is massive and in a county which is already heavily urbanised and one of most congested in the country. Detrimental impact on Hitchin and surrounding villages. The development and proposed northern bypass and eastern extension will result in more traffic on A505 leading to more congestion in Hitchin. Impact on Hitchin's infrastructure and traffic has been ignored. Not supported by N Herts DC. Views of residents east of Luton should be crucial factor in the decision making process.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
883	Cedric Macro	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2393	Mr Maguire	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to: its designation as Green Belt; its impact on the countryside, wildlife and the villages of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green as well as Tea Green and Lilley; its impact on the infrastructure notably roads, hospitals and schools; and its location in North Herts given the Authority's lack of support for the proposals. Objects to the lack of detailed financial impact analysis to test the proposals and Members taking decisions without having been presented with the technical evidence.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
967	E Maguire	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. Bypasses benefit those outside the town more than those in Luton. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded - No supporting financial impact analysis? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3245	J C Mahoney	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the overspill of Luton into Hertfordshire. We are growing and providing less and less food and will have to import more at greater costs. There will be delay in providing infrastructure but the most important matter is the water supply in this very dry area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of water infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3987	John R Mahoney	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: ID 326591 Objects to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons It would destroy an area of great natural landscape beauty. It would not assist in regeneration of the Luton Conurbation It would be on green belt land which must be protected from development for this and future generations. It would generate massive extra traffic that would not be attracted by the proposed bypasses. There is scant evidence that the option to build on the extensive number of brown-field sites in Luton has been properly and vigorously pursued despite its many advantages. Decisions are being taken before completion of other option studies A full, transparent and up-to-date financial appraisal is essential and regrettably absent so far The housing development cannot possibly fund the necessary soft and hard infrastructure. This development is wrong in principle. The planning is flawed, partisan and partial. The alternatives have not been effectively and vigorously considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing, funding and viability information. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy cannot debate the Immigration policy at national level but addresses issues of in and out commuting and will help address housing/jobs imbalances in the future</p>				
3929	Mrs Kim Major-George	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass for the following reasons: Will be built in the area covering Lilley Bottom which is outrageous. Green Belt land is a much needed break from urban sprawl of Luton. Infrastructure will not cope and there is no talk of schools, medical or other facilities being proposed. Has not been thought through and from a lay person's point of view a lot of back handers and under table dealings has brought about a scheme in a stunning area of Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3522	Nicolas Mamier	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL development. Acknowledge need for additional housing but not in area which encroaches into Herts. Option was reached without due consideration to other options. No infrastructure to support development and requires vast public funding. Roads already congested and won't cope with increased traffic. Local services eg schools, hospitals are already overstretched and would not cope with extra numbers. Local services, amenities such as sports facilities, shops not suitable to cope with extra numbers. Emergency services already overstretched and villages in Herts. would suffer. Luton would incur huge costs for encroaching into Herts. Proposed bypass won't ease traffic but will bring more traffic to the Herts. side of Luton. Will destroy for ever irreplaceable Green Belt and Landscape Grade 1. Severe effect on wildlife and will take away Luton's 'playground' where people walk and enjoy the fresh air. Scope to develop empty properties in Luton and previously developed land without breaching green belt.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3514	Joy Mann	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development to the East of Luton would be contrary to the Core Strategy Vision which states that Luton and South Beds will be known as the Green Growth Area. Several extremely attractive villages would be absorbed in to scheme which is also contrary to the vision.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2229	Mr S Mann	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton urban extension: Loss of Green Belt contrary to 'Vision' para 3.2 Negative impact on villages Impact on bats and other biodiversity Impact on Chilterns AONB Other viable options eg West of Luton</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2998	Mrs Alison Manning	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton proposed development owing to its location in the Green Belt and the impact on the villages as well as public houses that are reliant on people visiting the area to walk in the beautiful Chilterns extension. Also objects to the impact that this development would have on the wildlife and farmland, including red kites, deer and bats. States that the proposals for infrastructure are inadequate and would cause congestion, notably in Hitchin which would be gridlocked. Questions why this is a preferred location given that North Herts oppose the development. Concerned that the budget would spiral and additional funding would be required.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3212	Paul Markham	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The expansion of Luton to the east is beyond the council's boundaries. The area is designated green belt and should not be proposed for development. Need to look towards brownfield land as the car plants are expected to shut down.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed.</p>				
890	Mr J Marks	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2417	Mr D Marlow	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the development to the East of Luton owing to its designation as Green Belt land with the aim of preventing further urban sprawl and its impact on the landscape as well as the hamlets and villages of Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green, Tea Green and Lilley. States that a development of this kind requires extensive infrastructure which is financially no viable and not supported by the Highways Agency in the case of the Luton Northern Bypass and therefore questions how this will be funded. States that the development to the East of Luton is not supported by North Herts District Council whose area it is situated and that people need to know how 13 options became 4 and include this Green Belt land. Objects to the decision of the Joint Committee without members having been presented with the technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment, and environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1165	Mr Richard Marsh	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton: Scale of proposed development; Land designated Green Belt, forming a natural eastern boundary of Luton to prevent urban sprawl; Development will engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green &amp; Lilley; Land is used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility; Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure overstretched and development will increase traffic on A505 and rural roads; Whitwell has existing traffic congestion problems; Highways Agency not support Luton north bypass; Development will overstretch hospitals &amp; educational facilities; North Herts Council does not support the development to the east of Luton in whose land the development is situated; The CS being issued without a proper financial analysis being issued to test the proposals; Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas; Queries how decision taken without Joint Planning Committee having been presented with the technical analysis.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
915	Mrs Margaret Marshall	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I DO NOT support the diagram. It proposed huge expansion east of Luton in North Hertfordshire. This would ruin the character of the region and destroy the beauty of the villages in it.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2960	C R Mason	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development East of Luton owing to: impact on water resources and loss of farmland particularly with future predictions of global warming likely to aggravate the situation impact on countryside and loss of open space and the resultant impacts of this on health and loss of trees to absorb carbon products</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence, including impact on water infrastructure and flood risk. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3982	Mr Roger Masters	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the development north of Houghton Regis for the following reasons: - Unacceptable increase on roads and rail travel. - Loss of protected and much loved green belt - Inadequate community facilities such as schools and hospitals.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3916	Mrs Melanie Matthews	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register my objections to the East of Luton proposals which would swallow up the beautiful villages of Tea Green and Cockernhoe. Green Belt has been protected for a reason and this should not be negotiable. Not everyone wishes to live in a huge urban sprawling jungle with little character or history. Although the developments are in Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire will be dramatically affected by such a huge population increase and I feel the objections of North Herts District Council and Herts County Council.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3462	Clare Matthews	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed site to the East of Luton is green belt land and has been protected for a reason. I object to the increased pressure this development will place on the infrastructure placed on neighbouring locations in terms of jobs, social amenities, transport links etc which will be inevitable. The development will swallow up unique smaller towns and villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3378	Mr Harry Maughan	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Yes with provisos on transport and Leighton Linslade Housing Provision: Transport - The LBC idea of a Luton/Dunstable Busway is totally illogical. The 3 town centres congestion problem &amp; technical/operating Aspects. There is no discernable support from the community - and if attempted would totally destroy the one thing that will cut into South Bedfordshire Road Traffic Congestion: A Railway Formation - as the basis of restoring a multi-modal integrated transport system. Rail would give local, district regional, national and inter-national journeys - and freight movement too. (LBC Officers have stated Busway ignores ... 2009-2010 Luton and Bedfordshire Minerals and Waste Development Plan - No Road Bulk Transport is coming up). LL Housing Growth Location - In Time the Eastern Development will see 6000 units come about. only serving it by a Stanbridge Parkway Station and the Southern Development by a Leighton Buzzard South Station - Sustainability, if an extended railway route replaces the proposed busway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector. East West Rail consortium consulted on a preferred route for the section between the MML and the ECML. The preferred route that emerged from that work was a route between Stevenage and the south of Luton.</p>				
2107	Mr Harry Maughan	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard and South Bedfordshire as a whole already has identified transport infrastructure deficits The renewal of east-west railway links across Bedfordshire is key to delivering sustainable transport as opposed to the 'Translink' guided bus way scheme. EastWestRail and RailFuture provided as examples of the benefits of rail development. A genuine multi-modal transport strategy needs to be put forward</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: East West Rail consortium consulted on a preferred route for the section between the MML and the ECML. The preferred route that emerged from that work was a route between Stevenage and the south of Luton <input type="checkbox"/> Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable rail</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2927	Maureen Cooper	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development. The roads and large number of houses will affect the people of Hitchin and surrounding villages and cause problems for everyone in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2693	J C and I R E Mayles	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: attended local area committee meeting and decision process seemed very undemocratic east of Luton area was not fully represented on joint planning committee compared to other areas do not understand how the area went from standby status to preferred choice it would be vandalism to destroy green belt which has outstanding wildlife area unsuitable for development due to insufficient infrastructure will create more traffic, adding to already congested roads local schools will not cope with influx huge investment required for infrastructure, schools, medical support and developers will only supply a fraction of cost so where will money come from</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2766	Mrs E McAllister	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Keep Luton on the other side of the border. Land is Green Belt and would be spoilt. Wildlife has not been considered. People in Wigmore and Stopsley enjoy the area. Traffic into Luton is already bad.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2497	Mr Robert McAllister	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to building on countryside Use existing empty housing</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2494	Sharon McAllister	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development increased traffic</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2694	M R McArthur	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Area originally not preferred and no reason has been given for the change, even to joint planning committee members Fail to see how this area, with its drawbacks outweighs other suggested areas If the scheme is to succeed it should not be at the cost of living standards</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2352	Mr T R McCafferty	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about congestion, flooding, unemployment and lack of infrastructure Primary concern is the impact new residents will have on the existing population of Leighton Buzzard</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
3763	Gordon McCallum	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objection to the planned East of Luton development for the following reasons Questionable consultation procedures disbelieve of proper talks held between local authorities and residents impact on the environment and unpublished findings Impact on infrastructure and unpublished findings Likelihood for unfair decisions Have all links between parties been fully declared? Will all of your actions stand up to rigorous scrutiny by legal and press investigations?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation has been undertaken in North Herts., North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further evidence to be gathered in the further testing and refining of options.</p>				
3764	Phyllis McCallum	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objection to the planned East of Luton development for the following reasons Questionable consultation procedures disbelieve of proper talks held between local authorities and residents impact on the environment and unpublished findings Impact on infrastructure and unpublished findings Likelihood for unfair decisions Have all links between parties been fully declared? Will all of your actions stand up to rigorous scrutiny by legal and press investigations?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation has been undertaken in North Herts., North Herts. and Herts. CC have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further evidence to be gathered in the further testing and refining of options.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3977	Gina McCarry	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Countryside to be substituted by concrete Social services as well as public infrastructure will be overstretched Current difficulties to cope with the demands of an overpopulated town and surrounding area</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1092	Miss Leanne McCarthy	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: objects to loss of green belt land around hamlets of Mangrove green and Tea green in Hertfordshire - infrastructure required the a development of this site is not viable and is not supported by the Highways Agency - the proposed bypass cuts through recreational areas and woods and areas of ecological and archaeological importance - objects to the Core Strategy that has been issued without proper detailed financial impact analysis - objects to the fact that a decision was taken without the technical evidence available</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1087	Mr Michael McCarthy	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: objects to loss of green belt land around hamlets of Mangrove green and Tea green in Hertfordshire - infrastructure required the a development of this site is not viable and is not supported by the Highways Agency - the proposed bypass cuts through recreational areas and woods and areas of ecological and archaeological importance - objects to the Core Strategy that has been issued without proper detailed financial impact analysis - objects to the fact that a decision was taken without the technical evidence available</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1085	Mr Mark McCarthy	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: objects to loss of green belt land around hamlets of Mangrove green and Tea green in Hertfordshire - infrastructure required the a development of this site is not viable and is not supported by the Highways Agency - the proposed bypass cuts through recreational areas and woods and areas of ecological and archaeological importance - objects to the Core Strategy that has been issued without proper detailed financial impact analysis - objects to the fact that a decision was taken without the technical evidence available</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1090	Sally McCarthy	Not given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: objects to loss of green belt land around hamlets of Mangrove green and Tea green in Hertfordshire - infrastructure required the a development of this site is not viable and is not supported by the Highways Agency - the proposed bypass cuts through recreational areas and woods and areas of ecological and archaeological importance - objects to the Core Strategy that has been issued without proper detailed financial impact analysis - objects to the fact that a decision was taken without the technical evidence available</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage</p>				
3513	Mr Terry McGaffin	Nottingham	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development owing to impact on villages, landscape, Liley Bottom, wildlife and quality of life. Land is designated Green Belt, forms a natural boundary to Eastern Luton and prevents urban sprawl. Extensive infrastructure is needed, including a northern bypass and eastern extension through Liley Bottom. This would be financially non-viable. Goes against claim that this option would preserve and enhance countryside and heritage. The Highways Agency does not support the northern bypass so how will it be funded? The Draft Core Strategy has been issued without proper financial impact analysis to test the proposals. Development is not supported by North Herts DC. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became 4. Other more suitable options have been dismissed eg full use of brown field sites and regeneration and refurbishment of areas in Luton. Decisions were taken by the Joint Planning Committee in the absence of technical and economic analyses, therefore object to lack of due diligence.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3515	Mrs Jill McGaffin	Nottingham	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development owing to impact on villages, landscape, Liley Bottom, wildlife and quality of life. The land is designated Green Belt, forms a natural boundary to Eastern Luton and prevents urban sprawl. Extensive infrastructure would be needed, including a northern bypass and eastern extension through Liley Bottom. This would be financially non-viable. Goes against claim that this option would preserve and enhance countryside and heritage. Highways Agency does not support the northern bypass so how will it be funded? The Draft Core Strategy has been issued without proper financial impact analysis to test the proposals. Development is not supported by North Herts DC. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became 4. Other more suitable options have been dismissed eg full use of brown field sites, regeneration and refurbishment of areas in Luton. Decisions were taken by the Joint Planning Committee in the absence of technical and economic analyses, therefore object to lack of due diligence.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
249	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Same reasons as question 3. Extension into North Herts is totally unjustified, and not wanted by the people of North Herts.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2779	Christina McIsaac	Darley Hall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Development of 5500 houses, employment and a bypass in North Hertfordshire would destroy green belt and wildlife, three villages would be surrounded by new housing states and two more would have large warehouses on their doorstep. The consequences of so much traffic through Hitchin and this section of the M1 would be horrific. The process is not democratic given that the proposal falls within a different administrative area.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3120	Alistair McKenzie	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
966	Mrs M L McLaughlin	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. Bypasses benefit those outside the town more than those in Luton. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded - No supporting financial impact analysis? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
4055	Mr Ian McNicoll	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is surely vital for the people of Luton as a place for recreation. I do not consider that you have publicised the consultation to people like myself in other neighbourhoods who would be affected by the loss of amenity. Continued development on the outskirts of Luton is killing the town centre, the heart of the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3645	T M McPheat	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The preferred option to the east of Luton was agreed by the Joint Committee with incomplete information. Other options have not been fully explored.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2768	Mr F J E McPherson	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development, Northern Bypass and Eastern Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and impact on traffic. Contends that proposal is in direct conflict with Core Strategy principles and vision, notably protecting important landscape and the identity of villages. Although no houses will be built in the Chilterns AONB, the proposed 4 lane Northern Bypass will damage this significant asset. N Herts is against the development and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land for this development. A505 is already congested, Hitchin suffers gridlock and the lanes around Cockernhoe and Lilley Bottom are unable to accommodate current traffic levels safely. Increased traffic from the development will exacerbate appalling congestion. Other options for development are available eg West of Luton which is on lower grade green belt, incorporates social infrastructure including a football stadium and will not need the same level of infrastructure expenditure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3779	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly protest against proposal to build 5,500 houses East of Luton. The schemes are in clear conflict with your own published principles and there are better alternatives available. The West of Luton (WoL), which is also for 5,500 houses, requires no public funding. As one of the Core Strategy's concerns is that "significant additional funding would be needed beyond existing budgets", this WoL option must be more attractive on this basis alone. Furthermore, the WoL scheme is on lower grade Green Belt than the EoL scheme and the road infrastructure is on existing B roads, not on productive farmland designated AONB. It also incorporates social infrastructure including a 22,000 seat football stadium for Luton Town Football Club.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3789	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly protest against proposal to build 5,500 houses East of Luton. The schemes are in clear conflict with your own published principles and there are better alternatives available. The West of Luton (WoL), which is also for 5,500 houses, requires no public funding. As one of the Core Strategy's concerns is that "significant additional funding would be needed beyond existing budgets", this WoL option must be more attractive on this basis alone. Furthermore, the WoL scheme is on lower grade Green Belt than the EoL scheme and the road infrastructure is on existing B roads, not on productive farmland designated AONB. It also incorporates social infrastructure including a 22,000 seat football stadium for Luton Town Football Club.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4019	P Mead	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Area is overpopulated already. People will not find jobs. Beautiful countryside will be destroyed forever. Other less populated areas are available which will have less impact. Queries whether housing and employment pressures are the result of immigration policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy cannot debate the Immigration policy at national level but addresses issues of in and out commuting and will help address housing/jobs imbalances in the future</p>				
3464	Mr Mellor	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Leighton Buzzard proposed urban extension because of: massive loss of green belt, over development of Leighton Buzzard, lack of infrastructure to cope with already over developed area, lack of job opportunities in immediate area, loss of much of current green corridor between town and villages, farmland urgently needed for food/bio fuel requirements, development requires building of additional facilities, loss of narrow gauge railway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including impact on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2592	Professor Geoffrey Mercer	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: In direct conflict with Core Strategy 'vision' to provide attractive areas to live and visit and a good quality of life Residents of villages value and use the area of Grade 1 beauty and significance. The consultants recommended against development given the high sensitivity of the landscape. Support for the Black Route comes from people who want the bypass as far away from them as possible and was not a vote in favour of desecrating the AONB Section 11.4 expresses support for areas that support biodiversity. The Land Use Consultants note that the whole east of Luton area forms part of the Chilterns Agricultural landscape which is important for farmland species. Contradicts the aim of AONBs and Areas of Significant Landscape Value.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3828	Mrs Ann P Mercer	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development in North Hertfordshire will desecrate a huge rural area which is recognised to be one of the most beautiful parts of the county, full of historical interest and wildlife. Why should Luton and Bedfordshire seek to fulfil its housing requirements in Hertfordshire? The area in question is Green Belt which is intended to be permanent. A large part of the area has been designated an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is valued by residents from the villages affected and by residents of Luton. The proposals to build 5,500 houses will mean that the villages of Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green will be completely swallowed up. The character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed and acres of arable land will disappear. There would also be substantial increases in traffic on the A505 to and from Hitchin, within Hitchin, which is already a bottleneck, and on the rural roads in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3534	Mr and Mrs Millins	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We strongly object to this proposal. We have lived in the Clipstone Brook area for 40 years and have experienced flooding many times, filling property with sewage when heavy rain causes the brook to overflow and the drains are unable to cope. The proposal to build houses on a flood plain is ludicrous, it is exactly what it is - A FLOOD PLAIN</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on flood plain) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. Measures are proposed in the Core Strategy to mitigate flooding in this area and the town.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2997	GM and J Mills	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Building houses to the east of Luton would result on the loss of natural habitat for wildlife and act as a protection to the AONB and will put a strain on road, social and community infrastructure. The proposal will change/engulf the villages of Cockermhoe and Mangrove and will have an adverse effect on Tea Green and Breachwood Green and other surrounding villages. The proposal is in North Herts and should not have been considered for development. Other more logical alternatives should be considered to the North and South along the M1 corridor. The council has approximately 2500 empty properties which could be used.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2516	W N G Millward	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development: Loss of Green Belt Recommendation of Land Use Consultants being ignored Loss of quality farm land Loss of best scenery in Hertfordshire Impact on villages Increased traffic Un democratic No explanation of why East of Luton selected as preferred location Population growth should be accommodated in the North</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure..</p>				
2119	Milton Keynes Council	Milton Keynes	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The Council has carefully considered the Core Strategy and supporting documents and has no comments to make. The Council looks forward to further feedback on the Core Strategy's progress and wishes to be kept informed of future stages and retained on your database.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3665	Mrs Diane Moles	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development. Can't understand how 13 options were put forward and one of the chosen was in North Herts. Area already has major traffic problems which will be exacerbated by additional cars from the proposed development. Bypass will not help but will just increase rat runs and people will not use public transport even if it is provided. Stopsley has lost its village identity over the years and we need some green land left for future generations to enjoy. The same will happen to the villages in N Herts but with more irretrievable damage. Objects to loss of wildlife and recreation space. Luton has considerable amount of land not built on and sold to developers for non housing projects. Where will the people in the new development work? Concerned about strain on Luton's resources. Areas west and north of Luton don't have same density and commercial units as east of Luton. Vast numbers of houses in Luton are empty and many brown field sites available so whole situation should be reassessed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3114	K D Moles	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The JIU ignored Land Use Consultants' assessment which does not recommend the development of the area to the East of Luton and made the decision to opt for the east of Luton option without seeing data on all 13 options. The area is home to an abundance of wildlife and has areas of national archaeological and historical importance which would be lost forever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of all the existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3607	Laura Monks	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development, Northern and Eastern Bypasses owing to loss of Green Belt, impact on landscape, villages and Chilterns AONB. Proposals are against the CS's vision of safeguarding the Chilterns AONB. Land Use Consultants concluded that given the high sensitivity of the landscape, development was not recommended. Queries how council can go against own advisors. Supporter of local biodiversity including the habitat for national priority farmland bird species, deer, rural mammals and bats. Wants to know what assessment of the impact of the proposed development on wildlife. Cannot understand how development would contribute to the regeneration of Luton/Dunstable as there are large areas within the conurbation that could be used or reused. Vauxhall Way could be widened with much less disruption and for less cost than a bypass and with links to major transport arteries (M1). Believes there is self interest from Councillors who live in West of Luton and would like them to abstain from voting .</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3034	Howard Monks	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the east of Luton owing to its impact in the countryside as well as: its location in Green Belt and adjacent to AONB it is not brownfield land as favoured by the Government it does not regenerate the conurbation of Luton/Dunstable Questions how 13 options became 4 options and the criteria used for this as well as how brownfield sites in Luton have been ignored in favour of development of Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3621	Joanna Monks	Stotfold	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass for the following reasons: Would result in building over some of the most beautiful land in the country. Land is Green Belt and adjacent to an AONB. Government initiatives would be for using brownfield sites not countryside. Will do nothing to regenerate the Luton/Dunstable conurbation. Would like to know on what criteria the other 13 options were put aside. Do not understand how ex - Vauxhall site has been ignored in favour of building on prime Green Belt land. Vauxhall Way can be used more effectively for a bypass than the proposed Black Route. Core Strategy recognises that it cannot allocate land for development so do not understand why this is being pursued and queries whether or not there is self interest from Councillors and local MPs. Concerned about impact on wildlife and AONB and asks if there have been reviews conducted on the impacts on birds, wildlife and protected species such as bats and frogs.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA assesses potential development in the urban area and concluded that insufficient sites existed to meet the development requirements in the RSS and its review. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2990	Barbara Monks	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed development to the East of Luton owing to its location in Green Belt land and adjacent to AONB as well as its impact on the landscape. Questions how this development would contribute to the regeneration of the conurbation of Luton/Dunstable and suggests that there are large areas in Luton and/or Dunstable that can be used or reused.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2673	K N Montague	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the impression given that North Herts agree with the proposals. Objects to the development given that Herts has its own housing and North Herts may have to absorb more housing as a result of West of Stevenage development. Objects to lack of transparency including lack of assessment of impact in Hertfordshire and clear explanation of why other sites have been discounted. Objects to lack of evidence on Site L in the WCS and lack of account of travel implications beyond the boundary, particularly Hitchin.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure. Pre Submission Core Strategy to clarify approach to working with North Herts.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2876	Samantha Moore	Gosmore	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to build 5,500 houses in the green belt of North Hertfordshire. This would spoil the countryside, fail to help regenerate the Luton Dunstable conurbation, destroy the purpose of designating the green belt and make traffic through Hitchin even worse. There are better alternatives around Slip End, Caddington, Dunstable, Toddington and Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2372	Ms Janice Moore	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton as well as the proposed bypass as a resident of Lilley for 15 years owing to the impact on the countryside, notably Lilley Bottom, which her family regularly walk, ride horses, ride bicycles and go running over and its designation as Green Belt land. Also objects to the impact of the development on the villages including Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green whose inter village community spirit would be lost and the impact on the roads and schools in the area. Considers that other brown field sites which could be considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2875	Daniel Moore	Gosmore	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to build 5,500 houses in the green belt of North Hertfordshire. This would spoil the countryside, fail to help regenerate the Luton Dunstable conurbation, destroy the purpose of designating the green belt and make traffic through Hitchin even worse. There are better alternatives around Slip End, Caddington, Dunstable, Toddington and Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2913	Mr Noel Moore	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Land is Green Belt with a high sensitivity rating and not recommended for development. Villages will be swallowed up. Area is designated AONB and it would be criminal to lose it. Bird life in area is in decline and will only deteriorate with development. Development would impact on Pipistrelle bats that roost in our house.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity. The area to the East of Luton south of the A505 is not AONB. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to mitigate the impact on villages, landscape and biodiversity.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2661	Grace Moore	Lilley	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypass do not want development in countryside Loss of wildlife				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2881	Robert Moore	Gosmore	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to building 5,500 homes in North Hertfordshire green belt in a grade 1 sensitive landscape Other reasons for objection are: traffic congestion, the swamping of green belt villages, continued urban sprawl and lack of financial viability. Other alternatives are: land around Slip End, Caddington, West of Dunstable, South of Toddington and North of Houghton Regis				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: There are landscape designations which are graded to indicate landscape value. These are not to be confused with the Green Belt which aims to keep land permanently open independently of landscape value. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
3948	C C Moore	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Objects the Spatial Development strategy due to the following reasons Roads around the proposed area for development are already congested The proposed By-pass would not be enough to turn the existing situation around Pollution will increase as a result of development				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.				
JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.				
1082	Mrs Frances Morland	Offley	Q. 4	No
Comment: Objects to development to the East of Luton because of development impact on: Villages and surrounding countryside Hitchin and A505 in terms of traffic Other infrastructure Considers that these impacts have been ignored objects to the Joint Committee making decisions without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1554	Mr Robin Morland	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land is designated as Green Belt to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. The proposed East Luton Bypass will pass through and destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. The Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass so how will this bypass be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development and we need to know how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. The Joint Committee should have known this before it issued the Draft Core Strategy</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3526	John R Morley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Area is Green Belt and very attractive which would be spoiled by the development. There are several small villages which would lose their individual character. The increased infrastructure needed would have a negative impact on the area's beauty. Other less damaging options are available to meet Luton's housing needs.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2589	Mrs Julie Morris	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Incursion into Hertfordshire and undemocratic process Detrimental impact on farm land, green belt, wildlife Next to AONB Increased traffic congestion leading to even more bypasses Should consider alternative brownfield sites or less sensitive areas to West and North of Luton in Bedfordshire Developers make more profit from greenfield sites but we should not let greed corrupt our duty to guard the wealth that is the beauty of the countryside</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3826	Mrs S J Morrison	Nr Wheathampstead	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is one of the most delightful spots amongst all the towns, roads and concrete that is blighting Hertfordshire. A large area of Green Belt would be lost forever. Enlarging villages and merging them, destroying country lanes to widen them for high speed traffic, all this causes further pollution. No doubt woods and trees will be demolished and with more tarmac being laid floods will ensue.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of flooding, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3914	Mr A Morton	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons The area in question is part of the Green belt, not only providing essential space for Luton, but also for the several large towns within Hertfordshire/Bedfordshire district. The proposed area for development is part of an AONB The existing bypass proposal is not the best alternative Inadequate consultation in Hertfordshire Development has been proposed by authorities that has not jurisdiction within the proposed area for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1255	J Moss	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to destroying the beautiful countryside to build more housing. Use of vacant houses for providing new homes. Important that the English heritage is protected from development. Objects to building on the green belt. Reducing immigration would reduce the need for new homes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Mitigation of the impact on the heritage of the area is important. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3333	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Although we are supportive of the key principles of the strategy, it is considered that there is no need to delay land within the Luton and Houghton Regis urban extension. The urban extensions are fundamental to the delivery of the strategy and should be allocated in the submission version of the Core Strategy. This should be accompanied by greater detail on their planning and implementation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to address this</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for this</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2521	A E Mount	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Loss of Green Belt Other 9 expansion areas have disappeared from document Negative impact on villages and hamlets Increased traffic and pollution Development not supported by N Herts DC - therefore illegal Impact on local services No technical analysis given to Members</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assesses potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2366	Karen Moyle	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concern over loss of Green Belt land, impact on wildlife Concern over the impact on the narrow gauge railway Concern expressed over building on the flood plain Concern over the lack of existing infrastructure and whether any of the promised infrastructure will actually be delivered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as flood risk. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2378	Mr Andrew Moyle	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concern over loss of Green Belt land, impact on wildlife Concern over the impact on the narrow gauge railway Concern expressed over building on the flood plain Concern over the lack of existing infrastructure and whether any of the promised infrastructure will actually be delivered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Recently developed and proposed housing accounted for in this decision. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on narrow gauge railway and deliver the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
3918	Mrs M Munn	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am writing to object to the East of Luton 'preferred option'. The land is in Hertfordshire and no mention is made of the effect this will have on Hitchin. A new Luton bypass will mean even more traffic passing through Hitchin. I feel very strongly that this development hasn't been given any sympathetic thought to the residents of North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3679	Alan Murphy	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: A number of the evidence studies draw conclusions that appear to contradict the reasoning offered in the Core Strategy, while other studies appear inconclusive and incomplete to justify their use to support the proposed spatial strategy. The evidence studies do not support the proposal for development to the east of Luton, nor the amount of Greenfield land that is planned for development. The costs of major infrastructure should be carefully reappraised (alongside their impact on the economic viability of development areas) and the existing urban capacity re-evaluated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including continued review of urban capacity and infrastructure need and funding.</p>				
885	Janice Murphy	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the AONB Would destroy wildlife such as deer, badgers, Kites and Hawks, some low in number already Development would not assist in the regeneration of the conurbation It would create huge amounts of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be taken away from the town centre by the bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
889	Luke Murphy	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the AONB Would destroy wildlife such as deer, badgers, Kites and Hawks, some low in number already Development would not assist in the regeneration of the conurbation It would create huge amounts of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be taken away from the town centre by the bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
886	Shane Murphy	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the AONB Would destroy wildlife such as deer, badgers, Kites and Hawks, some low in number already Development would not assist in the regeneration of the conurbation It would create huge amounts of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be taken away from the town centre by the bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
887	Arthur Murphy	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the AONB Would destroy wildlife such as deer, badgers, Kites and Hawks, some low in number already Development would not assist in the regeneration of the conurbation It would create huge amounts of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be taken away from the town centre by the bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1571	Lynda Murray	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Leighton Buzzard urban extension for the following reasons: It is Green Belt land which must be preserved it is also a flood plain. Flooding has already occurred in the area and will be made worse by this development. There are no new jobs in Leighton Buzzard. New residents will be working in other towns making Leighton Buzzard a commuter town. As they will be working out of town they will not add to the local economy while relying on services such as dentists and doctors. Leighton Buzzard has already suffered from intensive development changing its character. More housing cannot be sustained and will be to the detriment of the town. Roads cannot be improved and nor can other infrastructure. It is a small market town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Account has been taken of recent completions in Leighton Linslade. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
3174	Mr and Mrs K J Murray	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Development to the east of Luton would mean loss of green belt, the loss of individual villages and amenities, increase traffic through the villages and Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2522	Rosalind Murray	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: encroaching into Hertfordshire No infrastructure or public funding to support development increase in traffic congestion More traffic in Hertfordshire resulting from proposed bypass Destruction of Green Belt Destruction of wildlife Loss of amenity Should use empty properties first</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2523	Gavin Murray	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: No evidence to support selection of this site above others No infrastructure or public funding to support development Proposed bypass will add to, not ease traffic in Hertfordshire Destruction of Green Belt and loss of Landscape Grade 1 Destruction of wildlife Empty properties should be used and additional housing in existing urban areas Support improved public transport infrastructure and development close to it</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport, viability assessment and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3954	Anonymous	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Land is Green Belt. It will destroy surrounding villages and wildlife. Would like to understand how 13 possible sites became 4, including EoL. Roads will not cope with increasing population as they are full to capacity. Luton bypasses were not discussed with N Herts Council even though it is in their area. Congestion will increase on roads and other transport facilities stretched due to dwindling number of jobs in Luton and surrounding area, creating more commuter chaos and pollution. Emergency services and local hospital will not cope. No benefit for Luton, just problems.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.				
3952	Anonymous	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It is in green belt. A big housing estate was built close to Cockerhoe in the 80s so why target this area of Luton again when there are other areas that should have their fair share of new housing. It will destroy Cockerhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green. Not sure that all the options have been correctly studied. Will have a major impact on surrounding wildlife and amenity for children. Roads around east Luton are already full to capacity and will not cope with further congestion. Concerned about percentage of social housing and the associated problems that sometimes arise with social housing developments. Police are already overstretched and will not cope with growing population and social issues arising. No benefit for Luton, it will just be a burden on the town with congestion and chaos.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3565	Mr and Mrs Richard Nash	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports proposal of an urban extension to the east of Leighton Linlade. The number of houses to be provided in this area could be increased from 2,500, for two principle reasons. 1. Problems associated with the proposed allocation of 5,500 houses to the east of Luton, both technical and administrative. 2. The Core Strategy proposes a substantial number of dwellings to be provided within the existing urban areas as flats and apartments. This sector of the housing market experiencing problems so is unrealistic to expect these schemes to come forward. Could these developments provide the housing numbers suggested, whilst at the same time accommodating complimentary facilities? All of these facilities could be provided to the east of Leighton Buzzard, which could be increased to around 5,000 houses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2928	Thelma Nash	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Luton has ample Bedfordshire land available; it should not encroach into Hertfordshire. Build to the North or West of Luton, or both. The minister has approved 5,500 houses West of Stevenage. This would mean 11,000 houses built in one small part of North Herts, only a few miles apart. You suggest a new employment area, yet Luton is full of run-down semi derelict factory areas. Regenerate those before building more. Look to Stopsley or land along the Bedford Road, between Luton and Maiden, for development. Hitchin and Stevenage need to promote their own regeneration without competing with your invasion. Lilley bottom is a beautiful area. Do not consider putting a bypass through it. Find a northerly route in Bedfordshire. Take heed of the professional advice you have received and accept your plans are unsuitable and unacceptable for the land in question! Your plans are geared to appeasing the voters of Bedfordshire by exporting development elsewhere. Hertfordshire is capable of planning its own development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3489	Mrs G Nash	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There are no adequate proposals for Leighton Linlade to integrate 2500 dwellings into the already congested and inadequate road and rail links. If the emphasis is on, 'complementing and safeguarding its character and viability', why is there no mention of the Narrow Gauge Railway, which will be directly affected by the proposed developments? It is a contradiction to offer, 'further high quality open space and green linkages to the countryside' while building on greenbelt land. Until the infrastructure deficit has been rectified, no new developments should be considered in Leighton Linlade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including impact on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2929	R E Nash	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development. Luton has ample Bedfordshire land available. Query why Green Belt of Hertfordshire is more appropriate than less beautiful Wardown Hills. Luton's housing needs should be met by building to the North or West of Luton, or both. Mr Prescott has already approved 5,500 houses West of Stevenage. Opposed to any encroachment into Hertfordshire to create new employment areas when Luton is full of semi derelict factory areas which should be regenerated before building more. Should look at areas like Stopsley when need to build. Should not consider putting a motorway sized bypass through Lilley Bottom. Need to revisit issues and take on board the professional advice already received on unsuitability of the land for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The re-use of previously developed land is a key aim of the Core Strategy. However, the evidence indicates that to meet the regional housing requirements the Core Strategy needs to allocate urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3125	S Nash	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3119	Mrs D Nash	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2120	National Grid PLC	Warwick	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Would like to be involved with preparation &amp; review of all DPDs &amp; plans relating to: overhead transmission lines, underground cables, gas pipeline installations &amp; transmission pipelines; Site specific allocations/land use policies affecting sites with overhead lines; Land use policies/development proposed adjacent to high voltage substations sites and gas above ground installations; Policies diverting underground or overhead transmission lines &amp; relating to infrastructure or utility provision; Policies relating to development in the countryside; Landscape policies; Waste &amp; Mineral Plans. Consultation on planning applications, affecting our assets. Happy to provide pre-app advice. NG prefers that buildings are not built directly beneath overhead lines, as this can hinder access to and maintenance of them. Statutory safety clearances between overhead lines, the ground and built structures must not be infringed. NG happy to provide advice in confidence where needed and provide advice publications online.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Engage with National Grid when working on the detail of the Urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome National Grid's interest in the preparation of development plan documents affecting their operational land. Officers will engage with National Grid when working on the detail of strategic sites in the Core Strategy and other sites in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
2171	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Natural England endorses reasoning for safeguarding countryside as in Para 4.10. and supports general approach of Spatial Development Strategy e.g. strengthening public transport framework and urban area first principle. But concerned about impact of proposed urban extensions on natural environment, especially EoL on AONB and urge council to follow advice and guidance in Landscape Character Assessment. Also impact on Marl Lake SSSI, Houghton Regis Chalk Pit Wildlife Site and hydrology issues. Urge council to follow advice &amp; guidance in emerging Water Cycle Strategy to avoid impacts on SSSIs and comply with duty to conserve and enhance them and stop unauthorised access to Marl Lake site which will only increase with more development. Would like to see adverse environmental impacts avoided through detailed masterplanning. Support delivery of green infrastructure provision – quality open space and green linkages to countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Overcome Natural England concerns while working on the Core Strategy Sustainability Appraisal.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome Natural England's general support for Policy CS1. Officers will continue their engagement with natural England while working on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1551	Mrs H Naylor	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to housing growth in Beds and north of Houghton Regis due to following: number of houses to be built is an arbitrary figure imposed by Gov on Beds bears no relation to local needs; not local houses for local people, more commuters will need to use local roads; Existing roads are gridlocked and public transport is woefully inadequate; existing infrastructure of any kind in the area is poor, lacking, badly maintained; where are the jobs for the so-called sustainable development - already many unemployed people in the area; - loss of green belt, productive land that will be needed to provide more food for the country; - East of England is the driest area in the country, an increase in housing would be an additional strain on an already creaking system of water supply; - queries how this development will be sustainable. Developer have a poor track record of providing infrastructure for development. High densities of people can lead to greater social problems, Houghton Regis already has many problems.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport, employment and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2966	Philip Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development, Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11 of the Core Strategy; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment which concludes that development is not recommended in Area L1; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area (identified in the consultants study) which is a material consideration; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton scheme. Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton for mix of apartments and housing which would meet the needs of single people, older people (close to amenities) and would prevent urban sprawl and need for road infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and it will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. The Strategy aims to maximise the potential of existing urban areas and provide a range of housing types. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates that to accommodate the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate urban extensions.</p>				
3170	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the east of Luton's green belt land. All options have not been properly considered and the proposed area falls within North Hertfordshire. The Joint Planning Committee must consider the impact of the proposal on the environment, the added pollution, destruction of countryside and loss of green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1407	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is no justification for including East of Luton as a strategic urban extension. It would result in the loss of Green Belt countryside FOR EVER!! Some of the area is classified as Landscape Grade 1, highest possible, and is also of high agricultural value.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3204	Mr P Neil	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The east of Luton proposal would destroy an area designated green belt, swallow up the villages of Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and would threaten the existence of Lilley as a separate village.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to mitigate the impact on villages.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3189	Mrs M Neil	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is green belt. The proposal would encroach on the countryside and swamp the area's villages. North Hertfordshire District Council does not support the proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3002	J W F Newbury	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to a development on such scale to the east of Luton. The Core Strategy has ignored the effect on Hitchin and its traffic and other infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2070	NHDC	Lilley Bottom	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Opposes EoL development owing to: transport infrastructure is currently inadequate to satisfy current road traffic demand; proposed additions and extensions to the guided bus way are unworkable; increase in road traffic will be intolerable. Little regard has been paid to the Independent Environmental Assessment which states that Lilley Bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding beauty unsuitable for development. There are alternative proposals, e.g. west of Luton which has been discounted prematurely. The opportunity to consult fairly and fully with North Herts residents, in particular, those in the threatened area, was discarded. This MUST render the consultation as "flawed" and unfair. There must be an immediate halt to this process, and a radical rethink on what is best for the residents, the future economic stability of the area, and the beautiful protected countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3468	Mr Colin W A Nicholas	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Eastern Leighton Buzzard urban extension because: issue of flooding from Clipstone Brook, loss of wildlife, views from narrow gauge railway will be lost, extra cars from the development would need to drive into the town - peak hour traffic would grind the town to a standstill, social and community facilities will be overloaded, lack of employment opportunities in the town centre.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including impact on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				
2594	Ellen Niven	Little Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Building on green belt. There are places in Luton that can still be developed. Destruction of wildlife habitat. Increase in traffic in villages. Destruction of countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2509	David Niven	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to impact on Green Belt. No financial viability study.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2508	Susanna Niven	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development on Hertfordshire/Bedfordshire Green Belt. Increased traffic. Negative impact on people and wildlife.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt. Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. □</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3938	Fiona Niven	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I'm writing to object to the East of Luton preferred option. This would destroy the countryside and disturb any birds or animals that inhabit it. It would make a lot of traffic on the edge of Luton that will disturb everyone close to it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2510	Hamish Niven	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Should not build on Hertfordshire land</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review.</p>				
506	Dr John Noble	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: My main concern are ones of principal (there is no good reason for continued expansion in and around Luton: growth and investment should be focused exclusively in existing inner city areas) and reasonableness (most of those people who will be adversely affected by the proposed expansion in the North East of Luton are residents of North Hertfordshire. This consultation document is skilfully written, but fundamentally flawed in argumentation. There are no good reasons for expanding Luton; it is a dreadful place as it is, with more than its fair share of crime and social problems, including unemployment. To consider expanding those problems into neighbouring rural areas is crass. As a resident and taxpayer living in North Hertfordshire I object most strongly to any suggestion that Luton and South Bedfordshire to seek to expand into rural Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including potential contribution of different urban extensions sites to meeting key objectives. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1988	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is further Green Belt consideration to which little thought has been given in selection of the Preferred Options. PPG2 sets out the various purposes which Green Belts fulfil, one is that they prevent urban sprawl from resulting in coalescence with nearby villages. If the EoL Extension goes ahead, the North Herts villages of Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green would be swamped by new development. Their individual identities and rural setting would be entirely destroyed. This is unacceptable. The only occasion where this would occur would be as a result of the urban extension in North Herts. Bedfordshire villages near to the conurbation would not suffer from coalescence. For this reason, the land east of Luton should retain its Green Belt designation. The Green Belt has functioned extremely well here since it was originally designated, with little or no urban fringe problems. The existing urban edge is not unattractive and it sits well within the landform so that it is invisible in any long views.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1904	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Its objections, summarised below, are set out in the following sections:.... Section 5: All 13 (bar 1) of the sites considered at the Issues and Options stage are currently designated as Green Belt. It would appear therefore that this national designation has not been a factor in selection. However, such an approach is unsound, in that it ignores the purposes which led to designation in the first place. In particular, one of the purposes is to prevent urban sprawl leading to coalescence with nearby settlements. For the East of Luton site, the proposed development would lead to the loss of the individual identity of Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green. None of the other proposed urban extensions result in coalescence with existing villages.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
1977	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Urban Extensions Site Development Economics Study states that it is a 'work in progress' based on information/data available at the time and such caveats are understandable in current circumstances. However one weakness is lack of costing data for proposed Luton Eastern Bypass and therefore its funding does not appear as a factor on the viability of the Preferred Options. Given the likely huge costs of the scheme, this could have a dramatic effect on the viability of the Preferred Options, casting doubt on their deliverability. NHDC notes that the consultants' brief required a viability assessment of two alternative development (contingency) scenarios as well as Preferred Options. Welcome the evidence that JC has given thought to alternative development strategies. NHDC makes on comment on acceptability of Options 2a and 2b but notes that both appear potentially viable and hence deliverable alternatives to Preferred Options.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards their submission. The Sustainability Appraisal of subsequent Core Strategy Plan will bring together the appraisal of the sites in the Site Matrix Assessment and wider sustainability issues of the preferred options. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will consider different contingency scenarios to provide flexibility to the strategy.			
1976	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: As referred to in Para 2.1, the preferred options were apparently selected, inter alia, on the basis of assessing technical evidence. NHDC is strongly of the view that the evidence base is insufficiently robust to justify the selection of the options in the CS: Preferred Options document. Assessing the various evidence studies available on the website, NHDC concludes that two in particular (including SA/SEA - see the above section) are crucial to the selection process. Others are more relevant to the provision of infrastructure, community facilities, green space, etc at a later stage. Thus NHDC has concentrated on these two studies: Transport Modelling &amp; Accessibility Study (Halcrow, March 2009) Environmental Sensitivity Study (Beds CC, Dec 2008) and (Land Use Consultants, Dec 2008) Its criticisms of the weaknesses of these two elements are set out in Sections 6 and 7 below. However, NHDC believes these inherent weaknesses amount to substantial flaws which invalidate the selection of the Preferred Options.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards their submission. The Sustainability Appraisal of subsequent Core Strategy stages will bring together the appraisal of the sites in the Site Matrix Assessment and wider sustainability issues of the preferred options.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1900	North Hertfordshire District Council		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Its objections, summarised below, are set out in the following sections:.... Section 2: There is no clear justification for the selection of the "preferred options". The Issues and Options consultation (June 2007) identified 13 possible development sites (A-M) and 10 different options for development, putting forward various combinations of sites. It is entirely unclear how these sites/options have been narrowed down to the selected 4 proposed urban extensions. This lack of transparency is in direct conflict with the requirements of the current plan-making system, and as such, means that the Core Strategy as it stands is unsound.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy 'Preferred Options' document explained how the options at Issues and Options stage had been reduced to those set out in that document</p>				
1837	North Hertfordshire District Council		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No clear justification for the preferred options. <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence base does not allow selection of the preferred options. <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence assesses east of Luton as viable without considering contribution towards the Bypass. <input type="checkbox"/> Green Belt designation has not been a factor in selection. <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of environment east of Luton has not been given due weight. <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic is one of the key considerations. However, the TA is the weakest part of the evidence. <input type="checkbox"/> More housing could be accommodated in the built-up area. <input type="checkbox"/> 17,600 dwellings need to be planned for beyond the limits of the conurbation yet 19,000 are being planned. No more than necessary should be planned. <input type="checkbox"/> Review focus on 4 large extensions. <input type="checkbox"/> The preferred options should be amended to plan for the larger number of dwellings to the east of Leighton Buzzard. <input type="checkbox"/> West of Luton proposals have not been given proper consideration. <input type="checkbox"/> There could be greater capacity north of Houghton Regis. <input type="checkbox"/> Development could be located to the north of the bypass, linked to development to the south.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work.</p>				
1974	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It is also noted that Halcrow's SA Working Paper on the 10 options identified at the Issues and Options stage concludes that "following the appraisal of all the spatial options against the sustainability objectives ..., Spatial Option 7 is considered to be the best performing spatial option." This option did not propose any development east of Luton within North Hertfordshire on Site L. No explanation is given as to why this conclusion has not been accepted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the process of site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Option 7 involved 'development focused on achieving wide distributional spread with minimum land take'. Evidence showed that this option could not deliver the amount of housing and contingency required to meet housing need. Therefore, Option 8 'development focused on achieving wide distributional spread with maximum land take' was taken forward to the Preferred Options. The Sustainability Appraisal of subsequent Core Strategy stages will bring together the appraisal of the sites in the Site Matrix Assessment and wider sustainability issues of the preferred options.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1908	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Quality of the environment EoL has not been given due weight in the assessment process. Its loss to development would be disastrous. Lilley Bottom (site L1) is one of the most attractive stretches of countryside within Herts, on a par with adjoining land to the north of A505 which is designated part of the Chilterns AONB. Selection of this site is contrary to the recommendation of the Joint Committee's own consultants, who state that "it is not considered appropriate for development to take place" in Lilley Bottom. Even site L (the plateau area between Lilley Bottom and Luton) is said to be "one where some small scale development may be appropriate provided sufficient mitigation is implemented." 5,500 new dwellings, an employment area and new bypasses are by no stretch of the imagination small in scale. The methodology applied to the assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity is also faulty, in that it does not provide a true indication of the relative differences in quality between the various options.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts, deliver infrastructure and ensure sustainability.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1975	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Site Assessment Matrix (SAM) should be part of overall SA/SEA process and must be substantially improved. SAM provides no relative appraisal of sites or transparent explanation for selection of preferred options and is extremely misleading. Conclusion regarding Site L (EoL) says "small scale development may be appropriate in landscape terms provided sufficient mitigation is implemented". But the evidence on which this is based (Land Use Consultants) paints a very different picture such as "significant constraints" and conclusion that development would be inappropriate. Preferred Options would mean substantial development within Site L and no explanation given as to why LUC's views have been ignored. No 'golden thread' leading from identification of 13 potential sites at Issues and Options stage to the 4 urban extensions in CS Preferred Options. NHDC therefore believes CS is unsound due to lack of transparency.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts, deliver infrastructure and ensure sustainability.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Sustainability Appraisal of subsequent Core Strategy stages will bring together the appraisal of the sites in the Site Matrix Assessment and wider sustainability issues.</p>				
3081	Councillor Tony Northwood	Luton	Q. 4	
<p>Comment: To consider the extension on Luton into North Herts. District without the agreement of the neighbouring authority is contrary to good governance and democratic principles. The proposal area is remote from Luton's town centre and poorly served by transport infrastructure. The town as grown already beyond the bounds of a sustainable settlement and have reservations for any further extensions elsewhere.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport, accessibility and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3376	Anonymous	Leighton Linshire	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Disagrees with the CSPO on grounds of housing and employment locations, types and quantities, transport provision/commuting/congestion, damage too and loss of Green Belt and Countryside, cross boundary working.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Leighton Buzzard) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3821	Tom O'Brien	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Leighton Buzzard. There is no infrastructure to accommodate this and the existing roads are dilapidated with chaotic traffic. My house already has a risk of flooding on the flood plain. I do not want the value of my house or quality of life to decrease. Why is it that residents and their views do not get taken seriously?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure</p>				
2141	Mr David Ockendon	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton urban extension is not financially viable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test deliverability of the proposals.</p>				
2423	Offley Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There are many other ways of providing homes for people, including fully utilising existing properties in the region - empty homes, converting other buildings, where the infrastructure already exists in population centres, work places, brownfield land and new homes in population centres to provide low cost, low carbon public transport. Other sensible options need to be explored. There are alternative proposals, e.g. to the west of Luton but we feel that not enough options within your geographical area were considered prior to the option of North Hertfordshire. It is never too late to consider other proposals which will save our greenbelt land enjoyed by thousands of people and creates a buffer zone between communities. In the case of Cockerhoe, the Green belt is approximately 200 yards wide at its narrowest point. In conclusion, Green Belt is not suitable for 5500 homes, you would be destroying the countryside and adversely affect traffic in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed.</p>				
2415	Offley Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The Draft Core Strategy approved for public consultation on 20th March by the Joint Committee includes proposals to build 5500 houses on Greenbelt Land in North Hertfordshire, immediately to the east of Luton. Offley Parish Council wish to register its strongest possible objection to this development. This parish will be the most directly affected by your proposals as includes Cockerhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green, which will be swallowed up by the proposed Development. Not only will these hamlets be engulfed but other areas will be blighted, i.e. Breachwood Green and Lilley as well as destroying Lilley Bottom's character.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2600	Miss Diane Oldham	Letchworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: could set a precedent allowing any county to fulfil their housing requirements by building them in a neighbouring county houses should count towards Hertfordshire's quota Is there a financial viability study? any new major roads should benefit development for future decades, not just a quick fix Hertfordshire's Green Belt should be permanent to keep it from overdevelopment Bedfordshire is a large county that should make required development within its own boundaries - Hertfordshire has its own housing challenge</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3355	O'Neill Homes Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the principle of allowing small scale development in and on the edge of rural settlements, such as Toddington.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3473	John Orna-Ornstein	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed east of Luton development: Area is beautiful green belt land Area is well used for recreation and it would be a tragedy for people of Luton and Hitchin if land was built on. Other options in Bedfordshire should be considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4049	Sophia Orton	St. Paul's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: <input type="checkbox"/> Need to protect Green Belt otherwise the countryside that is enjoyed by many Londoners will disappear. Congestion and public amenities will be stretched to impossible levels. Villages such as Whitwell are already suffering from traffic jams. The south east regularly suffers from water shortages and with extra demand water will run out. County cannot sustain more people if everybody is to have a reasonable quality of life. The river Mimram has its course along the Lilley Bottom Road, one of many natural aspects of this beautiful area, and it would be devastated by any building or other development. People need space around their homes. Building on Green Belt will deprive present occupants of their ways of life and new comers of ever seeing and living within the green countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The first stage of the Water Cycle Study supported the preparation of the Preferred Options and the second stage soon to be finalised) together with other work prepared since the preferred options will provide further information on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures which will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3260	D H Osborne	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
Comment: Luton should not consider to expand into Hertfordshire without consultation with the areas most affected (Hitchin and North Hertfordshire).				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Further consultation to be undertaken at each stage of the LDF preparation as stated in the SCI.				
JC Reason for Response: Consultation has been undertaken in North Herts.				
3731	H Osborne	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
Comment: I am concerned that Luton should be expanding into areas of unspoilt Hertfordshire countryside. This area is probably the furthest away from Luton's existing main infrastructure such as the M1 and rail system. Proposing to develop in an area that requires additional, massive road construction in order to operate seems to be an unnecessary burden of additional cost. The areas of potential development around Caddington, Slip End and Houghton Regis seem far better placed to minimise the need for additional roads whilst providing the extra housing.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2439	Ms Angela Osbourne	Offley	Q. 4	No
Comment: Objects to proposed development EoL in N Herts including 5,500 homes, North and Eastern Bypass and park and ride owing to the impact on the Chilterns AONB including its rare chalk land down land, beautiful landscape and wildlife. States that it seems inconceivable that plans to destroy this spectacular countryside should in any way be part of "the preferred option" of Luton and South Bedfordshire's planning committee. Enclosed with the submission are photographs taken of red kites which the consultee identifies were once common across Great Britain but suffered big losses in numbers and were re introduced to the Chilterns. Photographs also include hares as well as a herd of deer including a White hart whose habitat would be lost. Suggests that other areas should be preferred including the area to the north of the A5-M1 link where transport links have already been given the go ahead or to the South East of the A1081 where potential employment sites have been identified for the Local Framework Core Strategy.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				
1550	Mrs Pauline O'Toole	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
Comment: Noticed a telephone number to call if requiring a translation on the back of the summary document, called the number and asked for a copy in English - explained that a spatial strategy meant nothing to her and the map/diagram key was very small. The main points of the paper were explained but finds it hard to make a judgement on the Committed Luton Bus way extensions when the first part is yet to be built. Also, the urban extension to the north of Houghton Regis is preferred and not preferred, back to square 1 then. A lack of responses is not solely due to apathy, people don't understand it's content and there is no return address.				
JC Response: Partially agree				
Proposed Action: Ensure that graphics are designed with Limehouse constraints in mind to maximise legibility of graphics. Ensure that next documents are in plain English as far as technically possible. Ensure that all necessary details are available to the public to help the next consultation stage.				
JC Reason for Response: It is acknowledged that the key diagram is too small and all efforts will be made to ensure future documents have more legible graphics. We understand the difficulties people will encounter with the new style of planning documents and included in page 100 a definition of 'Spatial Planning' and other related terminology. Policy CS1 identifies land to the north of Houghton Regis as a preferred option.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
863	Joanne Ottley	Welwyn	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure not financially viable. Bypass will destroy chalk valley of Lilley Bottom Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3420	SE Owen	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to Eastern Development of Leighton Buzzard because: Roger Tym and Partners Study in 2002 made no mention of further development of Leighton Buzzard area; town centre traffic is often at a standstill and we believe that Eastern Distributor road will do nothing to alleviate the problem - situation can only get worse with additional 2,500 dwellings; traffic noise from proposed Eastern Distributor Road will result in a lower quality of life for those living in the vicinity; impact of current developments being built has not yet been fully felt; questions interest of community to commit to urban extension on such a large scale into green belt land to the east of Leighton Buzzard so far in advance on need; would appear that development in Leighton Buzzard would not need to be seriously considered until 2021 at earliest, and seems ironic that plan indicates the creation of and access to green spaces when this is exactly what proposed to build on.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Policy CS7 provides the context in which housing will be managed and monitored allowing for revisions on commencements and delivery rates depending on housing completions. Development could be brought forward or held back when ensuring the continuous five year available land supply. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3369	Ms Sheila Page	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Partially. Assumption that there should be 'delivery of housing and employment together' in CS1 is based on assumption that links to the outside (London &amp; MK) should be reduced. No justification for this in report. Increased specialisation of employment is likely. The likely demand will therefore be for good links within and away from Luton and the discussion of transport (with the welcome proposals for greater integration centred on the rail station) is consistent with this. It rightly emphasises the advantages of Luton's transport links. Some respondents also considered that park and ride scheme should be pursued. Given this response, why is there so much support for 4 new park and ride schemes? Using 2 forms of transport is always less convenient than using 1; using 3 (rail links to outside Luton) is not credible. The emphasis should be on improving direct public transport links. The implementation proposals should consider the difficulties for public transport or cycling posed by stand-alone developments.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to deliver infrastructure. Amend text supporting CS1 emphasising self containment aspirations.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is agreed that greater cross-referencing may be needed to ensure the justification of self containment aspirations of the Spatial Portrait is justified in CS1. The implementation of transport proposals will be dealt with the overall delivery of the strategy in the Delivery Plan. Work on the impact of proposals (transport and otherwise) will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2983	Alex G Painter	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Proposing to develop a 10,000 hectare area between Luton and Hitchin on the grounds that Government's housing targets cannot be met within their own boundaries is totally unacceptable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence and does not propose as much as 10,000 hectares. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2515	Mrs AJ Palmer	Codicote	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Against the East of Luton preferred option for the following reasons: 1. It goes against all the principles of sustainable development. 2. It will have a totally unacceptable adverse impact on the environment. Any future development must be on brownfield sites only. We need affordable housing for local people in areas where the demand is greatest. 3. It will mean the unacceptable loss of yet more good farmland. There are concerns about how we are going to feed people as it is. This farmland is also home to many rapidly declining species. 4. Building thousands of houses in an area that experiences problems with water supply is dumb. 5. It is in North Herts and we don't want it. The environment, infrastructure etc would not be able to cope with the problems West of Stevenage would cause, let alone East of Luton as well. 6. It is Green Belt - this was brought in to stop unacceptably stupid/mad developments such as West of Stevenage and East of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3953	Enid and Terry Pamment	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I read with dismay the plans to extend Stevenage. It would spoil the landscape and reduce property prices.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Response relates to another LDF</p>				
3638	R D Parker	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to location in North Herts not Bedfordshire, loss of Green belt, impact on rural communities and quality of life. Consultation with affected local parishes and communities was poor or non-existent and they are not represented on Joint Committee and were not given a chance to lobby. Ignoring advice of Land Use Consultants regarding archaeological sensitivity and inappropriateness of place for development. Need for an East of Luton Corridor is untested and uncoted. Increased traffic on A505 has not been considered and there is already a bottleneck going into Hitchin. People living east of Luton already suffer traffic congestion. There are other more suitable sites such as Bush Wood. An urban extension north of Houghton Regis would put a green buffer zone around Chalton and the only objection is that it wouldn't pay for the East of Luton Corridor. Both N Herts DC and Herts CC are against the EoL proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2869	R D Parker	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Moral and Ethical rights against choosing a preferred option outside predetermined boundaries Flawed consultation process (poorly advertised, short notice of presentations, lack of NHerts representation on the JC) Destroying rural nature of villages of Cockernhoe and seriously affecting Beachwood Green and Lilley Unnecessary destroying of Green Belt and beautiful countryside Ignoring advice of LUC identifying significant archaeology of national importance over the area Ignoring the detrimental effect on thousands of people Lack of adequate transport planning by not considering the effects of increased traffic There are other more suitable sites without the detrimental effects such as: Area 'M', or a larger scale of development north of Houghton Regis. The proposal does not pay for the 'untested' requirement for an East of Luton Corridor. The Core Strategy would easily lead on to believe that Hertfordshire County Council and North Hertfordshire District Council are in agreement with this proposal.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree			
<p>Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Land-use and spatial planning strategies are concerned with the land and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are essential for the delivery of any strategy and the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of those involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The plan will also consider contingency scenarios to provide flexibility to the strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>			
1572	Mr K.W Payne	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton development because: it is impertinent to encroach into the territory of another authority there is ample land in Luton/Bedfordshire that could be used for development as well as empty properties is a pleasant area of countryside recreation, woodland, rolling hills and unspoilt small villages and settlements should be preserved for the benefit of those living in Luton and Hertfordshire landscape could never be replaced</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1196	Miss H Payne	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton proposal and scale of such a development due to: - loss and destruction of most outstanding natural beauty in the region; - negative impacts the development would have on Bedfordshire and North Hertfordshire, understands that new homes need to be built to accommodate the increasing population but considers that there needs to be an alternative solution; - the effect of the development will be widespread - loss of villages and the impact on Luton; - the roads are congested with the current traffic - will not be able to cope with more traffic; - loss of the countryside is distressing and the array of wildlife will lose their habitats if the proposals go ahead; - loss of trees if development goes ahead.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1198	Mr B Payne	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the proposed East of Luton development because: - green belt land should buffer town and country; - if development is required, why not look at areas in Luton such as brownfield sites, vacant land and buildings which have existing infrastructure in place; - the proposed development will add to the existing traffic congestion, increase levels of pollution and loss of the countryside; - the proposed development will result in a loss of villages, wildlife, trees, hedgerows, flora and fauna that should be protected,</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment as well as environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
880	J C Pearce	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. North Herts District Council does not support development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
947	A J Pearce	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
946	C J Pearce	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3463	Mr Philip Pearson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East Leighton Buzzard urban extension as considers its s being destroyed by Councils. There has been no provision of new public facilities to go with the housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. New facilities will be provided in the next phase of housing in the South of the town.</p>				
1762	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC supports and recognises development requirements in the Luton area cannot all be accommodated on land within the existing urban areas; endorses an urban extension to the north of Luton; acknowledges development of the urban extensions will be phased and time span indicated; endorses two large scale mixed-use strategic urban extensions on north of conurbation; acknowledges approach to further growth at LB and notes proposed EoL urban extension. NLC objects to Key Diagram showing incorporation of land east of the A6, contrary to clear policy guidance in MKSMSRS. Key Diagram shows the proposed alignment of Luton Northern Bypass between the M1 and the A6 as located south of Chilterns AONB. However, Para 5.43 says JC has approved outer LNB route as its preferred option. The 'green' route passes through the AONB. If the LNB alignment is based on the green' and 'black' routes, Key Diagram should be amended more accurately to show that part of the preferred alignment to the west of the A6 passes through the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts, deliver infrastructure and set site boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome the support for Policy CS1. The preferred options gave an indicative direction to the location of the urban extensions. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals and help defining set site boundaries.</p>				
1375	Helen Peto	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton Preferred Option because: would involve building on Green Belt land would involve the loss of beautiful countryside adjacent to an AONB the countryside is essential for people's mental and physical health it would destroy the character of Lilley, Offley, Tea Green and Cockernhoe it would generate more traffic on already congested roads in Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment, environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3450	Mrs M Petworth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Keep the Green Belt and sand hills. Leighton is overfilled already. Need a zebra crossing between Appenine Way and Tescos. Need to attend to anti-social behaviour and crime. Need for community services to create more supportive neighbourhoods.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule (including community services) and sources of funding to ensure deliverability. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2959	Phillips of Hitchin (Antiques) Ltd	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to building 5,500 houses in the North Herts countryside bordering Luton. It seems illogical that Bedfordshire should plan to achieve 'their' housing targets by using land in another county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Land-use and spatial planning strategies are concerned with the land and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are essential for the delivery of any strategy and the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of those involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix.</p>				
945	Eve Philpott	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3860	Maya Pieris	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the East of Luton proposal. It would not assist in the regeneration of the Luton conurbation. It is vital that Green Belt land is protected from such development for this and future generations. It would generate massive extra traffic that would not be attracted by the proposed bypasses. There is little evidence that the extensive number of brown field sites in Luton have been pursued. The following questions need answers: - How will the transport issues be addressed, particularly the A505/A602 which is already a bottleneck. - What criteria was used in the selection of the preferred options? - What mechanism will be created to give residents of the affected neighbouring areas democratic influence over the Luton authority? - Why are decisions being taken before completion of other option studies? - This development cannot possibly fund the necessary infrastructure so how will that funding be delivered and when?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2897	Mrs S E Pike	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to expansion of Luton into North Hertfordshire, and area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Green belt villages will be subsumed by the development which by its scale cannot be in keeping bed considered. A development of this size will add to the traffic problems already existing in Hitchin</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2911	Mr S V Pike	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to expansion of Luton into North Hertfordshire, and area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Green belt villages will be subsumed by the development which by its scale cannot be in keeping or be considered. A development of this size will add to the traffic problems already existing in Hitchin</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport as well as environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3343	Mr David Pilcher	Bedford	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: I think - rural settlements and the green belt need much protection, as much for those in urban areas to escape to as for those living there.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for this</p>				
3927	Sir Thomas Pilkington	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development and bypass for the following reasons: It is on Green Belt land. It does not come under the authority of either Luton or South Bedfordshire. It is in a particularly beautiful area and the planners have clearly never looked at this area but have merely decided on what seems expedient as a result of looking at a map.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1970	Pirton Parish Council	Pirton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Loss of unique and beautiful countryside. Development to the east of Luton will destroy the quality of life for many of the residents of North Hertfordshire. Housing development in North Hertfordshire should not be claimed by Luton and South Beds for their RSS allocations. There would be a significant increase in traffic congestion especially around Hitchin and the A505 from Luton. Bedfordshire contains areas far more appropriate for this type of development. No consultation has been sought with neighbouring North Hertfordshire councils.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Land-use and spatial planning strategies are concerned with the land and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are essential for the delivery of any strategy and the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of those involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). <input type="checkbox"/> Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3599	Esme M Plant	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: There is no employment left in Leighton Buzzard and little likelihood of any. Our streets cannot be widened without destroying the market town. More cars would increase gridlock, pollution and pedestrian danger. Greenbelt land should be sacrosanct. Our birth rate is not increasing. We have been deceived before by promises of infrastructure and our sewage works have not been enlarged since before Cotefield Drive was built. We need our fields to grow food for our population or we will emulate the war years, ploughing-up lawns, verges and pastures for food production. The only profit will be to the developers. We need to get rid of the illegal, unselected regional assemblies who concern themselves with local council affairs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure</p>				
2696	S L Pleat	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: beautiful area should not be sacrificed to homes for Bedfordshire traffic system already congested and even if bypass were built, Hitchin would have huge amounts of extra traffic plans are unrealistic as there is inadequate funding for all facilities needed experience of over development in Hertfordshire has made life unpleasant Green Belt being eroded No proper consultation was allowed on most developments in Hertfordshire and same undemocratic methods are being used here would like information on other options and detailed information about financial viability</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The consultation process will continue through the pre-submission consultation stage and finally the Examination in Public of the Core Strategy providing wide and open debate on the proposals to their adoption.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3516	Rosemary J Plendesleath	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Town is already too congested with newest estates having a total lack of facilities and green spaces. Would bring thousands more vehicles into the area causing congestion and more on road parking problems. In past developments, infrastructure has been promised but has never materialised. So much loss of green space already and will result in more wildlife loss through loss of habitats and beautiful countryside.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3605	Richard Pleydell-Bouverie	Nr Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL development because: Ridge which runs parallel to Luton's eastern boundary through Mangrove Green &amp; Cockenhoe creates a visual barrier between Luton's urban character and N Herts attractive rural landscape and would be ruined by development spreading eastwards. Environment Sensitivity Assessment stated that the landscape was as special as the AONB north of Lilley recommending no development. Acknowledges that housing targets are set by central government but believes that Luton and Bedfordshire's development should be kept within own boundaries. Extension of the Northern Luton Ring Road to link up with airport and Park and Ride site near Lilley will not mitigate inevitable increase in traffic from development on rural lanes which are already unable to cope. Flooding in 2001 reached Kimpton and the cause was never proved but was probably a large soak away on the edge of Luton taking run off from large development by Wandon End. Proposed development will cause further flooding in N Herts.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on the landscape and the biodiversity of the area. Measures to mitigate flood risk will also be tested.				
4039	Mrs Sarah Pointer		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Opposes eastern development of LB due to: Loss of Green Belt and detrimental impact on wildlife. The fact that the unique narrow gauge railway will be blighted by this development. Houses will be built on flood plain and so run off from this new development will affect existing properties. The lack of infrastructure - pre-school places are difficult to secure in the town. Traffic congestion and how this fits with being a cycle friendly town. The presence of so many empty properties in the area. The fact that a new development will affect the unique character of LB.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work. The CS will ensure development is accommodated whilst minimising exacerbating the risk of flooding. All mitigation measures will be deployed to this effect. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible.				
2418	Valerie Pollington	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose East of Luton preferred option. It is NIMBYISM on the part of the Luton and South Beds Councillors. - loss of green belt - loss of farm land and farmers livelihood - Swamping of 3 villages - Increased traffic in Hitchin - Increased possibility of flooding in the Mimram Valley due to surface run off.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3545	Chris Porter	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Leighton Buzzard eastern development plan. Any escalation of traffic density will be unmanageable in the current and proposed infrastructure. The massive increase in commuter traffic travelling through town towards Aylesbury would put this already gridlocked route beyond breaking point. Any northern or eastern plans would not improve the condition of the town until there is a second, realistic north-south road through the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on flood plain) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Measures are proposed in the Core Strategy to improve traffic flow.</p>				
3452	Anne Porter	Linslade	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to any further housing development in Leighton Linslade. The town is already overloaded. We have three large, new estates that all lack infrastructure (Billington park, Sandhills and Pages Priory).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure is proposed as part of next phase of housing in Southern Leighton Buzzard. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence.</p>				
3530	Terry Potter	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Facilities and services are being stretched to their limits due to increased developments. The infrastructure is not in place to support more housing. None of the previously promised recreational resources have been implemented. The attractiveness of edge-of-town living that brought me into the area will be lost with the proposed development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. New infrastructure will be provided in the next phase of housing to the south of the town.</p>				
2206	Mr Mark Poulton	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Insufficient existing infrastructure in the town Increased traffic congestion will be created partly due to the lack of employment in the town and thus the need for out-commuting Will lead to increased air pollution Contends that Milton Keynes would be a more suitable location for further development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified Luton area as one for significant development. Milton Keynes is also an area identified for significant new development. The Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including approach to ensuring the delivery of infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
951	Michael Powell	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2871	Luke Powell	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Reject this proposal for 5,500 homes east of Luton. It is rural area with valuable farming land , which we need. This urbanisation of our countryside is a crime. I am absolutely against the proposal</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2879	Guy Powell	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to development to the East of Luton owing to the loss of countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3168	Debbie Powell	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Brownfield land in and around Luton should be used instead the green belt to the east of Luton . 5,500 more homes would make the current traffic volume a nightmare. The local social and community infrastructure is already at breaking point, not to mention lack of jobs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: SHLAA provides evidence of potential development land in the urban area. This shows that there is insufficient deliverable land in urban areas to meet development needs. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis as well as employment land needs.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
955	Audrey Powell	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2795	Max Powell	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: A few years ago Luton Airport wanted to bury our countryside under acres of tarmac. Now Luton Council want to cover it with houses and roads. The Green Belt should be protected at all costs. More homes mean more cars, a bypass would not alleviate the problem. More homes mean more people with few jobs locally and an already overloaded infrastructure how will the area cope? Please stop this proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2151	Mrs Audrey Pratt	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development East of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2072	Preston Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly against building 1000s of homes East of Luton, invading an area of prime Hertfordshire countryside, building over Green Belt. These plans are contrary to the concerns/needs of thousands of people and do not properly consider the really important issues. Hertfordshire is already one of the most crowded/over-populated counties in the south east and the remaining countryside is needed by existing residents. Precious countryside and farming land must not be lost. Ggrave concerns about the increase in traffic, especially the bottleneck between the A505 and A602. Traffic uses rural lanes as rat runs. Increases in traffic will have a detrimental effect on standards of roads, for which Hertfordshires Highways will be responsible and diminishing the quality of life of village residents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2932	Tracy Priestley	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Inappropriate to build on Green Belt land. Would ruin villages and permanently destroy the character of Lilley Bottom. No road or social/community infrastructure for proposed housing. Already an congestion problem in Whitwell which would increase. Highways Agency does not support Luton Northern Bypass so how will it be funded? Draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial impacts analyses or sustainability investigation to test the proposals. Not supported by N Herts DC despite statements implying otherwise. How did 13 expansion areas become 4, including Green Belt land?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2210	Mr A Pugh	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: congestion impact on Hitchin's infrastructure Not supported by North Herts DC No technical analysis provided to Committee members</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2217	Mrs SM Pugh	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: congestion impact on Hitchin's infrastructure Not supported by North Herts DC No technical analysis provided to Committee members</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3672	Jacqueline Pyle	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Large scale development ill suited to virgin rural location. Environment and biodiversity. Infrastructure in particular transport, water supply and drainage. Unreasonable for Hertfordshire to accommodate Bedfordshire's housing targets and associated infrastructure and funding challenges. Bedfordshire should seek to locate this development within its own boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3915	Margaret Quow	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Impact on the Green Belt The proposed development will aggravate the existing congested roads Better alternatives for development ( such as Luton town ) still need to be considered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2961	Margaret Quow	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the east of Luton owing to the loss of attractive countryside which is useful to the people who live in Luton and possible to walk peacefully as well as the impact on the roads which are congested and the facilities that will need to be built. States that there was objection against Butterfield Green development which the consultee suspects is largely empty and underused. Suggests that Luton town has a number of empty units which could be redeveloped which would help to make Luton a much better looking place.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
884	Kyle Radford	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the AONB Would destroy wildlife such as deer, badgers, Kites and Hawks, some low in number already Development would not assist in the regeneration of the conurbation It would create huge amounts of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be taken away from the town centre by the bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3936	Mrs Lorna Radmall	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons Impact on Green Belt Luton and South Beds constitutes better alternatives for the proposed development The proposed road infrastructure will seriously impact on the Green Belt as well as increase the existing traffic around the area. Green Belt is vital to the area and as such it should remain untouched Water supply for the area will be threatened by the proposed development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4045	Joanna Rae	Royston	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It will become more important for populations to be sited closer to work and nearer to stations so that the use of carbon is diminished. The population that they propose to hose in the east of Luton is much further away from both stations in Luton and the centre of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1094	Mrs D Rancine-Godfrey	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockermhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Requires financially unviable infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1096	Charlie Rancine-Godfrey	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockermhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Requires financially unviable infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1099	Dylan Rancine-Godfrey	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Requires financially unviable infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
350	DR JANE RANSOM	Pirton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the diagram. It proposes huge expansion East of Luton in N. Hertfordshire that will ruin the peace and character of the region, and the beauty of the ancient villages which will be destroyed by their urbanisation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2933	M H Ransom	Pirton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the east of Luton expansion proposal. This would wreck a most beautiful, high-quality piece of Green Belt land and the proposed new roads would increase traffic through Hitchin, which has more than it can cope with already.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3908	Mr C A Ray	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy because: land within proposed development area is designated green belt, supposed to prevent urban sprawl. The proposed land is used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. The development will impact in many villages located within the Green belt area. The character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at Breaking point. There will be substantial increase of traffic on the A505 and on the surrounding rural roads. The Draft Core Strategy has been issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis or sustainability investigation to test the proposals. The Development to the East of Luton is not supported by NHDC, in whose area is situated Uncertainty about how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 and include this beautiful Green Belt Area. The way the JPC had taken decisions without having been presented with the technical analysis. Existing Brownfield sites in Luton should be considered as a better alternative.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3123	Mrs P M Ray	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3084	Robert D Reid	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the encroachment on the green belt of development to the east of Luton</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3000	Veronica Reid	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is designated Green Belt supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is an invaluable recreation facility for Luton and North Hertfordshire's residents. The proposal would destroy the character of Lilley Bottom and valuable farmland, cause substantial increases on traffic and place a strain on over-stretched infrastructure (social community and road)</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure.</p>				
2414	Elizabeth Reilly	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton preferred option as Green Belt land is intended to be permanent and not developed. Concerned that existing infrastructure, particularly rail and road transport links cannot cope with existing demand let alone increased traffic. Where will the funding come from for other facilities such as hospitals, schools and shops etc?</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
963	Mr and Mrs Riant	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1370	Janet R Richards	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to the East of Luton proposal to build homes and a bypass because: - the area is designated green belt area, which is supposed to guarantee no development - astonished that development of this size can be considered; - the area is one of outstanding natural beauty, the development would destroy the beautiful countryside and farm land which is already in short supply within the South East of England; - development would generate a huge amount of traffic in and around the area, which is already congested, this development would add to the traffic making it impossible to travel around without the need for further road development. Understands the need to build more affordable housing within the region but feels that alternative locations need to be considered that would not cause an impact on the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2452	Mr Tony Riley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the East of Luton owing to the impact on the traffic which the consultee identifies is at breaking point. Objects to the lack of consideration given to Hitchin and the impact on the A505, particularly with the Eastern Bypass and Northern Bypass making it easier to Hitchin than to get to Luton.</p> <p>Identifies that the proposed development to the east of Luton is not supported by NHDC and states that people need to know, and the Joint Committee should have known, how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 and include the land to the east of Luton. Objects also to decisions being taken without members of the Joint Committee being presented with the technical analysis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3142	Mrs Jill Rix	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Traffic to the east of Luton and Hitchin is already at breaking point and roads are incapable of taking more traffic, especially the A505. No consideration has been given or a study made of the effect of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages, road and other infrastructure given that the bypass will make it easier for residents of the development to get to Hitchin. N Herts DC does not support the proposal. How did 13 possible expansion areas become just 4, including beautiful Green Belt land? Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses. The views of east of Luton residents and other affected people should be properly considered. Bedfordshire should build houses in their own county and not steal Hertfordshire's land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3198	Stephen Roach	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Has worked for various councils in Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire as a youth and community worker and comments are the result of speaking to a diverse range of people: Appreciate more housing is needed but infrastructure not there eg schools are already of a poor standard. Roads already gridlocked and additional homes will exacerbate this. Employment is already a problem in the area, with unemployment rising and more people than any other area commuting to London for work causing stress on roads. Town centres need to be increased in size and their appearance improved, particularly Luton, which looks horrible, Dunstable, which is a ghost town, and Stevenage, which is feels unsafe. Luton Airport needs to double in size to cater for employment growth. Emergency services will need to increase size and locations to accommodate population growth. Suggest building an amusement park, like Thorpe Park on or near to old Vauxhall plant site to increase visitors to the area and employment opportunities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is committed to match development with its necessary infrastructure and put in place phasing mechanisms to ensure this is the case. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure, timing and sources of funding. Each town centre has specific characteristics and may benefit and suffer from different issues. A responsive master planning of town centres is considered a more effective approach than just expansion. The Employment Land Review recommends retaining the Vauxhall site in employment use. Nevertheless, if the Vauxhall site were to become available it would be tested through the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD and not this Core Strategy.</p>				
3943	Parin Robbins	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: To build over the area to the East of Luton would be catastrophic not just for the people whose homes are in the vicinity but also for the wildlife that frequent this area. There are also a great number of leisure pursuits that would have their enjoyment curtailed by this development, horse riding, cycling clubs and ramblers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2867	H M Roberts	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the building of 5,500 houses in Hertfordshire. The proposal would take prime agricultural land. Other land should be found outside the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3427	Peter Roberts	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development to the East of Luton is not only an abomination on one of the few totally rural areas left in North Hertfordshire, but it is also enjoyed as a breath of fresh air by many people living in the Luton area. There are many areas around various towns in Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, where prime agricultural land, as well as an area of extreme natural beauty will not be ruined forever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule, delivery commitments and viability of the proposals. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
36	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Subject to the timely implementation of the transport infrastructure. Junction 11A is not yet fact and the A505 / M1 link not even in a programme. Past experience suggests that we will have all the housing completed and the road network still being discussed. This will be totally unacceptable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Delivery Strategy will outline approach to ensuring delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivery of infrastructure, including new roads, in step with housing delivery is critical to a sustainable Core Strategy Plan.</p>				
1203	Miss Ellie Robinson	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton development because: - loss of wildlife - people love the countryside and so will be upset and sad - lots of people love the countryside for walking.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including retention of recreation space.</p>				
420	Mr Andrew Robson	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposed expansion east of Luton into North Hertfordshire, which is an area of attractive countryside. The proposed development would ruin the character of the region and the beauty of the villages in it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3105	Susan Rodger	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development as well as the Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. N Hertfordshire has its own targets but is using brown-fill sites to do this. Suggests Vauxhall Sites as available for development. The Butterfield site has many unoccupied premises precluding need for this development. The development will absorb several villages. The countryside is idyllic for walking, is the most beautiful in Hertfordshire and must be protected at all costs. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3103	Dr & Mrs A Rodger	Letchworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development as well as the Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. N Hertfordshire has its own targets but is using brown-fill sites to do this. Suggests Vauxhall Sites as available for development. The Butterfield site has many unoccupied premises precluding need for this development. The development will absorb several villages. The countryside is idyllic for walking, is the most beautiful in Hertfordshire and must be protected at all costs. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3107	Samuel Rodger	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton development as well as the Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to: Its impact which will not help with the improvement of the image of Luton or the quality of life of people contrary to the aspirations in Chapter 11; Is contrary to the advice in the LUC assessment; Its lack of consideration to the historic importance of the area; Its location within North Herts; Its worsening impact on the already existing congestion. N Hertfordshire has its own targets but is using brown-fill sites to do this. Suggests Vauxhall Sites as available for development. The Butterfield site has many unoccupied premises precluding need for this development. The development will absorb several villages. The countryside is idyllic for walking, is the most beautiful in Hertfordshire and must be protected at all costs. Suggests that other options exist including the West of Luton Alternatively suggests redevelopment in Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3442	R D Roe	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the preferred urban extension East of Luton. Apart from the well established objections for not building on Green Belt land, such as destruction of wildlife, loss of recreational areas etc, Brown field sites still exist close to the town centre, for example the old Vauxhall site. Where are the cost/benefit analyses for these proposed developments, there appears to be no financial analysis for these various options. Such development would bring chaos to the roads into Luton. The construction traffic to build these houses over the next 5 to 10 years would be a nightmare to residents in this area. Have such costs to the environment in pollution and carbon emissions been included in this proposal?</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
3471	Ms Pauline Roffe	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East Leighton Buzzard preferred urban extension because of lack of infrastructure - no hospital, factories, no health centre, all needed to help the developments thrive; town is frequently gridlocked, there are too many cars and high street does not attract new investment</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including impact on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.			
2179	Derek Rogers	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed urban extension East of Luton</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
2197	Andrew Rogers	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed urban extension East of Luton: scale should develop on brownfield sites in Bedfordshire first; other sites available Have not consulted Hertfordshire properly will ruin villages Financially unviable Loss of Green Belt; should not build on AONB - proposal conflicts with Preferred Option CS15 No benefit to residents of Hertfordshire</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3867	Mrs April Rogers	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to impact on the Green Belt, wildlife, landscape, villages and loss of access to countryside. Should be building on Luton's numerous brownfield sites before such sites. Requires extensive infrastructure including the bypasses. Objects to the impact on the bypasses on the AONB and AONB of Lilley Bottom valley and on wildlife. Directly conflicts with CS15. The Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass so how will it be funded? Objects to lack of consultation with Hertfordshire. Development will be of no benefit to anyone in Hertfordshire, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of the environment. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis, is not supported by North Herts DC. How did 13 expansion areas become 4?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3865	Mr Fintan Rogers	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to impact on the Green Belt, wildlife, landscape, villages and loss of access to countryside. Should be building on Luton's numerous brownfield sites before such sites. Requires extensive infrastructure including the bypasses. Objects to the impact on the bypasses on the AONB and AONB of Lilley Bottom valley and on wildlife. Directly conflicts with CS15. The Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass so how will it be funded? Development will be of no benefit to anyone in Hertfordshire, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of the environment. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis, is not supported by North Herts DC. How did 13 expansion areas become 4?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3859	Mr Frederick Rogers	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to impact on the Green Belt, wildlife, landscape, villages and loss of access to countryside. Should be building on Luton's numerous brownfield sites before such sites. Requires extensive infrastructure including the bypasses. Objects to the impact on the bypasses on the AONB and AONB of Lilley Bottom valley and on wildlife. Directly conflicts with CS15. The Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass so how will it be funded? Development will be of no benefit to anyone in Hertfordshire, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of the environment. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis, is not supported by North Herts DC. How did 13 expansion areas become 4?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3866	Mr William Rogers	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to impact on the Green Belt, wildlife, landscape, villages and loss of access to countryside. Should be building on Luton's numerous brownfield sites before such sites. Requires extensive infrastructure including the bypasses. Objects to the impact on the bypasses on the AONB and AONB of Lilley Bottom valley and on wildlife. Directly conflicts with CS15. The Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass so how will it be funded? Development will be of no benefit to anyone in Hertfordshire, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of the environment. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis, is not supported by North Herts DC. How did 13 expansion areas become 4?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
958	Gillian Rogers	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3870	Mary Rogers	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to impact on the Green Belt, wildlife, landscape, villages and loss of access to countryside. Should be building on Luton's numerous brownfield sites before such sites. As a Luton resident am insulted that the renovation of historic town of Luton has been discounted in favour of an easier option. Requires extensive infrastructure including the bypasses. Objects to the impact on the bypasses on the AONB and AONB of Lilley Bottom valley and on wildlife. Other options exist. Directly conflicts with CS15. The Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass so how will it be funded? Would like to see the studies of the irreversible impact to wildlife. Development will be of no benefit to anyone in Hertfordshire, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of the environment. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis, is not supported by North Herts DC. How did 13 expansion areas become 4?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
957	Ivor Rogers	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
541	Mrs Margaret Rollason	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No, I do NOT support the diagram, as it proposes huge expansion east of Luton in North Herts that ruins the character of the region and the beauty of the villages in it. Not to mention the loss to agriculture</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3847	ML and SL Rosser	King's Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We wish to make a formal objection to the possible East of Luton development. This part of the Green Belt is almost contiguous with, and yet as a whole complementary to, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the north of Lilley. Moreover, your breathtaking cynicism in using North Herts' land to solve Beds/Luton's housing requirements by despoiling what little rural and high quality green belt land we have left, is nothing short of reprehensible and unpardonably undemocratic. Those who will be affected most have no means of voting against those making the decision. If this area has been deemed one of the Preferred Options, what criteria have been used for this choice? How will the transport cope? Where is the financial viability study?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3574	Martin Rosser	Kings Walden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the East of Luton proposal. This part of the green belt is complementary to the Chilterns AONB. The Green Belt is outstanding and largely unspoilt. Using North Herts land is reprehensible and undemocratic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessment. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1123	Mr Alan Rowan	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure, and development will lead to increases of traffic on the roads. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass, which devastates Lilley Bottom. Development will overstretch emergency services and educational facilities as well, is believed to be under-investigated as part of the work. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Questions demand for housing, also for office/commercial property as Butterfield and Capability Green are half empty.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
1156	Mrs Tracy Rowan	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Traffic / Roads to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the roads. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass, which devastates Lilley Bottom. Development will overstretch emergency services and educational facilities as well, is believed to be under-investigated as part of the work. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Questions demand for housing, also for office/commercial property as Butterfield and Capability Green are half empty.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.			
906	Miss Katherine Rowan	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure financially non-viable. Increased traffic to the east of Luton and Hitchin. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Develop brownfield land first. Employment and infrastructure will not cope with growth in Bedford, 20 miles to the north, let alone east of Luton. Development will over stretch educational facilities. Query housing demand.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1124	Miss Brooke Rowan	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development EoL because: Land is Green Belt and supposed to prevent urban sprawl and inappropriate to build on natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land is invaluable recreational facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and villages like Tea Green destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis. Traffic / Roads to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch educational facilities as well. NHDC does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Development should focus on brownfield land prior to greenbelt Requires financially unviable infrastructure. There is insufficient employment to support the housing growth or infrastructure to support the volume of cars. Questions demand for housing, also for office/commercial property as Butterfield and Capability Green are half empty.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
895	Anna Rowan	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2996	Alan Rown-Robinson	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the east of Luton owing to its potential to impact on their village. Expresses concern that North Herts District Council appear to have been consulted very little even though the proposed developments would be to a considerable extent in their area.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee and officers are engaged in the process. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2912	Royal College of Music	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land between Luton Airport, Tea Green, Lilley and Stopsley is of significant natural beauty and of great amenity value. If it were to be developed it would be destroyed while there are other areas surrounding Luton more suitable for development. It seems that the alternatives have not been properly considered. The land lies within the green belt which intended to be permanent. Traffic generated by the proposal would add to the already congested roads and junctions in Hitchin and Stevenage as well as the county lanes and village roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2029	B Ruckwood	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: North of Luton Development - .. I am very concerned about the 4500 houses that you are planning to build in this area for the following reasons. It has been forecast that by about 2011, there will be a worldwide drought and food shortage because of climate change. All of these developments take up land and bring more people to the area, who will need water and food to sustain them. This will happen in other towns too. England is a small country and there will be insufficient land left for food crop or animal farms. Although at the moment we import food from abroad, they will have shortages themselves. I feel there are too many people coming into this country, if they stopped this influx, they would not need all of these houses and our problems would be solved. there would be more jobs available and it would stop the drain on the NHS. Instead of solving problems, it is better to prevent them in the first place. For these reasons, I strongly oppose the proposed development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. We must plan to meet the development requirements outlined.</p>				
3644	Jackie Rudom	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose any further development east of Leighton Buzzard due to loss of green belt land, and the future of the narrow gauge railway. There is inadequate infrastructure to support more growth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. Measures are proposed in the Core Strategy to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3430	Amanda Ryan	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The EoL proposals will totally destroy an AONB and this is certainly not an issue that should be decided by a council that is in the next county! The area is home to hundreds of species of animal, birds and plants which wouldn't survive under a concrete jungle. There are a number of small businesses which would not benefit from this ridiculous idea as well as hundreds of horses being stabled in the locality as this area is the best area for miles to ride safely off the road. The countryside is used by hundreds of people every day for recreational purposes, walkers, ramblers and riders all value it enormously. The roads in the area would never cope with the additional traffic so I suppose your idea to that would be to build more roads. All of the villages that you are proposing to swallow up are their own communities. Find somewhere else to build your houses, ideally on brown field sites such as Vauxhall where inner town regeneration would actually benefit the locals and the town as a whole.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to maintain key green linkages.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3368	Master Henry Ryden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object development East of Luton. Please don't build houses and a big road because it won't be nice and quiet anymore. It will be 'zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom' all the time. I am very sad that lots of houses and big road are going to go straight across where I ride my bike and walk my dog in the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including retention of recreation space.</p>				
2974	Amelia Ryden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton owing to loss of amenity which consultee uses the land for currently including riding bike and walking dogs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to maintain key green linkages.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3923	Amelia Ryden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Strategy Spatial Development due to the following reasons; Housing development as well as new road infrastructure will seriously impact on pedestrian and cyclist safety and their existing infrastructure Landscape and Scenic Amenity to be impacted as a result of development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision (including alternatives to the private car), timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2962	Neil Ryden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development as well as the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Bypass owing to: lack of evidence and consideration of the traffic impact of the additional housing and the 2 bypasses on the Hitchin and other areas which makes the plans flawed the impact on the landscape and the lack of regard to the conclusions in the LUC Assessment including the advice that development in Area L1 is not recommended the impact on the villages which does not accord with the Core Strategy principles in Section 3 and 11, the lack of consideration to other options, including the west of Luton proposal which is on lower grade Green Belt compared to East of Luton and has transport infrastructure the lack of pursuit of brownfield development opportunities or smaller urban extensions States that the decision making process and consultation process has been fundamentally flawed and suggests that the analysis is redone properly before any decisions are made.</p>				
JC Response:	<p>Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>			
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Consultation will continue through the pre-submission stage prior to the examination in public allowing for further engagement. <input type="checkbox"/><input type="checkbox"/></p>			
3937	Ruth Ryden	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. Green Belt should not be changed unless there are absolutely no alternatives. Other alternatives have yet to be fully explored including brown field sites in Luton and west of Luton on lower grade Green belt land. East of Luton is the only site where distinct villages will be totally consumed, totally against the principle of the Green Belt. NHDC will not plan for the development so why persist with it? We are privileged to live near such outstandingly beautiful countryside, enjoyed by numerous people for varied recreational activities. It is an area of diverse wildlife.</p>				
JC Response:	<p>Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>			
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3946	Sue Ryder	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: In 2000/2001 there was severe flooding in Kimpton from springs in the Lilley Bottom area. Now more expanse of concrete and tarmac is proposed. The proposed land for development is in Herfordshire. It is beautiful countryside which will be destroyed together with several villages. It will be Herfordshire roads that will be clogged up with extra traffic and HCC who have to maintain them. Will it also be Herfordshire schools that have to find extra places?</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The first stage of the Water Cycle Study supported the preparation of the Preferred Options and the second stage soon to be finalised) together with other work prepared since the preferred options will provide further information on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures which will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>			
182	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the diagram, as it proposes huge expansion east of Luton in North Herts that ruins the character of the region and the beauty of the villages in it.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including mitigation of the impact on the villages.</p>			
2458	M A Sanders	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed development to the east of Luton owing to its designation as Green Belt land and the undermining impact that development would have on this concept. Also objects owing to the impact on the landscape and the increased traffic as well as the loss of green space near to where people live and the impact on infrastructure. Objects to the fact that this proposal is being promoted by Bedfordshire Authorities in North Herts who have their own housing target to meet. Wants to see the area remain as countryside for everyone's enjoyment.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			
868	Mrs E A Sanders	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Existing traffic volumes already unacceptable to drivers and residents. No consideration to effect of extra traffic generated by new development on already stressed roads in and around Hitchin. Development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505. Bypass will make it easier for residents in the new development to get to Hitchin than to Luton. Area is extremely beautiful, particularly chalk valley at Lilley Bottom, supporting many species of flora and fauna. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including infrastructure and transport assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to mitigate impact and retain recreation areas.</p>			



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
864	Pat Sanders	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Encroaching on area of considerable beauty and landscape value supporting many species of fauna and flora. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Eastern bypass would destroy outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.			
3877	Mrs E Saunders	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is actually in Hertfordshire and in Green Belt. Countryside is unspoilt and provides green lungs for Luton residents and is an integrate part of N Herts landscape. Village life in Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green would be taken over and the proposed roads would destroy the peace and quiet and add to pollution. Should look at infilling like in Hitchin. Luton's brownfield sites should be utilised and not try to solve its problems by stealing from its neighbours.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA assesses potential development in the urban area. This has identified that there are insufficient sites to meet the housing needs. The Site Assessment Matrix has assessed other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
2100	Ms Denise Saunders	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The allocation of new housing should be determined nationally by an independent panel; Leighton Buzzard's existing infrastructure is already stretched by some of the more recent housing developments; Concern over flood risk; and concern about impact on historic narrow gauge railway</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including identification of mitigation measures.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy will not debate the means by which Government allocates national and regional housing figures. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1552	John Savage	Tring	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Makes strongest possible objection to proposals to develop land between Luton and Lilley Bottom, including the A505 - Luton Airport link road. The land is prime countryside and Lilley Bottom is a beautiful valley with attractive views from both sides. Makes special effort to go walking in the countryside between Luton and Hitchin. This precious unspoilt countryside needs protection, not desecration and is inappropriate to choose it for potential development. There have to be better ways of accommodating Luton's growth. Given the need to curb carbon emissions, building more roads to encourage more motor vehicle transport is clearly unsustainable and should be rejected. He urges that these proposals be dropped from the Core Strategy.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3313	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Q. 4	No
Comment: See CSOP 3312 comment.				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: No action Required		
JC Reason for Response:	The Luton and South Bedfordshire Employment Land Review (2008) concludes that new employment allocations should be considered as part of any urban extension proposed. The study considered land at Junction 10A but noted that it falls outside the MKSMSRS area of search.			
3956	Stephen Sharratt	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The land to the East of Luton is green belt land and this plan will destroy farmland and several villages and cover a large area of beautiful countryside which is currently used by many people from within the Luton area for leisure purposes. Towns such as Hitchin will suffer from larger amounts of traffic.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.			
2205	Mrs G Shaw	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Bedfordshire should not be able to appropriate land in Hertfordshire. It is an area of outstanding beauty. Villages will be swallowed up and traffic will increase enormously along Lilley Bottom through to Codicote and St Albans. Whitwell already has a lot of traffic making it dangerous for pedestrians.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2878	Adam Shaw	Gosmore	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to build 5,500 houses in the green belt of North Hertfordshire. This would spoil the countryside, fail to help regenerate the Luton Dunstable conurbation, destroy the purpose of designating the green belt and make traffic through Hitchin even worse. There are better alternatives around Slip End, Caddington, Dunstable, Toddington and Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix which assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3970	P A Shaw	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Enjoy walking in the countryside around Lilley. It is an area of outstanding beauty and Hertfordshire residents are privileged to have countryside such as this to enjoy. Fear loss of the area and encroachment into Hertfordshire countryside and towards Lilley. Area currently enjoyed by residents of Stopsley and Wigmore and it is important for families for relaxation and exercise and horse riders who can ride for miles without going on roads. All this will be carved up for houses and roads. Lilley already has a traffic problem and the volume will increase towards Luton and Hitchin which is already a bottleneck. Green Belt land must be kept for future generations to enjoy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3995	P J Shaw	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: ID 326683 Objects the Spatial Development strategy due to the following reasons The proposed development will be catastrophic to the environment it will impact on AONB The additional population, together with the increased traffic would be most detrimental to the surrounding rural villages who would lose their identity. Hitchin will suffer greatly particularly from increased traffic using the proposed new road system.. The proposed area for development is already enjoyed by many residents who go there for walking, horse riding and enjoy the outstanding scenery. Proposed development constitutes an invasion into Hertfordshire's Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2368	GL Shaw	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It is abhorrent that Luton and Beds Councils should be considering developing a large area of Hertfordshire. Any new residents would suffer from aircraft noise. Could build high rise flats in Wardown Park but should stay within the Borough boundary whatever happens.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including consideration of airport noise. The SHLAA assesses potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2514	JS Sheach	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton: increased traffic into Hitchin loss of Green Belt impact on villages N Herts DC does not support the proposal</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence environmental sensitivity.</p>				
291	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The villages of north Herts should not be involved in this plan in any way. Rural communities and areas of beauty will be destroyed and the traffic implications will stretch far beyond.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3466	Mrs Helen Shephard	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: objects to Eastern Leighton Buzzard preferred urban extension because: no infrastructure to sustain the huge growth nor in the infrastructure promised, traffic congestion already exists and more housing will make it worse, no sufficient parking at the train station and parking fees are high, east of Leighton Buzzard on the flood plain of the Clipstone Brook and more building would increase the risk of flooding, Leighton Buzzard is a lovely market town that has been growing gradually with time and should not be ruined by building on greenbelt countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including impact on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3833	Elizabeth Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the building of 5,500 houses to the East of Luton. The building will be on green belt and Area 1 which I understand is contradictory to building regulations. Cockerhove and Mangrove Green will be swamped and will lose their identities. It will destroy the ecological diversity of the area with the impact of roads and an Eastern Bypass along Lilley Bottom which is one of the most beautiful places in Hertfordshire. The destruction of parts of AONB in Lilley by the Northern Bypass will have a destructive effect on the recreational use of the area. The increased traffic turning east to Hitchin will cause immense problems and congestion in Hertfordshire. There are areas to the West of Luton that would equally serve the development without encroaching on Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2991	Elizabeth Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the development of Area L. There is no convincing case for the selection of this area when compared with other areas previously identified. The very special circumstances necessary to overturn the presumption against inappropriate development in the green belt have not been demonstrated. It would result on the loss of identity of the villages of Cockerhove, Tea Green and Mangrove Green which are likely to coalesce and also result on the loss of open countryside some of which is classified Landscape Grade I and contains areas of ecological diversity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1262	Mr E Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Strongly objects to East of Luton urban extension. Although this is green belt and not an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), there is no step change between it and the land north of the A505 which is AONB. The Environmental Assessment gives this area Grade 1 status and does not consider it appropriate for development. The area is used for recreational purposes (footpaths and bridleways) by local villagers and residents of Luton and Stopsley. The area is home to protected species whose habitats will be destroyed by the development. The document makes reference to concentrating new development within existing urban areas - this should be prioritised, for example the Vauxhall Site. 5,500 homes equate to approximately 15,000 which constitute a whole new town dumped in North Herts. Traffic - the development will funnel more traffic east and west between M1 and Cambridge and traffic through Hitchin. Concludes that the decision for East of Luton is for political gain for Luton and Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3216	Mr H L Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The eat of Luton proposal would expand over the top of Mangrove Green, Tea Green and Cockernhoe villages and surrounding countryside. Your environmental assessment gave most of Cockernhoe area a Grade 1 status and did not consider it appropriate for development. The small area which was not Grade 1 was Grade 2, where significant constraints were identified. The area is home to many protected species whose habitat would be destroyed for ever. The proposal is contrary to the principles to limit development outside principal settlements in Core Strategy paragraphs 4.10 and 4.16. Regeneration and renewal could be promoted in the 100 acres of the Vauxhall site. There are other options which have not been properly investigated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy promotes urban development but not all the requirements outlined in the East of England Plan for the Luton area can be met in the urban areas. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including the LUC environmental sensitivity assessment. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including mitigating the impact of development on villages and landscape.</p>				
1401	Tom Sheppard	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: NON serious point (does not want to see!): "Future needs and economies of scale must be addressed in east of Luton proposals - stop/start or small scale solutions often aren't cost effective in the long term. Place infrastructure between Luton, Hitchin, Stevenage, Letchworth and Baldock, then concrete over the land - starting at Luton's eastern boundary. Then mark out positions of development, utilities and transport infrastructure, making it easy to build in the future (filling in square plots). Look at expanding Royston too." REAL issue: When and where will it stop? Stop giving into political demand/targets. UK population has trebled over last century and is a real issue. Population control must be considered, dropping in 5500 houses is a quick fix. Urban expansion cannot go on forever, the UK cannot take anymore. Casually destroying greenbelt countryside for short-term gain (i.e. 'Hotel Bastille' at Butterfield) is not the way to proceed. Never mind 2012 or 2020, look ahead 100 years, when will it stop!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires.</p>				
2496	Miss Laura Shipley	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed expansion into Herts Green Belt Housing demands in Bedfordshire should not be allowed to ruin Hertfordshire countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2495	Mr Paul Shipley	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development Loss of Green Belt Housing demand for Bedfordshire should be met by Bedfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3983	E F Shirley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reason: Should not destroy the beauty of grass and trees with concrete and bricks. Should find somewhere else.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2972	Mrs L M Short	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Will swallow up beautiful rural villages and spoil walks through the area. Plans do not consider impact on Hitchin which is already too busy with traffic. N Herts DC and Herts CC both oppose the plans.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2096	Mr A K Silver	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to further development in Leighton Buzzard due to volume of existing housing allocations and completions</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Recently developed and proposed housing accounted for.</p>				
2617	Nadine Simmons	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Impact on Lilley Should not build on designated Green Belt Large estates do not improve quality of life West of Luton scheme a better option Additional infrastructure required will change countryside beyond recognition Villages will become part of conurbation Rural character lost forever</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2793	R B Simmons	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton would destroy a large part of the Green Belt; a Grade 1 landscape conservation area and would result on the loss of the villages of Cockerhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green, the loss of character of the Lilley Bottom valley and impact on the wildlife in the area. The proposal do not take into account the lack of infrastructure to support such development. South West of Luton should be given the same consideration for development. The proposal has been badly advertise din Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document. in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure commitments to deliver the proposals. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action.</p>				
3725	Nathan Simmons	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL owing to impact on landscape, villages, Lilley Bottom, quality of life of residents, noise and air pollution, loss of recreation and amenity areas. The area selected did not have the same evaluation as other areas which would have far less impact on the environment such as West of Luton . Other sites exist in urban area eg Vauxhall site. Luton airport does not need an additional access road as it is well served by the M1 and therefore Eastern Bypass is unnecessary. Northern Bypass would destroy an irreplaceable part of the Chilterns AONB and studies for a no bypass option have not been completed. Lack of infrastructure to support proposals. Traffic is already bad and roads will not support an additional 10,000 cars. How will medical and schools facilities and other infrastructure be funded? CS was poorly advertised in N Herts and was very difficult for the average person without specialised knowledge to understand. Unfair for housing to not count towards Hertfordshire's allocation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3813	D Simpson	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The new housing in the former sandpits has already placed unreasonable burden on existing infrastructure. Development to the east and north-east of Leighton Buzzard will hardly, 'minimise impact on surrounding countryside'. Removing green belt from southern Bedfordshire should not be an option. Expected shortfalls in NHS funding will be unreasonably strained by a further increase in population.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Core Strategy plans for new employment in the urban extension. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1160	Ms Jean Simpson-Riley	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton due to: Scale of proposed development; The development would have a detrimental effect on the traffic congestion in Hitchin; The effects of the proposed development on Hitchin, its traffic and other infrastructure has been ignored; North Herts Council does not support the development to the east of Luton; Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas; Queries how decision can be taken without the members of the Joint Planning Committee having been presented with the technical analysis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
3481	Pamela and Raymond Skeggs	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development of land east of Luton within North Herts will result in loss of countryside, landscape and biodiversity. This land is an area of high landscape value and is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB. The proposed development would result in an unjustifiable loss of a large area of green belt. It would engulf hamlets such as Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and their characters and identities would be lost. Other options do not appear to have been properly evaluated in comparison to the east of Luton option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4056	Nick Slaymaker	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I'm appalled to hear of your county's plan to invade and destroy some of the most beautiful country in North Herts. I will do everything I can to oppose. We're already fighting Stevenage who are threatening to invade from the east.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2499	Mr Graham Slow	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Increased risk of flooding. Impact on wildlife. Impact on roads and traffic congestion. Loss/impact on railway</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on narrow gauge railway, deliver the necessary infrastructure and mitigate flood risk.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2502	Mrs Jeanette Slow	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concerned about proposed East of Leighton Buzzard development: Increased risk of flooding. Impact on roads and traffic congestion. Loss/impact on railway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact on the landscape, biodiversity and Narrow Gauge Railway as well as deliver the necessary infrastructure.</p>				
909	R Small	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Character of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
752	AG Small	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3429	Anthony Smalldridge	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to Eastern Leighton Buzzard urban extension because of the loss of designated green belt, traffic issues along Vandyke Road and Shenly Hill Road, traffic impact on the town centre and increased traffic around/access to schools on eastern side of Leighton Buzzard; designated flood area and the provision of social and community infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2957	Derek Smedley	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton development owing to its encroachment into Hertfordshire as well as its impact on infrastructure, roads, local services, emergency services, villages, landscape and Green Belt, wildlife and an area where people in Luton can walk, relax and enjoy fresh air. States that preferred option decision has been made without due regard to alternative options including empty homes and brownfield sites in Luton which could be developed without breaching the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3890	Mrs S M Smith	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development and bypasses for the following reasons: Should retain Green Belt for benefit of all urban dwellers in Luton and N Herts. Permanent loss of 'green lung' and increased congestion on outskirts of Luton and Hitchin which are already difficult to drive through. Increase in housing has not been properly costed and would like to see proof of proper funding for social/community infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4054	Mr and Mrs R J Smith	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. The affordable family homes are not supported by plans for new schools when existing schools are already at capacity. GP surgeries, hospitals and emergency services are already over-stretched, putting lives at risk. Recreational facilities are already under-resourced. The present infrastructure cannot sustain the development and would require extensive public funding to provide. Our local roads are already congested and extra traffic will result in gridlock and road safety risk to residents. The bypass would require unreasonable public funding and destroy Green belt land and wildlife, similar to what has already been achieved to great detriment at Butterfield Green. The development would destroy an area of outstanding beauty, used regularly to exercise and unwind. Other avenues must be explored first and the regeneration of inner town areas must be prioritised before development of open spaces.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3974	Mr G P L Smith	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development Object, Eastern and Northern bypasses , employment area and Park and Ride for the following reasons: Destruction of agricultural land. Destruction of wildlife. Loss of biodiversity. Increase in road traffic on existing overcrowded roads. Unjustifiable loss of green belt. Loss of identity of existing villages. More suitable sites are: 2000 houses west of Leighton Linlade 3000 houses north of Houghton Regis 5,500 houses around Caddington and Slip End.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3445	Ian G Smith	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write to oppose the plans to develop housing, commercial development, and roads into North Hertfordshire, to the east of Luton. The transport infrastructure is inadequate and an extra 5,500 homes will be totally intolerable. Little regard has been had to the Environmental Assessment which clearly states that Lilley Bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding beauty and is not suitable for development. There are alternative proposals, for example, to the west of Luton. The opportunity to consult fairly and fully with North Herts residents was discarded by you making the consultation flawed and unfair.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Consultation has been undertaken. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3843	Mrs Rachel Smitham	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register my strongest possible objection to the ridiculous proposal to build 5,500 houses to the east of Luton. Many people use the area for walking, cycling and horse riding. The roads would not be able to cope with the increased traffic neither would the local schools and health care etc. Local businesses and families who have lived in these villages or used the amenities would suffer immensely from these outrageous proposals. The local stables may have to close as the business would struggle to operate without adequate grazing and the roads would not be safe for horses to be exercised. There are many empty buildings and sites in which housing can be built on without destroying our beautiful countryside and disturbing the wildlife in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1530	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We oppose housing to the East of Luton and think that there should be 4500 houses to the east of Leighton Buzzard and that there should not be a Luton Northern Bypass until the alternatives had had more work on them.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix . Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Comments on transport infrastructure are dealt with in the comment schedule for section 5.</p>				
888	Mrs G Southern	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
894	Miss L Southern	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Infrastructure is financially non-viable. Eastern bypass will destroy Lilley Bottom chalk valley. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1162	Mrs G Southern	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
1161	Miss K Southern	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
3358	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the Core Strategy proposals in general terms and consider that the emphasis which it places on urban concentration and strategic urban extensions linked to sustainable transport infrastructure is in principle a 'sound' strategy. However, the draft submission stage should make clear that early delivery of all urban extensions will be encouraged and that the council will not seek to hold back commencement on any area should promoters/developers be in a position to bring forward development at an early stage. To maintain a healthy 5 year housing supply it would be possible to enable the release of some small sites within or adjoining the proposed extension areas to come forward at an early stage provided that wider masterplanning is not compromised. The proposed direction of growth are sound and have been based on a robust and credible evidence base. Particular support is given to Houghton Regis proposal.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Welcome the support for the Core Strategy. With regards to phasing, the Core Strategy does not preclude the Urban Extensions coming forward ahead of 2012/13 providing they are accompanied by the required supporting infrastructure. Policy CS7 - Delivering a Constant Supply of Housing provides the framework for the monitoring and management of housing provision. This policy provides the context to review the commencement and rate of delivery of urban extensions to resolve delays, constraints etc. and maintaining a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. Therefore, it is believed the Core Strategy responds adequately to the noted concerns.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3109	Jim Southon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: NHDC strongly opposes any expansion into Hertfordshire. Luton has ignored the recommendations of its own study which did not recommend the North Hertfordshire area for development given its high sensitivity. The proposal rests on the East of Luton bypass which is extremely expensive and will cause further congestion to the roads leading into Luton, Hitchin and surrounding roads. This region of North Hertfordshire is an area of outstanding natural beauty. No mention is made of any alternative to the proposal and it ignores other development proposals submitted for more efficient schemes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3110	Sue Southon	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Luton Councillors should not be allowed to impose their wishes onto residents living in Hertfordshire and imply that North Hertfordshire Council approves of their plans. Other options make more sense (e.g. Bushmead Master plan - A vision for Luton West) and are not being considered. LBC seem to have disregarded commissioned study's advice not recommending the area for development. It appears dependent on the East of Luton bypass despite its enormous problems and costs. No consideration seems to have been given to the 'swallowing up' of villages and the area's beautiful countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. The Delivery Plan will also take into account a range of contingency scenarios to provide flexibility to the strategy. ☐proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and it will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3423	W H Sowerby	Cornwall	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: My objections to the East of Luton proposals include the following: - The proposals are in North Herts and Hertfordshire is firmly against this development. - The proposal is in direct conflict with the principles and vision that the plan will provide attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life. - 5,500 houses would be built on Green Belt land with a high sensitivity rating and the proposed bypass would impact upon the Chilterns AONB. - The Core Strategy recognises that there is congestion along the A505 and the extra houses will make this far worse. I appreciate that new housing is needed in the region but there does appear to be a more viable option in the form of West of Luton. You could also consider small developments in the existing villages in South Beds and North Herts which would go a long way to resolving the overall housing problem.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure and the strategy's delivery partners.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3811	Christopher Spence	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to more houses in Leighton Buzzard east. We have not enough work for our existing residents. This land should be a SSSI and flood overspill lake, taking the strain off the Clipstone Brook.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Core Strategy plans for new employment in the urban extension. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure, including measures to mitigate flood risk.</p>				
1135	John and Geraldine Spicer	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3476	B Squires	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is one of outstanding landscape quality equivalent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The area is adjacent to Luton Airport which is subject to both aircraft noise and significant risk of aircraft accident. Additional development should only be allowed provided that Luton airport is required to severely cut air and noise pollution. An urban extension in this area would also have an unacceptable impact on the existing road network. You must keep the conservation of the countryside in mind. If we have to suffer the loss of this Green Belt, then there must be a requirement that the numerous woods within the area are not cut down. The majority of housing should be for first time buyers. The area concerned is in Hertfordshire and, consequently, any development should count as part of the Hertfordshire allocation, not Luton or Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3479	P R Squires	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is one of outstanding landscape quality equivalent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The area is adjacent to Luton Airport which is subject to both aircraft noise and significant risk of aircraft accident. Additional development should only be allowed provided that Luton airport is required to severely cut air and noise pollution. An urban extension in this area would also have an unacceptable impact on the existing road network</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3548	Miss T Srodecki	Houghton Regis	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development and Northern Bypass due to impact on villages, the landscape, Lilley Bottom and the Green Belt as well as wildlife. Proposal is contradictory to the vision that states that Luton &amp; South Beds will be a place recognised for its vibrant surrounding villages whose individual identity will be conserved within the environment of the Chilterns and Downs. LUC concluded that given the high sensitivity of the land, development is not recommended. Huge amount of extra traffic would cause intolerable strain on road system and exacerbate gridlock in Hitchin. Black Route option disregards importance of AONB which government says should be protected. N Herts is against development and has its own targets to meet. Much better options are available eg West of Luton. An orbital road around Luton would draw business away from town centre. Widening of Vauxhall Way is the most sensible option using existing roads, linking efficiently with M1 and airport. No bypass option studies not complete.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including assessment of Non Bypass Options as per Report to Joint Committee in March 2009.</p>				
722	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: HRDC approves JC's approach to suitably located land due to insufficient opportunities for development within existing urban area. Under estimation of no. of dwellings needed within urban extensions in next 5 years. HRDC willing to work with JC and JTU to secure early implementation of SUE North of HR. Suggest CS needs to be sufficiently flexible and should include statement: "The JTU do not anticipate significant delivery in the urban extension prior to 2012/2013. However it will not resist development coming forward subject to suitable phasing and commitment on infrastructure delivery." HRDC willing to incorporate within own proposals: range of residential opportunities, new strategic employment site, extension to guided busway, delivery of appropriate supporting social and green infrastructure. Believe that N of HR will contribute significantly to improvement of Dunstable and HR. Can achieve regeneration through redeveloping existing sites eg provide affordable housing through refurbishing existing stock</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy does not preclude the Urban Extensions coming forward ahead of 2012/13 providing they are accompanied by the required supporting infrastructure. Policy CS7 - Delivering a Constant Supply of Housing provides the framework for the monitoring and management of housing provision. This policy provides the context to review the commencement and rate of delivery of urban extensions to resolve delays, constraints etc. and maintaining a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. It also highlights the Core Strategy's flexible approach to affordable housing contributions which would apply to the housing regeneration aims noted in HRDC comments. Therefore, it is believed the Core Strategy responds adequately to the noted concerns.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2442	St Ippolyts Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objection to the proposed EoL, lack of consultation in the area, lack of comparative analysis. Objects to impact of EoL on Green Belt and impact on hamlets and villages. Does not support proposals for Strategic Highway T transport infrastructure owing to impact on AONB and conflict with CS15. Contends the 2009 public consultation on the route options was flawed in that it was focused on residents in the main conurbation. Impact of E. Bypass cannot be justified and lack of EU, National and Regional funding shows that cannot be justified. No consideration has been given to the impact of increased traffic on the A505 to the east of Luton and its impact on Hitchin and the neighbouring villages such as St Ippolyts. The proposed eastern section of the Northern Bypass and the Eastern Bypass should be deleted from Preferred Option CS4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The consultation process will continue through the pre-submission consultation stage and finally the Examination in Public of the Core Strategy providing wide and open debate on the proposals to their adoption. Comments on transport infrastructure and CS4 are dealt with in the comment schedule for section 5.</p>				
3770	St Paul's Walden Estate Company	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Our tenants and farming would be affected when the daily traffic block in Whitwell is made very much worse by Luton residents driving to the towns in north Hertfordshire. The east of Luton proposal lacks any credible analysis of the alternatives to the north and southwest of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				
2618	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Inclusion of EoL not justified. Loss of green belt, Grade 1 countryside and high agricultural value land. Green belt forms natural boundary to Luton and prevents urban sprawl. Land is invaluable recreational facility. Will engulf hamlets and blight villages. Most attractive areas of countryside, farmland, oak woodlands will be lost and character of Lilley Bottom destroyed. Area is home to huge range of wildlife. Traffic to east of Luton already at breaking point, will increase on A505 and rural roads and congestion in St Pauls Walden and Whitwell, with no solutions given. Will overstretch medical and school facilities. No detailed financial impacts analysis or sustainability investigations to test proposals. Development cannot fund necessary infrastructure so where will it come from? More suitable alternatives should be explored including empty homes, converting buildings where infrastructure exists, using brownfield land, providing and promoting a good public transport system.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3809	Valerie Stanbridge	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to further housing development in Leighton Linlade area. It has suffered a vast amount of housing development in recent years, far more than the roads can cope with. More houses will lead to more traffic and more pollution. There is insufficient employment in the area so why build houses that force people into their cars to find employment? There would be immense devastation to local wildlife in an area of rural beauty. The development can only serve as a commuter dormitory for London.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. Core Strategy plans for new employment in the urban extension. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure</p>				
3668	Charles Stephens	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to EoL development due to loss of Green Belt and countryside, impact on hamlets and villages and quality of life. Major development requires extensive infrastructure which is financially unviable. Bypasses will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Traffic going into Luton and Hitchin is already at breaking point and the additional housing and bypass would only add to the congestion. Queries whether there will be sufficient employment to sustain expansion of this size, and if not people will have to commute, adding to congestion and pollution. Object to a Draft CS that has been issues without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support the development. How did 13 possible expansion areas become 4? Object to JC taking decisions without technical analyses. Wants to know why JC thinks it is alright to damage countryside not in their county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3155	Mrs Jane Stephens	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL due to: designated Green Belt which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton preventing urban sprawl. Impact on villages, quality of life. Major development needs extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for E and N bypasses, financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton N bypass will come from as not supported by Highways Agency. Traffic going into Luton &amp; Hitchin already at breaking point and more housing and bypass will only add to the congestion. Queries whether sufficient employment to sustain expansion of this size. Object to a Draft Core Strategy that has been issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support the development. How did 13 possible expansion areas become 4, including Green Belt land? Objects to JC taking decisions without technical analyses. Would like to know why JC thinks it is alright to damage countryside not in their county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1125	Mrs Carol Stevens	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3971	R Stevenson	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Destruction of agricultural land. Destruction of woodland. Destruction of wildlife. Loss of biodiversity. Loss of public amenity. Increase in road traffic. Unjustifiable loss of green belt adjacent to an AONB. Object to proposed Eastern and Northern bypasses , employment area and Park and Ride. Alternative sites for housing development are to the west of Leighton Linlade, to the West of Dunstable and around Caddington and Slip End.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3523	Dr Jennifer Stewart	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I object to the disproportionate, enforced, indiscriminate and unsustainable proposals to build 6,000 dwellings on 850 acres of Green Belt land. The recent housing expansion has not brought more jobs or opportunities for local people. Our town is at breaking point, unable to support the existing population with the required infrastructure and with intolerable congestion. Further, large scale development will accelerate the decline of our historic town and negatively impact on our communities and quality of life. Large sections of the Green Belt will be lost forever and our town and local villages will be irreversibly changed for the worse. The proposed, or similar, development is to be turned down and that Leighton Linlade and surrounding parishes excluded from the Growth Area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1414	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Include land adjoining J10A in Key Diagram as could play key role in delivering CS objectives. CS10 proposes safeguarding land for development. Include greater flexibility in CS9 &amp; CS10 for flexible approach to delivery of this site. Include site in CS1 as strategically important and which ELR identified it favourably. Junction 10A is a key Junction for improvement required to unlock development across growth area. Proposed works will impact upon our client's land but clients willing to cooperate to consider the design of the proposed junction. Site is already excluded from the Green Belt and should therefore be preferable to further Green Belt release. Key diagram fails to include provision of a park and ride site at J10A. Given the site's proximity to the M1 J10 on a key radial route into Luton and inclusion with the Adopted Local Plan and Local Transport Plan, park and ride is considered to represent a key component of a sustainable transport strategy now and in the future.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land adjoining Junction 10A in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Land adjoining J10A will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Suggested amendments to policies, text or other elements of the Core Strategy outside Chapter 4 are dealt with in the appropriate comments chapter schedule.</p>				
1558	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: - essential information absent - core strategy flawed - tunnelling under the airport not feasible - insurmountable issues in proposing extra capacity on key national transport routes - inability to deliver and a certain burden to taxpayer due to insufficient</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
3533	A Stovell	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It is ridiculous to build more houses when we haven't the infrastructure to cope with what we have now. Get this sorted then maybe we can look at some sensible plans.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this. New infrastructure will be provided in the next phase of housing to the south of the town.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2116	Strealey Parish Council	Luton	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Strealey Parish Council passed resolution of no confidence in decision of Luton &amp; South Beds JPC due to lack of consultation on CS. Are opposed to their recommendations as: villages N of Luton not consulted properly, no representation on JPC, forced to accept representation from Houghton Regis TC who do not share interests; impact of N bypass not considered or housing development on villages N of Luton; jobs will be to the south, housing in north and bypass only for travel Dunstable to Hitchin; transport plan will not increase alternative transport use in Luton; 4000 houses proposed between N Luton and bypass not based on evidence and no jobs to support them, and not needed as plenty of empty properties in central Luton. Junction 11a should be used for a local bypass and not for access to local roads. N Herts, not supported by NHDC</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 sites. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The consultation process will continue through the pre-submission consultation stage and finally the Examination in Public of the Core Strategy providing wide and open debate on the proposals to their adoption.</p>				
2140	Mr Alan Stubbs	St. Albans	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Any urban extension should be to the west of Luton, in Bedfordshire</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development to West of Luton. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2466	Mr & Mrs Sudweeks	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton Preferred Option because: - Land is actually in North Hertfordshire - Plans mean losing the boundary which prevents Luton urban sprawl - Effect on Hitchin not mentioned - Increased traffic through Hitchin to the detriment of town. At the moment traffic can be gridlocked - Bypass routes not discussed - NHDC and HCC both oppose the plans.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3136	Dr Kuldip Sule	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Moved to countryside to get away from urban sprawl and does not want future of village changed. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3134	Tara Sule	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. Lives in Cockernhoe, enjoys the diverse community and does not want to see surrounding villages engulfed by Luton making one large urban sprawl with patchy green spaces. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Objects to Draft Core Strategy being issued without proper financial impacts analysis to test the proposals and the JPC taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.□</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3137	Ajay Sule	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. Lives in Cockernhoe, enjoys the diverse community and does not want to see surrounding villages engulfed by Luton making one large urban sprawl with patchy green spaces. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Objects to Draft Core Strategy being issued without proper financial impacts analysis to test the proposals and the JPC taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3135	Leela Sule	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Moved to countryside to get away from urban sprawl and does not want future of village changed. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3451	Mrs P Swadling	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard will cease to be the same through increased intrusion onto Greenbelt, housing on flood plains and a continued lack of infrastructure with continued increase of traffic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4040	Lorna Swain	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose the development to the East of Luton. It saddens me that so much countryside will be destroyed by this. Many people use the area for recreational purposes. Plus, my ability to travel within Luton will be effected by the extra traffic this will bring.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3458	Mrs Susan E P Sykes	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I do not understand how you can approve planning in North Hertfordshire when you are the Luton and South Beds Joint Planning Committee. The traffic to the east of Luton is already a complete mess and there has been no thought given to how this could be improved. This will also cause complete chaos to Hitchin's infrastructure. There also appears to have been no consideration given to the impact that this would have on beautiful green belt land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. The Joint Committee are not approving development they are proposing land to the east of Luton as an area for development based on their evaluation of options. This is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments.</p>				
2493	Freddie Symonds	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton: Loss of countryside Increase in traffic Impact on village</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3496	Stephanie Symonds	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It is an area of outstanding natural beauty. Luton and Bedfordshire should use brownfield sites and infilling like Hertfordshire CC. The water table, schools, hospitals and roads will not cope. Will be left with a sprawl of unsellable houses to blight the landscape.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3498	Hugh Symonds	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It is on green belt land. Luton and Bedfordshire should not encroach on Hertfordshire land when they have plenty of brown field sites which could be developed or utilise unoccupied buildings.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3444	Mark Symonds	Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Only a complete philistine would consider the complete and utter destruction of this unique area which must rate as one of the most beautiful in North Hertfordshire, not to say the whole of the UK. The land is green belt in the truest sense of the word - a green oasis free from houses, roads and factories. Everyday the roads into Luton are completely blocked, as are those going into Hitchin. Furthermore, if there is a need to build additional housing then why not build them in Luton? Finally, why are we building these houses in the first place?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1547	Karen Szabo	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object strongly to the proposed development at Leighton Buzzard. Flood plains must not be exploited for the short term, short sighted profit for the few. Removing the Green Belt is eroding heritage for future generations and is backward thinking. Leighton Buzzard has already accommodated large building projects already without extra infrastructure. Danger of Leighton Buzzard becoming a sink town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Account has been taken of recent completions in Leighton Linslade. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>				
2919	Mrs Jane Tanner	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Purpose of Green Belt is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl. Proposal will deprive people of beautiful countryside and will swamp villages and hamlets. Area is home to wide range of wildlife and enjoyed by public at large. Increased traffic will increase congestion and pollution in already narrow busy country lanes. Not supported by N Herts DC. Why should population of N Herts have Bedfordshire housing foisted on them?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2921	John P Tanner	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Purpose of Green Belt is to protect countryside and prevent urban sprawl. Proposal will deprive people of beautiful countryside and will swamp villages and hamlets. Area is home to wide range of wildlife and enjoyed by public at large. Increased traffic will increase congestion and pollution in already narrow busy country lanes. Not supported by N Herts DC. Why should population of N Herts have Bedfordshire housing foisted on them?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3591	Miss Alison Taylor	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to East of Luton proposal because: - it will destroy a large area of countryside, wildlife habitats and amenity for local residents. - it will increase traffic congestion and consequently atmospheric pollution in and around Hitchin. - it is morally indefensible that one local authority should assume that it can take Green belt land belonging to a neighbouring authority and build on it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3894	Marc Taylor	Unknown	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development of eastern Leighton Buzzard. All main transport links, bar the M1 are to the west of Leighton Buzzard, but this development is to the East. The Railway for London and Milton Keynes, the main road link to Milton Keynes, the main employment growth (Milton Keynes, Aylesbury, Oxford, Bicester, Brackley) and the town's sports centre all lie to the West. It would be better not to increase our through town car traffic, which will happen if the Eastern Development goes ahead. There are very limited or no public transport links from Eastern Leighton Buzzard to the West. Why are we building on green belt land, where there is no employment, lack of school places, poor transport links, lack of utility infrastructure? When there is city brown belt land to build on, where there is employment, there is schooling, there is land needing to be used for development as opposed to agriculture. The Narrow Gauge Railway, now a key Tourist Attraction, will be damaged or lost.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1358	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Taylor Wimpey supports the recognition of the importance of SUE in supporting new commercial development within existing urban areas, as well as the need for phased delivery of SUE from as early as 2012 as supporting infrastructure is made available. Full support is given to the identification of a large scale mixed-use strategic urban extension to the north of Houghton Regis between the M1 and A5.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2704	Mr Roger Tester	Baldock	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton extension Shouldn't be meeting housing targets by building on N Herts land Will ruin the environment if nowhere is available in Bedfordshire to put targeted development then the targets are a nonsense Already too much 'Bedfordshire' development very close to boundaries eg Shefford, Arlesley &amp; Stotfold (mid Beds)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2146	Thames Water Property Services	Reading	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Planning for water and sewage infrastructure provision is an essential pre-requisite for development and must not be prejudiced by a portfolio of LDDs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy submission stage will identify the exact area for strategic housing and employment land as well as provide the main direction for the location of the Site Allocations DPD. This together with work with Water and Sewage providers in the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will ensure best provision to meet future needs.</p>				
3419	The Coach House	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Queries assertion urban extension EoL will be planned for by N Herts DC how destroying productive farmland and AONB for housing and associated infrastructure will be sustainable, attractive and provide a good quality of life. Identifies that the report by Land Use Consultants states that any proposed development would be impossible to mitigate and that development is not recommended. Contents that there would also be an increase in carbon dioxide emissions, as well as noise and visual pollution. States that no meaningful financial and economic assessments have been undertaken with the including so many provisos as to make the whole exercise meaningless given the paucity of financial information. There has also not been a valuation of amenity, health, wildlife and clean air. The East of Luton option is the only option that has had any serious evaluation. Alternatives are to do nothing and reject the requirement in the RSS, or to recycle existing empty homes which there are estimated to be over 2,000.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Strategy aims to maximise the potential of existing urban areas and provide strategic urban extensions beyond 2012 to supply the housing required in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Policy CS7 provides the context in which housing will be managed and monitored allowing for revisions on commencements and delivery rates depending on housing completions both in Brownfield and green field land (including whether empty homes become available).</p>				
1500	The Crown Estate	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We support the key diagram in all but one respect: Butterfield employment area should be identified to expand and be designated a Strategic Employment Site. It will become such so why not plan for it and designate it so?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Identify land in and around Butterfield as an strategic employment location in the Key Diagram.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy identifies land in and around Butterfield as strategic employment sites. Its absence in the Key diagram is an omission to be rectified.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1210	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We would wish to see wording strengthened to reduce the likelihood of development in areas identified as 'not preferred'. We would wish to see more emphasis on protection of rural character and identity. We would wish to see more emphasis on the development of the Green Infrastructure network.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Strengthen the environmental aims of chapters 11, 12 and 13 in the light of latest studies and Sustainability Appraisal.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Green Infrastructure Strategy will inform and strengthen the aspects of the Core Strategy relating to Green Infrastructure and together with further evidence since the preparation of the Preferred Options will ensure that rural character and identity are key considerations in the achievement of the overall strategy as highlighted in its vision. The Core Strategy cannot prevent planning applications coming forward for proposals outside the preferred options since it is the nature of the planning system to assess each application in its own merits. It is therefore more effective to concentrate on a strategy which presents a robust case for the most sustainable development areas which will be able to withstand any test at planning appeals.</p>				
2130	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Site L (east of Luton) lies outside the area for which data was gathered for the Water Cycle Study and therefore conclusions about its suitability are erroneous.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Figure 2-1 of the Water Cycle Study (page 9) indicates the study's area and it includes site L. The site falls outside the Luton and South Bedfordshire authority boundaries outlined in red and brown but is within the study area covered by the entire map. Information, assessment and conclusions are drawn for site L as per the other sites across the study sections.</p>				
2128	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: An urban extension East of Luton (Site L) would be a constraint for Hitchin and North Hertfordshire and inequitable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2129	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No account has been taken of Herts CC development plans and North Herts is not properly represented on maps. No attention has been given to problems that the east of Luton extension will cause for Hitchin. Alternative sites south and west of Luton have not been assessed and are not mentioned or considered as viable options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. The Delivery Plan will also take into account a range of contingency scenarios to provide flexibility to the strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and it will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3734	The Ramblers, Hertfordshire & N Middx Area	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development for the following reasons: Inappropriate for area which is beautiful countryside with a wide network of footpaths used for recreation by people from Luton and elsewhere in the region. The Green Belt land is as beautiful as the Chilterns AONB and instead of being destroyed should be incorporated into the AONB to protect it for future generations to enjoy. The existing landscape and visual character will be lost forever and cannot be mitigated against. There are other ways to provide homes outlined by Campaign to Protect Rural England. Proposal appears to be just an incentive for opportunistic house builders who do not consider the adverse impacts on local communities and the natural environment. People do not want this development and the value in these times of productive land for food and woodlands close to existing population centres should not be underestimated. Support submissions made by KEOLG and CPRE and these comments should be considered in addition to theirs.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals to retain recreation areas.</p>				
1179	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Pleased that ecologically sensitive areas W of Dunstable and W of LB not preferred options. Urban extensions must be well designed to preserve existing habitats and species and promote ecological networks. Concerned about Luton N Bypass on Key Diagram as will have devastating and unacceptable effect on biodiversity and landscape, affecting 6 County Wildlife sites, 2 SSSIs and running through Chilterns AONB. As it's only a local scheme, it should be removed. Concerned about proposed guided Busway route running close to or through HR Marl Lakes SSSI containing national priority Biodiversity Action Plan habitats. PPS9 promotes protection of SSSIs. Busway extension should be carefully considered, avoiding HR Quarry and this shown on Key Diagram.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy seeks to avoid or mitigate adverse impact</p>				
3634	Mrs M Thomas	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The more I hear about the East of Luton development, the more horrified I become. Our beautiful Hertfordshire land must be preserved, especially when other options are available in Bedfordshire.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3911	Mrs M Thomas	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It would swallow up villages and destroy beautiful Hertfordshire Green Belt. Wrong for Bedfordshire to think they can spill over into Hertfordshire and create more traffic chaos. The area is a haven for wildlife and humans and should be retained for all.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1453	Jill Thomas	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Protests strongly against the summary document. Has particular concerns about Luton housing and bypass proposals devastating the countryside and it's character. Firstly the loss of greenbelt in North Hertfordshire to future generations. Secondly, Hertfordshire villages will totally lose their identities (the ultimate price!). Thirdly, the outstanding natural beauty of Lilley Bottom will be destroyed - this is outrageous as is a precious amenity and irreplaceable. Fourthly, the additional traffic generated will have an adverse impact on the areas roads. Summary - Protect the designated greenbelt, the notion of greenbelt is that it is permanent unless there is no alternative than to encroach upon it. Other options including "no bypasses" have not been properly evaluated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2826	Mr F Thomas	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose proposal to the east of Luton based on the high sensitivity of the landscape, loss of Green Belt, detrimental effect on the villages and noise and light pollution in the roads through Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3426	Eleanor Thomas-McCann	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I write in protest against the proposed East of Luton development. The countryside is home to lots of wildlife. We use the beautiful area often for walks and bike rides with my family, friends and with my guide unit, the 2nd Stopsley Guides. If the development goes ahead it will destroy the countryside forever, which is green belt land and increase in traffic congestion in the area. All this would be a great shame. I am sure there must be another place where the development could take place without destroying such beautiful countryside which is appreciated by so many people from the countryside and town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure, including green infrastructure and recreation spaces.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3424	Rebecca Thomas-McCann	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am writing to you in protest against the proposed East of Luton development. It will ruin our beautiful countryside that many people enjoy, its peace and quiet, its beautiful walks and its wildlife. It will destroy all the wildlife's habitat forever and that would be very sad. There would be more traffic congestion and more noise pollution. There must be better places to develop which aren't Green Belt land and which wouldn't destroy such a beautiful area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1114	Mr Peter Thompson	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Object as Core Strategy been issued without a proper detailed financial analysis being issued.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2062	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Consultee promotes their land to the North of HR (Map attached). Land is predominantly located within and beyond A5-M1 link. Support the Preferred SUE to North of Houghton Regis. Proposes comprehensive approach towards securing the delivery of the urban extension and seeks whole of area between A5, M1 and A5-M1 link to be included. Concerned that the Environmental Sensitivity Study's conclusions for the area around Thorn Road and Thorn Farm. Considers that detailed on-site assessment of this area would present a more balanced view and identify only limited pockets of environmental interest requiring specific, targeted mitigation, particularly given lack of nature conservation or landscape designations. However, recognises the Site Assessment Matrix considers the contributions of sites to a wider number of overall sustainability features.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including the proposed supplementary area of land within the area of the preferred direction of growth to the north of Houghton Regis in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
2062	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The delivery of the A5/M1 link road is expected to significantly reduce congestion within the local area and it is considered therefore that, given this substantial benefit which will be delivered as part of this overall scheme, this will be one of the key sustainable features of the proposals. The additional benefits at this site relate to the ability to provide employment land given this new link with the major transport infrastructure network. Supports Core Strategy's intention to promote the Luton &amp; Dunstable Busway through this area, which would enhance its sustainability in transport terms and considers a more detailed survey and assessment will clarify how development can be successfully integrated and assimilated into this area.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including the proposed supplementary area of land within the area of the preferred direction of growth to the north of Houghton Regis in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal <input type="checkbox"/></p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2062	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Believes that the allocation of 7,000 houses to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis could be increased owing to concerns over East of Luton and scale of urban development in the immediate term. Considers that the Housing Trajectory is highly unrealistic especially for Luton over the next 4-5 years. In addition, considers that the assumption that 40% of the 15,400 dwellings from 2021 - 31 is very ambitious given that these sites have not been identified. Overall it is considered that the development on the northern side of Dunstable &amp; Houghton Regis (Sites F and H) incorporating an integral section of the A5/M1 Link Road which has funding committed, represents a sustainable, comprehensive and deliverable proposal to provide the appropriate housing, employment and road infrastructure that is required to support the towns into the future when compared to alternative development options including those potential road schemes which are without funding.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Test the inclusion of the proposed supplementary area of land</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including the proposed supplementary area of land within the area of the preferred direction of growth to the north of Houghton Regis in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p>				
2335	Heather M Thorne	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton overload services loss of countryside</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity analysis and infrastructure requirements. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3438	Mr Malcolm Thurgood	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: We have seen a reduction in local employment and an increase in traffic flows to employment points outside of the town, including greater congestion to the railway station. The potential problems of the existing flood plain within this area have not been fully addressed. The supply of infrastructure will be subject to local and central government financing, which, given the deterioration of public finances, must be a cause for concern. The local jobs, transport links and facilities for the town should be in place before any new housing is proposed. My GP surgery is not able to take on more new patients - it is running at maximum capacity given the additional population from current new housing. Leighton Buzzard has grown significantly over the last 30 years, with infrastructure always lagging behind the developers, who build, create their profits and move-on, leaving issues to be dealt with from the public purse and with the infrastructure sometimes not appearing at all.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this</p>				
2689	Mrs Cherry Thurstan		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: unacceptable for Luton and South Bedfordshire to appropriate a large area of land in Hertfordshire N Herts DC is opposed to proposal makes a mockery of local democracy and sets an alarming precedent</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2695	Mrs N Thwaites	Darley Dale	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Impact on AONB status and Greenbelt and the villages of Mangrove Green, Tea Green and Cockernhoe. The proposal is contrary to the Core Strategy's vision and its aim to protect the environment</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Strategy is committed to support growth within sustainable values. This will mean that although change will occur we will manage it to conciliate the social, economic and environmental interests for the area. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1340	Toddington Estates Ltd	Cambridge	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the identification of Toddington as a settlement for some further growth, but we are concerned that some of the other selected settlements are not as appropriate to accommodate any more development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome the support for some further growth at Toddington. The remaining settlements listed in Policy CS6 benefit from a level of self containment which justifies their identification for some further growth.</p>				
1339	Toddington Estates Ltd	Cambridge	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: We support some further limited development at Toddington</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2501	Mrs V Tomkins	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: As a resident of North Herts, I cannot understand how or why an authority from another county i.e. Luton and South Beds thinks it can simply build on our land. Hertfordshire has enough problems of its own with regard to government requirements for housing without Luton trespassing across the border. We need this green belt land as a buffer against Luton's urban sprawl. Our roads are crowded at the best of times and cannot cope under pressure. The water system cannot cope in the dry times and this is one of the driest parts of England. We are short of doctors and dentists - in short we cannot cope. Luton should build on its own land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: When drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2582	B J Toone	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development: Bypass would devastate AONB and wildlife and damage would be irreparable Luton has already lost a huge amount of green space Green belt land must be protected</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity analysis.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3735	Ms B J Towler	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Spatial Development Strategy &amp; Key Diagram. It conflicts with the Core Strategy's own principles and vision. Objects to associated noise as a result of highway construction will not have a good image nor offer quality of life impact on green belt given the high sensitivity of this landscape. Black route (Northern Bypass) impact on Lilley Chilterns AONB to be damaged by the preferred Black Route option. National Priority Farmland bird species to be affected by the EoL scheme. Historical and cultural importance of the EoL area to be affected by the proposed development. North Herts authorities are firmly against the proposals. Congestion will be worsened. There are other options available to the EoL scheme Other alternatives to be considered i.e. traffic congestion on the east side of Luton could be eased by widening Vauxhall Way rather than building a very expensive bypass Scheme clearly conflicts with the Core Strategy's published vision and principles and there are better alternatives available.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3732	Mr B Towler	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to Spatial Development Strategy &amp; Key Diagram. It conflicts with the Core Strategy's own principles and vision. Objects to associated noise as a result of highway construction will not have a good image nor offer quality of life impact on green belt given the high sensitivity of this landscape. Black route (Northern Bypass) impact on Lilley Chilterns AONB to be damaged by the preferred Black Route option. National Priority Farmland bird species to be affected by the EoL scheme. Historical and cultural importance of the EoL area to be affected by the proposed development. North Herts authorities are firmly against the proposals. Congestion will be worsened. There are other options available to the EoL scheme Other alternatives to be considered i.e. traffic congestion on the east side of Luton could be eased by widening Vauxhall Way rather than building a very expensive bypass Scheme clearly conflicts with the Core Strategy's published vision and principles and there are better alternatives available.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3611	Mrs Oonagh C Trumble	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development. Questions the authority of one county to be able to annexe land of a neighbouring county. Land is Green Belt and loss would be detrimental to local residents' quality of life and would add demands on health, education and emergency services.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3357	Trustees of Richard Pilkington	Great Offley	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Land at Wandon End Farm, Tea Green (as outlined in the attached plan) would form a suitable rounding off of the current proposals to the east of Luton and we would put the area forward for consideration as residential development.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	<p>Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of the proposed supplementary area of land within the area of the preferred direction of growth to the East of Luton in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	Agree subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the supplementary inclusion of such a relatively small scale area of land <input type="checkbox"/> within the preferred direction of growth to the East of Luton is the <input type="checkbox"/> most appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in <input type="checkbox"/> the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying <input type="checkbox"/> sustainability appraisal			
3962	Alison Turner	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development, northern and eastern bypasses (Black Route) for the following reasons: 5,500 extra houses will not offer a good quality of life for people in village of Great Offley, local villages or visitors. Hitchin gets heavily congested at peak times and can become gridlocked if an accident happens. Black Route proposal will cut up landscape that is agricultural and an AONB and has archaeology of national importance. West of Luton and centre of Luton would be a good alternative for housing. Invest in Luton to prevent it slowing dying. Instead of the bypass, widen Vauxhall Way. Many lives will be adversely affected and once the development goes ahead it cannot be reversed. The AONB is a major asset for many people and its loss would be forever for everyone.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Increase cross referencing with other Core Strategy sections.</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. Greater cross referencing of crosscutting policies in Section 4 will help to highlight the consistency of policy in the overall strategy.			
3150	Liz Turner	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt which is intended to be permanent and forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A major development requires extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for eastern and northern bypasses which is financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Concerned about spending so much on bypass in current economic climate and how it will be funded. The draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became 4, including beautiful Green Belt land. Objects to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3470	Mr Keith Turner	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East Leighton Buzzard preferred urban extension because of lack of adequate local infrastructure particularly transport, adverse changes to the character of the town and loss of green space.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including impact on Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as protection of the flood plain.</p>				
2958	Ben Turner	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL scheme and bypass. Proposal won't assist in much needed regeneration of conurbation. Bypass won't achieve key objective of attracting traffic away from town centre. N Herts DC cannot be expected to allow development to satisfy S Bedfordshire's growth agenda as it has its own. Significantly more housing is proposed east of Luton than east of LB and north of Luton, which is not justified in light of document which says that those areas are least sensitive in terms of impact on landscape. Query how it is possible to mitigate impact and maintain rural context of villages as any development will destroy distinctive rural character, landscape and communities of these villages and surrounding valuable countryside. No details given of how full range of different development options were chosen. Process is flawed and committee should be compelled to explain its rationale and revisit options that were arbitrarily discounted. Flooding is a regular feature of valley along Lilley Bottom.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2890	Karen Turner	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Oppose proposal to build 5,500 houses to the east of Luton. This is green belt land and according to Land Use Consultants development is not recommended because of the high sensitivity of this landscape. The y also note that the whole of east Luton area forms part of the Chilterns agricultural landscape which is important for national priority farmland bird species. There are bats and their roosts in Lilley and these are protected in England. North Hertfordshire has its own requirement to provide additional housing and they did not contemplate to use this land. Small villages will be consumed by this proposal while the use of brownfield land within Bedfordshire itself would be less invasive. The area around Lilley Bottom is prone to flooding and the risk will increase with any development on land above it. Extra traffic would cause huge congestion.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3151	Patrick Turner	Kimpton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt which is intended to be permanent and forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A major development requires extensive infrastructure, hence proposal for eastern and northern bypasses which is financially unviable and will pass through and destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Concerned about spending so much on bypass in current economic climate and how it will be funded. The draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial analysis to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Queries how 13 possible expansion areas became 4, including beautiful Green Belt land. Objects to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule, delivery commitments and viability of the proposals. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
2946	R J Turney	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Object to anomaly that allows Bedfordshire to dump their housing commitment onto Hertfordshire. N Hertfordshire will need to double its proposed housing requirement and Bedfordshire will be allowed to build none. Plenty of room around Gravenhurst, Shillington and Barton le Clay triangle. Object to destruction of countryside including archaeological sites, villages, hamlets and ancient woods. Bedfordshire Councillors have a hidden agenda which involves poaching Hertfordshire countryside to achieve it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: When drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these two aspects are an essential element for the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3848	RJ Tustin	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Spatial development strategy due to the following reasons The Development will destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the designated AONB Green Belt to be impacted by a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton Its not the best alternative The Green Belt forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl, and as a result, it is intended to be permanent Villages such as Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green located at the Green Belt, will be swallowed up by the housing proposal. Uncertainty about how will the project manage the extensive transportation and logistics issues The housing development alone cannot possibly fund all the necessary infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3850	RJ Tustin	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Spatial development strategy due to the following reasons The Development will destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the designated AONB Green Belt to be impacted by a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton Its not the best alternative The Green Belt forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl, and as a result, it is intended to be permanent Villages such as Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green located at the Green Belt, will be swallowed up by the housing proposal. Uncertainty about how will the project manage the extensive transportation and logistics issues The housing development alone cannot possibly fund all the necessary infrastructure</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3853	Rita Tustin	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Spatial development strategy due to the following reasons The Development will destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the designated AONB Green Belt to be impacted by a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton Its not the best alternative The Green Belt forms a natural barrier to urban sprawl, and as a result, it is intended to be permanent Villages such as Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green located at the Green Belt, will be swallowed up by the housing proposal. Uncertainty about how will the project manage the extensive transportation and logistics issues The housing development alone cannot possibly fund all the necessary infrastructure</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2979	Tony Tyler	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development. Consider to be in direct conflict with Core Strategy principles and vision. Objects to its impact on the Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity and villages. Objects to the 'Black Route' northern bypass as will dissect the Chilterns AONB, a significant asset to the area and make Lilley unattractive even if no houses are built on AONB land. States that support for the 'Black Route' reflects the number of people living in the 'Inner Route' who want the bypass as far away as possible. Identified that the EoL housing and bypass proposals are in N Herts and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land for this. N Herts is against this development. Suggests there are other options available that require no public funding and are on lower grade Green Belt whereas the EoL scheme will require significant additional funding beyond existing budgets. A full orbital road around Luton would be to the detriment of the town centre. An alternative to congestion would be widening Vauxhall Way.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3718	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am appalled by the proposal to build 5,500 houses east of Luton. Proposing the development of a huge area of land outside your county borders demonstrates unbelievable arrogance and a blatant disregard for the impact on the residents of North Herts. West of Luton could be chosen instead as it can support the same level of development, requires no public funding and is on lower-grade Green Belt. The road infrastructure would be based on exiting B-roads rather than arable AONB and incorporates social infrastructure including a new football stadium.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2729	Kate Tyler	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development due to impact on landscape, heritage, biodiversity and villages in this location. Goes against Core Strategy principles and vision. According to Land Use Consultants, the area is highly sensitive and should not be developed. Objects to North Luton bypass owing to impact on AONB and states that support for the proposed 'Black Route' is from people who do not want the bypass near them. East of Luton forms part of the Chilterns agricultural landscape, important for national priority farmland bird species. Identifies that N Herts are firmly against development and Luton and S Beds cannot allocate land for this development. Congestion along A505 will be made worse. Suggests other options are available eg West of Luton. States that a full orbital road round Luton would be detrimental to business in town. Should widen Vauxhall Way, linking to M1 via new roads to airport. Significant additional funding would be needed and therefore tunnels are an offensive extravagance.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2864	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton falls within North Hertfordshire and cannot be allocated by this draft Core Strategy. The proposal to the east of Luton will be contrary to the draft Core Strategy intention to create attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life (section 11) and the strategy's vision to be known as a Green Growth Area. The proposal is in Green Belt land rated sensitivity level 1 and include Iron Age and Roman sites likely to be of national importance. It would also have an effect on the biodiversity of the area including bats which are protected. The proposal fails to address the impact of the increase of traffic as a result of this development. The Joint Committee could choose land to the West of Luton as another option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3480	Peter Urbanowski	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development owing to impact on villages, landscape, Lilley Bottom, wildlife and loss of amenity areas. Other areas mentioned in the CS have not been given equal evaluation. The area proposed is designated Green Belt and should be protected at all costs. The Northern bypass would cut through an AONB with great loss to the area. Other options are still under consideration and valid and the Northern bypass would not solve traffic problems in Luton. Infrastructure does not exist to support the proposal and the development would not support the necessary infrastructure costs which would fall on others, including Luton. Hertfordshire has its own housing quotas to fulfil and these houses would not count towards theirs which is unfair. There are other brownfield sites within Luton that could be developed. Luton airport does not need an additional service road as it is adequately provided for by the M1 Airport Link. The additional traffic generated would bring enormous problems to the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3482	Natasha Urbanowski	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development due to impact on villages, landscape, Lilley Bottom, and wildlife and loss of amenity areas. Other areas mentioned in the CS have not been given equal evaluation. The area proposed is designated Green Belt and should be protected at all costs. The Northern bypass would cut through an AONB with great loss to the area. Other options are still under consideration and valid and the Northern bypass would not solve traffic problems in Luton. Infrastructure does not exist to support the proposal and the development would not support the necessary infrastructure costs which would fall on others, including Luton. Hertfordshire has its own housing quotas to fulfil and these houses would not count towards theirs which is unfair. There are other brownfield sites within Luton that could be developed. Luton airport does not need an additional service road as it is adequately provided for by the M1 Airport Link. The additional traffic generated would bring enormous problems to the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2654	Simone Urbanowski	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area is designated Green Belt Grade 1 and should be protected at all cost The villages would disappear under an urban sprawl The Lilley Bottom valley would disappear along with wildlife and amenity to the people The Northern Bypass would cut through an AONB. The Bypass would not solve Luton's traffic problems Existing infrastructure does not support the development which could not fund the infrastructure required The 5500 houses proposed would not count towards Hertfordshire's allocation Luton Airport does not require an Eastern Bypass There are other 'Brown Field' sites in Luton which could be developed (Eg. old Vauxhall site) Additional Traffic generated would cause problems, especially at the eastern end of the A505 dual carriageway at Hitchin</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Landscape designations which are graded to indicate landscape value are not to be confused with the Green Belt which aims to keep land permanently open independently of landscape value. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals. <input type="checkbox"/> The re-use of previously developed land is a key aim of the Core Strategy. However, the Vauxhall site has not been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy process and it is identified within the Employment Land Review as a site which should not be released for other uses. Comments on transport infrastructure are dealt with in the schedule for section 5 comments. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
828	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the diagram, as it proposes huge expansion east of Luton in North Herts that ruins the character of the region and the beauty of the villages in it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2923	Mrs Jennifer Veasey	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. On Green Belt land. Hertfordshire has been built over with new towns. Queries where the water come from. No infrastructure and the roads cannot manage the traffic. Queries why building has to be in the South East and where the work for people in these homes will come from. Green Belt, not concrete is for relaxation and exercise.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on existing evidence including transport, employment and infrastructure (including water infrastructure) assessments. Further work needed to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3631	Mr C T Veasey	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am opposed to building homes on green belt land to the east of Luton because of the risk to water supply in the area. Why put basic resources in jeopardy?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Water companies have plans in place to provide water.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2006	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: We support CS1 Incorporate specific reference to community safety including 'secure by design' standards.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add reference to design in the cross cutting policies of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome the support for CS1 . However, the reference to secure by design would sit more comfortably within the cross cutting policies of the Core Strategy and the forthcoming Development Management DPD.</p>				
3238	Michael H and Sheila J Wadsworth	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton and associated roads is an invasion of attractive and unspoilt countryside, lying just outside the AONB. There are other less attractive areas in the same county rather than Hertford which are more adequate for expansion.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
902	Bernard Wagland	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
903	Mrs Barbara Wagland	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3495	Mrs Penelope Wakefield	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is designated Green Belt A valuable area of natural beauty will be lost forever. It is an important area providing recreation for both Luton and N Herts residents. Several beautiful and historic hamlets will be destroyed and the character of Lilley Bottom lost forever. Local infrastructure such as roads, schools and hospitals will not sustain such an increase. The development is not supported by N Herts DC. The Highways Agency does not support the new bypass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3931	Stephen Waldman	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to EoL development: Don't understand why it's a preferred option. Understand HR was rejected as 1st choice because no go ahead for proposed road scheme yet there's no road improvement proposal for EoL scheme. Bloor Homes exhibition showed EoL scheme served by existing roads - outrageous. A505 can't cope with more traffic, scheme is being finalised before any decision re Eastern bypass. Will impact on geographical balance, environmental welfare of everyone in area. Herts boundary is natural boundary to Luton/Dunstable with unspoilt Chiltern Hills and designated Green Belt which should be permanent. Bloor Homes recognised this by hinting at a linear park – merely a token gesture. Compare this to featureless flat farmland north of HR. Query funding for the scheme which requires major infrastructure. A cheap scheme will result in social problems similar to those experienced by affordable housing developments in the past. Before scheme is approved, essential that facilities are properly and visibly funded.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The first stage of the Water Cycle Study supported the preparation of the Preferred Options and the second stage soon to be finalised) together with other work prepared since the preferred options will provide further information on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures which will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3984	Antony Walker	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Protest against East of Luton proposal. North Herts already suffers from noise and other environmental pollution caused by Luton Airport. Bedfordshire has a problem in providing land for houses but so does Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3570	Mr G Walker	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development and northern bypass owing to impact on villages, landscape, Green Belt as well as wildlife. No comparative assessment for alternative options provided. Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass. How will this and other infrastructure be funded? A highway running through an AONB conflicts with government policy. Land Use Consultants concluded that development is not recommended in Lilley Bottom. Other options would have a lower impact and use existing road infrastructure and do not require public funding. N Herts do not support the development. No validation to support an Eastern bypass which is sufficient to compensate for the harm it will cause to the green belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area. Demolition of the area East of Luton and the bypass directly contradicts with the vision to protect conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB. Congestion around the A505 will only be exacerbated. Improved public transport infrastructure is required.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3849	E Walker	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons; Core Strategy and vision is contradictory to the proposal The development is not recommended by the land use consultants Impact on Green Belt and Villages Impact on biodiversity Increase of traffic as a result of housing development The proposed Black Route option disregards the importance of the AONB North Hertfordshire District Council is opposed to this scheme There are clearly much better options West of Luton scheme constitutes a better alternative due its existing infrastructure Regeneration of the conurbation is not helped by this scheme</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3980	Dr Peter Walker	Bendish	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons A large and unjustifiable area of Green Belt will be lost Many villages within the developed area will loose their identity The development will lead to a substantial increase in the traffic To plan on behalf of North Herts</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3825	E Walker	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons; Core Strategy and vision is contradictory to the proposal The development is not recommended by the land use consultants Impact on Green Belt and Villages Impact on biodiversity Increase of traffic as a result of housing development The proposed Black Route option disregards the importance of the AONB North Hertfordshire District Council is opposed to this scheme There are clearly much better options West of Luton scheme constitutes a better alternative due its existing infrastructure Regeneration of the conurbation is not helped by this scheme</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2685	Simon Walker	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to expansion of Luton into Hertfordshire and the loss of Green Belt</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage</p>				
2887	Mrs I I Walker	Stanmore	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to building on North Hertfordshire's Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
4004	Martha Walker	Bendish	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: ID 326678 Objects the Spatial Development strategy due to the following reasons The character of the land between Cockernhoe, Mangrove Green and Tea Green and beyond would be destroyed forever "Each house has to be planned for two cars" Hence, the proposed expansion will make traffic congestion worse. The proposed by-pass will swallow up even more land, give us pollution and noise.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy cannot debate the Immigration policy at national level but addresses issues of in and out commuting and will help address housing/jobs imbalances in the future</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2489	C Walkerley	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton preferred option because it would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the designated area of outstanding natural beauty. The development would not assist in the much needed regeneration of the conurbation. It would generate a huge amount of traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be attracted away from the town centre by the proposed outer bypass. This is an ill conceived development proposal and should be stopped now.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence, including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity assessment. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2877	Mrs J Walter	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Questions the right that the Joint Committee has to propose development in North Hertfordshire when Luton is in Bedfordshire. Also objects to East of Luton owing to the impact on the roads and services and the fact that residents in North Herts do not want to be merged with Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3126	Mr R E Wand	Bendish	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: Land is designated Green Belt and is supposed to prevent urban sprawl and it is inappropriate to build on beautiful countryside which forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. The land is a valuable amenity for residents of N Herts and E of Luton and would be lost. It would engulf hamlets like Cockerhoe and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. Current social/community and road infrastructure would be overstretched. There would be substantial increases in traffic on A505 and Whitwell already suffers congestion problems which would worsen. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it and the additional road infrastructure needed is not financially viable. The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom. N Herts DC does not support proposals despite statements in summary document implying the contrary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2984	Mrs P Wand	Bendish	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton owing to its location on Green Belt land and in Hertfordshire as well as impact on the country roads which are already congested and hazardous. Questions how the Luton Northern Bypass will be delivered given that the Highways Agency does not support the scheme. Questions how other infrastructure will be funded. Objects to the Core Strategy being issued without proper detailed financial impacts assessment or sustainability investigation to test proposals as well as detail about how 13 options became 4. Contends that other options exist within Bedfordshire on brownfield sites to meet this number of houses.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: In drawing up a strategy, land-use and spatial planning are concerned with the land itself and not ownership nor administrative boundaries. Nevertheless, these are essential to the delivery of any strategy and therefore, the Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1083	Miss Elaine Wardle	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1353	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: The Town Council believes expansion, should it take place, should be to the east of the Parish and NOT in the area between Linslade and the A4146 bypass</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy Plans for this</p>				
1084	Mrs Pamela Wardle	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: <input type="checkbox"/> Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1476	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: It will destroy countryside and villages that deserve not attack but preservation. It will put an intolerable strain upon transport.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence, including transport assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including mitigation of the impact on the villages.</p>				
3909	Mrs Catherine Watkins	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concerned about the affect of the East of Luton Development on Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green. Particularly concerned about the graveyard in Cockernhoe where whole family is buried and worried that it will be demolished even though it is consecrated ground.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3676	Kayleigh Watson	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL. Other areas have not been given equal evaluation and which would have less impact on the environment eg West of Luton. Area designated Green Belt Grade I and should be protected as a buffer at all costs. Villages will disappear as other Luton villages have. Lilley Bottom valley will be gone forever along with all the wildlife and a great amenity to people of both Herts and Beds. Northern Bypass will cut through an AONB and won't solve the traffic problems within Luton. Other options are still under consideration and valid. There's no infrastructure to support such a development and no financial viability study has done. Hertfordshire has its own housing targets to meet and the proposed houses would not count towards its allocation and therefore an unfair burden. Luton Airport does not require an Eastern Bypass as it is adequately served by the M1. Additional traffic generated by the development would cause enormous problems and would change the local countryside beyond recognition.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2047	Angela Watts	Wingfield	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposal to build 40,000 houses to the north of Houghton Regis between A5 and A5120. What happened to Green Belt policy for retaining land for future generations? Will open floodgates for people to build on any land. There is enough brownfield land in local towns and villages that could be used more productively, eg several sites in Dunstable, Hockliffe, Luton, Toddington, currently incomplete due to current financial climate. Little hope for new developments which are unnecessary and unwanted to be completed. Where are the people who need the housing? Object because estates built without sufficient infrastructure provision; no new jobs in area to sustain new workers; local hospitals already overloaded; increased congestion on already busy roads. Local councils and communities should agree housing projects and have say in our future.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2058	David Watts	Wingfield	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposal to build 40,000 houses to the north of Houghton Regis between A5 and A5120. What happened to Green Belt policy for retaining land for future generations? Will open floodgates for people to build on any land. There is enough brownfield land in local towns and villages that could be used more productively, eg several sites in Dunstable, Hockliffe, Luton, Toddington, currently incomplete due to current financial climate. Little hope for new developments which are unnecessary and unwanted to be completed. Where are the people who need the housing? Object because estates built without sufficient infrastructure provision; no new jobs in area to sustain new workers; local hospitals already overloaded; increased congestion on already busy roads. Local councils and communities should agree housing projects and have say in our future.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2051	Edward Watts	Wingfield	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposal to build 40,000 houses to the north of Houghton Regis between A5 and A5120. What happened to Green Belt policy for retaining land for future generations? Will open floodgates for people to build on any land. There is enough brownfield land in local towns and villages that could be used more productively, eg several sites in Dunstable, Hockliffe, Luton, Toddington, currently incomplete due to current financial climate. Little hope for new developments which are unnecessary and unwanted to be completed. Where are the people who need the housing? Object because estates built without sufficient infrastructure provision; no new jobs in area to sustain new workers; local hospitals already overloaded; increased congestion on already busy roads. Local councils and communities should agree housing projects and have say in our future.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is does not propose 40,000 homes north of Houghton Regis. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified North of Houghton Regis as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4060	David Weavers	Not known	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: The land is green belt and of high importance to the wellbeing of the larger local community. It is an area of beauty and tranquility and more housing will remove this. It is home to a variety of wildlife, historic trees and vegetation. The villages in the area are a destination for people from the local town to enjoy. The land for development will just incorporate more local villages into Luton which is a 'rat race'. It is a valuable supply of farm land. Local infrastructure is poor and more housing will add to this, with roads, schools and hospitals currently under resourced. Attempt to develop this land is based on greed and lack of thinking and there must be other options such as Vauxhall site. This site is an easy option and there is a need to look at other more palatable options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
1075	George Webb	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1040	Mrs Lila Webb	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate site selection.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the infrastructure schedule and the commitment of stakeholders to deliver the strategy. The Examination in Public will test the commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities). The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3912	Michael Weedon	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It will need a lot of ancillaries such as schools, shops to support it which means steamrolling over significant and beautiful areas that are designated Green Belt. Villages would be overwhelmed and lost their identities like Stopsley, once an independent village, now a characterless suburb. Bypasses would add to traffic congestion and pollution and disfigure large areas that have been part of the landscape for centuries. Acknowledge the need for more houses but should seriously consider better and far less controversial locations and options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2954	Mrs J A Weller	cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton is in direct conflict with the Core Strategy's vision, principles and the environmental aims of section 11. The villages, their identity and the wildlife in the area will not be safeguarded despite evidence from Land Use Consultants concluding that given the high sensitivity of this landscape, development is not recommended. Vast areas of farmland needed for food production and green belt will be lost. There is already congestion and the proposal for 5,500 new homes will make it worse. Country lanes such as Brick Kiln Lane would not be able to cope. North Herts. is against this development and the core strategy cannot allocate land for it. Alternative sites should be found such as the proposal to the West of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3232	Mrs M E Wells	Great Offley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Land to the east of Luton is of outstanding natural beauty and is in green belt. The East of England Regional Council is not a democratically elected body and should not force Hertfordshire to accept the scheme which the county does not want.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. This Core Strategy cannot debate regional figures which have already been established.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
771	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: No, because new roads are not required; upgrade the existing A505 Vauxhall Way, improve traffic routing within Luton Town Centre and implement integrated transport schemes (guided bus way, etc.) The east of Luton scheme and associated highway is Green Belt and would encroach upon an area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the east of Luton has traffic problems enough already.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments and environmental sensitivity assessments. Schemes are proposed in the centre of Luton to help improve traffic. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1154	Michael West	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1151	Sandra West	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1113	Mr Derrick West	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Object as Core Strategy been issued without a proper detailed financial analysis being issued.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1153	Peter West	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas. Joint Planning Committee lacked technical evidence in decision making on the Core Strategy.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3397	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: lack of facilities to deal with increase in population, no appropriate transport proposals for Leighton, lack of local employment opportunities, flooding issues, impact on Narrow Gauge Railway, removal of green belt and impact on villages.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
990	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: If only it were so simple! This "diagram" is a travesty of the facts, ignoring the rural communities around Leighton-Linslade.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Pre Submission Core Strategy to include boundaries to the proposed urban extensions		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy plans to safeguard the villages to the East of Leighton Buzzard by maintaining Green Belt between them and the edge of the urban area.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3965	Mrs G E Westell	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: Invasion of Hertfordshire green belt by expanding Luton to satisfy government housing targets is preposterous. It will spoil delightful countryside, wildlife and swallow up villages like Lilley, Breachwood Green etc, making a sprawling urban conurbation, joining up to Hitchin and then Stevenage and will end up in the West Midlands. There has been enough house building in recent years with people having to use cars to get out into what is left of the countryside. There will be many more brownfield sites available from businesses closing down, and these should be used first.. The houses provided will not provide accommodation for those trying to get on the property ladder as they will be too big and of too high quality. Infrastructure is often promised but does not materialise as cost proves too high so we will be left with acres of houses no facilities for leisure, local shops, schools or public transport.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy cannot debate already established national or regional housing figures. Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land to the east of Luton). The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
3830	RM Westwood	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons: EoL preferred option is not recommended by Land use consultants given high sensitivity of this landscape A huge area of high green belt land would be seriously impacted by the housing development impact on area's landscape and biodiversity The huge amount of extra traffic from this housing would without a doubt cause an intolerable strain on the road system and exacerbate the gridlock caused through Hitchin and beyond which is already highly congested at peak times. The proposed black route option disregards the importance of the AONB. North Herts District Council is strongly opposed to this scheme There clearly are much better options open to the joint committee The west of Luton scheme already has an existing road infrastructure and does not ruin areas of national importance. Consequently, it constitutes a better alternative to the East of Luton preferred option. Green Belt's beautiful areas to be impacted by East of Luton development</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			
948	Mr and Mrs C Whates	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3021	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object. There is no sufficient justification for including East of Luton as a strategic urban extension. This will result in the loss of Green Belt and countryside, some of which is classified as Landscape Grade 1 and is of high agricultural value. The development would fully engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight other villages like Tea Green and Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3543	Ms Sue Wheldon	London	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to EoL development, northern bypass through Green Belt and eastern bypass through Green Belt with sensitivity rating level 1. Believes scheme will add to deterioration of Luton Town centre which has become a cultural desert, relatively unsafe and a former shadow of itself. Has several suggestions for re-establishing Luton's reputation and success incl. promoting sustainability, public transport infrastructure, new housing in town centre, Brownfield sites and invest in the town centre not bypasses, promote outdoor cafés, market stalls and link shops with the Arndale, build on unique textiles and fashion heritage, make the town safe &amp; desirable for elderly people. Luton needs to re-position and re-brand itself; it has tremendous potential. Council needs to take a paradigm shift in attitude and open its mind to the real issues. Put a sustainable heart into the town centre today. Unsustainable to invest in an unviable, unnecessary bypass and proposal to build more suburban housing on green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy plans for urban redevelopment, improvement of the town centre, environment, retail and cultural offer as well as new public transport and improved safety. Luton Gateway will lead on the marketing of the area to encourage new development. This alone will not meet the development requirements of the area as outlined in the RSS and its review.</p>				
3157	Mrs R Whetnall	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: To proceed with the East of Luton Option would compromise green belt land, and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Landscape Value. It would generate an enormous amount of traffic in the local area and the proposed bypasses would funnel road traffic towards Hitchin putting pressure on that town's roads and community. The proposal would eradicate the villages of Mangrove, Cockernhoe and Tea Green. Land to the east of Luton is outside the remit of either Luton or South Bedfordshire and none of the other options identified in the Issues and Options document have been properly evaluated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3766	Isobel White	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons; Plenty of houses to be built next to existing reasonably quiet areas. Increase of traffic around Lilley Safety concerns for cyclists and pedestrian as a result of Black Route Impact on biodiversity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
89	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
Comment: None given				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text but does not support strategy				
1378	Mr Stephen White	Luton	Q. 4	No
Comment: Opposes the 5500 proposed homes to the east of Luton. This development would ruin an area of outstanding natural beauty and biodiversity. The Council should use empty buildings in Luton if they own them and if they do not, they should buy them and make use of them. The Labour Party is taking a risk with these plans, they should stop and dispose of them because nobody wants them.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
3728	Fraser White	Lilley	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to proposed east of Luton development for the following reasons; is located on designated green belt, other alternatives are available, increase in the amount of traffic impact on Lilley's residents, public footpaths will disappear, Northern Bypass will run through an AONB destroying public footpaths and wildlife, in conflict with core strategy principles and there are better alternatives available.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2624	Malcolm White	Welwyn Garden City	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development: Other areas for development will have less impact on environment and have not been given equal evaluation, eg West of Luton Villages will be lost to urban landscape similar to others in Luton Loss of Landscape Grade 1 at Lilley Bottom valley and wildlife Bypass will cut through Chilterns AONB and will not solve traffic problems in Luton Unfair that Hertfordshire should take up Bedfordshire's allocation of housing How will development support infrastructure required? Is there a financial viability survey? Burden will fall on Hertfordshire's taxpayers				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3772	Jamie White	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Spatial Development Strategy due to the following reasons; Plenty of houses to be built next to existing reasonably quiet areas Increase of traffic around Lilley Safety concerns for cyclists and pedestrian as a result of Black Route Impact on biodiversity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of environmental sensitivity. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				
3726	Kathryn White	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed east of Luton development for the following reasons; is located on designated green belt other alternatives are available increase in the amount of traffic impact on Lilley's residents public footpaths will disappear Northern Bypass will run through an AONB destroying public footpaths and wildlife in conflict with core strategy principles and there are better alternatives available</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1078	Shirley White	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development (5500 houses and bypass) to the East of Luton because: Development will over stretch hospitals and other infrastructure as well. Stop the proposal now!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
3595	Brian Whitehead	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: A possible extra 10,000 cars in the area will add tremendously to congestion and do not accept that people in the new development will use the new ring roads and never want to shop or work in Luton. No new schools are proposed so where will the children be educated? Existing schools do not have the capacity for new students. Should not destroy some of the best green space of the very little that is available to Luton residents. How did East of Luton go from last resort to first choice without explanation?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3532	Mrs I Whitfield	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: When extra housing was proposed in South Beds, Leighton was not included in the calculations. The town has already borne the brunt of Billington Park and Sandhills, with no new infrastructure for the thousands of extra people living there. There are no firm commitments for extra facilities, only the certainty of more squashed-together housing. The development site is on Greenbelt and floodplain and cannot be seen in any way as an asset to the town. The proposals should be revisited and rejected until well-thought plans are drawn up that satisfy the needs of existing and future residents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including on flood plain) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well as mitigation of flooding. New infrastructure will be provided in the next phase of housing to the south of the town.</p>				
901	Denise Whitham	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. How will infrastructure be funded? North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2177	Andrew Wiggins	Slip End	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to urban extension East of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2757	Susan Wiggins	Slip End	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton brownfield development. Should built on Luton brownfield sites which are better placed for transport infrastructure. Land is designated Green Belt to prevent further urban sprawl. Would destroy hamlets and villages. Extensive infrastructure needed necessitating both northern and eastern bypasses. Infrastructure financially non-viable and eastern bypass will destroy AONB. Government policy says major development should not take place in AONB. Other options are available. Proposal directly conflicts with CS15. Risk to rare wildlife. No benefit to Luton or Hertfordshire residents, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of irreplaceable rural environment. Luton resident's access to countryside will be removed permanently. Draft Core Strategy has been issued without proper financial impacts analysis. Not supported by N Herts DC. How did 13 possible expansion areas become 4?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. A key aim of the Core Strategy is the re-use of Brownfield land. The evidence shows the need for the allocation of urban extensions to deliver the housing requirement. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 sites. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
3872	David Wiggins	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development owing to impact on the Green Belt, wildlife, landscape, villages and loss of access to countryside. Should be building on Luton's numerous brownfield sites before such sites. As a Luton resident am insulted that the renovation of historic town of Luton has been discounted in favour of an easier option. Requires extensive infrastructure including the bypasses. Objects to the impact on the bypasses on the AONB and AONB of Lilley Bottom valley and on wildlife. Other options exist. Directly conflicts with CS15. The Highways Agency does not support the Luton Northern bypass so how will it be funded? Would like to see the studies of the irreversible impact to wildlife. Development will be of no benefit to anyone in Hertfordshire, just more traffic, pollution and destruction of the environment. The Draft Core Strategy was issued without a proper detailed financial impacts analysis, is not supported by North Herts DC. How did 13 expansion areas become 4?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
954	A E Wildy	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4044	Dr and Mrs JRB and JM Williams	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development for the following reasons: It is a plan to make a megatown encompassing the expanded airport and servicing area at the expense of a neighbouring county without consultation, agreement or the effect it would have on neighbouring towns. Luton's 'green lung' would be reduced, ruining many ancient villages and prime agricultural land. Extra traffic through North Herts and Hitchin would be insupportable. It would bring on stage closer the complete concreting over of the mega city of 'Hatfield - Welwyn- Stevenage - Hitchin - Letchworth - Baldock'.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
3985	Joan Williams	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: ID 326701 Objects the Spatial Development Strategy due to; Urban Development expansion to take place into Hertfordshire Green Belt</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.			
3265	Barbara Williamson	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton would result on an encroachment into Hertfordshire's countryside. All aspects of the proposal should be considered and the council should be prepared to finance it. North Herts, does not support the proposal and should not be expected to pay for this development. The villages of Cockernhoe and Tea Green will be swamped by this expansion. The roads serving the area are already congested and cannot take any more traffic. Employment in Luton is reduced and the car and van industry under threat of closure, this questions where the people occupying the proposed houses will work.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
JC Reason for Response:	The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and environmental sensitivity analysis. The East of Luton area has significant potential to provide new employment locations.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1563	Sandra Willingale	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to 5,500 homes in N Herts Green Belt because: impact on beautiful, irreplaceable area of Herts green belt countryside, diversity of wildlife and flora in area; Queries whether JC members have walked and appreciated its beautiful paths woodlands and seen the deer, hares, many rare birds and acres of blue bell carpeted woodland and other beautiful natural sights in area; sheer impracticality of required infrastructure and the extent of the heavily congested routes either side of the proposed area. Queries how bypass proposals do anything but aggravate the existing problems. Considers that brownfield sites within Luton and around the airport should be used and house building should be concentrated within the town and within the county of Bedfordshire where the Joint Committee's electoral responsibilities lie. the Draft Core Strategy has been issued without proper, detailed financial impact analysis to test proposals and without members of the Committee having been presented with the technical analyses</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy identifies specific areas of search for the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) needed. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding.</p>				
3768	Mr G Willis	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I am concerned about the proposal for a great number of houses to be built between Houghton Regis and the proposed new northern bypass road. The current road network around Toddington and Houghton Regis cannot cope with additional traffic. Will the proposed bypass be built first to ease congestion? I object to the loss of Green Belt for my grandchildren and future generations. Where will these additional people work as there is already a shortage of jobs in the area?</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This required a Green Belt review. Scale of housing prior to the A5-M1 link being completed and opened will be tested further against the capacity of the road network. Future employment land is planned.</p>				
3517	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Q. 4	Yes
<p>Comment: Support in principle the approach of concentrating new development within or adjacent to urban areas. Need a variety of urban extensions in various locations such that if one project stalls other schemes can be brought forward to ensure PPG3's five year land supply requirement. There is a clear ability to bring forward development of an urban extension to the east of Leighton Linslade. CS1 is supported so far as it relates to the east of Leighton Linslade. Support the Environmental Sensitivity Report and Site Appraisal Matrix which concluded that the most appropriate direction for growth (for Leighton Buzzard) is the east and north-east. Considers a more accurate consideration of the landscape and archaeological issues within the potential development areas can be taken from the assessment work completed as part of the Environmental Statement submission for the urban extension to the east of Leighton Linslade planning application.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact on environment.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultee supports CS1. Further work to be undertaken to refine and test development proposals including areas which should be safeguarded from development owing to their environmental sensitivity.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3880	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton potential urban extension in the grounds that it is inappropriate for the Core Strategy to indicate meeting its development requirements in a different Local Authority area, unless there is a clear indication that this is accepted by the adjoining authority. In addition we share North Hertfordshire Council's main concerns: flawed technical evidence supporting the allocation of east Luton , the allocation lies within Green Belt land and would result in the coalescence with existing villages, detrimental effect on biodiversity and the environment, loss of Grade I agricultural land, unsound traffic modelling as it stops at Bedfordshire/Hertfordshire border. Even if the allocation were to be regarded acceptable in principle, the Bloor Homes presentation in 2006 only proposed 3,000 dwellings in order to ensure that the ridge line closest to the town would not be breached.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of employment, transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3087	J M T Willoughby	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Agree with technical questions raised by KEOLG. the plan fails to include convincing solutions for road communications and public services for a population of the size expected. A plan on this scale cannot be properly considered without projections of its cost and the sources of funding. Object to rural Hertfordshire suffering major erosion to accommodate the urban expansion demanded by planners in another county.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2868	Mrs Ruth Willoughby	Ickleford	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposed development of Luton into North Hertfordshire. Luton's dilemma maybe solved if the Vauxhall site become redundant.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Employment Land Review recommends retaining the Vauxhall site in employment use. Nevertheless, if the Vauxhall site were to become available it would be tested through the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD and not this Core Strategy.</p>				
2595	Mr Ian Wilson	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed development East of Luton: Destruction of designated Green Belt and home to protected and rare species Green Belt land should only be built on as last resort and other options are available Engulfing villages and loss of their boundaries could never be reversed Existing road infrastructure insufficient to cope with extra 10000 cars Impact of 5500 families on local employment and existing communities views of east Luton residents should be properly considered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The purpose of this and subsequent consultations will be to understand the concerns and aspirations of the community so that these can be taken into account in the planning of the area. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3531	P Wilson	Harpenden	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Why has this option been selected ahead of others put forward. There is no real evidence or justification. As North Hertfordshire has had no say in the plans the whole lot should be filed in the dustbin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1164	Mrs Deborah Wilson	Luton	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Lacks proper detailed financial impact analysis Requires financially unviable and environmentally destructive transport infrastructure. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the roads. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will overstretch emergency services and educational facilities as well, is believed to be under-investigated as part of the work. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3140	Michael Wiltshire	Ross-shire	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed EoL development for the following reasons: land is designated Green Belt. Is an invaluable recreational facility used by many people from a wide area. Will engulf hamlets and blight villages. Traffic to the east of Luton and Hitchin and roads are incapable of taking more traffic. Social/community infrastructure will be overstretched. The bypasses will only benefit those outside Luton town centre. The Highways Agency does not support the northern bypass so how will this an other essential infrastructure be funded? The Draft Core Strategy was issued without proper detailed financial impacts to test the proposals. N Herts DC does not support the proposal. It is an example of 'nimbyism'. There are more suitable brownfield sites with existing infrastructure available. How did 13 possible expansion areas become just 4? Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without technical analyses. The views of east of Luton residents and other affected people should be properly considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and ensure delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
956	Mr and Mrs J Windebank	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>			
3407	Miss Suzanne Winder	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to unsustainable over-development of Leighton Buzzard as development south of town been built without the necessary infrastructure, additional housing will be on floodplains, heritage railway will be destroyed as will green belt. Lack of employment opportunities in Leighton Buzzard so people will have to travel elsewhere and by car - roads and train station cannot cope with the cars they have to accommodate at the moment. Leighton Buzzard is being turned into a dead dormitory town.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Account has been taken of recent completions in Leighton Linlade. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linlade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to protect the flood plain.</p>			
2374	Anne Wingate	St Albans	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The area to the East of Luton is Green Belt and should be preserved for people to relax in. Farms are needed to produce food and shouldn't be destroyed.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact.</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>MKSMSRS requires Green Belt Review to accommodate development needs. PPG2 allows for Green Belt boundary reviews.</p>			
4059	Julia Winter	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Your plans to build 5,500 new homes East of Luton beggars belief. I walk regularly in the area you are planning to virtually destroy and am incensed that you should even consider using it as Luton overspill.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts.</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. The evidence indicates that to deliver this requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1542	Mr John Wojdyla	Tebworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the development proposals north of Houghton Regis. Luton and Dunstable Hospital struggling to supply the increasing population, GP's are overstretched and there are not enough dentists - how will the health care cope with the increase in population? The existing traffic congestion and the development proposals will exacerbate it. The unemployment situation is dire - where would the extra jobs come from? There is no local need for extra housing so all the new inhabitants would be commuters therefore putting strain in the local transport infrastructure. This development proposal is not sustainable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence shows that there is a local housing need. The housing targets outlined account for this and adds to this the needs arising from elsewhere within the wider South East. The Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including approach to deliver new employment and infrastructure.</p>				
2936	Master Jack Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. How can you consider destroying Lilley Bottom, an AONB? It is a safe place to cycle along bridle paths and in countryside. Where will the next generation of children go? I would really miss it if weren't there. I don't want to look at thousands of houses near Lilley Bottom. Our teachers have told us what an outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom is and they cannot believe anyone is considering destroying it. This development is not supported by the people of Lilley. It will blight our countryside. We have no wish to become part of the Luton sprawl.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				
2849	Thomas Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the scale of development proposed to the east of Luton. The land is designated Green belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton, preventing further urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight other villages like Tea Green and Lilley. The draft Core Strategy has been issued without a detailed financial impacts analysis and has been presented to the Joint Planning Committee for decision without technical analyses. It is not supported by North Hertfordshire District Council.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2935	Master Max Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development east of Luton. How can you consider destroying Lilley Bottom, an AONB? It is a safe place to horse-ride along bridle paths and in countryside. Where will the next generation of children go? I don't want to look at thousands of houses near Lilley Bottom. Everyone keeps telling us to exercise more and get out in the fresh air and now you want to take away the best countryside around here. Why? Our teachers at Hitchin Boys have told us what an outstanding chalk valley Lilley Bottom is and they cannot believe anyone is considering destroying it. This development is not supported by the children of Lilley. It will spoil our countryside. We don't want to become part of Luton - we like living in the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport assessment and environmental sensitivity assessments. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to retain recreation areas.</p>				
3138	Phillip Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed EoL development because: land is designated Green Belt preventing urban sprawl and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight villages like Tea Green and Lilley. A development such as this requires extensive infrastructure hence need to build Luton northern and eastern bypasses, which is financially unviable and the eastern bypass will destroy the chalk valley Lilley Bottom. Queries where funding for the Luton northern bypass will come from as Highways Agency does not support it. Lilley Bottom and the AONB are important for personal recreation. The development would have no benefit for N Herts residents and would be a drastic loss of beautiful countryside. N Herts DC does not support proposals. Would like to know how 13 possible expansion areas became 4 including beautiful Green Belt land. People of Lilley do not support the proposal as it will blight countryside and they do not want to become part of Luton sprawl.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				
2848	Wendy Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the scale of development proposed to the east of Luton. The land is designated Green belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton, preventing further urban sprawl. It would engulf hamlets like Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green and blight other villages like Tea Green and Lilley. The draft Core Strategy has been issued without a detailed financial impacts analysis and has been presented to the Joint Planning Committee for decision without technical analyses. It is not supported by North Hertfordshire District Council.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements to ensure that development is accompanied by its associated infrastructure. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1100	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 4	No
Comment: I object to the seeking of a strategic urban extension to the east of Luton (see reasons under "Spatial Development Principles").				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
2985	John Wood	Holwell	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposal to build in excess of 5,500 houses on the eastern side of Luton. This is not supported by North Herts. The proposal would destroy an area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the AONB, swallow Green belt land intended to be a barrier to urban sprawl and would not assist in the regeneration of the conurbation. It would generate traffic on the edge of Luton that would not be attracted away from the town centre by the proposed bypasses, have disastrous effects on Hitchin's traffic congestion and may increase traffic passing through local villages. Given the large number of houses and the infrastructure requirements needed, have any viability studies been carried out?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.				
2963	Mrs Phillipa Wood	Holwell	Q. 4	No
Comment: Object to the proposed EoL development. Not supported by North Herts DC. Would destroy area of great landscape beauty adjacent to AONB and will not assist regeneration of conurbation. Would generate huge amounts of traffic on edge of Luton and bypass will not attract traffic away from town centre. Increase in traffic east of Luton will have disastrous effect on Hitchin's traffic congestion. It will be easier for residents of proposed development to get to Hitchin. Is there a study on possible effects on Hitchin's infrastructure? Will increase traffic passing through local villages such as Pirton and Holwell. Designated Green Belt is natural barrier to urban sprawl and intended to be permanent. Development will swallow up villages such as Cockernhoe, going against whole point of green belt. The large number of houses proposed will need new infrastructure eg schools, medical, local shops. Have any viability studies been carried out regarding these requirements? Proposal is ill-considered and inappropriate.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure. Further work to be undertaken to illustrate the site selection process.				
JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review (including land to the east of Luton) to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2943	Ms Margaret Woods	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to development to the East of Luton including the black route of the Northern Bypass and the Eastern Bypass owing to: impact on the Green Belt and landscape which is contrary to the advice in the LUC landscape assessment (which graded this area as "high sensitivity" and stated that "development was not recommended"). Is contrary to the vision to raise the image of Luton and the preferred approaches outlined in Chapter 11 and Chapter 12. North Herts object to the development. The impact on the road network, notably A505 and Hitchin which is gridlocked at peak hours. Also objects owing to the potential of other sites including: West Luton scheme, innovative development within Luton itself including new medium and low rise apartments and housing as well as redundant factories and office buildings. This would meet demands of single people, older people wanting to be near amenities and prevent urban sprawl.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: To objectively and without prejudice test the appropriateness of including land to the West of Luton in the Core Strategy submission document in the light of all appropriate evidence and accompanying sustainability appraisal.</p> <p>Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Proposals for land to the West of Luton have been brought to our attention through the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation and will be tested and evaluated in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal to the submission Core Strategy to determine the most appropriate course of action. Consultation will continue through the pre-submission stage prior to the examination in public allowing for further engagement. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
4030	Sue Wooley	Not Given	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to 4,500 houses and bypass to the north of Luton. The bypass passes through an AONB. The natural areas around South Bedfordshire and Luton are a resource for everyone living south of the county. The area is of scientific and archaeological importance. It should therefore receive protection. North Luton will also become a traffic nightmare.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Although the Core Strategy is committed to the re-use of urban land. The evidence indicates that to deliver the regional housing requirement the Core Strategy needs to allocate a number of urban extensions. The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review and identifies areas of search (including land east of Luton). Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy cannot debate the Immigration policy at national level but addresses issues of in and out commuting and will help address housing/jobs imbalances in the future</p>				
3219	Nigel Wootton	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed East of Luton development: The idea of Cockerhoe, Tea Green and Lilley Bottom being engulfed is deplorable. The extra traffic would make living in Luton and Hitchin unbearable. Local road infrastructure would not cope even with the Northern bypass. The topography of the site is too hilly for development. Local drainage cannot cope with demand in extreme weather. Local people do not want to lose beautiful countryside and villages to urban sprawl.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards the Core Strategy submission stage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3421	Mrs Amy Worden	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: I wish to register my objection to the Leighton Buzzard eastern development. Infrastructure is needed before any more housing developments take place. The traffic calming that has been carried out has not had any effect on the peak time traffic. The proposed development is at the opposite side of the town to the train station. There will also be a large loss of Green Belt land if this development goes ahead. There will also be a loss of wildlife. The proposed development site is on a flood plain. I can only see more concrete in the area could mean more problems. Our national heritage railway track would be surrounded by housing and could be threatened. As it is driven by steam it is not the correct environment in which to run it. There is little employment in Leighton Buzzard as companies are closing down. The size of the proposed development will mean that people will be travelling out of town to find employment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impact (including the Narrow Gauge Railway) and deliver infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Scale of development to the East of Leighton Buzzard is considered the most appropriate to meet the needs of the town and the Growth Area's requirements. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence which identified East of Leighton Buzzard as the most appropriate location surrounding Leighton Linslade. New employment land and infrastructure will be needed and the Core Strategy plans for this as well seeking to mitigate impact on Narrow Gauge Railway.</p>				
3113	Philip Worthington	Lilley	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Loss of greenbelt, wildlife habitats and the amenity of those using the area for recreation. Questions why North Herts. should provide a development area for Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2905	Mr J S Wright	Cockermhoe	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Concerned with the proposed building of 5,500 homes in North Herts green belt. The neighbouring villages will be swallowed up and wildlife destroyed. There are other sites around Luton such as Caddington and Slip End.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including environmental sensitivity assessments. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
941	Dr Christopher Wroe	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the development to the east of Luton in North Hertfordshire. The area is next to an area of outstanding natural beauty, and is itself idyllic countryside. The area is designated as green belt entirely for the purpose of preventing urban sprawl. The proposal does not convince me that sufficient amenities and transport facilities will be available to the development straining not only Luton but other towns such as Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure. Pre Submission Core Strategy to include boundaries to the proposed development.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Further clarification of the measures to achieve the infrastructure delivery would be helpful.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4062	Mr David Weyer		Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The entire length of Clipstone Brook has been designated as flood plain so any new development will decrease the ability of flood water to drain away. The loss of Green belt will also mean the loss of valuable arable land at a time when food production needs to be increased. Cuckoos also live in these areas and so will be under threat. The charm of the narrow gauge railway will be lost if it no longer travels through countryside. The transport infrastructure in the town cannot accommodate any more new development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. The CS will ensure development is accommodated whilst minimising exacerbating the risk of flooding. All mitigation measures will be deployed to this effect. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible.</p>				
605	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: The spatial strategy is flawed in that it relies over-heavily on a development east of Luton, on Hertfordshire Green Belt. In turn the infrastructure needed to support such a development east of Luton, even if it was to be supported by North Hertfordshire District Council (which it is not), is unaffordable and encroaches on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Beauty (AONB) which makes such road building illegal. The eastern extension of the Luton northern bypass (black route) is unclear in the key diagram</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and infrastructure assessment as well as environmental sensitivity and site economic assessments. Delivery of housing in East of Luton is a risk factor that will be considered in the Housing Delivery Strategy. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
3231	Jack Wynn	Letchworth	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Objects to Luton houses in Hertfordshire when there is plenty of spare land in Bedfordshire. Objects to destruction of beautiful countryside which does not belong to Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of infrastructure and environmental sensitivity. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
2916	Mr D K Yates	Stevenage	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Building plans scheme by disgraced government minister. Query need for thousands of houses and basis on which figures were made. Housing is for immigrants and their families.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action Required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Its requirements must be delivered.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2745	Robert and May Young	Hitchin	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed East of Luton development. Hertfordshire has its own housing targets to meet and their planning experts have rejected EoL as suitable. Hertfordshire authorities have not been consulted. Development and associated roads will ruin Lilley Bottom. Green Belt means no development. There should be no further development on green lung between Luton towns and Stevenage and Hitchin. Bedfordshire should meet its own housing targets within its own boundaries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Regional Spatial Strategy justifies the Green Belt Review to deliver the amount of development it requires. Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix. The Core Strategy Delivery Plan will detail the commitments of all partners involved in the delivery of the proposals, the infrastructure schedule and sources of funding. The Examination in Public will test whether there is sufficient commitment from all partners (including adjoining local authorities) to provide adequate certainty on the delivery of the proposals during the plan period.</p>				
755	L Young	Whitwell	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the East of Luton because: Land designated as Green Belt, which is supposed to prevent urban sprawl. Land is inappropriate to build on which forms a natural eastern boundary to Luton. Land used as a recreational area and is an invaluable facility. Development will result in loss of hamlets like Cockerhoe and Mangrove Green and villages like Tea Green and Lilley, destroying their character. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point - road infrastructure over-stretched and development will lead to increases of traffic on the A505 and rural roads. Whitwell has existing traffic congestions problems. Highways Agency does not support Luton northern bypass. Development will over stretch hospitals and educational facilities as well. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including assessment of transport, infrastructure and environmental sensitivity as well as site economics. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
961	Mrs C Zimmern	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
959	Mr R Zimmern	St. Ippolyts	Q. 4	No
<p>Comment: Object to development to the east of Luton because: Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point. No consideration has been given to effects of traffic on Hitchin and surrounding villages. What will be the effects to other infrastructure in Hitchin? Bypasses will make it easier for residents to the east of Luton to get to Hitchin than to Luton. North Herts District Council does not support development. Query how 13 possible expansion areas became just 4 expansion areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test the proposals and identify measures to mitigate impact and ensure the delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development and required a Green Belt review. North Herts. have observer status on the Joint Committee. Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport and environmental sensitivity analysis. The SHLAA and Site Assessment Matrix assess potential development in the urban area and other potential urban extensions. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
1591	EERA		Figure 1	
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to achieve sustainable development</p>				
607	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.42	No
<p>Comment: This means I assume that there is no certain funds. Without that certainty the infrastructure list is little more than a vacuous wish list. It should be tested against previous success to plan. In any event I would think that these will be for capital developments only and NHDC will pay for running costs. Where will residents go to school? Who will pay? Who will deal with sanitation and who will pay. easy questions to ignore if NHDC residents are paying.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. The Core Strategy and its Delivery Plan will be the subject of public scrutiny and its soundness tested at the Examination in Public.</p>				
3712	Jackie Davies	Kings Walden	Para. 4.42	Yes
<p>Comment: The high pressure gas pipelines will have to be moved at great cost and further disruption as they are re-located nearer to Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The details of infrastructure provision and costings will form part of the Core Strategy Delivery Plan supporting the proposals.</p>				
2827	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.42	No
<p>Comment: If suitable funding for the infrastructure "exists", why isn't it being deployed? It's the fact that there is such an 'infrastructure deficit' which makes opposition to much of the document evident.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is committed to match development with its necessary infrastructure and put in place phasing mechanisms to ensure this is the case. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3707	Keith Ewington	Kings Walden	Para. 4.42	Yes
<p>Comment: The high pressure gas pipelines to the east of Luton will have to be moved at great cost and further disruption as they are re-located nearer to Hitchin.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The details of infrastructure provision and costings will form part of the Core Strategy Delivery Plan supporting the proposals.</p>				
3314	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.42	Yes
<p>Comment: Infrastructure planning and funding arrangements should be spelt out in the core strategy. If preferred option CS2 is intended to signal that an agreed schedule of infrastructure including the J10A proposals will be funded by development across the plan area then this would be a fair and reasonable way of proceeding which we would support.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements. Policy CS2 provides the policy basis to secure developer contributions for infrastructure although other sources of funding will also contribute to the delivery of infrastructure. This will be detailed in the delivery plan.</p>				
991	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.42	No
<p>Comment: if suitable funding for the infrastructure exists, why isn't it being deployed? It's the fact that there is such an infrastructure deficit which makes opposition to much of the document evident.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is committed to match development with its necessary infrastructure and put in place phasing mechanisms to ensure this is the case. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.</p>				
606	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.42	No
<p>Comment: The funding sources are not stated. It is unlikely that levies on house building to the east of Luton can possibly finance the necessary infrastructure</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Plan to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS2 does not exclude sources of funding other than developers contributions. The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.</p>				
602	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.43	No
<p>Comment: There appear to be some heroic assumptions on the willingness of developers to contribute. I would expect that only those which directly relate to developer to profit maximisation will be pushed.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. The Core Strategy and its Delivery Plan will be the subject of public scrutiny and its soundness tested at the Examination in Public.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
16	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 4.43	No
Comment: east of Luton will barely manage to pay for the tunnel under the airport for which there is no consent.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Plan to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The Preferred Options are based on an evaluation of evidence at the time including a Site Assessment Matrix and transport modelling.				
2275	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.43	Yes
Comment: Cannot expect developer contributions to fund the infrastructure. Proposals should be costed in details and those to be funded by developers clearly defined in order to judge financial viability of proposals.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add supporting text to Policy CS2 clarifying sources of funding to deliver supporting infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS2 does not exclude sources of funding other than developers contributions. The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.				
558	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.43	No
Comment: A dedicated plan of infrastructure requirements serving each development makes more sense. Nobody these days has an open cheque book. What if we have another Capability Green fiasco? By this, I mean the surrounding carriageways which took nearly five years to complete just because the developers didn't do their home work! Give people sound viable plans not unachievable ideals.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.				
398	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 4.43	No
Comment: It is unwise to expect developer contributions to wholly fund strategic infrastructure on a sub-regional scale. Infrastructure requirements directly related to the proposed development areas should be drawn up and costed to demonstrate the financial viability of the preferred options.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add supporting text to Policy CS2 clarifying sources of funding to deliver supporting infrastructure.				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS2 does not exclude sources of funding other than developers contributions. The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.				
1478	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 4.43	Yes
Comment: Or how about adopting the west of Luton development proposals - these are the only ones which already have full financial backing? Then proper discussion can be had about major regional improvements.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Plan to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure				
JC Reason for Response: The Preferred Options are based on an evaluation of evidence at the time including a Site Assessment Matrix and transport modelling.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3023	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 4.43	No
<p>Comment: Developer contributions cannot be expected to wholly fund strategic infrastructure which is on a sub-regional scale. There needs to be a 'menu' of infrastructure requirements directly related to the proposed development areas drawn up and costed, in order to demonstrate the financial viability of the preferred options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, its providers, timing and funding.</p>				
608	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.43	No
<p>Comment: See comments on 4.42 - very unlikely to be enough to pay for the infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: See response to Comment ID 606</p>				
569	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 4.44	No
<p>Comment: "the details of which are currently being finalised." These should have been finalised prior to any submission. Without them, and a realistic assessment of their chances of success, it is impossible to determine whether the list of infrastructure developments amounts to little more than a wish list. Without that level of detail we should assume that none of the infrastructure developments (other than those directly related to developer profit maximisation) will be delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will at its submission stage be accompanied by a Delivery Plan which will clarify the delivery of supporting infrastructure. The forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD will include the policy details on Planning Obligations and the 'tariff' based approach to developer contributions.</p>				
609	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.44	No
<p>Comment: Effectively a repeat of section 4.43</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 4.44 establishes the difference between the developers contributions sought through current Supplementary Planning Documents (paragraph 4.43) and new guidance currently being developed in partnership with the Local Delivery Vehicle such as the 'tariff' based approach.</p>				
1060	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Preferred Options CS2 Support/Object/Comment: Comment Comments: We support the principle of making clear the strategy and requirements for delivery of supporting infrastructure through developer contributions. The strategy should make clear the thresholds for securing contributions, the rationale behind the proposals and ensure all items required are clearly defined in accordance with Circular 05/2005 to ensure that developers is only required to contribute to issues "necessary" to make development acceptable. Clear engagement should be sought from landowners and developers in developing the approach to planning obligations to ensure that the level of contributions sought are proportionate to the likely receipts from development and do not discourage development in the town, thus reduce the competitiveness of Luton as a place to invest.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will at its submission stage be accompanied by a Delivery Plan which will clarify the delivery of supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy and any subsequent Local Development Framework document comply with Circular 05/05 tests to ensure developers contributions are necessary. However, the planning obligations thresholds will be contained within the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1943	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: The LSPs support POCs2 (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
821	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.45	No
Comment: This observation appears to be very woolly. Developer contributions will never supply all the funds need for the infrastructure of such a strategic plan. Clearly there should be a detailed costing of all the elements of this plan and especially those sub-regional elements that are not clearly apposite to developer contributions. The economic viability of these options should be clearly apparent and especially those relating to environmental impact and carbon costing.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.				
JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding.				
3221	DP9	London	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: Advises that in developing this approach regard needs to be had to Circular 05/05 to ensure that the planning obligation payments relate directly to proposed development and fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind. The mechanism under which payments can be made as part of planning obligations should not be considered to be a carte balance tax on development but a mechanism to mitigate impact. Payments should take into account the individual site circumstances of each scheme and the feasibility of the development that is being proposed.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements. Policy CS2 provides the policy basis to secure developer contributions for infrastructure although other sources of funding will also contribute to the delivery of infrastructure. This will be detailed in the delivery plan. The detail of developers contributions will be contained in the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD and therefore Policy CS2 would benefit from a cross reference to this document.				
1584	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: EEDA welcome the fact that the Core Strategy is looking at innovative forward thinking ways of infrastructure funding including the introduction of a tariff based approach. We are aware of other locations in the region pursuing similar propositions in Cambridgeshire and Chelmsford and we would encourage the Council to consider how the IDP might best be used in this context.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Integrated Development Programme will play an essential role on the preparation of the Core Strategy's Delivery Plan to accompany the submission stage document.				
4007	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: Support developer contributions where feasible, viable and in line with Circular 5/05. Amend CS2 to include wording such as, '€ where relevant' and '€ of an appropriate scale'. Also include wording such as, 'careful and tight definition of type of infrastructure that is relevant'. Support tariff approach as it enables advance funding and avoids infrastructure becoming a break on development delivery.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Agree that developer contributions should be relevant and appropriate. However, this is in the essence of Circular 05/05 and there is no need to repeat it in Policy CS2. The policy will be complemented by a detailed SPD on Planning Obligations. Support for the 'tariff' is welcomed.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2828	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: YES! YES! YES!				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1855	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: Reduce the tariff on areas of known land contamination to facilitate redevelopment of such areas. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The JTU acknowledges that development needs to be viable and this will be part of the considerations on the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD which will include the policy details on Planning Obligations and the 'tariff' based approach to developer contributions.				
121	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.45	No
Comment: Experience suggests that developers make promises and don't deliver. How can you ensure that promises to provide infrastructure are kept? When the proposed developers of the Leighton Buzzard eastern housing estate show-cased their proposals, they admitted that their promises to contribute to, say health centres and schools, depended on commitments from health authorities and education department.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The forthcoming submission Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan containing a schedule of infrastructure to deliver the strategy, its timing and sources of funding. At the Examination in Public, the deliverability of the Core Strategy will be tested and if it fails the strategy will not be adopted.				
1752	Government Office for the East of England	Cambridge	Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: Note that the Luton Gateway LDV commission Infrastructure Funding Study which should be completed before moving to pre submission - this will enable you to firm up proposals in this respect.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
3236	GVA Grimley Ltd for and on behalf of AXA Reim		Para. 4.45	Yes
Comment: Finds a combination of tariff and traditional S106 obligations to secure monies for new development as stated in CS2 acceptable in principle. The combined contribution must be fair and reasonable. Financial contributions should only be sought as set out in Circular 05/05. Would object to any tariff that was not based on up to date, robust and credible needs assessment. Supports "flexible and responsible implementation of this policy (CS2)" as stated in para 4.46 but feels that it should be incorporated into core strategy policy CS2.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements. Policy CS2 provides the policy basis to secure developer contributions for infrastructure although other sources of funding will also contribute to the delivery of infrastructure. This will be detailed in the delivery plan. The detail of developers contributions will be contained in the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD and therefore Policy CS2 would benefit from a cross reference to this document.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3286	Hives Planning on behalf of Arnold White Estates Ltd		Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: The costs of major transport infrastructure, and other location ally specific items, should be borne by the related urban extension or development in that town generally, not spread over all developments.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: Add cross reference to forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD to text supporting Policy CS2. Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	National Planning Circular 05/05 provides the criteria to ensure that planning obligations relate directly to the proposed development and that is the basis development contributions will be sought together with the tariff based approach supported by policy CS2. The details of developer contributions will be developed further as part of a forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD. It is not the intention of the Core Strategy to advocate a distribution of planning contributions but to ensure that developer contributions relate to the development proposal and that the delivery plan clarifies all sources of funding to deliver the strategy.			
3401	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Support CS2 as a matter of principle provided infrastructure costs do not prejudice the development of sites within existing urban areas in favour of the proposed urban extensions and provided also any tariff is responsive to economic fluctuations in development values.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree			
<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
1294	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreements on developer contributions should be written by local authority lawyers in future.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree			
<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	The details of planning obligations and Section 106 agreements will be contained in the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.			
3440	Maurice Leslie	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.45	No
<p>Comment: To allay the fears of the local population, it is essential that detailed infrastructure plans are placed before the public and adequately debated by Council members - the views of those members brought before the public.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree			
<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. The Core Strategy and its Delivery Plan will be the subject of public scrutiny and its soundness tested at the Examination in Public.			
1922	Luton Forum	Luton	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: The LSPs support POCs2 (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
JC Response:	Agree			
<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
3680	Alan Murphy	Luton	Para. 4.45	No
<p>Comment: It is concerning to note that the evidence study, 'Future Social and Community Infrastructure Needs (UCL/ Colin Buchanan) concludes under Clause 9.1.7, that a reliance on developer contributions to fund a significant proportion of infrastructure needs is not a viable strategy for Luton and South Beds'.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree			
<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	If the strategy is to be successful in the delivery of infrastructure needed to support development commitments towards provision should be secured following a wide range of sources. The Core Strategy proposes the use of planning obligations and a tariff approach to developers contributions. It commits to explore community trusts and similar models to forward fund, manage and maintain community infrastructure and work with partners in a delivery plan which will help delivery priority infrastructure alongside development.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2174	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Preferred Options CS2 - Developer Contributions and the Delivery of Supporting Infrastructure Natural England supports the approach to securing developer contributions for strategic and local infrastructure, particularly in relation to the provision of green infrastructure as identified within the Luton and Bedfordshire Green Infrastructure Plan and subsequent lower tier district and parish plans. We have already provided detailed comments on this approach through the recent Planning Obligations SPD consultation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3316	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Infrastructure planning and funding arrangements should be spelt out in the core strategy. If preferred option CS2 is intended to signal that an agreed schedule of infrastructure including the J10A proposals will be funded by development across the plan area then this would be a fair and reasonable way of proceeding which we would support.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements. Policy CS2 provides the policy basis to secure developer contributions for infrastructure although other sources of funding will also contribute to the delivery of infrastructure. This will be detailed in the delivery plan.</p>				
3815	D Simpson	Unknown	Para. 4.45	No
<p>Comment: Developer contributions have not been forthcoming from the recent developments in Leighton Buzzard so why can we expect this to be different?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding. The Core Strategy and its Delivery Plan will be the subject of public scrutiny and its soundness tested at the Examination in Public.</p>				
356	Sport England	Bedford	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Sport England supports the principle of preferred option CS2 with respect to the comprehensive and consistent approach proposed to securing developer contributions across Luton and southern Bedfordshire. With respect to sports facility provision, standards of provision and developer contributions will need to be coordinated as well as the decisions about whether on-site provision should be made within the urban extension or contributions made towards the implementation of strategic projects within the existing urban areas (e.g. the proposed Luton Aquatics Centre and new dual use facilities on secondary school sites). The emerging or completed sports facility and playing pitch strategies for the Luton and former South Bedfordshire areas should be used for informing how these issues are addressed as they will cover existing/future facility needs, provision standards and developer contributions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
717	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Regarding Preferred Option CS2, HRDC is willing and able to liaise closely with JC and its officers to determine the appropriate package of developer contributions for HR North urban extension. Details of package will need to comply with government guidance and reflect the costs associated with the development. Findings of DTZ Urban Extensions Site Development Economic Study are noted. Study concludes that HR is a sensible and viable place to deliver a new community. Study suggests further work is needed on all urban extensions and HRDC looks forward to working with JTU on this aspect, especially place making agenda. HRDC welcomes approach set out in Para 4.46, considered helpful in any CS policy. HRDC is confident that it can deliver a sustainable and attractive community at HR North provided JC's requirements are both realistic and flexible. HRDC supports approach to planning obligations advocated in DTZ study as it is only way that a balance can be struck between acquiring and requiring benefits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1413	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Policy CS2: we support the principle of a clear strategy and requirements for delivery of supporting infrastructure through developer contributions. The strategy should clarify thresholds for securing contributions, the rationale behind the proposals and ensure all items required are clearly defined in accordance with Circular 05/2005. This is particularly relevant to our client's site adjoining J10A. Improvements to J10A are clearly a sub-regional requirement, relevant to growth and development across the conurbation. Our client is willing to cooperate with LBC as the Council's aspirations are progressed, but any contributions required must be reasonable and split proportionately between all developments impacting upon the junction. Clear engagement should be sought from landowners and developers to ensure that the level of contributions sought is proportionate to the likely receipts from development and do not discourage development in the town, reducing competitiveness of Luton as a place to invest.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will at its submission stage be accompanied by a Delivery Plan which will clarify the delivery of supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy and any subsequent Local Development Framework document comply with Circular 05/05 tests to ensure developers contributions are necessary. However, the planning obligations thresholds will be contained within the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p>				
1557	Thames Water Property Services	Reading	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Support is given for the inclusion of this section, but is concerned that Policy CS2 refers mainly to developer contributions and planning obligations and no specific reference to utilities infrastructure. Developer contributions cannot be used for water and waste water infrastructure as is funded through OFWAT.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The details of infrastructure delivery and developer contributions will be set out in a Delivery Plan accompanying the submission Core Strategy and the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD. However, this chapter would be improved by providing greater detail on the type of infrastructure to be delivered and by which means.</p>				
1501	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: We support this approach and that it applies equally to development within urban areas and to SUE's. The approach, however, must be on the basis that developer contributions are relevant and of an appropriate scale.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The policy must comply with Circular 05/05 'reasonable tests'.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1213	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.45	No
<p>Comment: Acceptable infrastructure delivery needs to consider timing as well as funding, to ensure the necessary green (and other) infrastructure is in place in advance of development where necessary - rather than added on at the end of what can sometimes be years of development. Experience of existing developments is that greenspace delivery is too late in the cycle. There needs to be a policy of identifying green infrastructure and implementing in advance or development or earlier in the cycle, to allow it to be properly planned and established. There also needs to be a clear strategy for the maintenance of new green infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2. Make sure this comment is fed into the Green Infrastructure Strategy which in turn will be the main basis for Green Infrastructure matters in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure, time of delivery and funding arrangements. <input type="checkbox"/> The different subsections of the Core Strategy will be better placed to indicate the particular needs and requirements of specific infrastructure. The Green Infrastructure Strategy will be able to address concerns regarding this provision. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
1180	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: The Bedfordshire and Luton Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan (2007) and subsequent district and local green infrastructure plans have identified suitable projects which would benefit from developer contributions. The Wildlife Trust suggests that contributions towards the provision of green infrastructure should be specifically mentioned in this policy to ensure sufficient weight is given to them. Policy ENV1 of the East of England Regional Spatial Strategy pushes not only for the development of green infrastructure plans but also their implementation. Developer contributions would be one way of implementing some of the actions in these plans.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: CS2 provides the policy framework for developers contributions and delivery of supporting infrastructure. However, it cannot be expected to provide details of need and provision on each type of infrastructure. The different subsections within the Core Strategy are better placed for this. In addition the delivery plan schedule will list all infrastructure to be provided to support the strategy and its sources of funding.</p>				
2007	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: We support CS2</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
992	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: YES! Yes ! YES!</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2554	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: DTZ Site Development Economic Study conducted without balanced view of costs of major infrastructure, essential to potential development areas Distorted economic viability of the options has produced a preferred strategy which includes East of Luton and uniquely assumes major public funding</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The evidence supporting the Core Strategy will need to demonstrate the deliverability of the Core Strategy proposals and its supporting infrastructure. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan at submission stage containing a schedule of infrastructure provision, timing and funding.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1101	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 4.45	Yes
<p>Comment: The DTZ Site Development Economic Study (16 February 2009) seems to have been conducted without a balanced view of the costs of major infrastructure, such as A-class roads, which will be essential if each of the potential development areas is selected. This has distorted the economic viability of the options and produced a preferred strategy which includes the east of Luton (area L) and, as a result, appears uniquely to assume major public funding.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. New infrastructure and measures to mitigate impact of new development will be needed.</p>				
610	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 4.45	No
<p>Comment: Are we sure that the developer levies either should be, or need to be, the same in all areas of development. The need is to ensure that developers have the incentive to not only build but to provide appropriate social housing and relevant infrastructure</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is not the intention of CS2 to provide for blanket requirements across the strategy's area. This is nowhere implied in the Strategy.</p>				
1944	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.46	No
<p>Comment: The third bullet point referring to infrastructure hardware suggests that 'soft' infrastructure is excluded from the support of developer contributions. The words 'hard ware' should be deleted. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: To rephrase bullet point three to make clear that it refers to the delivery arrangements of infrastructure to be planned before development such as strategic roads, rail infrastructure, utilities etc. and that at no point it implies the exclusion of 'soft' infrastructure from developers contributions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: As policy CS2 stands, there is no need to differentiate between different types of infrastructure. Other sections of the Core Strategy including the delivery plan and the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD will contain the bulk of the detail. The intention of bullet point three is to highlight the different working arrangements for the infrastructure which needs to be planned well in advance to development and the infrastructure which needs to be planned alongside development. It is acknowledged that the 'hard-ware' term may be misleading.</p>				
931	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.46	No
<p>Comment: All sounds wonderful, but in practice Southern Leighton Buzzard developments have all come with almost no infrastructure. We have seen over the last few years developers 'do their utmost' to provide little infrastructure, and whole communities left 'stranded' on the outskirts of the town. We are not holding our breath that the town will ever get a community hospital, or purpose built health centre etc., only roads and schools, and thousands of houses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The forthcoming submission Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan containing a schedule of infrastructure to deliver the strategy, its timing and sources of funding. At the Examination in Public, the deliverability of the Core Strategy will be tested and if it fails the strategy will not be adopted.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1923	Luton Forum	Luton	Para. 4.46	No
<p>Comment: The third bullet point referring to infrastructure hardware suggests that 'soft' infrastructure is excluded from the support of developer contributions. The words 'hard ware' should be deleted. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
JC Response:	<p>Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: To rephrase bullet point three to make clear that it refers to the delivery arrangements of infrastructure to be planned before development such as strategic roads, rail infrastructure, utilities etc. and that at no point it implies the exclusion of 'soft' infrastructure from developers contributions.</p>			
JC Reason for Response:	<p>As policy CS2 stands, there is no need to differentiate between different types of infrastructure. Other sections of the Core Strategy including the delivery plan and the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD will contain the bulk of the detail. The intention of bullet point three is to highlight the different working arrangements for the infrastructure which needs to be planned well in advance to development and the infrastructure which needs to be planned alongside development. It is acknowledged that the 'hard-ware' term may be misleading.</p>			
3315	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 4.46	Yes
<p>Comment: Infrastructure planning and funding arrangements should be spelt out in the core strategy. If preferred option CS2 is intended to signal that an agreed schedule of infrastructure including the J10A proposals will be funded by development across the plan area then this would be a fair and reasonable way of proceeding which we would support.</p>				
JC Response:	<p>Partially agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>			
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The Core Strategy will include a delivery plan at its submission stage. This plan will contain a schedule of infrastructure and funding arrangements. Policy CS2 provides the policy basis to secure developer contributions for infrastructure although other sources of funding will also contribute to the delivery of infrastructure. This will be detailed in the delivery plan.</p>			
1782	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 4.46	No
<p>Comment: DTZ evidence was not sufficient to enable elected councillors to proceed and endorse preferred options fairly because the study is a "work in progress" and raised issues around pricing, viability, a lack of full costing analysis of site constraints and infrastructure requirements and a number of key assumptions made to "fill in gaps" as its basis for assessment of each site. Costs associated with access roads to each preferred option have been based on design and quality for new urban extension only. Dropped prices makes preferred options less viable. Query how process can proceed when short term housing is needed but none of the preferred options are viable. Report contains numerous assumptions with no conclusions. There's no clear analysis of Area L. JC councillors should not have voted without necessary information. If preferred extensions are not viable without infrastructure costs then how can CS be taken forward? An alternative option without expensive orbital bypass is needed.</p>				
JC Response:	<p>Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals. Delivery Strategy to outline measures to secure delivery of infrastructure</p>			
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Preferred Options based on evaluation of existing evidence. A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. Delivery is a key factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core strategy. There is a mechanism in PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>			
1215	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 4.46	No
<p>Comment: The reference to delivery of infrastructure in "a phased and timely way" is weak, and needs to make specific reference to delivery of infrastructure (including green infrastructure) in advance of development where required.</p>				
JC Response:	<p>Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Add a subsection in Chapter four containing the main outcomes of the delivery plan relating to policies CS1 and CS2.</p>			
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Although the bulk of the detail for infrastructure delivery will be contained in other sections of the Core Strategy, Chapter four would benefit from a stronger reference to delivery to support policies CS1 (Spatial Development Strategy) and CS2 (Developer Contributions and the Delivery of Supporting Infrastructure).</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2008	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 4.46	No
<p>Comment: The third bullet point referring to infrastructure hardware suggests that 'soft' infrastructure is excluded from the support of developer contributions. The words 'hard ware' should be deleted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Rephrase bullet point three to make clear that it refers to the delivery arrangements of infrastructure to be planned before development such as strategic roads, rail infrastructure, utilities etc. and that at no point it implies the exclusion of 'soft' infrastructure from developers contributions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: As policy CS2 stands, there is no need to differentiate between different types of infrastructure. Other sections of the Core Strategy including the delivery plan and the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD will contain the bulk of the detail. The intention of bullet point three is to highlight the different working arrangements for the infrastructure which needs to be planned well in advance to development and the infrastructure which needs to be planned alongside development. It is acknowledged that the 'hard-ware' term may be misleading.</p>				
4286	Anonymous. This comment is an aggregation of 37 anonymous responses made via the Core Strategy Preferred Options Summary Document questionnaire			
<p>Comment: Priority must be given to protecting green belt areas and strategy seems to do this. Generally in favour but not everyone wants to live in urban areas so support limited development in villages to revitalise and regenerate them. The strategy provides a logical approach and seems appropriate to meet Principles. Strategy supports long term job creation. infrastructure should be provided before or at same time as additional housing. Attempts to make the best of an unsatisfactory situation and is more realistic than the original expectations of central government. Support CS1 provided land is used for aesthetically designed houses and surroundings. It is the best and fairest way of providing houses and facilities needed for the area. It preserves the character and nature of various types of environment in a sustainable way. Development has been matched to transport links. Support CS1 but questions where all the employment will come from. Employment strategy for major areas e.g. Luton is a priority.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Ensure sound employment delivery strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
4287	Anonymous. This comment is aggregation of 78 anonymous responses made to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Summary Document questionnaire			
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard lacks basic infrastructure and is at saturation level. Leighton Linslade should have its own Core Strategy. No development in N Herts or any smaller towns or villages to protect their character and quality of life. Insufficient attention given to benefits for communities. More development in town centres, higher density, better use of existing unused sites and properties. Pointless building more houses in Dunstable without more shops, jobs and a bypass and it should be traffic jam free. Dunstable and Houghton Regis infrastructure cannot support further development. Leave AONB, SSSI areas and green belt alone. Discussing which sites to build on is irrelevant as South East England is overdeveloped and overpopulated. Build houses close to employment. Urban extensions should centre on Luton because of good transport links and job opportunities. Quantity of proposed homes is a problem, not the principle. Busway will be an expensive white elephant. Improve quantity/quality of public transport.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4288	Anonymous. This comment is an aggregation of 79 anonymous responses made via the Core Strategy Preferred Options Summary Document questionnaire			
<p>Comment: Protect rural settlements, green belt and scenic landscape from large scale development, urban sprawl. Transport inadequately addressed with no mention of cycling or walking. Need a rail link to Dunstable, not a guided Busway. Bypasses will encourage more car use and should not be built. Supporting the airport is not a sustainable option. No idea given of the massive infrastructure needed for large scale housing, including roads and jobs, which need improving before houses are built. Developments will add to gridlock. More information / evidence needed for rural areas and North of Luton and clarity on exactly which urban extensions are options. No development to east of LL, which cannot support more people or traffic or N of Houghton Regis and Dunstable, N Herts or on floodplains. East of Luton is better option than east of Leighton due to good transport links. Develop existing sites within towns, reuse run down and empty properties. Plan ignores thousands of homes Aylesbury Vale want to foist on LL.</p>				
JC Response: Not Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
4285	Anonymous. This comment is aggregation of 36 anonymous responses made to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Summary Document questionnaire			
<p>Comment: Principles too generalised to agree with. Views of local people have been listened to and future needs will be met. Support maximising potential of urban areas to avoid large scale extensions in rural areas. Good balance between green and brown field development. Regenerate student flats and fill empty offices before building more. Growth in rural settlements should be kept to a minimum. Realistic assessment of what growth is sustainable in medium and longer term. Respect Green Belt but containment of AONB is important. Need jobs and schools that can walk or cycle to. It will improve employment opportunities with better transport links. Hope for houses with open spaces for recreation. Balance provision of homes with minimum impact on countryside and job opportunities. Development east of Leighton Buzzard should generate developer funding for eastern relief road and improvements to Eastern Way/A5 junction. Generally support proposals but areas to south and south west of Luton were not included.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
4080	This is a summary of a standard letter that was copied and sent by 135 people (Standard Letter 'A'). Please note that only identical letters are included in this total. Variations of the letter, however slight, have not been included in these numbers a			
<p>Comment: Strongly object to a development of such a scale east of Luton. Traffic to the east of Luton already at breaking point and no consideration given to the effect on Hitchin or surrounding villages. The Luton northern bypass and eastern extension will result in more traffic on A505 with catastrophic effects on Hitchin's already congested roads. The proposed bypass will make it easier for residents in the proposed development to get to Hitchin rather than Luton, therefore would like to see the study of the possible effects on Hitchin's infrastructure. Object to a Draft Core Strategy that has totally ignored the effect on Hitchin and its traffic and other infrastructure. EoL development is not supported by North Hertfordshire District Council. How did 13 possible expansion areas become just 4, including beautiful Green Belt land? Object to Joint Planning Committee taking decisions without Committee members having technical analyses. Views of residents east of Luton should be properly considered.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Ensure impact on Horth Herts is understood		
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4277	Broadwater Residents <input type="checkbox"/> A small petition from Broadwater residents (Stevenage) signed by 7 people.			
<p>Comment: Object to expansion into Herts countryside and query why Luton and Central Beds Councils are keen to extend Luton across the county boundary. Suggest two alternatives - North of Luton towards Streatley &amp; Lower Sundon and north west of Luton between Houghton Regis and Leighton Buzzard - which both have easier access to M1 and main roads. North Herts already has problems without importing more expansion and accompanying headaches such as infrastructure, pressure on schools, more traffic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Ensure impact on Horth Herts is understood</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
4291	Keep East of Luton Green (KEOLG) <input type="checkbox"/> Postcard petition printed and distributed by Keep East of Luton Green group (KEOLG). 4,942 individually signed and addressed postcards were sent in.			
<p>Comment: Object to the East of Luton 'preferred option' proposal for building in excess of 5,500 houses on the eastern side of Luton as well as a traffic bypass. This would destroy and area of great landscape beauty adjacent to the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. This development in the Green Belt would not assist in the much needed regeneration of the conurbation. It would generate a huge amount of traffic at the edge of Luton that would not be attracted away from the town centre by the proposed outer bypasses. This is an ill conceived development – stop it now! Let wisdom prevail.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
4284	Mangrove Hall Farm Residents Association <input type="checkbox"/> Summary of a petition letter signed by 162 people resident in and around Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green, Tea Green and Wandon End.			
<p>Comment: Object to EoL plan because land is Green Belt and natural boundary preventing urban sprawl, will engulf hamlets &amp; blight villages. People choose a village lifestyle to enjoy benefits of open countryside, being part of a community. This will be ruined by any development. Other areas more suitable for development. Infrastructure not there to support development. All routes in and out of it will add to traffic problems. Park &amp; Ride scheme is unpopular, redundant in Bedford etc. No sufficient explanation given of road funding at Cockernhoe School exhibition. Object to CS being issued without detailed financial impact analysis to test proposals. Strong concerns about creating employment opportunities - would like a satisfactory answer on plans to attract work. Only answer given is to build office space while factory units are currently sitting empty and a proposal to create employment because it is near the airport but will destroy greenbelt. Many signatories have lived in area whole life and know its history.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
4289	Diane Moles <input type="checkbox"/> "Development Petition" signed by 443 people			
<p>Comment: " We, the undersigned, oppose the development to the area around Cockernhoe and Lilley. We believe this beautiful countryside should be protected as green belt"</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
4290	Diane Moles <input type="checkbox"/> "Save our Countryside" petition signed by 1048 people			
<p>Comment: " We, the undersigned, oppose the development to the area around Cockernhoe and Lilley. We believe this beautiful countryside should be protected as green belt. We ask Luton Council and our local MP to oppose this development in every way possible."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4082	This is a summary of a standard letter that was copied and sent by 64 people (Standard Letter 'B'). Please note that only identical letters are included in this total. Variations of the letter, however slight, have not been included in these numbers and			
	<p>Comment: Object to EoL development and N and E Luton Bypasses due to impact which won't improve Luton's image or quality of life contrary to aspirations in Ch11 of CS; contrary to LUC view that development not recommended in Area L1; no consideration of area's historic/heritage importance (evidence study) - a material consideration; location within N Herts who oppose development and lack of appropriate consultation, see response of 27.02.09; its impact on existing congestion. Other options exist e.g. WoL scheme, requires no public funding, on lower grade Green Belt, roads not on farmland and incorporates LFC stadium. Or suggest redevelopment in Luton for mix of flats, houses to meet needs of single, older people, preventing urban sprawl and more roads. Object to bypasses due to impact on landscape (AONB), biodiversity, on Lilley; Luton orbital road would draw traffic around the town but to detriment of businesses. Alternative is widening Vauxhall Way to link to M1 via new airport roads thus saving cost of tunnelling</p>			
	JC Response: Not Agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
	JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.			
3432	Anthony Smalldridge	Leighton Buzzard	Accessibility and Transport 5	Yes
	<p>Comment: Proposed application for eastern urban extension to Leighton Buzzard will impact on town centre traffic as currently the town experiences severe congestion especially during rush hour despite new bypass. Roads particularly affected include West Street, Lake Street, new junction at Grovebury and Billington Road and access junctions to two main supermarkets. With population set to increase this can only worsen as there is a limited number of access road into town centre. Car parking will need to be reviewed. Traffic along Vandyke Road - higher density development proposed will inevitably mean increased traffic to gain access to town centre, traffic flow problems already experienced. Traffic along Shenly Hill Road - proposed residential development along both sides of this road will mean increased traffic using this road to reach Heath Road, the width of this road restricts two-way traffic. Increased traffic around/access to schools on eastern side of Leighton Buzzard - until new schools are built.</p>			
	JC Response: Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
	JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			
3391	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Accessibility and Transport 5	No
	<p>Comment: The document puts forward no 'appropriate' transport proposals for the Leighton Buzzard area, with the investment emphasis directed towards Luton, Houghton Regis and Dunstable. It is preposterous to consider that the proposed development for Leighton-Linslade will integrate into the already congested and inadequate road and rail links.</p>			
	JC Response: Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
	JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
142	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: The old Dunstable to Luton branch railway line. The infrastructure is still there. Turning this disused line in to a modern rail/tram line would offer more success and provide a greater impact on congestion reduction than a bus route. There is a real opportunity here if some national or 'green' funding can be found. It would connect the centre of Dunstable and Luton directly, providing a real alternative to the car. This is as your report suggests one of the main routes of congestion in the wider conurbation. Saying that car use is not sustainable, ignores the reality that car use is certain to increase if 25,000 plus new homes are added to the area. <input type="checkbox"/> A tram line as well as creating a new route separate and unaffected by road congestion and road works, would be a more desirable alternative to the bus in terms of reliability and status. Having a tram would be a big kudos/sense of pride and development for Luton. <input type="checkbox"/> A tram would fit very well in with the future vision of Luton as a 'Green Growth Area'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector.</p>				
822	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: Excellent aspirations to sustainable transport systems but no indication as to what these are apart from a park and ride concreting over agricultural land-not very sustainable for the environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainable transport principles are set out in paras 5.53-5.69.</p>				
4008	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Support alternatives to the car.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Alternative means of transport to the car will be pursued wherever possible</p>				
2830	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Then declare that it's crucial!! If the issue can't be overcome, then it falls.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
200	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: Transport IF not an end in itself.... has no-one proof read this?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Not a spatial matter</p>				
3842	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 5.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the recognition that the planned housing and jobs will generate increased car travel and congestion, unless more sustainable alternatives to the car are found.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support or otherwise for this statement is not a spatial matter</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1411	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Public transport services should have been looked at a long time ago. Over the past few years all the road 'improvements' have made things worse. Nothing has ever been thought about for the long term future.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The only recent new roads are the dualling of Airport Way and building of Hucklesby Way in Luton, both of which have reduced congestion local to those areas.</p>				
1416	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph Policy: Paragraph 5.1 Support/Object/ Comment : Comment The inclusion of a Strategic Employment Site at our Clients site at J10a incorporating a park and ride would allow for development to be provided with supporting infrastructure that is wholly in accordance with paragraph 5.1 and the Core Strategy. This has been expanded upon in how it is a key components of the Transport Strategy in Chapter 4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Continue ongoing objective evaluation of all alternative sites for potential growth related development prior to the next: Core Strategy pre-submission stage .</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of this site as a preferred location for development within the Core Strategy is the most appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies and accompanying sustainability appraisal</p>				
2057	David Watts	Wingfield	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: My main reasons/objections are:.... 4. Increased congestion on our already busy roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Strategic bypasses will reduce through traffic and, combined with encouraging local travel by PT/walk/cycle, will contribute to minimising congestion, and indeed reduce congestion in some parts of the area.</p>				
2055	Edward Watts	Wingfield	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: My main reasons/objections are:.... 4. Increased congestion on our already busy roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Strategic bypasses will reduce through traffic and, combined with encouraging local travel by PT/walk/cycle, will contribute to minimising congestion, and indeed reduce congestion in some parts of the area.</p>				
2056	Angela Watts	Wingfield	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: My main reasons/objections are:.... 4. Increased congestion on our already busy roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Strategic bypasses will reduce through traffic and, combined with encouraging local travel by PT/walk/cycle, will contribute to minimising congestion, and indeed reduce congestion in some parts of the area.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
993	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Then declare that it's crucial. If the issue can't be overcome, then it falls.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
611	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.1	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton development relies upon the extension of the guided busway and is entirely dependent upon North Hertfordshire funding this extension</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Bus way extensions will be a combination of short lengths of segregated bus way and buses running on roads to serve new development, and will be funded by developers and not the Councils.</p>				
17	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley	Para. 5.2	No
<p>Comment: and destroy more countryside when the West of Luton has the infrastructure. Lilley Bottom is already congested and access to the A1/M1 can be horrendous. so why not add 5500 houses.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
143	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.2	No
<p>Comment: Providing adequate roads for car drivers is essential. Reducing lanes for bus use is not always helpful. Car drivers do exist, their views and infrastructure should be provided for. Road safety, e.g. enforcement and planning of roads with safety in mind is desired by me. There are real alternatives, such as the Luton-Dunstable tram link I have proposed. Also alternative ways of operating buses (dedicated school buses and monthly etc or discounted locals tickets) and much more 'joined up thinking' in terms of routes and times for buses is also welcome.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector.</p>				
1615	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.2	No
<p>Comment: We absolutely agree that implementing sustainable transport alternatives to the car is crucial to delivery of the objectives of the Core Strategy, but consider this position is seriously compromised by the unqualified statement in this paragraph that private car accessibility should also be adequately planned for. Public transport initiatives that are not supported by positive deterrents to car use for local journeys will not achieve the degree of modal switch required to make a significant impact on the level of future vehicle demand described at 5.16.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy must plan for reality in order to be sound. Car transport is likely to remain a significant means of travel in the forthcoming plan period so it is necessary to plan appropriately for it.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4009	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.2	Yes
Comment: Private car accessibility should be adequately planned for.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Travel by car is likely to remain a significant means of travel during the forthcoming plan period.				
835	Mr Eastwood	Hitchin	Para. 5.2	No
Comment: How does building two new, unnecessary bypasses (on Green Belt/AONB) provide a "sustainable alternative to the car"???? New roads create new car journeys and make the situation worse.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Strategic bypasses will reduce through and cross-conurbation traffic and, combined with encouraging local travel by PT/walk/cycle, will contribute to minimising congestion, and indeed reduce congestion in some parts of the area.				
1998	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 5.2	No
Comment: The impact of traffic is another crucial consideration. NHDC believes that the transport evidence prepared on behalf of the JC is not fit for purpose and should not be used to justify the selection of sites for development. It has come to this conclusion in collaboration with Hertfordshire County Council, the local highway authority for the area, and it fully supports the views expressed in the County Council's response to the consultation. Additionally, NHDC has sought and received advice from consultants currently engaged in preparing Urban Transport Plans for Stevenage and Hitchin and a note setting out the consultants' conclusions is attached as appendix 2 to this document. It is also understood that others are highly critical of the methodology underlying the transport modelling.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The refinement of transport related supporting evidence is ongoing in order to address all such matters of concern.				
1417	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.2	No
Comment: Park and ride is identified as a key alternative to the private car yet one isn't proposed to the south of Luton, only services that serve the north, east and centre of the town are proposed. The location of our Clients site near junction 10a of the M1 offers an opportunity to capture car trips at a key gateway into the town and would be a key component of a sustainable transport strategy. The site is included in Adopted Local Plan policy and the Local Transport Plan. Such provision can be expanded to become a key transport nodal point and development associated with the scheme enhances this ability.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Continue ongoing objective evaluation of all alternative sites for potential growth related development prior to the next: Core Strategy pre-submission stage .				
JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				
475	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.2	No
Comment: It may be that Park and Ride schemes stimulate car use and, instead, further investment should be directed into rail transport.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: An aspiration exists for a northern parkway station serving development north of the conurbation. There are also plans for improvement of existing stations.				
90	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.2	No
Comment: Park & Ride schemes require land to be re-used for parking - and therefore concreted over, and increases the need for dirty, polluting buses				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: A modest amount of land will be required to implement a Park and Ride. Bus technology is not a spatial matter.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1252	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.3	No
Comment: The St Ives Busway does not work and is a waste of tax payers money. Why should this one be any better?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The St Ives bus way is not in the area being planned for through this Core Strategy				
37	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.3	No
Comment: Clause 4.34 suggests that Leighton Buzzard would not be developed during this period, with development concentrating in the Luton and Dunstable urban areas. Sounds like it will turn out to be a free for all. From a development point of view Leighton Buzzard will be more appealing to a developer, so how do they get focussed on the other areas?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy addresses the spatial planning requirements across the whole of the southern Bedfordshire Growth area through an holistic vision and associated spatial strategy.				
1418	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.3	No
Comment: The Guided Bus way will only capture trips from the north-west, centre and east of the town. Therefore proposals to improve public transport should also focus on the south and include a Park and Ride at M1 Junction 10a. This is recognised as a strategic location for a park and ride site in the Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 (paragraph 12.37) and adopted Local Plan policy for the site. This service could provide important links with the Guided Busway from this direction and play a key role in providing an inclusive public transport network.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Continue ongoing objective evaluation of all alternative sites for potential growth related development prior to the next: Core Strategy pre-submission stage .				
JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				
1217	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.3	No
Comment: This para contradicts para 4.34 which suggests that Leighton Linslade will not be considered until after the main urban area (see 1st bullet under spatial development principles).				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy presents a holistic vision for the whole growth area				
1355	Mr Barry Wardle	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.3	Yes
Comment: The Town Council hopes that the inclusion of this paragraph will enable funding to be made available for the Station Travel Plan - a document which sets out major changes to our railway station and is part of a national project of just 30 towns who have been asked to produce a forward blue print for their railway station				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Station Travel Plans are mentioned in para 5.66.				
612	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.3	No
Comment: The guided busway has been widely criticised, not to say reported as being under-funded. The main concerns are that it does not serve Luton & Dunstable Hospital and does not in any way serve the east of Luton (Stopsley & Wigmore. Similarly the guided busway does not serve the planned Stopsley-based aquatic centre. Similarly the central Luton public transport interchange has been widely criticised.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Core route of the Luton Dunstable Bus way does not serve the Stopsley and Wigmore areas. However these areas can be served by a combination of services operating on Bus way extensions to serve the east of Luton development together with P&R services.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1419	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.4	No
<p>Comment: Development is concentrated to the north of the town and opportunities to the south to provide employment and infrastructure improvements have been neglected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Significant employment opportunities are proposed around London Luton Airport, including the provision of a strategic employment site. Such provision will be readily accessible from areas in the south of Luton.</p>				
476	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.4	No
<p>Comment: No road building</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
2831	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.5	No
<p>Comment: Yet M1 J11a wasn't constructed (or even allowed for) in the recent widening scheme of the M1. So much for Vision for the future!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision of a new Junction 11a with the M1 is part of the A5-M1 Link scheme.</p>				
932	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.5	Yes
<p>Comment: This vital A5/M1 link road MUST be constructed before major housing growth developments are built, or all the roads in southern Bedfordshire will grind to a halt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Councils will consider the opportunities for some development to take place prior to the northern bypasses being fully complete whilst also seeking to ensure that the new link is provided as early as possible</p>				
201	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 5.5	No
<p>Comment: The A5-M1 link and Luton Northern bypass are required just to handle what's already here. No more development at all until they are complete.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The amount of transport infrastructure needed to enable the delivery of necessary development is continuously being refined and fed into the process of refining the Core Strategy</p>				
994	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.5	No
<p>Comment: Yet M1J11a wasn't constructed (or even allowed for) in the recent widening scheme of the M1. So much for Vision for the future!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision of a new Junction 11a with the M1 is part of the A5-M1 Link scheme.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2406	Charles F Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Building more houses will lead to further congestion on the town's roads and will result in danger to pedestrians and cyclists The overcrowding on public transport will also worsen as more people commute from the town to work</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2407	Charlotte Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Building more houses will lead to further congestion on the town's roads and will result in danger to pedestrians and cyclists The overcrowding on public transport will also worsen as more people commute from the town to work</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2656	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Whilst recent road improvements to West St. have improved traffic circulation this can only be seen as short term accommodation. 2500 proposed houses will probably put another 5000 cars on our congested roads and the infrastructure should be planned and developed to accommodate the increase prior to any approval of housing development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2604	Mr Christopher Bartlett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: The increase in number of vehicles on our roads will have a significant impact on road safety and the roads we have totally incapable of carrying more.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1155	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: It is essential that any development in rural villages be conditional upon improved public transport measures, particularly linking those villages to the principal towns. Without this, any development in the rural area will be unsustainable and merely encourage more journeys to be made by car, whether for employment, shopping or leisure trips. For example, Barton's public transport leaves much to be desired. It comprises an hourly bus service between Luton and Bedford with no late evening journeys and only five on Sundays, and a further service to Luton at approximately 2-hourly intervals during the working day only. There is no direct bus service to Dunstable, Houghton Regis and only one return bus service to Hitchin once per week (Market Day), or to the nearest railway stations (Harlington or Leagrave). This standard of public transport is insufficiently attractive to those who have the choice and it is not good enough to support any significant level of new development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2505	Mr Chris Bosworth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: As jobs for new residents are not available locally, more people will need to commute using a train service that is incapable of supporting any passenger growth in the near future 'Standing room only' on train services is already the order of the day</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Significant additional employment opportunities are included in the emerging Core Strategy.</p>				
3573	Mr Barry Brownsell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3589	M J Carr	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: No adequate transport improvement proposals are put forward for Leighton Buzzard as investment appears to be directed at the Luton and Dunstable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2321	Mr David Collins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Traffic infrastructure has not been delivered to relieve the impact of new housing developments that Leighton Buzzard has seen in recent years Even if new bus schemes are delivered successfully they will not absorb all the new traffic that will be generated Comments that cycle ways are often provided on unsuitable roads and so are ill-used in the town The proposed Eastern distribution road is not a viable solution to congestion in the town and will affect Heath and Reach in particular. It may also lead to further development The road layout of the historic market town imposes a natural limit on the amount of traffic the town can support A new route into town would need to be constructed either from Grovebury Road or the A505 This new route should be constructed before further housing development is considered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2477	Rebecca Cossburn	Eggington	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Concern expressed over the levels of traffic through Eggington from LB The weight of traffic already through the village has meant that the representor's car has been crashed into twice while parked in the last couple of years Further development can only lead to more traffic through the village which will be a danger to pedestrians and property</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1616	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The Joint Committee should be aware that the concept of a spine road to serve the eastern urban extension at Leighton Buzzard is not supported by CABE.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: This is not affect a spatial matter.</p>				
2542	Martin Davey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: If there is an average of 2 people per new house, an addition of 6,000 homes represents an 50% increase in population. The town is ill-equipped to cope with such a huge increase in cars and people. The roads are already creaking under the increased weight. Particular concern regarding Heath Road which will become the main route for Milton Keynes -bound traffic.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2832	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: We note the use of the phrase "This development will (also be served by a spine road ...)" which has the tone of 'finality' about it. Surely this road (is it to be paid for and installed by the developers?) will prove too expensive for the development if it is to be of a "reduced" size. Doesn't this make the whole proposal "unsustainable" in a financial sense?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Viability evidence indicates this road is deliverable through the approach set out in the emerging Core Strategy.</p>				
3576	Mr Keith Fish	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
933	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: In a letter to John Ellis from SBDC dated 03.02.09, the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment 'were unable to offer support' to the eastern development proposals in LB; mainly due to the Eastern Distributor Road, which they said formed the first phase of a ring road, as it linked to the A505. They suggested that the main desire lines from the development should be into the town centre and that the distributor road should play a more minor role in the street hierarchy i.e., not a main route for commercial vehicles but a minor spine road.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2228	Mr Christopher Gravett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: The rail infrastructure in Leighton Buzzard is already overstretched with station car parking at capacity and the number of rail services cut in peak periods leading to overcrowding. There is a great deal of traffic congestion in the town centre despite the bypass and this will increase with further development. The junction from Eastern Way which will be used by residents on the new development will become increasingly dangerous with more traffic as it is positioned on the brow of a hill. The alternative route to the A5 via the Hockliffe junction will be equally congested.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3537	Jon Green	Eggington	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: No adequate transport improvement proposals are put forward for Leighton Buzzard as investment appears to be directed at the Luton and Dunstable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2159	Ms Jayne Green	Eggington	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: No adequate transport improvement proposals are put forward for Leighton Buzzard as investment appears to be directed at the Luton and Dunstable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2373	Edith Griffith	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Leighton Linslade is gridlocked from the volume of traffic generated by new developments. The town is positive about cycling and does not wish to see a greater number of cars using it. The new estates that have been built have very narrow service roads that together with on-street parking make it difficult for emergency vehicles to gain access when responding to emergency calls</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
244	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The siting of the proposed urban extension to the East of Leighton-Linslade makes its integration into a local transport network difficult. Because the issue of local employment has not been addressed as part of this planning exercise, it is inevitable that the inhabitants of the urban extension will need to work outside of the area and will probably commute by car. I predict Hockliffe will be very congested in the morning rush hour. Access to the Railway station will require driving through the town; few commuters are content to use buses when it is necessary to connect with a train. Placing the extension to the West of the town would make more sense from a strategic transport point of view; I note such a planning application has recently been rejected.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Significant additional employment opportunities are included in the emerging Core Strategy. Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			
845	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: A 'spine' road is not necessary and will add to pollution. This would greatly affect existing residents in a negative way.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			
2394	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: A great deal of money has been spent on the road network on the Linslade side of Leighton Buzzard but house building is being proposed on the Eastern side Development on the western side would therefore make more sense as in addition to this, commuters would be able to access the railway station more easily and even on foot.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Evidence indicates that delivering some growth to the east of Leighton Linslade is an appropriate approach to pursue through the Core Strategy. Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			
2363	Mr & Mrs John Hastwell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard is already gridlocked with traffic all day The proposal will deter people from going to Leighton Buzzard for shopping and they will use other centres like Milton Keynes instead, harming the local economy</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3579	Linda Holbrook	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2350	Mrs Jean Holmes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: More inhabitants in Leighton Buzzard will lead to more commuters and cars and therefore greater congestion Alternatives to car travel like local bus services are inadequate for most who need to commute to work and rail services are overstretched too</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2578	Anne Lathwell	Eggington	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: The congestion on the roads is becoming dangerous and our children become prisoners in our homes through fear of speeding traffic along roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A comprehensive approach to transport is being developed through the Core Strategy to support the phased delivery of necessary development.</p>				
3572	Leighton-Linlade Opposes Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2543	Mrs G Lopez	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: There is no infrastructure to support any additional volume of increased traffic and we certainly do not want any current roads becoming new thoroughfares.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2628	Mr Robert McAlister	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Despite recent road 'improvements' the streets of this town are still experiencing high levels of road congestion. Not only are the roads of this town already over capacity but there is also insufficient rail capacity. Any proposal to provide bus services, even with real time traffic information, I believe is unrealistic.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.	Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included together with all associated contingency measures.		
2629	Andrea Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The large housing developments of the Sandhills and Billington Park are partly responsible for the terrible traffic congestion in the town and this has only just been addressed with some success. Thousands more cars coming through the town centre would reverse this improvement. Leighton Linslade has had a successful start in becoming a cycle friendly town - again this initiative would be damaged by the enormous increase in traffic generated by the new development</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.	Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included together with all associated contingency measures.		
2769	Mr Robert Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The road network through Leighton Buzzard is really severely congested. Travelling across the town can take an inordinate amount of time. The trains are overcrowded. The roads will become even more congested.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.	Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included together with all associated contingency measures.		
2525	Brian Patton	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Development will increase pressure on existing gridlocked roads to MK, Luton and the M1 to London.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	In order to be 'sound' this scenario must be avoided. As the Joint Committee is aiming for a 'sound' strategy this scenario will be avoided.	This scenario must be avoided. As the Joint Committee is aiming for a 'sound' strategy this scenario will be avoided.		
2230	Nicola Roberts	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Traffic congestion is a major problem in the centre of Leighton Buzzard. The rail station is overwhelmed due to the large amount of out-commuting. Not enough train services are run from the town and the station car parking is already at capacity. Further development would make this situation even worse</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.	Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included together with all associated contingency measures.		

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
38	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The question arises as to what sequence? i.e. Roads before houses or houses before roads. The only example of roads before houses was Milton Keynes, and that was a long time ago. The recent experience is houses before roads - disaster and aggravation all around</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2385	Mr Martyn Robinson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: There have been improvements to the road network in Leighton Buzzard like the removal of traffic lights which has increased traffic flow However this will be negated by an increased volume of traffic from new residents Further congestion will arise from the fact that these new residents will have to commute away from Leighton Buzzard to find employment</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3744	Lorraine Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Roads like Vandyke Road in LB are narrow and already difficult to negotiate This development will aggravate the to situation on these sorts of roads The Planets Estate will become a rat-run with increased traffic in the area where three schools are situated The introduction of thousands of extra vehicles with this development, makes a mockery of the designation of LB as a "cycling town". Due to lack of employment within LB, commuter traffic will also increase and the rail services are also at capacity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2532	Brian Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Roads like Vandyke Road in LB are narrow and already difficult to negotiate This development will aggravate the to situation on these sorts of roads The Planets Estate will become a rat-run with increased traffic in the area where three schools are situated The introduction of thousands of extra vehicles with this development, makes a mockery of the designation of LB as a "cycling town". Due to lack of employment within LB, commuter traffic will also increase and the rail services are also at capacity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3566	Mr C Shane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2301	Cindy Sharp	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Roads and railways in Leighton Buzzard are already overburdened and will not be able to cope with additional traffic generated by new residents</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2746	Stephen Sheppard	Eggington	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed 2500 dwellings for Leighton Linslade cannot be integrated into the already congested and inadequate road ad rail links.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2295	Mrs Christine Simmonds	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard has an established/historic network of roads that cannot be altered These roads are already at capacity and further congestion will discourage people from shopping in the town centre</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2470	Jacqui Sparks	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Currently the roads are often gridlocked even with the removal of traffic lights in favour of roundabouts so the two cannot accommodate further traffic generated by new housing development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2748	Sue Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
Comment: The proposed 2500 dwellings for Leighton Linslade cannot be integrated into the already congested and inadequate road ad rail links.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
3564	Mr David Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
3582	Edward Syrett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
Comment: The investment in transport is directed solely at Luton and Dunstable so the already congested road and rail links will not be able to accommodate the traffic generated by 2500 additional dwellings				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
1218	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.6	No
Comment: There is mention of "alternatives to the private car" but no specific mention of cycling and walking - this is not acceptable if wishing to promote the 'green growth area' concept. Throughout much of this chapter there is little mention of cycling and walking until late on (5.64). The need for development to link infrastructure, including where people live, work, go to school and seek recreation, via walking and cycling, should be specified.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Walking/cycling are mentioned in paras 5.61-5.64.				
2637	Mr Michael Turton	Linslade	Para. 5.6	No
Comment: Traffic flow through the town centre has only just been alleviated through an excellent reworking of the road system and together with the new bypass. Dumping further housing on the town will bring that back to square one.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2728	Carrie Tyas	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: As it stands mornings are very busy with two local schools on route to the A5 and with this development it will bring more vehicles to the roads.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2334	Mr Martin Walker	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: No plans to increase the road network or link to the Leighton Buzzard bypass so existing roads will be unable to cope with increased traffic. The plans would increase the amount of traffic on the notoriously dangerous crossroads at Vandyke Road which would result in more accidents. Dual carriageways are needed to accommodate increased traffic such as those in Milton Keynes New roads need to be built to take the traffic to the M1, the bypass or the station.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
477	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: This will further increase motor vehicle mileage and emissions.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2633	Mr Ray Watkins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Traffic passing through the centre of town has a choice of only two main single-carriageway routes: Hockliffe Road and Vandyke Road, These routes are already over-congested, without the additional traffic generated by the new development.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
995	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: I note the use of the phrase "This development will (also be served by a spine road ....) which has the tone of finality about it. Surely this road (which is to be paid for and installed by the developers?) will be too expensive for the development if it is to be of a "reduced" size. Doesn't this make the whole proposal "unsustainable" in a financial sense?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Viability evidence indicates this road is deliverable through the approach set out in the emerging Core Strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
91	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.6	No
<p>Comment: Why this witch-hunt against the use of private cars? Compared to building on the countryside in such large scales, the carbon footprint of modern cars is less by comparison. I appreciate the need for better public transport - but better does not = more.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This does not affect a spatial matter.</p>				
621	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: "It will also be necessary to deliver the Luton Eastern Bypass so appropriate accessibility for private cars and commercial vehicles is provided." Strongly object to this for two reasons: 1. conflating two different points, housing development and long distance travel - aren't all the people in this propose development meant to cycling or travelling by bus to Luton; 2. encouraging further road traffic will have detrimental effects for Hitchin; 3. hard to see how this fits in with "sustainability"</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
18	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: north Herts. will be delighted to provide an infrastructure for a development they do not want!!!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2276	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal. Proposed urban extension does not necessitate a bypass which has more to do with keeping traffic out of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1519	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: The reference to NHDC is nonsensical. Residents of any development in this area would have an 'affinity' with Luton rather than Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Not a matter the LDF can influence</p>				
3233	Christine Davy	No address	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: This paragraph does not mention Shared Space or Home Zones. I think both of these are viable for new developments. These will help in making the highway feel more like a public space where pedestrians and cyclists are more important than vehicles.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Shared space/home zones are a matter for the detailed layout of the individual developments which will be addressed in more detailed LDF documents, such matters are covered by Government and local design guidance.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4010	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.7	Yes
<p>Comment: The wording should be amended to reflect that off-site delivery is dependent on feasibility and viability. Justify the need for the eastern bypass, the phasing of such infrastructure and define the appropriate level of car accessibility. It is inappropriate to state that the bypass is necessary until the Transport Appraisal identifies the operation of the road network without such a bypass. The strategy is silent on the benefit of the road in it's 'bypass' function or its benefits to airport expansion. If the need for the bypass is proven, we would be able to deliver land under our control to facilitate its delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
703	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: I object to this on the grounds the Luton Easterly Bypass will serve the long distance motorist rather than the East of Luton extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
399	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: I object to this. The East of Luton urban extension does not in itself justify a Luton Easterly Bypass. The bypass will be used to take long-distance traffic around the extension rather than serving it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
400	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: I object to this. The East of Luton urban extension does not in itself justify a Luton Easterly Bypass. The bypass will be used to take long-distance traffic around the extension rather than serving it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1325	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: Even if the extension to the east of Luton was justified, or was ever approved, I don't see how this would warrant the construction of a Luton Easterly Bypass. This would not be serving residents in the East of Luton, but would be more likely to be used by long distance traffic generally.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
169	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: How can the North Hertfordshire District LDF ensure that appropriate additional strategic public transport infrastructure will be delivered to link this development with the existing main conurbation? This is, as previously stated a LUTON problem. There is no doubt that the Luton Eastern Bypass is sorely needed. This will however, not address the transport problem mentioned above, that the main route into Luton - Crawley Green Road - is currently barely sufficient for the level of traffic already experienced. The addition of several thousand houses to the east of Luton will mean a substantial number of extra vehicles wishing to use this route. This is simply not a workable outcome. Traffic on this route would come to a complete standstill at busy times. It already does, so how can extra traffic be borne? Talk of public transport is ridiculous. Most people wish to use the convenience of their cars. Public transport is currently completely useless.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1412	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: Eastern bypass connecting the A505 to Airport Way will cater for traffic from north Herts going to the Airport and through traffic , as well as any non-local travel from the east of Luton development. In particular it will reduce traffic (and therefore emissions) on the dual carriageway section of Hitchin Road and Vauxhall Way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2619	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: The proposed east of Luton extension does not in itself justify a Luton Easterly Bypass. This has more to do with taking long-distance traffic around the conurbation rather than serving the east of Luton extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
478	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: Strong objection. North Hertfordshire does not need or want any new roads. It desires, instead, to protect at all costs the small amount of countryside now remaining.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivery of growth is likely to require the provision of new infrastructure.</p>				
1479	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: I object to this strongly - a bypass will help people drive round Luton, not go to a new bit of it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3024	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: Object. The proposed East of Luton urban extension does not in itself justify a Luton Eastern Bypass . It has more to do with taking log-distance traffic around the conurbation rather than serving the East of Luton Extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
613	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.7	No
<p>Comment: North Herts have not committed to the busway extension. The eastern extension of the Luton northern bypass (black route) is still far from planned. - investigation work is still ongoing. The route has major problems, not least how it might terminate near London Luton airport. Simple arithmetic says this would be unaffordable without huge public subsidies.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
620	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: "is considered that bringing forward a smaller number of larger scale urban extensions is the most sustainable way forward and is therefore is the preferred approach" Two points: a. assumption that people want to live in large scale homogenous (poor architecture etc) developments. Not the case; b. small scale fits better with sustainability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Large scale developments will consist of smaller individual areas each with their own character: this is not a level of detail for the Core Strategy to address.</p>				
2277	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposal. No evidence of what constitutes 'critical mass' or that infrastructure of the appropriate scale should not be provided for small scale extensions. Critical mass depends on a number of variables. Conflict between East of Luton identified as a larger extension but not seen as a first priority.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				
4011	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Qualify the text to recognise the need to identify an appropriate phasing mechanism for infrastructure and identify those schemes that solely benefit development as opposed to those with a wider benefit and shared funding/ responsibility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				
704	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: I object as there is no evidence to support this. The statement is based on an ideal, rather than a true study of actual requirements.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
402	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: I object to this. Please show me the evidence that the "critical mass" of each of the proposed urban extensions is necessary to provide infrastructure at the appropriate scale. Surely this depends on a range of factors including location, incidence of existing infrastructure, interaction with other settlements outside of the sub-region and so forth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				
1415	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: I have to object to this idea. Is there any evidence that the 'critical mass' of each proposed extension is necessary to provide infrastructure at the appropriate scale? This depends on a range of factors including geographical location, existing infrastructure and interaction with other settlements outside of the sub-region, as a few examples.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				
292	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: The bypass is entirely unacceptable. It would increase traffic, destroy countryside, spoil local amenities and blight existing communities. It would also draw more traffic into nearby towns and villages, such as Hitchin. If Hitchin also built a bypass, then along with the Luton bypass, the two would destroy the entire stretch of countryside between the two towns. Rural communities would become ghettos caught between roads and ruined by traffic noise.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivery of growth is likely to require the provision of new infrastructure.</p>				
479	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: All development should be confined to increasing the density of existing major towns, thereby obviating the need for new road building.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paras 4.21-4.30 indicate there is insufficient land within urban areas to accommodate the Governments growth requirements for the area.</p>				
1483	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: You talk about critical mass and yet earlier you talk about preserving villages and small communities of character. This makes very little sense. In reality isn't this led by developers who see larger profits in larger, more concentrated developments?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				
3026	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.8	No
<p>Comment: There is no evidence linking the critical mass of each proposed urban extension to the provision of an appropriate scale of infrastructure. It depends on a range of factors.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Critical Mass of larger scale developments is covered further in paras 4.21-4.30.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3317	Associate		Para. 5.9	No
<p>Comment: Given the uncertainty and costs associated with the East of Luton urban extension and related bypass; there is clearly not a high level of accessibility to the national transport network as suggested and there may well not be during the plan period. Conversely, the L&amp;G land south west of M1J10A is exceptionally well located in terms of both criteria.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2278	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.9	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed commercial extension of Luton airport into N Herts. Loss of valuable green land Further impact on villages from noise and light pollution Threat of encroaching urbanisation</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
3697	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.9	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed employment site (Century Park): Would vandalise and urbanise prime agricultural and abolish footpaths used by residents of Wigmore, Darley Hall and Breachwood Green. It would pollute the skyline and open views and generate traffic which would rat run through villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Century Park is already allocated for development in the current Luton Local Plan.</p>				
1742	David Lock Associates	Milton Keynes	Para. 5.9	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the promotion of strategic employment sites in areas with high levels of accessibility to the national transport network and particularly around the proposed Junction 11a and the Midland Main Line.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Accessibility is a key factor when locating such uses.</p>				
4012	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.9	Yes
<p>Comment: We recognise the merit of focussing strategic employment sites in areas with high levels of accessibility to the national transport network, in particular the airport.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Accessibility is a key factor when locating such uses.</p>				
2833	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.9	No
<p>Comment: Given that there is only "passenger" connectivity at Leighton Station, how can this be used for "strategic employment sites" when the mainline rail service is at least a mile or more (as the crow flies!) from any current or planned employment area?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Leighton Buzzard station is not allocated as a strategic employment site.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1420	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.9	Yes
<p>Comment: A Strategic Employment Site at J10a also provides an opportunity for development with high levels of accessibility to the national transport network in accordance with Policy 5.9. Furthermore, linked with the provision of a Park and Ride site, this location would become a transport nodal point and support the sustainable transport strategy for Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Continue ongoing objective evaluation of all alternative sites for potential growth related development prior to the next: Core Strategy pre-submission stage .</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of a strategic employment site around J10a is the most appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies. The Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&amp;R site south of Luton.</p>				
996	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.9	No
<p>Comment: Given that there is only "passenger" connectivity at Leighton station, how will this be used for "strategic employment sites" when the mainline rail service is at least a mile or more (as the crow flies!) from any employment area?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Leighton Buzzard station is not allocated as a strategic employment site.</p>				
614	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.9	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree wholeheartedly that this is essential and even with the locations suggested. The east of Luton residents are likely to find the new employment more difficult to access than people outside the area - this in part negates the benefits to the area being planned for.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy ensures that residents of East of Luton will have access to employment facilities.</p>				
170	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 5.11	No
<p>Comment: This is a nonsensical statement! To get to railway stations, most people need their cars, to give one example. Bus services are completely inadequate. The writer of this paragraph does not seem to understand why the majority of journeys are undertaken by car. People are NOT stupid as the writer seems to suggest. The question to ask is: why are people continuing to use their cars? The answer is that public transport, cycling and walking DO NOT offer viable alternatives for many journeys.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver a balanced approach to transport with good alternatives available to the private car as well as ensuring the private car is considered when making spatial decisions.</p>				
1422	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.11	Yes
<p>Comment: A Park and Ride site at J10a would offer a very viable alternative to the private car for trips from the south into Luton town centre thus providing further opportunities to reduce car trips on key corridors with the resultant effect on the environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Continue ongoing objective evaluation of all alternative sites for potential growth related development prior to the next: Core Strategy pre-submission stage .</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of a strategic employment site around J10a is the most appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
615	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.11	No
Comment: Rail links to Milton Keynes do not exist - it is only a bus route from Luton to Milton Keynes.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Rail services to Milton Keynes operate from Leighton Buzzard station.				
2280	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.12	No
Comment: Also paras 5.13 and 5.14 Continued urbanisation of this part of England is inappropriate and unacceptable. Document makes equal and opposing claims: car ownership and pollution are too high, but 41,700 new homes with people aspiring to own cars will solve this problem.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
625	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.13	No
Comment: What evidence is there to show that building further roads reduces congestion? It may delay it or transfer it but to suggest that it eradicates congestion is absurd.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Strategic bypasses will reduce through and cross-conurbation traffic and, combined with encouraging local travel by PT/walk/cycle, will contribute to minimising congestion, and indeed reduce congestion in some parts of the area.				
144	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.13	Yes
Comment: The M1 and Railway line does restrict east-west movement across the wider conurbation and cause traffic funnelling. Is there the potential with bridges and tunnels to create some strategic building to limit the impact of this?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
3235	Christine Davy	No address	Para. 5.13	No
Comment: There is no mention of ensuring that schools are built to accommodate the children from the new developments. Luton already has a problem with not enough school places in the locations they are needed. There is also no mention of safe cycling/walking routes to schools.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Provision of schools in the new developments is included in the social and community infrastructure needs covered in ch 8 of the Core Strategy.				
616	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.13	No
Comment: Traffic in the main conurbations can be very bad. The congestion in Dunstable is likely to be eased by its northern bypass. The study need to consider not just the major conurbations cited but also the effect on traffic congestion on the A505 and in/around Hitchin. The effect on Hitchin has not been considered				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The traffic effects on principal roads in the Hitchin area have been considered.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
145	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Speeding in Luton on residential roads is a very real issue; in general and as people bypass traffic black spots. More needs to be done in enforcement, rather than just signs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
171	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 5.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed! Why then does the Core Strategy seek to develop in the area to the east of Luton, currently in N Herts district. All the problems mentioned in this paragraph most certainly apply to the connecting corridor of Crawley Green road. Noting in the Strategy addresses the much greater problem that would be caused in this corridor, should the proposed development succeed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1763	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 5.14	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC notes the observation at paragraph 5.14 of the Preferred Options which states that congestion in both the principal urban areas is having an increasing impact on journey times and the reliability of journeys. The congestion also has other impacts on the quality of life in the area. NLC contends that the provision of the Luton Northern Bypass is important in not only supporting the wider growth agenda but also in addressing the issues described at paragraph 5.14 of the Preferred Options document. NLC endorses paragraphs 5.28 and 5.30 of the Preferred Options wherein reference is made to a potential park and ride site on the A6 to the north of Luton. Such a facility would, in combination with the LNB, address some of the concerns expressed at paragraph 5.14 of the Preferred Options</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1532	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.14	Yes
<p>Comment: The main issue is the lack of alternatives to car. There are very few buses in Leighton Buzzard that start running before 9.00 am. The information of sustainable transport options is minimal. There has been cycling strategy in Dunstable. There needs to be a programme of travel planning and huge increase in promotion and the supporting cycling and walking.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
480	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Then introduce congestion charging and low emission zones.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: LTP sets out a phased approach to dealing with congestion, with the implementation of schemes/initiatives to manage the network and encourage greater use of sustainable modes of transport.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
618	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.14	No
<p>Comment: Congestion is acute in Luton particularly on certain access routes, of which Crawley Green road is one. The development east of Luton will simply add to this congestion as the suggested road infrastructure does nothing to ease the flow of traffic into the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2316	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.15	No
<p>Comment: The modelling undertaken for the plan is not considered robust. The Transport Appraisal contains little or no commentary on public transport capacity, travelling speeds or interchange penalties. The locations and benefits of bus priority measures are not detailed. No assessments have been undertaken for the PM peak. The traffic related conditions on the overall network are different during the peak periods and could represent worst case scenario. Further clarifications are required to validate the new 2007 base model. The conclusion in paragraph 7.1.6 of the TA is debatable as it is generally understood that additional highway capacity encourages more car travel. There is no acknowledgement in the modelling of induced traffic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. The impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
619	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.15	No
<p>Comment: Though interesting, the results are inconclusive. The no-bypass options were still being studied when the decisions on the Preferred Options were taken</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1423	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.16	No
<p>Comment: There are no proposals for transport infrastructure which will help relieve congestion in the south and the potential for a Park and Ride at junction 10a is entirely complimentary and supportive to this goal. This is recognised in current policy within the Local Transport Plan and Adopted Local Plan which provides for the provision of Park and Ride in this location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&amp;R site south of Luton.</p>				
481	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.16	Yes
<p>Comment: Need to disincentivise road traffic use through congestion charging and implementation of low emission zones.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: LTP sets out a phased approach to dealing with congestion, with the implementation of schemes/initiatives to manage the network and encourage greater use of sustainable modes of transport.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
626	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.17	No
<p>Comment: "This approach integrates well with national, regional and sub-regional policy which states that development in Growth Areas should be sustainable." I had no idea that large scale development equalled sustainability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sustainability is a broad concept</p>				
146	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.17	Yes
<p>Comment: I agree that road links and amenities and services need to be in place in the new areas before housing development is completed. Otherwise it will only place even greater demand on those areas which are already stretched and provide poor quality environment and services to the new areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1618	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.17	No
<p>Comment: Given our opposition to the concept of an East of Luton urban extension, it should be noted here that we also oppose the concept of an East Luton Bypass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
4013	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.17	No
<p>Comment: It has not been demonstrated how transport improvements are a pre-requisite of some preferred development. This should be qualified in terms of further testing, phasing and funding responsibility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3845	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 5.17	No
<p>Comment: Building new bypasses on the premise that these will reduce congestion is not compatible with policy at any level. The Halcrow model is deficient in not making any allowance for the likely increase in strategic trips that will arise as a result of the expansion of road capacity around the fringes of Luton. Although the Halcrow Assessment ignored induced traffic, the consultants still conclude that the benefits of a Northern Bypass would be 'marginal'. This conclusion is also supported by Peter Brett Associates work undertaken on behalf of Bedfordshire County Council .</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1424	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.17	Yes
<p>Comment: A Strategic Employment Site at J10a incorporating a park and ride would integrate well with National, regional and sub-regional policy which states that development in Growth Areas should be sustainable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Continue ongoing objective evaluation of all alternative sites for potential growth related development prior to the next: Core Strategy pre-submission stage .</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of a strategic employment site around J10a is the most appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies. The Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&amp;R site south of Luton.</p>				
622	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.17	No
<p>Comment: The Luton northern bypass (black route) intrudes into the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As such this is illegal. The Highways Agency have said that they do not support such a bypass. The bypass possible routes towards the London Luton Airport are problematic, to say the least</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPS 7 allows development in AONBs in exceptional circumstances. All final bypass routes included in the Core Strategy will be deliverable in every way.</p>				
4014	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The approach relying upon DASTS is generally supported.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1856	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 5.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Include flood risk reduction alongside climate change. Transport schemes need to be appropriately designed to ensure flood risk reduction and the management of natural catchments. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy addresses issues of Climate Change issues.</p>				
3704	Ruth Sayers	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.18	No
<p>Comment: No specific study has been carried-out to identify the effects on Leighton Linslade townspeople of traffic and aircraft fumes mixed with silica particulates from open-cast quarrying. If we add 4,000+ homes and 6,000+ cars, might we be cooking up a chemical soup to the detriment of the town and health of its residents? Please investigate before any final decisions are made.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Continue work on the Health Impact Assessment</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a matter covered under the Minerals and Waste Development Plan not the Core Strategy. That said a Health Impact Assessment is being undertaken to measure the health related issues related to the Core Strategy.</p>				
4015	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.21	Yes
<p>Comment: Supported, subject to testing how successful the group of transport infrastructure proposals put forward will be to remove through-traffic and enable public transport to perform efficiently.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2834	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.21	Yes
Comment: Yes! Yes! Can we have Traffic calming, please!!				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Not a spatial matter				
997	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.21	Yes
Comment: Yes! Yes! Traffic calming, please!!				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Not a spatial matter				
623	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.21	No
Comment: The bypass consultations took place almost entirely in Luton & South Beds. Had more than 1 consultation taken place in North Herts then the results may well have been different. It is completely bizarre that North Herts District Council were not even consulted. The Highways Agency does not agree and the no-bypass option is still being worked on.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council were consulted.				
624	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.21	No
Comment: The bypass consultations took place almost entirely in Luton & South Beds. Had more than 1 consultation taken place in North Herts then the results may well have been different. It is completely bizarre that North Herts District Council were not even consulted. The Highways Agency does not agree and the no-bypass option is still being worked on.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: North Herts. District Council were consulted.				
4016	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.22	Yes
Comment: Differentiate between the infrastructure that is of an appropriate scale to development and that which requires additional funding to be sourced, reflecting its development access function and strategic benefit.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
627	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.23	No
Comment: The Key Diagram is far from clear - this is so important that it needs a more detailed and larger scale diagram				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Include a simpler approach regarding the visual representation of spatial data in the next version of the Core Strategy.				
JC Reason for Response: A simpler approach will be pursued regarding the visual representation of spatial data in the next version of the emerging Core Strategy.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2323	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.24	No
<p>Comment: The Strategy fails to achieve its aims as the transport model confirms public transport proposals are limited. Modal share of public transport "From" trips in the morning peak stay between 3-4% from 2007 to 2026. No cost-benefit analysis has been provided. □ The report to the Joint Committee, (20/03/09), asserts a central building block of the Strategy is to ensure new development is accessible by high quality public transport. Proposals in the Transport Appraisal are geared towards private vehicles rather than public transport. There is little mention of walking and cycling. □ The public transport elements are insufficient to achieve stated aspirations. Bus priority schemes alone have only a marginal affect on achieving mode shift. It takes a variety of measures to increase public transport mode share. Successful schemes include measures such as enhanced information; wider coverage of routes; improved bus shelters and access to them; reduced waiting times and faster journey times.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy aims to deliver a balanced approach to transport with good alternatives available to the private car as well as ensuring the private car is considered when making spatial decisions.			
2282	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.25	Yes
<p>Comment: And para 5.26 "Agree"</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	N/A			
2835	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.25	No
<p>Comment: The West-coast mainline has reached (or is reaching) capacity, since more commuters from further North (up the line) are already now added to the commuter services, and because of the 'capacity issue' more trains from the north are now NOT stopping at Leighton station.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	This is not a matter the Core Strategy can address.			
245	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.25	No
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy notes that the West Coast Main Line has recently been upgraded, without acknowledging that this was actually to enable a high-frequency long-distance passenger train service. Benefits to commuter services have been limited to an increase in the length of trains, rather than frequency. I understand that these two factors have now reached their limit i.e. there are no opportunities for additional 'Rush Hour' trains serving Leighton Buzzard, neither can the trains be lengthened beyond 12 coaches. Scrutiny of the London Midland timetable will reveal that the majority of Rush Hour trains are already 12 coaches long and, from daily experience, I know that they are regularly full, with passengers standing all the way to Euston. Any assumption that train services to London will be able to absorb additional demand from inhabitants of the Urban Extension is therefore flawed.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Network Rail are consulted on the emerging Core Strategy			
998	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.25	No
<p>Comment: The West-coast mainline has however, reached capacity, since commuters from further North (up the line) are already now added to the commuter services, and because of the capacity issue more trains from the north are NOT stopping at Leighton station.</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Network Rail are consulted on the emerging Core Strategy			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4017	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.26	Yes
Comment: Initiatives regarding the Luton-Dunstable Busway are supported.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
629	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.26	No
Comment: This doesn't serve Stopsley or Wigmore and is connected neither to the proposed aquatic centre in Stopsley nor to Luton & Dunstable Hospital. This will not alleviate traffic congestion to the east of Luton.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Core route of the Luton Dunstable Bus way does not serve the Stopsley and Wigmore areas. However these areas can be served by a combination of services operating on Bus way extensions to serve the east of Luton development together with P&R services.				
2283	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.27	No
Comment: Object to proposed development because of damage to the environment				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The strategy seeks to locate development in less sensitive areas and to mitigate impact				
2327	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.27	No
Comment: Table 1.1 in the appraisal lists the proposed transport improvements. Those for the Emerging Preferred Core Strategy Scenario involve several major road schemes along with a variety of bus priority measures, including some extensions to the busway. The proposals for the Enhanced Emerging Preferred LDF Core Strategy involve five major road schemes, with no public transport schemes. The consultation document suggests that services of at least 4 buses per hour will operate through the specific blocks of development, significantly below the level of service needed to achieve modal shift. Cities of comparable size where bus services offer a realistic alternative to car have much higher frequencies. Similarly, the 5 buses per hour offered on the extended busway does not represent a notable step change in provision.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
2357	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.27	No
Comment: Ultimately the Core Strategy cannot contain substantive references to development in North Hertfordshire. The County Council is therefore concerned about some of the statements made in the POCD if these were to materialise in any similar form in the ultimately approved Core Strategy. Some examples of current references which are considered inappropriate for reason outlined above include: <input type="checkbox"/> - Preferred Option CS1 - specifically the inclusion of the reference to development East of Luton and reference to North Hertfordshire. <input type="checkbox"/> - Key Diagram - the level of detail is inappropriate. This detail should also be removed from any later stages of the document. <input type="checkbox"/> - Paragraph 4.28, 5.27, 5.29 and 5.32 all contain too much detail e.g. the size of the development.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy makes appropriate references to North Hertfordshire				
630	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.27	No
Comment: Needs commitment by North Herts District Council, who are actively opposing the development EoL				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: North Hertfordshire District Council are involved in the preparation of the Core Strategy				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1620	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.28	No
<p>Comment: We question the case for a Park and Ride facility at the A5/A505 junction given the high level of intrusive visual impact it will have at this location, and that of the 4 Park and Ride facilities proposed it has the least potential patronage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence indicates that a P&amp;R site in this location is necessary.</p>				
2328	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.28	No
<p>Comment: The corollary of improved public transport is traffic restraint. Traffic congestion diminishes bus reliability and increases operating costs. Since additional road capacity provides only a temporary relief from congestion, the road schemes proposed in the various scenarios would need to be complemented by measures such as the control and pricing of parking. There appears to be no mention of a parking strategy in the transport appraisal. This is likely to be a problem if it is expected that local operators are expected to provide additional bus services on a commercial basis. Proposals for Park and Ride need to be accompanied by an effective parking/routing strategy which makes parking within the town centre less attractive and frequent, low cost buses into the town centre.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1425	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.28	No
<p>Comment: A Park and Ride site at J10a should be included in this list as per the Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 paragraph 12.37 which states that "In particular, it is felt that sites around the M1 junction 10a and the northern edge of the conurbation could provide viable park and ride locations in the medium to long term" and Policy SA1 of the Local Plan 2001-2011 regarding a park and ride facility at this location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&amp;R site south of Luton.</p>				
1503	The Crown Estate	London	Para. 5.28	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the provision of P&amp;R sites but in the context of a complete bypass M1 to A505.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
772	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 5.28	No
<p>Comment: Not enough. Put one on the A505 at the entrance to Luton; expand the provision at the Luton Airport Parkway station and provide buses from here to locations other than the airport.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Continue to propose a P&amp; R site at this location</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A P&amp;R site on the A505 east of Luton is proposed</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
628	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.29	No
<p>Comment: Given these normally run at a loss, who will pay? Has Luton considered the economic effect of a reduction in parking revenue?</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2285	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.29	No
<p>Comment: Object as it will permanently damage the environment and only benefits Luton, not the local villages</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1623	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.29	No
<p>Comment: Because we oppose any urban extension or bypass development into North Herts, it follows that we also oppose any Park and Ride facility on the A505 east of Luton in a location that is based on such developments taking place.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
4018	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.29	No
<p>Comment: There is no evidence supporting the need for park-and-ride east of Luton. Additional detailed appraisal is required to identify the benefit of a multi-modal interchange on the A505 and how this might be incorporated within EoL proposals in the vicinity of the A6/ A505 link road.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence indicates that a P&amp;R site in this location is necessary.</p>				
75	Mr Martyn Garrett	Luton	Para. 5.29	No
<p>Comment: Why no Park and Ride site at the south of Luton i.e. M1 J10 area to reduce traffic into Luton?</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes for a P&amp;R site south of Luton.</p>				
2358	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.29	No
<p>Comment: Ultimately the Core Strategy cannot contain substantive references to development in North Hertfordshire. The County Council is therefore concerned about some of the statements made in the POCD if these were to materialise in any similar form in the ultimately approved Core Strategy. Some examples of current references which are considered inappropriate for reason outlined above include: - Preferred Option CS1 - specifically the inclusion of the reference to development East of Luton and reference to North Hertfordshire. - Key Diagram - the level of detail is inappropriate. This detail should also be removed from any later stages of the document. - Paragraph 4.28, 5.27, 5.29 and 5.32 all contain too much detail e.g. the size of the development.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include appropriate references to North Hertfordshire.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1426	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.29	No
Comment: A park and ride site at J10a should be included in this list as per the Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 and the Local Plan 2001-2011 (Policy SA1).				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				
3318	Associate		Para. 5.30	No
Comment: L&G proposals which include park-and -ride close to J10A of the M1 for employees of the airport and park-and-ride for those leaving the M1 and wanting to visit Luton town centre is not considered and has not been assessed.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of a strategic employment site around J10a is the most appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies. The Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				
1377	Mr Martin Howes	Luton	Para. 5.30	Yes
Comment: The Park and Ride scheme at Butterfield on the A505 should be implemented without further delay. If this scheme is not implemented soon it will be clear that the local authorities' commitment to Park and Ride is all talk and no action.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Delivery of P&R is important.				
1427	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.30	No
Comment: It is not clear if the site at J10a included in this assessment and if not, why not? The site should be included in further work supporting the transport strategy and the results of the assessment made available.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				
39	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.31	No
Comment: Surely the best option would be to link the Park and Ride site with the guided busway. not reducing capacity on already congested roads				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Where practical, the P&R sites would be linked with the proposed bus way extensions.				
1428	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.31	No
Comment: Paragraph 12.37 of the Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis Local Transport Plan 2006-2011 regarding a park and ride site at M1 J10a states that 'Good bus priority measures on routes into the main town centres would be essential for these sites to be viable, and Translink and the East Luton Corridor (ELC) can help to provide the required fast routes into Luton town centre.' It should be noted that the A1081, and ELC should be identified as a transport corridor to support the provision of Park and Ride at J10a.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4020	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.32	Yes
Comment: Support for bus prioritisation measures.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
2359	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.32	No
Comment: Ultimately the Core Strategy cannot contain substantive references to development in North Hertfordshire. The County Council is therefore concerned about some of the statements made in the POCD if these were to materialise in any similar form in the ultimately approved Core Strategy. Some examples of current references which are considered inappropriate for reason outlined above include: - Preferred Option CS1 - specifically the inclusion of the reference to development East of Luton and reference to North Hertfordshire. - Key Diagram - the level of detail is inappropriate. This detail should also be removed from any later stages of the document. - Paragraph 4.28, 5.27, 5.29 and 5.32 all contain too much detail e.g. the size of the development.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will include appropriate references to North Hertfordshire.				
632	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.32	No
Comment: The work on what this means with an east of Luton development has still to be done.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
2836	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.33	No
Comment: This will not be of any value to residents of the proposed Eastern development! It therefore has no relevance to this consultation.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
40	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.33	No
Comment: This is not sensible. The extent of bus traffic down these roads is almost non existent - 1 per hour! The road has already been compromised by the addition of a cycle lane. All this does is generate even more frustration which will impact upon safety. Bus lanes in congested urban areas such as cities with suitable width roads are beneficial. The bus lane serving the Oxford Park and Ride being a good example which benefits all road users. This proposal would benefit no one and aggravate many				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
999	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.33	No
Comment: Not of any value to users at the proposed Eastern development then!!				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1625	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.34	No
<p>Comment: We note the continuing support given in the Strategy to the concept of a Luton North parkway rail station, but quite clearly this cannot realistically proceed if one or other of the existing well-located rail stations at Leagrave and Harlington has to close. We consider that in addition to a 'parkway' based transport strategy there has to be a 'no parkway' based transport strategy as well.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2326	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.34	No
<p>Comment: There is also uncertainty associated with the potential impacts of the proposed routing of the transport links and the transport interchange points. These need to be consolidated collaboratively prior to finalizing the Core Strategy document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2329	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.34	Yes
<p>Comment: There is mention of an aspiration for a new station, however, this may require the closure of another station and therefore its deliverability is uncertain.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
737	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 5.35	Yes
<p>Comment: As stated above, we have reservations regarding a Park and Ride facility on the A6 to the north of Luton in terms of its impact on the setting of Dray's Ditches Scheduled Monument, and a similar facility to the east of Luton on the integrity of Putteridge Bury Historic Park and Garden. Both proposals will require careful planning and siting to minimise the impacts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Continue to consider features of historic importance.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The presence of features of historic importance are appropriately considered when formulating the Core Strategy</p>				
1317	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 5.35	No
<p>Comment: Object to Policy CS3 and relevant supporting text in Section 5 - Please see separately submitted documentation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3334	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Para. 5.35	Yes
<p>Comment: Although supportive in principle of the proposed park-and-ride facilities, the best location for a site on the A6 north of Luton is on the east side of this road. This could be incorporated on the planning and implementation of the North of Luton urban extension at submission stage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Detailed location will be addressed through more detailed planning documents.</p>				
1219	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.35	No
<p>Comment: The proposed policy lacks reference to cycling and walking, either in general terms or with regard to specific schemes or delivery of cycle strategy/Right of Way Improvement Plan objectives (while there are specific road schemes mentioned).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Walking/cycling are mentioned in paras 5.61-5.64, although this relates to key Principles and not detailed schemes.</p>				
631	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: because they amount to little more than a vapid unfounded wish list.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
178	Dr Steve Barley	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal. Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District' as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on - and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
3018	Holly Barnard	Lilley	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: States that the additions to the guided busway are inadequate and unworkable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Bus way is appropriate and deliverable</p>				
3162	Sue Barnard	Lilley	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The proposed additions and extensions to the guided busway are inadequate and unworkable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The guided bus way is an important element of transport infrastructure in the growth area</p>				
1962	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Cross-links must be established alongside the radial transport network. Bus routes must reflect the needs of the new communities. What will be the transport impact on the congested centre of Luton as the conurbation is extended?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1687	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 5	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Agreed with strategy without further comment				
19	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley	Q. 5	No
Comment: you are developing roads in the wrong areas of countryside. North Herts. will not finance the roads and what will happen to JCT 8 of A1 when the Stevenage development is finalised?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
2287	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 5	No
Comment: Object to East of Luton urban extension and therefore see related road infrastructure as unnecessary.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
1945	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	Yes
Comment: This addresses the key issues in the SCS. We welcome the proposals to extend the bus way to the proposed extensions. In line with the SCS, the guided bus way should be extended to Leighton Buzzard and Milton Keynes if sound and achievable. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
1808	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 5	No
Comment: The wealth of evidence suggests that an alternative package of sustainable transport measures should be introduced instead of the bypass options. There is no justification for the northern and eastern bypass proposals, which would be contrary to national policy (PPS7). The bypasses should be removed from the Core Strategy and key diagram. <input type="checkbox"/> The 'cut and cover' tunnelling is not a sustainable option as environmental or historic resources would be destroyed during the operation. If an outer bypass is maintained as a preferred option, the only way that this could be achieved would be if the whole of its alignment was to be in a properly constructed tunnel. Any road within the AONB or its setting would have a disastrous impact on the landscape and tranquility of the AONB, particularly when taking account of the likely form of the road and its associated lighting and signage.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery <input type="checkbox"/> Continue to consider features of historic importance.				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. <input type="checkbox"/>				
The presence of features of historic importance are appropriately considered when formulating the Core Strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1810	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Board objects to Bypass options but is concerned about their deliverability as there is a huge reliance on the cooperation of a neighbouring local planning authority and the Core strategy is based on an assumption that this will be forthcoming. The Board is very sceptical about this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3251	Mr M E Clarke	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The Luton-Dunstable Busway will be an expensive waste of money. Half the old railway is still in place - expand and upgrade that.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector.</p>				
3602	Ellie Clarke	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No I do not support the proposal to provide a park and ride site on the A505 east of Luton as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
223	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: I am anti any proposal that will carve up beautiful Hertfordshire countryside to put in place additional road systems.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
275	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The focus is far too strongly based around a Luton-Dunstable bus way. I feel a Luton-Dunstable tram link along the old branch line route would be far more effective, have a much bigger impact on congestion (not take up road space), provide a real effective and reliable alternative (not affected by traffic jams and road works) and deliver far more fully on both your environmental green growth aims and those to improve Luton's status (by boasting a tram link). I should hope National, European or Lottery funding could be sought for such a project. Most of the infrastructure in terms of the route and bridges is still there to make such a tram route linking both town centres a real possibility/opportunity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1520	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: There seems to be an expectation that North Herts should effectively service Luton's transport needs. Adding bus lanes will exacerbate, not improve, the situation as the A505 is used as an access route to the M1 south.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1399	Councillor Jenny Davies	Luton	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Because they seem to be based on the ludicrous notion that people will use public transport instead of cars. Rail is too expensive for ordinary people, especially families, to use and buses are unreliable and often dirty. Butterfield Business Park provided insufficient parking space for course users on the understanding that they would use the buses provided. They did not - the came by car and parked all over a neighbouring residential area and insulted, in the most unpleasant terms, residents who complained. This will be no different and translink is a waste of money. I simply do not believe that this transport "strategy" will do anything other than make the roads in the East of Luton area even more gridlocked than they already are. It is the stuff of nightmares but the members of the Joint Committee clearly do not care how residents are affected by their insane plans.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3268	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Enhancing public transport provision is supported and improving travel options by enhancing provision for bus, rail and walking as set out in CS3 in line with current Government guidance is supported. However, while this policy aims to increase modal shift away from use of the car, the Preferred options sites require significant road infrastructure which will ultimately lead to heavily car dependent communities. The Core Strategy should seek to direct development to accessible locations to reduce the need to travel which have supporting infrastructure in place. New development should be concentrated near to improved bus routes and existing rail stations in order to achieve sustainability. Highlights the conclusion in para 4.2.3 of the Transport Assessment which states "overall growth in public transport based person trips is lower, reflecting the fact that car travel has become relatively easier". This is a clear contradiction of the aims of the Core Strategy and current Government guidance.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
921	Mr Colin Dye	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal to 'Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District' .This would require building on green belt land when we should be preserving and indeed expanding such land to prevent this type of unnecessary urban sprawl. It would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1579	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: The plan also recognises that, notwithstanding the above ambition, the scale of growth being planned for will inevitably require some investment in strategic infrastructure (SC3,4). Critically, a number of these interventions are included in the regions RFA2 submission for completion in 2015. This includes the implementation of the Luton-Dunstable Busway. The A5-M1 link road is scheduled for delivery in 2014/2015.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1594	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1640	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Are Regional Transport Strategy Objectives addressed? Do any transport schemes promoted match regional priorities? Partnership working with the Hertfordshire authorities is supported. The Luton-Dunstable Busway is an RFA priority and scheduled for delivery between 2011/12 and 2018/19. The Luton Town Centre Transport Scheme was put back by the Region to ensure that is remained deliverable and the schedule suggests completion by 2012/13. The A5-M1 Link Road (Dunstable Northern Bypass) is scheduled to be delivered by 2014/15.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1644	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy seeking to try and change travel behaviour? Is there a policy seeking to enhance provision for non-motorised forms of transport? Partnership working with the Hertfordshire authorities is supported. The Luton-Dunstable Busway is an RFA priority and scheduled for delivery between 2011/12 and 2018/19. The Luton Town Centre Transport Scheme was put back by the Region to ensure that is remained deliverable and the schedule suggests completion by 2012/13. The A5-M1 Link Road (Dunstable Northern Bypass) is scheduled to be delivered by 2014/15.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
4021	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: The recommendation to bring forward a further A505 park-and-ride site should be qualified by being 'subject to detailed appraisal'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2113	Edlesborough Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Focusing development in urban areas first will benefit the new busway and prove the concept before extensions are funded. Limiting the number of cars per household by limiting parking provision will not work without affirmative action. The strategy misses the opportunity to execute a plan with a real commitment to public transport, improvements to existing bus routes and services are mentioned but no real commitment to bus transportation to enable people to give up cars. Nor are there inducements to limit the number of private vehicles.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2783	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: For the areas designated, yes. However, there's not a single mention of any improvements for transport around Leighton-Linslade!! So which should we have to decide on?</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>			
1857	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Location and drainage of large car parks (such as for park-and-ride) is of concern. Inner Source protection zones under Luton and Dunstable make the location of large car parks and bus maintenance depots a sensitive issue.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The detailed location of the P&amp;R sites has not yet been determined. Matters associated with flooding are covered in the Core Strategy</p>			
934	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: There can be no housing growth in Luton and South Beds without a commitment to improve existing, and implement new public transport schemes.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>			
846	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Nothing for Leighton Buzzard. fine if there is no further development.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>			
2711	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Unless the guided bus way serves the new station at J11a via Leagrave, the new station with close Harlington station. The Joint Committee have never taken on board that the original MKSMMS documents omitted Leagrave station in error, leading to the proposed need for a new station north of Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1745	Highways Agency	Bedford	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The Highways Agency has reviewed the Core Strategy Preferred Options Document (CSPO) and associated Transport Appraisal Document (TAD) prepared by Halcrow. This letter summarises the two reviews and draws out the key issues identified within each..... The provision of highways infrastructure may negatively impact on public transport modal share. Highways infrastructure and public transport systems will need to compliment each other to have a positive modal shift away from the car in the inner urban area(s). There is a lack of detail concerning proposed enhancements to public transport facilities, the Highways agency requires details to ensure they will be feasible and effective. These issues must be resolved prior to an Examination in Public.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.				
2558	Holwell Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The emphasis on avoiding congestion in and around Luton makes no recognition of the significant effects on traffic on routes to Hitchin, adversely affected by development east of Luton.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
202	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The priorities are all wrong. Replace the unwanted guided busway with a linked electric extension to the Thameslink. No more bus lanes, widen roads instead. Build the A5-M1 link and Luton Northern bypass and Luton inner ring road before any more development.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
705	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Extension eastwards of the Busway and a Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton are warranted only if the proposed urban extension East of Luton can be justified (which is unlikely).</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
403	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Extending the busway and a Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton are only warranted if the proposed urban extension east of Luton can be justified which, in my opinion, is very unlikely.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1888	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: This policy aims to increase the modal shift away from the use of the private car and the Preferred Option sites require significant road infrastructure to enable delivery. There is therefore an inherent potential conflict in such infrastructure requirements and their delivery, which is likely to lead to heavily car dependent communities, unless adequate provision is made for public and other forms of non car transport. The Core Strategy should instead therefore seek to direct development to accessible locations to reduce the need to travel, which already have the supporting infrastructure in place. New development should be concentrated to existing and improved bus routes and existing railway stations in order to achieve sustainability. Land West of Leighton Linlade is just such a location, it is adequately served by existing infrastructure and there is ready access to rail and bus in close proximity.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.			
1318	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Object to Policy CS3 and relevant supporting text in Section 5 - Please see separately submitted documentation.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			
1906	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Support alternatives to northern bypass. <input type="checkbox"/>If "improving public transport is central to the vision" and "increasing travel to work by public transport, walking and cycling", the bypasses would undermine the Strategy and the SCS. <input type="checkbox"/>Support new station in Chalton but not at loss of Leagrave or Harlington. Residents need regular reliable bus services (not "busway extensions"). <input type="checkbox"/>Support public transport interchanges, improved opportunities to walk, cycle and park and ride. <input type="checkbox"/>Public transport improvements would only work without the bypasses. Reopen railway with integrated bus network to achieve east west links. <input type="checkbox"/>Busway extensions would destroy wildlife corridor. It is not strategic, so no use to 150,000 people driving in or out of town daily. It is not an integrated system, attracting very few from their cars. <input type="checkbox"/>Luton's car use is 12% above the national average, and a major local contributor to climate change. The climate and business impacts of the busway and the Inner Ring Road could be negative.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.			
2081	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Encourage a sustainable development pattern that integrates environmental, social and economic objectives. i.e. the extension of the Busway to serve the sustainable urban extensions together with the Park and Ride sites will maximise the opportunity for sustainable travel and also benefit nearby residential areas. The range of public transport improvements should provide a framework for a step change in public transport provision, benefiting local residents and businesses and helping address traffic congestion. This will make a transport related contribution towards climate change mitigation objectives. Other benefits include reduced local pollution, respiratory diseases, accidents and less pressure on local health and emergency services, hence an improved wellbeing for residents.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree Proposed Action: No action required			
JC Reason for Response:	Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1924	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses the key issues in the SCS. We welcome the proposals to extend the bus way to the proposed extensions. In line with the SCS, the guided bus way should be extended to Leighton Buzzard and Milton Keynes if sound and achievable. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips. That said the Core Strategy focuses on delivering viable infrastructure extending the route to Leighton Buzzard and Milton Keynes has not been demonstrated to be viable.</p>				
2163	Markyate Parish Council	Markyate	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: There needs to be an adequate level of public transport to make car use unnecessary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy focuses on delivering viable infrastructure this approach has not been demonstrated to be viable.</p>				
916	Mrs Margaret Marshall	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: I DO NOT support the proposal "Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District. It would absorb green belt which is a resource we need to preserve and not build on. It would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1, adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
250	Mr Blair McGlashan	St Ippolyts	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: A park and ride site on the A505 East of Luton will do nothing to help congestion and pollution in Hitchin caused by through traffic from the A1 heading towards Luton. If anything it could increase it. I support the public transport options for new bus and rail services, but don't believe anything should be done with respect to car usage because this has only a temporary effect and just encourages more car usage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2175	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the expressed preference to deliver strategic public transport improvements targeted at reducing congestion and increasing modal shift away from the use of the private car.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2071	NHDC	Lilley	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The transport infrastructure is currently totally inadequate to satisfy current road traffic demand. The proposed additions and extensions to the guided busway are totally inadequate and unworkable. The enormous increase in road traffic usage by 5500 houses and new commercial park will create a totally intolerable and will extend the already gridlocked highways, particularly at peak times.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1999	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: It appears that little consideration has been given to the traffic implications beyond Bedfordshire. Whilst this may be understandable if the proposed development was concentrated in Bedfordshire associated with the north/south axis of the M1, it is unacceptable in seeking to justify development as proposed, with substantial new development to the east of Luton and two new bypasses around the eastern periphery of the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1764	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC supports those elements of Preferred Option CS3 which propose a park and ride site on the A6 to the north of Luton and anticipate strategic on-road bus priority measures along the A6 in the northern part of Luton. The success of such a bus priority measure will be significantly enhanced if the LNB is provided between the M1 and the A6.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
351	DR JANE RANSOM	Pirton	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposal 'recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further park and ride site on the A505 east of Luton within N. Herts District'. This would absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on - and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from A1, adding to road congestion round Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
41	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: In general yes but the numerous Park and Ride do not seem sustainable. The usage spread across so many would make them difficult and costly to service. Less and more targeted locations would seem better</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: P&amp;R sites are located on major roads in order to maximise the potential patronage.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
419	Mr Andrew Robson	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The stated aims are to reduce congestion and encourage a shift away from use of cars. The proposals will have exactly the opposite effect for Hitchin. They will encourage more traffic from the A1 through Hitchin to the A505, thereby increasing congestion, which is already very bad in Hitchin during the morning and evening rush hours. I do not support the proposal 'Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District' as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
542	Mrs Margaret Rollason	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No I do NOT support the proposal, as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on - and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion from Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
187	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal 'Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District' as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on - and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
184	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
183	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal. Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District' as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on - and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3483	Pamela and Raymond Skeggs	St Ippolyts	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Without the unjustifiable proposed urban extension to the east of Luton, the proposed busway, park and ride facilities would not be required.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1531	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: We do not support translink. we believe that there should be bus priority measures across the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The guided bus way is an important element of transport infrastructure in the growth area</p>				
3366	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: The extension to the guided busway and dedicated cycle route will be of benefit to the growth proposals north of Houghton Regis. However, no detail proposal currently exist. The potential for a new parkway railway station in the vicinity of the M1 J11A is also supported. The Joint Planning Unit should engage with the relevant stakeholders and LDV at the earliest possible time to promote the delivery of these pieces of infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
718	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: HRDC support the principal of the expansion of the guided busway but alternative improvements to public transport services might offer similar benefits to improved travel choice and the encouragement of sustainable travel patterns. The urban extension should not be predicated on the need to deliver an extension to the busway. A strategy to encourage public transport within the UEs will be needed to ensure all residents are within easy walking distance of public transport and where possible, essential facilities. Key to this is a high quality environment for pedestrians.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2443	St Ippolyts Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. The Parish Council of St Ippolyts does not support proposals for Strategic Transport Infrastructure. The proposed park and ride initiatives and bus priority measures on the A505 are not justified without the proposed urban extension of East Luton into North Hertfordshire which itself not justifiable.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
1429	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: Object on the basis that it includes Park and Ride as part of the package of sustainable transport measures but excludes provision for Park and Ride at Junction 10A, the key point of access to Luton from the south. <input type="checkbox"/> A Park and Ride site is included at the M1 Junction 10a in the Local Plan 2001-2011 and Local Transport Plan 2006-2011. Given the proposed safeguarding of land at J10a through proposed policy CS10, we consider a Park and Ride at this site should be included as part of a comprehensive development. The Local Plan states that 'Park and Ride has the potential to play an important role in intercepting car journeys at the edge of the urban area and transferring drivers and passengers to public transport, thereby reducing congestion and pollution in the town and reducing the demand for long-stay parking in the town centre'. A park and ride at the strategic gateway location of junction 10a would capture trips to the employment areas in the south of the town, Luton Airport and the Town Centre.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree	Proposed Action: No action required			
JC Reason for Response: The Luton Local Plan includes proposals for a P&R site south of Luton.				
1360	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: It is readily apparent that the success of the emerging strategy for the Luton &amp; South Bedfordshire Growth Area is highly dependant upon the delivery of a number of high profile transport infrastructure schemes. Taylor Wimpey therefore support Preferred Option CS3, in particular the Joint Committee's intention to work towards implementation of the Luton Dunstable Busway, serving the SUE north of the conurbation.</p>				
JC Response: Agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
1267	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: We do not feel that cycling and walking are promoted enough, or considered "essential", and this means that there is little likelihood of a 'Green Growth Area' being delivered.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	Proposed Action: No action required			
JC Reason for Response: Walking/cycling are mentioned in paras 5.61-5.64, although this relates to key Principles and not detailed schemes.				
1221	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: We feel inadequate attention has been paid to cycling and walking infrastructure.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	Proposed Action: No action required			
JC Reason for Response: Walking/cycling are mentioned in paras 5.61-5.64, although this relates to key Principles and not detailed schemes.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2131	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The proposed East of Luton extension would create a negative effect on transportation far beyond the proposed area and is not sustainable.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2064	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Overall it is considered that the development on the northern side of Dunstable &amp; Houghton Regis (Sites F and H) incorporating an integral section of the A5/M1 Link Road which has funding committed, represents a sustainable, comprehensive and deliverable proposal to provide the appropriate housing, employment and road infrastructure that is required to support the towns into the future when compared to alternative development options including those potential road schemes which are without funding. In addition we note the Core Strategy's intention to promote the Luton &amp; Dunstable Busway through this area, which would enhance its sustainability in transport terms</p> <p>JC Response: Agree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
829	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal 'Recommend that the North Hertfordshire LDF and associated LTPs include proposals to bring forward a further Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton within North Hertfordshire District' as this would unnecessarily absorb green belt - a resource we need to preserve, not build on - and would also exacerbate the transport issues in the area by encouraging traffic from the A1 thereby adding to existing road congestion around Hitchin.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2009	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: The option fails to specify enabling public transport to create viable rural communities.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
482	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: No new road building or by-passes as this not only increases road transport miles and emissions, but also destroys countryside and communities. Instead, should introduce congestion charging and low emission zones while, at the same time, further encourage cycling, walking and rail use.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree  Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver a balanced approach to transport with good alternatives available to the private car as well as ensuring the private car is considered when making spatial decisions.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3478	Warden Hill Residents Association	Luton	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: We are also pleased to see a "Park and Ride" facility located on the A6 into Luton and a "Bus Priority Route" inbound along the A6 into Luton. This Association has been asking enhanced public transport to be considered for many years, along with the removal of the Northern Bypass from this area, and we are pleased to see that the "Preferred Options" document appears to concur with our requests.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1488	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: If public opinion is ignored and urban extensions on the scale proposed are built where they are proposed, then improvements to public transport will be a necessity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver a balanced approach to transport with good alternatives available to the private car as well as ensuring the private car is considered when making spatial decisions.</p>				
773	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: It doesn't go far enough in implementing an integrated public transport infrastructure! The busway should link to Leighton-Linslade to effectively join the rail lines to the airport. Luton Central railway station urgently needs demolishing and completely rebuilding, as well as fully integrating into the bus network.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to deliver a balanced approach to transport with good alternatives available to the private car as well as ensuring the private car is considered when making spatial decisions.</p>				
1000	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: For the areas designated, yes - but there's not a single mention of any improvements for Leighton-Linslade transport!! So which do I have to decide on?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3027	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Q. 5	Yes
<p>Comment: Extension eastwards of the Busway and Park and Ride site on the A505 east of Luton are warranted only if the proposed urban extension East of Luton can be justified.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Over a third of car traffic entering Luton in the morning peak from the A505 to the east has a destination in the centre of Luton. Provision of a P&amp;R site in this area could reduce congestion on Hitchin Road in the town.</p>				
92	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent does not agree with the Core Strategy and has not supplied any further text.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
633	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 5	No
<p>Comment: The proposals rely heavily on the cooperation of North Herts which is not forthcoming. The guided busway even if extended into the East of Luton development area does not serve the East of Luton nor does it serve the new planned aquatic centre of the local hospital. The measures are inadequate to prevent further traffic congestion towards Luton Town Centre from the additional residents in the East of Luton development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
3388	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Para. 5.37	No
<p>Comment: Transport Assessment gives a more positive view than is met in practice. It has not assessed all of the major access routes to and through Leighton-Linslade.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Too much emphasis on the use of public transport which will be victim to congestion whilst stating that there should be one parking space per bedroom for each house. People all have cars to use. Congestion on local roads going to Dunstable and Luton, Milton Keynes and Aylesbury are well documented and not tackled in the TA. <input type="checkbox"/> If the people who move in are happy with low paid jobs on the development and want their children to go to new schools which will have no track record then there will be no addition to traffic problems. However, people will want highly paid jobs out of Leighton Buzzard and will want their children to go to the best schools. There will be a large impact on the road system from at least 8000 additional adults travelling to work each day and school run. The local road system cannot sustain this level of increased traffic.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
42	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.37	No
<p>Comment: Now we have confirmation that the policy is Houses before roads! Will we never learn. Even if the HA programme is met large elements of the housing development will be in place 4 years before the infrastructure is available. Now that is planning!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1780	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.37	No
<p>Comment: It is unthinkable and unworkable to propose an Eastern Bypass onto a roundabout that provides the one access point to the airport, which is already working at capacity. S.A.D. agree provision needs to be made for future growth but not directly around the airport where the proposed bypass will congest and prevent expansion in the future. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is encouraging commuting onto a critical national trunk road (M1), which does not have the capacity to support the extra traffic. The transport appraisal conducted by Halcrow (March 2009) is misleading. It is stated at 1.4.2 "The committed infrastructure includes M1 widening (Junctions 10-13)". This is wrong and highly significant.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
936	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.38	Yes
<p>Comment: The Government must be committed to the construction of the A5/M1 link road long before 2016. This road is the key to reducing congestion in our towns and needs to be constructed before mass housing commences.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The completion of the A5/M1 link road is important in the context of enabling growth to be delivered.</p>				
147	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.41	Yes
<p>Comment: Given that the target for the new M1 junction is 2016, and the North Luton bypass 2021, any housing schemes need to be delayed or planned to come on line at or after this time. To maximise their benefit and minimise their disruption (i.e. road closures, diversions and road building noise and pollution).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The extent to which it is possible to deliver growth development ahead of the implementation of such infrastructure is part of the ongoing studies underway that aim to finalise the Core Strategy transport evidence base.</p>				
634	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.41	No
<p>Comment: This bypass (black route) intrudes into Chiltern AONB - the consultation results are very marginal and their interpretation is dubious.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
636	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: Given the strength of feeling and the lack of a dominant answer, how can the black route be justified other than for crude political reasons?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2288	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: Despite objections to the eastern extension bypass, the intention is to go ahead regardless. Cut and cover options may be too expensive and a cheaper solution that does not protect the environment will be deemed an 'appropriate' solution.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3699	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: Also refers to paras. 5.43, 5.44 &amp; 5.45 Oppose Luton Northern Bypass for the following reasons: Route is preferred as a result of flawed consultation that did not seek the views of N Herts residents or consider the 'No Bypass' option. Impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage of the area falling within N Herts is unacceptable. Lilley would be dissected, lose its character and cohesions. Proposed tunnels are impractical and cost is prohibitive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. Council was consulted on proposals for Luton Northern Bypass</p>				
738	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 5.42	Yes
<p>Comment: The outer bypass route (i.e. the Green and Black routes is welcomed by English Heritage in terms of avoiding harm to Dray's Ditches Scheduled Monument, but there are likely to be many other issues in terms of setting, archaeological and landscape impacts. The green route between the M1 and A6 will pass close to Lower Sundon and may affect the setting of the Grade 1 listed St Mary's Church, as well as archaeological remains along the route. The black route from the A6 to the A505 will have a significant landscape and archaeological impacts, potentially severing the historic Icknield Way footpath, although we note that paragraph 5.43 proposes to tunnel the section around Galley Hill. The impact on the setting of Putteridge Bury Historic Park and Garden remains a key issue where the bypass meets the A505. The proposed Luton Eastern Bypass, which would presumably continue from this point, would cut through the park and garden and cause significant harm to its character and integrity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure the historic environment is considered when planning for the delivery of the growth area.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> The historic environment is an important consideration when planning for the delivery of the growth area.</p>				
2331	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: The main issues with the Luton Northern Bypass are: <input type="checkbox"/>1) The case for the bypass <input type="checkbox"/>2) The impact of the proposed route on the land in Hertfordshire east of Luton <input type="checkbox"/>3) The impact of the proposed scheme on the wider transport network in Hertfordshire <input type="checkbox"/>4) The wider development strategy</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
706	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: I Object as the outer bypass route has been chosen in spite of public reservations about the impact of the eastern section on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage designations (para 5.42). The 2009 public consultation on the route options was flawed in that it was focused on residents in the main conurbation. The proposed 'cut and cover' tunnels to mitigate the worst impacts of the highway on the landscape will make it prohibitively expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
404	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: The outer bypass route has been chosen in spite of public reservations about the impact of the eastern section on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage designations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1332	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: Object. The consultation of 2007 was flawed due to being limited to residents in the main urban area, not the residents of the surrounding countryside likely to be most affected by the construction of an outer by-pass. Also, equal respondents to all three of the options is hardly resounding public support for the outer by-pass - if the consultation was widened to include the Herfordshire areas you find the majority of support for the non-bypass option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All residents had the opportunity to engage in the consultation process.</p>				
1765	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 5.42	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC considers that paragraph 1.6 of the Preferred Options could be reworded to highlight the fact that the MKSMSRS forms part of the development plan, describes the exceptional circumstances requiring a review of the green belt at Luton and provides policy guidance regarding the preferred areas of search within which the green belt review is to be undertaken.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is not necessary to reiterate known facts of this kind in the Core Strategy. Further work is underway to finalise the recast Green Belt boundaries.</p>				
2144	Mrs Nicola Sadler	Lilley	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: The proposed 'black route' from the A6 to the A505 passes through an AONB which is contrary to national policy. It also passes a Site of Special Scientific interest. - No Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2448	St Ippolyts Parish Council	Hitchin	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: The preferred Northern Bypass route passes through the CAONB and conflicts with Government policy and CS15 in the Core Strategy to protect, conserve and enhance the CAONB. The Northern Bypass route has been chosen in spite of public reservations about the impact of the eastern section on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. The 2009 consultation on the route options was flawed in that it was focused on residents in the main conurbation. The proposed 'cut and cover' tunnels will make it prohibitively expensive. <input type="checkbox"/> No consideration has been given to the impact of increased traffic on the A505 to the east of Luton and its impact on Hitchin and the neighbouring villages such as St Ippolyts. These proposals cannot be justified without an adequate study into the effects on Hitchin's infrastructure with related public consultation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1791	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: The public consultation regarding the bypass options was in S.A.D.s opinion "marketed" and deliberately presented as a "this or that" route. The exhibition was presented in an influencing manner in order for the people to vote for an option that was furthest away from them. We took numerous photographs of the bypass exhibition. We believe that what was displayed and how the information was presented, was intentionally exhibited to promote and favour the Orbital Bypass and this was inappropriate. In contrast the non bypass option was not clearly explained or highlighted. Throughout all the evidence and despite the Core Strategy confirming at 5.1, "Implementing sustainable transport schemes and initiatives to encourage the use of such alternatives is therefore crucial to delivering the economic, social and environmental objectives of the Core Strategy", the non bypass option was in S.A.D's opinion not fully explored and very little analysis or information presented.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation was undertaken as comprehensively and inclusively as possible. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1777	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: From a traffic flow perspective the proposed Eastern and Northern Bypasses are fundamentally flawed. The National Planning Guidelines seek to provide growth that forms "Sustainable Communities". The Core Strategy and the preferred urban extensions (with the exception of Leighton Buzzard) are encouraging vehicular traffic away from the main conurbation (particularly in the East of Luton), directly to the M1. The Core Strategy is encouraging commuting onto a critical national trunk road, which is inappropriate and urgently needs to be addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> The transport appraisal undertaken and conducted by the Halcrow Group Limited (Final Version March 2009) is misleading. It is stated at 1.4.2 "The committed infrastructure includes M1 widening (Junctions 10-13)". This is wrong and, despite the commitment to hard shoulder running, is highly significant. <input type="checkbox"/> The capacity for the M1 to accommodate all the traffic from your preferred options is simply not there.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
483	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: The construction of a Luton Northern Bypass would have a major detrimental impact on rural landscape and on biodiversity and further encourage motor vehicle use. Strong objection.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1491	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: People who do not live in the areas affected were asked what impact a bypass would have. The consultation was therefore massively flawed. Plus, the impact on historic landscapes and biodiversity would be horrific.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation was undertaken as comprehensively and inclusively as possible.</p>				
3028	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: Object. The outer bypass route has been chosen in spite of public reservations about the impact of the eastern section on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage designations. The 2009 public consultation on the route options was flawed in that it was focused on residents in the main conurbation. The proposed 'cut and cover' tunnels to mitigate the worst impacts of the highway on the landscape will make it prohibitively expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: North Herts. Council /Herts. CC were consulted on proposals for Luton Northern Bypass</p>				
635	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.42	No
<p>Comment: Reference is made to the eastern extension. This was specifically excluded from the bypass consultations - a point challenged by KEOLG. The response was that the planning of this section was at a very different planning stage. North Herts were neither considered nor consulted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
642	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: Note comment on response to consultation and ignoring of its results. The consultation was of itself flawed as it was designed to maximise Luton objects over NHDC voters. That it was not as overwhelming as the committee hoped did not change their, no doubt predetermined, minds. As they are no doubt hoping for developers to pay, I doubt that any environmental mitigation will survive and the cheapest nastiest road will be built.. As to design, why is the area around Lilley Wood not considered sensitive? Any reason other than cost?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1642	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: We note the Joint Committee's adoption of the Outer route for extension of the Luton Northern Bypass to the A505, and the environmental mitigation proposed, but CPRE remains absolutely opposed to this alignment. This is destruction of protected AONB landscape on an unprecedented scale - not just the massive visual scar, but the despoiling of a much wider area of fine, tranquil countryside through the influx of all pervading traffic noise. We believe that the Joint Committee is making a serious strategic mistake here - it is a proposal so damaging, so controversial and so costly that the chances of it ever actually materialising must be extremely low. We note also that the work statutorily required to assess the 'no-bypass' alternatives to the bypass extension has not yet been completed. We consider it highly unsatisfactory that the Joint Committee should commit to this bypass extension without the conclusions from such an assessment being available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
1723	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: Little weight should be given to the consultation from Jan/Feb 2009 as it focussed on the population of Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis that, not surprisingly, tended to favour the outer route that would have the least direct impact on them. Why have the green and black routes been declared as preferred without the non-bypass option having been properly assessed? PPS7 states that major developments should not take place in AONBs, except in exceptional circumstances. We regard the proposed dual carriageway, 70mph bypass as such a major development. In line with PPS7, the northern bypass needs to be demonstrated that it is in the public interest, the need has been assessed, impact on the local economy and the cost and scope of meeting the need outside the AONB. The 'cut and cover' tunnel will not produce complete mitigation and is prohibitively expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All residents had the opportunity to engage in the consultation process. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2712	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: It is hardly surprising that the outer routes were preferred by the local urban community who are against a new road (the existing reserved route) being built close to their houses. This can only mean considerable degradation of the AONB towards Lilley and allow Luton to extend its urban development much further east. It is highly unlikely that large additional sums would be made available for tunnelling as there is already insufficient central funding for the bypass. Money was not found for tunnelling the M40 at Postcombe/ Chinnor despite being one of the most attractive areas of the CAONB with landscape value far above that of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation was undertaken as comprehensively and inclusively as possible. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2341	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: Previous consultation did not clarify role of the bypass. Transportation study concludes that additional travel benefits of the A6-A505 section are marginal. Difficult to see why it is identified as a preferred scheme. The two consultants' studies come to differing conclusions - one indicates the essential need for a bypass while the other suggests it is not essential.</p> <p>The no bypass option has no adverse impacts, only benefits. The consultation did not include proposals for the no bypass option.</p> <p>The scheme did not score well in the assessment submitted to the Regional Transport Forum. The need for and viability of the bypass needs to be revisited in advance of the next stage in the CS process. Proposals for the central section of the East West Rail link from Oxford to Cambridge have emerged with a link between the Midland Mainline and the East Coast Mainline provided by a new rail line between Luton Parkway and Stevenage. This could have a significant impact on the case for proposed road schemes.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Consultation was carried out on the non-bypass option. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>				
2342	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The eastern section of the outer Black route runs through Hertfordshire and the outer alignment will have an adverse impact on landscape, heritage and biodiversity. These impacts have been underestimated and the scheme will have significant, damaging ecological implications on the CAONB and three sites of ecological importance (Wards Wood, Wardswood Lane and Lilley Wood) <input type="checkbox"/> Local accessibility will be impeded as the proposed black route crosses Lilley Footpath 002, Lilley Footpath 003, Lilley Footpath 017, Lilley Byway Open to All Traffic 022 (Wardswood Lane)</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Ensure the natural and historic environments together with appropriately safeguarding access are considered when planning for the delivery of the growth area.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The natural and historic environments together with appropriately safeguarding access are an important considerations when planning for the delivery of the growth area.</p>				
2343	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The proposed route will impact upon significant known archaeological remains and passes close to other known sites. The entire route has high archaeological potential by its proximity to Icknield Way. The route passes through a number of known archaeological sites noted by the Historic Environment Record (HER). The area south of Lilleypark Wood has crop marks of archaeological remains across the bypass route. Prehistoric ring-ditches are known from aerial photographs (HER reference numbers 4400, 4401, 7942). A prehistoric double linear ditch (HER7941) and enclosures (HER7940) are also recorded. Earthwork features to the south and west of Lilley village may represent abandoned medieval structures or fields (HER1841). Prehistoric ring ditches and linear ditches (HER1117, 2397, 4402, 4403, 4407, 4478, 4495, 7943, 9056) are recorded north of Ward's Wood. The course of Icknield Way lies just to the north of the Hertfordshire/Bedfordshire border at the western edge of the Hertfordshire part of the bypass route.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Ensure the historic environment is considered when planning for the delivery of the growth area.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The historic environment is an important consideration when planning for the delivery of the growth area.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
405	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: This consultation was flawed because it focused on residents in the main conurbation. The proposed "cut and cover" tunnels to mitigate the worst impacts of the road on the landscape will make it prohibitively expensive.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			
3796	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The proposal that this damage would be avoided by two cut and cover tunnels for a part of the Black Route is derisory.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.</p>			
3786	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The proposal that this damage would be avoided by two cut and cover tunnels for a part of the Black Route is derisory.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			
2188	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The proposal for a cut and cover tunnel identified in paragraph 5.43 may help to mitigate some of the landscape, biodiversity and recreational impacts of this scheme, however based on the information currently available Natural England considers that these measures will not be sufficient, given the undeveloped character of this area, particularly along the entire length of the black route.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1766	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 5.43	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC notes the content of paragraph 5.43 of the Preferred Options document which refers to the Joint Committee's approval of an alignment for the LNB which follows the 'green' and 'black' routes described in the public consultation exercise undertaken in January/February 2009. If the alignment of the LNB is, in due course, expected to be utilised to define a reviewed/ revised green belt boundary, we would observe that the amount of land enclosed between the 'green' route and the northern edge of Luton has the capacity to accommodate a greater number of dwellings than is assumed for North Luton at Preferred Option CS6. Approximately 4500-5000 dwellings could be accommodated on the land situated between the A6, the northern edge of Luton, the M1 and the 'orange' route shown on the consultation leaflet produced in January/February 2009.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3186	David Sadler	Lilley	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The preferred Black Route would dissect the Chilterns AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3072	Peter Shaw	Lilley	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The proposed route of the Northern Bypass will ruin the Chilterns AONB and change the nature of Lilley village for good.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1182	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 5.43	No
<p>Comment: The consultation document stated that no firm proposals for this option have been developed but that it would "avoid the considerable environmental effects of the bypass and could improve travel opportunities for many more groups of people in the community". Page six stated the 'no bypass and enhanced public transport' option provides as good as or better outcomes in all of the categories apart from the highway-based accessibility". The public exhibition provided some case studies for what could be achieved but there were no specific plans. Other sections of this Strategy include plans for improving public transport but these were not presented as they should have been. This made it difficult to assess the option properly and should have been reflected in the analysis of the consultation. We are pleased that the concerns of stakeholders have been recognised. The correct response to the weight of stakeholders opposing any Luton Northern Bypass should have been sufficient to remove it from the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1492	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 5.43	No
Comment: "Cut and cover tunnels" are not compatible with government policy on preserving Areas of Outstanding Natural beauty - alternatives are available.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3029	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.43	No
Comment: Object. The outer bypass route has been chosen in spite of public reservations about the impact of the eastern section on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage designations. The 2009 public consultation on the route options was flawed in that it was focused on residents in the main conurbation. The proposed 'cut and cover' tunnels to mitigate the worst impacts of the highway on the landscape will make it prohibitively expensive.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure the its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Consultation was undertaken as comprehensively and inclusively as possible. <input type="checkbox"/> The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures.				
637	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.43	No
Comment: The results were marginally in favour of the green/black route. This result would have been very different had North Herts residents been consulted. The consultations did not show the possible eastern extension nor explain the link that was being made between provision of a Luton northern bypass and the building of houses. In this way it is arguable that the public was being misled or at best not being properly informed. Either way it puts the results of the consultation into doubt.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Consultation was undertaken as comprehensively and inclusively as possible.				
2289	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.44	No
Comment: Object to bypass as it only considers convenience of Luton residents and not those of rural N Herts				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
148	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.44	No
Comment: Given a timeframe completion of 2021 for the North Luton bypass. Clearly any housing reliant on this, in particular that located to the East of Luton can not be considered until this essential infrastructure is in place. Again the impact of road closures, diversions, long term road building (noise and pollution) would not be suitable for a new and potentially cut off residential estate. Planning and building of the infrastructure needs to come first.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1646	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.44	No
<p>Comment: Whilst extension of the Luton Northern Bypass to the A505 might reduce congestion in Luton, it is certain to increase it in Hitchin, a factor on which we have no doubt North Herts will adversely comment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1724	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 5.44	No
<p>Comment: Improved travel speeds should not be the only justification for the bypass - what is its strategic purpose? No account is taken of the effects of the northern and eastern bypasses connecting near Lilley and funneling traffic through Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
484	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.44	No
<p>Comment: Congestion in Luton should be tackled through the introduction of congestion charging. This would be more sustainable than building a bypass which would further increase vehicle mileage and emissions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: LTP sets out a phased approach to dealing with congestion, with the implementation of schemes/initiatives to manage the network and encourage greater use of sustainable modes having greater priority in the early years, with the possibility of congestion charging at a later stage</p>				
638	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.44	No
<p>Comment: There is no real evidence that this will be the case./ The congestion in the east if Luton is usually associated with traffic going from the east of Luton into the town centre area, which will Not be relieved by a northern bypass. There also need to be consideration of the possible effect on Hitchin. The Highways Agency does not support this bypass and this should be made clear</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
646	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Support this although I doubt the openness or fairness of any side by side assessment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2290	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: Fully support the non-bypass option				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3750	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Para. 5.45	Yes
<p>Comment: This should be better assessed prior to further development of the preferred route options as the effect of any such routes on the Green Belt area will be devastating in all respects.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
4022	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.45	Yes
<p>Comment: Non-bypass assessments must be applied to each element of infrastructure proposals, including the eastern bypass.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2713	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Para. 5.45	No
<p>Comment: A non-bypass option would increase the current levels of east-west traffic through Sundon and Harlington, many of this ignoring the weight and width ban.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
707	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.45	Yes
<p>Comment: I Support this as the non-bypass option should be further developed and assessed prior to the development of the preferred route options.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
407	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: This option should be further developed and assessed prior to the development of the preferred route option.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1334	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: Support. More consideration should be given to the non-bypass option.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3846	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 5.45	No
Comment: The assertion that the public transport option would provide less traffic relief has not been shown to be correct.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2186	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: During the detailed Jan/Feb 09 Bypass consultation, Natural England supported the development of an alternative, non-bypass option and maintains that this option must be explored fully in line with the policy framework stated above. While the need to explore this option is identified in paragraph 5.45 of the current consultation, there is no mention of this work as part of the further measures required for the North Luton Bypass, listed in paragraph 5.52.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1767	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: NLC agree with the observation at paragraph 5.45 of the Preferred Options that a non-bypass option will provide less traffic relief than would arise if the LNB is provided. The opportunity significantly to enhance public transport provision will arise if the LNB is constructed between the M1 and the A6. A material improvement in traffic conditions in the northern part of Luton will not be achieved without the LNB.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2620	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: The non-bypass option should be further developed and assessed prior to the development of the preferred route options.				
JC Response:	Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
1183	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: We are dismayed by this paragraph. There is a statutory obligation to explore the non-bypass option which should be undertaken with an open mind. The following extract is taken from the Transport Appraisal which accompanies this Core Strategy: "7.1.4 A complete outer eastern highway route improvement between the A505 and M1 Junction 10 performs more as a 'bypass'. The additional travel benefits of building the A6-A505 section of the Northern Bypass are marginal overall" It clearly states that the need for a bypass is not definite and given the huge environmental impact the creation of a bypass would have, the non-bypass option should be seriously considered.				
JC Response:	Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
485	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.45	No
Comment: No by-pass under any circumstances				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
1493	Mr Matt Warman	Lilley	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: Good - a non-bypass option will mean less traffic and be better for the environment.				
JC Response:	Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3030	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.45	Yes
Comment: Support. The non-bypass option should be further developed and assessed prior to the development of the preferred route options.				
JC Response:	Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
639	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.45	No
Comment: This is written in a way that effectively says that "lip-service" will be paid to this option ... the work is being done only to "meet statutory obligations"				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2330	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.46	Yes
Comment: Woodside Connection - 52. The principal scheme is expected to reduce traffic on the A5 south of Dunstable from the County Boundary to the M1 at Junction 9. The County Council would therefore support the option which gives the best traffic relief to the A5 in Hertfordshire, particularly for HGVs. The scheme should also include measures to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport so that the benefits of a new road link and spare capacity is not just used up by increased car trips.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3225	DP9	London	Para. 5.47	No
Comment: Advises that the Core Strategy needs to identify that Option 2 for the Woodside Link should be protected until such time as Option 1 is confirmed for implementation.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1053	Miss Sally Gray	Houghton Regis	Para. 5.47	No
Comment: How do you square the Woodside Connection through the centre of housing to be built between Parkside and the M1? I understood from the initial consultation that one of the goals of the planned development of roads and housing north of Houghton Regis was not to mix industrial and residential traffic and buildings. Option 1 will do exactly that.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1185	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 5.47	Yes
Comment: From the consultation in January/February 2009 Option 1 of the Woodside Connection has been preferred by this Core Strategy. The Wildlife Trust supports the choice of this Option as it avoids the nationally significant habitats and species which are found in Houghton Regis Quarry.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3319	Associate		Para. 5.48	Yes
<p>Comment: L&amp;G support the importance of improving M1 J10A and would be prepared to offer a fair and reasonable contribution towards the upgrade of this junction arising from their proposals for a strategic employment site on land to the south west. Initial assessments confirm that modifications being progressed by Luton Borough Council would be able to accommodate traffic generated by the east of Luton urban extension, Napier Park, Power Court and the L7G strategic employment proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Consider the role of Jnc 10a in delivering the strategic objectives</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of a strategic employment site around J10a is an appropriate course of action through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies</p>				
1580	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Para. 5.48	Yes
<p>Comment: Priority 3 of the transport goal of the RES seeks to ensure the maximum economic benefit from the region's international gateways. In addition Luton airport is recognised in the Air Transport White Paper. The core strategy recognises the beneficial strategic location that the sub-region enjoys and the benefits that can be derived from the role of London Luton Airport in attracting investment and the benefits of the M1 as a location for potential logistics development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1430	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.48	No
<p>Comment: Funding for the M1 Junction 10a improvements is not yet certain and will in part be reliant on development contributions. Whilst the need to improve this junction following the improvements to the surrounding network is acknowledged it is recommended that ongoing studies consider alternative solutions, including the accepted improvement as a traffic signal control junction as a result of the Napier Park development which may prove to be less expensive and better value when completed as part of an overarching integrated transport strategy with a Park and Ride site located at J10a. In considering the junction improvement it must be established how the proposed junction can facilitate the identified Park and Ride site and how bus priority might be incorporated within the junction improvement to facilitate a transport corridor approach to the ELC.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2560	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.48	No
<p>Comment: Halcrow LDF Transport Appraisal indicates only moderate problems with congestion at junction Suggests that improvement should only be brought forward as part of bypass project Long history of severe congestion at this junction which demonstrates serious flaw in model</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1102	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.48	No
<p>Comment: The Transport Appraisal indicates that there are only moderate problems with congestion at this junction within the timescale of the LDF and that these will cease by 2026 unless the east of Luton bypass is constructed. This suggests that improvement should only be brought forward as part of the bypass project. However, as there is a long history of congestion which would be rated severe at this junction, this is more likely to demonstrate a serious flaw in the model.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
652	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Object to the eastern bypass on environmental and health grounds. It does not: a. offset the destruction of green belt land; b. offset the destruction of natural habitats; c. evidence how, on the basis of other road developments, traffic speeds will be increased (and indeed answer whether this is a good thing); d. offset the destruction of land adjacent to the Chiltern AONB (and which would form part of it were it not for the artificial A505 boundary).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2291	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed urban expansion. There is no justification for destruction of green belt land, landscape and prime agricultural land where natural resources are already stretched to breaking point.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3700	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Oppose Luton Eastern Bypass for the following reasons: Any benefit would be insufficient to offset the damage to Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity and existing transport routes. No evidence to suggest that financial resources are available and a levy of £20,000 per house from the developers would be negligible.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1725	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: There is no justification or explanation of the strategic significance of the eastern bypass. The bypass will not serve the private transport needs of the urban extension. Only a small proportion of bypass users will be going to or from the urban extension. There is no discussion on the impact of the bypass on the Green Belt, Breachwood Green Ridge, Lilley Bottom, biodiversity or archaeological remains. These detrimental impacts must be assessed and weighed against the supposed benefits and costs.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
4023	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: It is not clear from the evidence where the improvement in travel speeds is drawn from. The transport evidence does not consider the presence of the bypass in isolation. It is not clear that a faster car travel speed in 2031, compared with 2007, is necessarily a positive outcome. If this speed reflects longer distance strategic traffic then it is clear that the scheme is beyond the realm of development access provision and its delivery should be shared between benefiting stakeholders.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
708	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: I Object as no real justification for providing an Eastern Bypass around the proposed urban extension East of Luton has been provided, sufficient to offset the harm it will cause to the Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
408	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: I object to this as I do not see enough justification for providing an Eastern Bypass around the proposed urban extension East of Luton which would offset the damage it will cause to the Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
409	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: I object to this as I do not see enough justification for providing an Eastern Bypass around the proposed urban extension East of Luton which would offset the damage it will cause to the Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1335	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Object - even if the East of Luton urban extension was approved I don't think sufficient evidence has been given for the development of an Eastern Bypass.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3681	Alan Murphy	Luton	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: There is a lack of credible evidence supporting the eastern bypass that, 'will serve the associated preferred direction of growth to the east of Luton'. The transport Modelling and Accessibility Study concludes at Clause 7.14 that it will perform more as a bypass. There is no stand-alone or other specific report on the testing of the eastern bypass. The impact of the bypass on Lilley Bottom would be highly damaging and entirely inappropriate. I object to the proposed east Luton bypass irrespective of whether it is considered part of any urban extension or as a separate strategic highway scheme</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3187	David Sadler	Lilley	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: The preferred Black Route would dissect the Chilterns AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3073	Peter Shaw	Lilley	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: The proposed route for the Northern Luton bypass and Eastern bypass will ruin the Chilterns AONB and change the nature of Lilley village for good.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2622	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: No real justification for providing an eastern bypass around the proposed extension east of Luton has been provided, sufficient to offset the harm it will cause to the Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1788	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: In regards to the environment, the fact that your own evidence suggests that development would be inappropriate in Area L can not be ignored. "Cut and Cover" tunnels at Galleys Hill and Wards Wood are not measures that make part of your proposed bypass any more acceptable. The orbital bypass will induce traffic and will create substantial emissions. There is an existing wildlife habitat thriving in the Area L where development is proposed. The area is a breeding ground and home to species such as Bats, Owls, Woodpeckers, White Deer, Monkjack, Buzzards and Red Kites. The Core Strategy and the evidence presented has not made any reference to the above, which S.A.D consider a critical aspect with regards to the East of Luton Proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1772	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Tunnelling under the airport is not feasible <input type="checkbox"/> The text fails to mention the existing section 106 is only for a single lane carriageway. The vehicular flow proposed will require at least dual carriageway. This exasperates the problem of tunnelling under a fully functional airport. <input type="checkbox"/> A tunnel would be unthinkable as there are 18 years remaining on the lease, therefore compensation would need to be agreed with the leaseholders. The proposed alignment of the tunnel (Luton Local Plan) indicates a route directly underneath the two taxiways. From an engineering perspective displacement has to be taken into account. The tunnel would need to be "Bored" to a depth in excess of 26 metres. <input type="checkbox"/> The roundabout directly in front of the airport where Spittlesea Road meets the end of the Eastern Corridor would be inaccessible due to the proposed tunnels short distance from the taxiway and necessity to comply within gradient guidelines.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1779	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: It is unworkable to propose a bypass onto a roundabout that provides the one access point to the airport, which is already working at capacity. S.A.D. agree provision needs to be made for future growth but not directly around the airport where your proposed bypass will congest and prevent expansion in the future. <input type="checkbox"/>The Core Strategy is encouraging commuting onto a critical national trunk road (M1), which is inappropriate. The capacity for the M1 to accommodate all the traffic from your preferred options is simply not there. <input type="checkbox"/>The transport appraisal by Halcrow (March 2009) states at 1.4.2 "The committed infrastructure includes M1 widening (Junctions 10-13)". This is wrong and despite the commitment to hard shoulder running is highly significant.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1792	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: We believe that what was displayed and how the information was presented, was intentionally exhibited to promote and favour the Orbital Bypass and this was inappropriate. The non bypass option was not clearly explained or highlighted. Throughout all the evidence and despite the Core Strategy confirming at 5.1, "Implementing sustainable transport schemes and initiatives to encourage the use of such alternatives is therefore crucial to delivering the economic, social and environmental objectives of the Core Strategy", the non bypass option was in S.A.D's opinion not fully explored and very little analysis or information presented.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
486	Walter	Hitchin	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: No bypass and especially not in North Hertfordshire where it would be hugely detrimental to the Green Belt, landscape, biodiversity and amenity value.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
775	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Eastern bypass is not required; simply upgrade Vauxhall Way to dual carriageway along it's entire length and improve the junctions with Hitchin Road and Crawley Green Road; remove the junction at Eaton Green Road.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3031	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockernhoe	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Object. No real justification for providing an Eastern Bypass has been provided, sufficient to offset the harm it will cause to the Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity of the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1103	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: The route beneath the Airport would only accommodate a single-carriageway road. A trunk road and busway on the same alignment would incur greater cost and land-take and have to be covered for a greater distance to protect the public from the risk of aircraft accident. Construction would disrupt Airport operations. The ELC passes through the PSZ, within which it is Government policy that "there should be no increase in the number of people living, working or congregating ... and that, over time, the number should be reduced as circumstances allow" and "Transport infrastructure is . . . considered for Public Safety Zone policy purposes as if it is residential, commercial or industrial development". The recently-built Airport link road and the junction with Gypsy Lane will not have capacity to take additional traffic from the bypass. The Transport Appraisal indicates otherwise but the modelling has been seriously flawed. The practicable solution would be for the bypass to reach the M1 at junction 9.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2563	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: Cost and construction difficulties Present road system will not be able to take additional capacity created by proposed bypass Additional traffic on Eastern Luton Corridor resulting from proposed bypass would raise questions of public safety A viable east Luton bypass would have to run south of the Airport to reach the M1, which is not possible due to planning restrictions in Luton Hoo estate and traffic volumes at Junction 10. The only practical solution is for the bypass to reach the M1 at Junction 9.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
640	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.49	No
<p>Comment: This is stated as a planning obligation to provide access, with a recommendation of a route underneath the airport. No approach or discussions have even taken place with the Airport owners or operators. Attempts were made previously to make access to Century Park from existing roads in Stopsley/Wigmore and this planning application was vigorously and strenuously refused. The provision of this link will not benefit existing residents in the east of Luton. It will not help potential residents of the east of Luton proposed housing to access services in Luton town itself.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
370	Mrs AC Heymans	Hitchin	Para. 5.50	No
<p>Comment: I do not agree with the building of two new bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) These would cut into green belt land causing unnecessary damage to the rural environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1320	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 5.50	No
<p>Comment: Object to Policy CS4 and relevant supporting text in Section 5 - Please see separately submitted documentation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The respondent's concerns are be assessed through comment ID 3844</p>				
3270	RL Adams	Wheathampstead	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The 'black route' along Lilley Bottom is totally unacceptable. NHDC will be responsible for the strategic plan for the north western edge of the A505 plan. The vast problems of entry in to Hitchin and circumference around, through to Stevenage and the interface with the A1M at Coreys Mill, have to be considered. More use should be made of the train system. West to East road transportation to Felixstowe is currently at 6 million units per year which is unacceptable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3229	Ms Jo Andrew	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Highways Agency does not support the Northern bypass. Who is going to pay for this?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3079	Emma Andrews	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern rig road would go across the AONB, the consultation was weighted towards Luton and any urban extension should stand up on its own merits (the road is not supported by the Highways Agency and there is no funding for it). No consideration seems to have been given to the effects of the bypass/development on the town of Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
658	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: In the context of eastern and northern bypasses: 1. Cost, there appears to be no external funding available which shows its real importance 2. Effect on local surroundings 3. Effect on wider surroundings eg Hitchin 4. passes through an AONB where such building would conflict with government policy 5. passes through an area of level 1 environmental character and conflicts with the obligation to preserve and enhance the land</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2770	Mr Paul Anness	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: This year five of the RSPB 'Red List' species have bred near enough to the 'black route' between the A6 at Streatley and the A505 at Putteridgebury to be affected by its being built. Red list species are those which are threatened and not shown a substantial recent recovery. If you go ahead with this development, Corn Bunting, Song Thrush, Yellowhammer, Skylark and Grey Partridge could all disappear from the area. Barn Owls are a regular sighting and breed very close as do Buzzards. Red Kite, until recently on the Red List themselves will breed soon if left undisturbed. Please re-think your plans and consider developing an alternative less wildlife sensitive area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels. This will include the need to comply with the relevant Wildlife Acts.</p>				
3172	L Auduley	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The bypass will destroy the beauty of the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2866	Kate Bantick	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass would dissect the Chilterns AONB, contrary to Section 12.1 of the Draft Core Strategy which notes the AONB is a significant asset and that no urban extension will be proposed in it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3060	Mr Michael John Barden	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3067	Mr Michael Richard Barden	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3058	Mrs Patricia May Barden	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3050	Mrs Tina Susan Barden	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3064	Mr Matthew James Barden	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3045	Karen S Barden	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3054	Mr James Michael Barden	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3069	Miss Machaela Leanne Barden	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3056	Miss Danielle Jenna Barden	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3062	Mr Mark Andrew Barden	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
179	Dr Steve Barley	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2036	Melanie Barry	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Luton has few areas of recreation which are accessible to all and allow recreation and relaxation in the countryside. One such area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)- Warden and Galley Hills (Chilterns) on the North East boundary of Luton which is also an SSI site. The suggested infrastructure planned will be of no benefit to current residents and will make traffic problems in the Luton area worse as the plans will take traffic form the A505, A5 and M1 and direct this through North East Luton. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2027	Noel Barry	Not Known	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The new plan for roads and housing would cut through country side which is designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty-warden and galley hills. The added volume of traffic directed through this area would make driving in north Luton nearly impossible The destruction of one of the only natural walking areas around Luton would be a disaster The lack of consultation over this very serious is Perhaps residents are not important enough and developers and there money shout louder. I OBJECT to any such plan to develop the warden hill area and its natural beauty destruction.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3215	Ms C Barry	LUTON	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The specifics of your road building ambitions are unclear and non specific. Energy should be concentrated on strengthening public transport options, without detriment to the environment, prior to any road building being embarked upon. It is hard to understand why you are persisting with the idea of a bypass to the airport when one of the Council's own transport committees have recently determined that this would be of no benefit to residents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1689	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3195	Mrs J M Bottrill	Luton	Q. 6	No
Comment: The bypass would only generate more traffic with no local benefit.				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2293	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
Comment: Object to proposed Luton Northern bypass and it should be deleted from proposals: conflicts with government policy conflicts with CS15 to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB No funding currently available from EU, State and national funds which means a shortfall that will lead to skimping on remediation of natural environment or it will not be done at all				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2043	Mrs Dorothy Brinklow	Tebworth	Q. 6	No
Comment: Although the M1 is reasonably near, in the event of closure due to accident the roads around the area and in particular the A5 become completely gridlocked. The extra traffic these roads will bring to the area would only add to these problems and also create new ones.				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2183	Mr Stuart Brown	Lilley	Q. 6	No
Comment: The road infrastructure to support the East of Luton development is not financially viable. The Highways Agency do not support the Luton northern bypass. The eastern bypass will pass through and destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom.				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2547	Mr Robert Burns	Whitwell	Q. 6	No
Comment: Proposed bypass goes through important archaeological sites Bypass not supported by Highways Agency suggesting lack of funding or lack of approval				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2981	Mr Paul Cacchioli	Walkern	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass and its eastern extension are financially non viable (Highways Agency does not support the Luton northern bypass). The eastern bypass section will destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom and impact on flora, fauna and wildlife in the surrounding area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2982	Mrs Kirsteen Cacchioli	Walkern	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass and its eastern extension are financially non viable (Highways Agency does not support the Luton northern bypass). The eastern bypass section will destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom and impact on flora, fauna and wildlife in the surrounding area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3041	Mrs P Camfield	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3020	Ms Maria Cann	Offley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects the proposed East Luton Bypass and North Luton Bypass (Black route) owing to the impact on the landscape, Green Belt and AONB. Suggests that there are alternative options including the widening of Vauxhall Way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1946	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses the key issues in the SCS. Concerns over the impact of these schemes (especially the A5-M1 link) on the area and the promotion of sustainable travel. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2485	Mrs EJ Chandler	Little Wymondley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Luton Northern bypass. This would destroy a landscape of great beauty, an outstanding area and deny people of Luton and Hertfordshire such beauty.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3166	Mrs D Churchill	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Luton Northern bypass would destroy the chalk valley of Lilley Bottom.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3603	Ellie Clarke	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of Green Belt land east of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3751	Robert Clough	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The strategy has totally ignored the effect on Hitchin and its traffic and other infrastructure. Traffic to the east of Luton is already at breaking point. If the development should go ahead with an associated Luton northern bypass and eastern extension, the result would be even more traffic being disgorged onto the A505 with a catastrophic effect on Hitchin's already chronic congestion. A park-and-ride scheme would attract people from around the Hitchin area to use it and the rail route from Luton as an alternative to the King's Cross line - yet more traffic! Are the bypasses vital to the strategy or can we improve the existing roads to achieve what is needed at a much reduced cost?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2138	Mr R Common	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern and eastern bypasses are financially unviable. <input type="checkbox"/> The eastern bypass will destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. <input type="checkbox"/> The Highways Authority do not support the northern bypass so how will this monstrous bypass be funded?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3350	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The 'no bypass' option cannot credibly address the development needs in the area. The benefits of providing the Luton Northern Bypass in the context of serving development and relieving other routes is a sound one. Its route should only be determined as part of the wider North of Luton urban extension masterplanning. Commends the design and alignment of the road that allows integrated development north and south of the road comprising the rail freight aspirations at Sundon Quarry, the full extent of AXA's land holdings south of Sundon Road and the full extent of Connolly Homes' land east of Sundon Park Road to include partial residential development and the restoration of the Park as green infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
859	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No, I take serious issue with the northern bypass (black) route. There's no justification for driving a bypass through the Chilterns AONB. This cannot be allowed to go ahead. Other options are available which do not go against the plan's own objectives to protect/conserves/enhance the AONB and do not go against the government's planning policies (only in exceptional circumstances - these are not). There is a similar issue with the Eastern Bypass running through Lilley Bottom valley - it goes against the plan's own objectives to protect/conserves/enhance the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
276	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Yes, but I feel that Crawley Green Road is already passed its maximum capacity for parts of the day, and do not agree with a plan that would see 5,000 plus homes built at the end of it, with it being the only sensible route to the town centres of both Luton and Dunstable. Yes because diverting (reducing) unnecessary traffic and keeping traffic volumes down on residential roads is a good aim. Recognising that car users need roads and routes they can use.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1192	Mr Lewis Guy Cox	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Luton bypass. Cannot comprehend how the bypass will ease traffic congestion, especially if the proposal for 5,500 homes goes ahead. The local roads will not cope with the increased volume. The Newbury bypass scheme was designed to ease traffic congestion but studies have shown that the rural roads adjoining the bypass will suffer up to 30% more traffic volume than before the bypass was constructed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1726	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: We oppose the inclusion of the Luton Northern Bypass between the M1 and A505 that lies within North Hertfordshire District. We object to proposals for a Luton Eastern Bypass through North Hertfordshire District. The options for the northern bypass should be kept open until such time as a comprehensive assessment of all the available options has been carried out. It seems that the JCs principle objective is to complete a ring road around the conurbation on the back of the planned growth areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3102	Douglas Cree	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3090	Caroline Cree	Norwich	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3080	Ailsa Cree	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3098	Sheila Cree	Norwich	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3076	Edward Cree	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3100	Frederick Cree	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery			
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3096	James Cree	Norwich	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2226	N J Curly	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to: 'Black Route' Northern Bypass and Eastern Bypass full orbital road around Luton would be detrimental to business in town Alternative is to widen Vauxhall Way</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1376	Councillor Jenny Davies	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Because it puts too much of our countryside under concrete.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1522	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Major through routes need to be considered at a multi-county level as solving a problem in one area will simply move the congestion elsewhere. Hertfordshire already has an extremely high traffic density and any Luton bypass which interacts with the A505 should be considered in this context.</p>				
JC Response: Agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3713	Jackie Davies	Kings Walden	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The local transport infrastructure is already under pressure. Eaton Green Road, Crawley Green Road and the A505 are extremely busy during rush hour. More housing and the proposed bypasses will add to the traffic in these areas. The smaller roads around Lilley Bottom are not designed to cope with increased traffic. Tunnelling under the airport would be prohibitively expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2904	Denise Dollin	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed eastern and northern bypasses are unnecessary and their case is not proven with studies for alternatives yet to be finalised. They will cause noise and light pollution day and night</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2924	William Dollin	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed eastern and northern bypasses are unnecessary and their case is not proven with studies for alternatives yet to be finalised. They will cause noise and light pollution day and night</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2926	William Dollin	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed eastern and northern bypasses are unnecessary and their case is not proven with studies for alternatives yet to be finalised. They will cause noise and light pollution day and night</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1567	Ms Jane Dorman	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the East Luton Bypass and the Black route of the North Luton Bypass because of the impact on the countryside, biodiversity and traffic in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3272	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Serious concerns over the deliverability of the strategic highway improvements and urban extensions to which they are linked. LNB has no agreed funding, highly dependent on developer funding and passes through CAONB, in conflict with CS15. LNB would need to be planned through NHDC's LDF, who will resist such allocations. A5-M1 link has no delivery schedule but has air quality compliance complications and spiralling costs. CS4 fails to refer to a potential J11a, critical to the A5-M1 link. East Luton bypass has no confirmed route or funding and will be resisted by NHDC. Leighton Buzzard eastern distributor road unlikely to be funded by the reduced urban extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
922	Mr Colin Dye	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3802	Dr James Dyer	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Northern Bypass destroying Green Belt, AONB, acres of good quality land, diminishing food production and increasing noise and carbon pollution. It will destroy wildlife habitats and the peace and tranquility of one of the most popular walking areas in the eastern Chilterns. I am aware of twelve important archaeological sites on the proposed route between A505 and A6. Their removal will destroy the integrity of a precious historical legacy that cannot be replaced. There is a better route: that which was first proposed in The Bedfordshire Regional Planning Report of 1937, but with modifications. The growth at Stopsley means that part of the route is no longer practical. A modified version from near the entrance to the crematorium, running north-west between the Regional Sports Centre grounds and Manor Farm, then straight down to the northern edge of the Bushmead development, passing Cardinal Newman school and Turnpike Drive, would do least damage to agriculture and the historic environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1578	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: The plan also recognises that, notwithstanding the above ambition, the scale of growth being planned for will inevitably require some investment in strategic infrastructure (SC3.4). Critically, a number of these interventions are included in the regions RFA2 submission for completion in 2015. This includes the implementation of the Luton-Dunstable Bypass. The A5-M1 link road is scheduled for delivery in 2014/2015.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1641	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Are Regional Transport Strategy Objectives addressed? Do any transport schemes promoted match regional priorities? Partnership working with the Hertfordshire authorities is supported. The Luton-Dunstable Bypass is an RFA priority and scheduled for delivery between 2011/12 and 2018/19. The Luton Town Centre Transport Scheme was put back by the Region to ensure that is remained deliverable and the schedule suggests completion by 2012/13. The A5-M1 Link Road (Dunstable Northern Bypass) is scheduled to be delivered by 2014/15.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1651	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Are any major transport generators covered by appropriate policies?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy</p>				
1595	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy</p>				
4024	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Clarification is required as to whether it can be demonstrated that the eastern bypass can deliver a sustainable benefit to public transport or the local economy. It is considered that the benefit is to the wider Luton and South Beds economy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. The impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3071	Miss Gemma Eastwood	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3052	Miss Gemma Eastwood	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3046	Miss Gemma Eastwood	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3156	Mr Roger Eastwood	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for the Northern and Eastern bypasses fall on Hertfordshire's green belt and on parts of the AONB. They are potentially environmentally disastrous and unnecessary. New road routes generates new traffic journeys and these roads will result on increased air pollution and huge volumes of M1 traffic on to the A505 to Hitchin and other local roads.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4280	Jane E Edwards		Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts. in their response dated 27th February 2009. No convenient east-west traffic route so traffic has to go through Hitchin, which is seriously congested. Suggest traffic be encouraged to use: M25 around London, M10 Hemel Hempstead to Hatfield, A428 Northampton to St Neots and A14 (M6) Huntingdon. No requirement for additional east-west link road and an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses. Solution is widening Vauxhall Way, which would link to the M1 via the new roads to the airport and not incur the cost to tunnel under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible. It is not possible to accommodate all the development needed into existing urban areas.</p>				
2977	Tim Edwards	Kimpton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the proposal to build a traffic bypass on the eastern side of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2784	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: As far as the proposal go, they are good. But again, not a single mention of any traffic alleviation in the Leighton-Linslade area - yet the proposal to build a minimum of 2,500 houses there has the potential to put a further 4000 cars on the local roads!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS4 outlines the approach for Leighton Linslade</p>				
1858	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Include commitment to managing drainage, following guidelines from Section 4 of Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3708	Keith Ewington	Kings Walden	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The local transport infrastructure is already under pressure. Eaton Green Road, Crawley Green Road and the A505 are extremely busy during rush hour. More housing and the proposed bypasses will add to the traffic in these areas. The smaller roads around Lilley Bottom are not designed to cope with increased traffic. Tunnelling under the airport would be prohibitively expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3092	Anne Faulkner	Spalding	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3094	Mr Derek Faulkner	Spalding	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. Considers that an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town but to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Suggests that an alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which is easy to widen, would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3160	Christopher Fenn	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed road linking land to the east of Luton to the A6 runs through the AONB and would have damaging effects on wildlife. The alternative route to bypass Luton, linking Round Green should be chosen.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3037	Mr and Mrs Fletcher	Streatley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed Luton Northern Bypass (Black route and Green route) owing to their impact on the pasture land and the impact on Streatley.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3201	Mr Ralph Ford	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
Comment: The proposed bypass crosses green belt land in an area of natural beauty and it will encourage a huge increase in traffic.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2874	Master Toby Fraser-Moore	Lilley	Q. 6	No
Comment: Object to the proposal to build a bypass through Lilley				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3182	Mr and Mrs R Gardner	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
Comment: The bypass is financially unviable and the eastern section would destroy the chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. Consideration should be given to where all the traffic will go when they encounter traffic jams.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
937	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	Yes
Comment: But not for Leighton Buzzard. By constructing a huge dual carriageway running from north to south of the proposed new development, the Eastern Distributor Road would serve as the first stage of a 'ring road or bypass' and instead of bypassing new housing, would run right through the middle of it. Connecting it to the A505 would encourage heavy commercial transport to use the route. The 'tranquillity' of the new development would not exist and the new population would not have 'clean air'.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2895	Abby Gee	Lilley	Q. 6	No
Comment: The bypass goes through the Chilterns AONB and would spoil areas where lots of wildlife live.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3179	Mrs J Gradwell-Smith	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The bypass would destroy green belt land and many species of wildlife. This unviable project would require extensive funding and would result in an unreasonable and impracticable engineering project.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3921	Miss Sally Gray	Houghton Regis	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Woodside route is not described in detail so it is not easy to comment on its impact. It will have to go along Sandringham Drive, to the detriment of family housing who will not have bargained on a major road on their doorstep. It will destroy hedges, woodland, parkland, a stream and associated wildlife, crossing the bus link and National Cycle Route. The copse is home to many summer visitors including chiff-chaff, blackcap, willow warbler and whit throat which will never return, just as the reed buntings have gone since the hawthorn scrub was destroyed. How can this possibly be the preferred route with a lower environmental impact than other options? It is contrary to intentions of preserving green infrastructure and keeping industrial traffic away from residential development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3964	Kate Griffiths	Not Given	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Opposed to Black route of Luton Northern Bypass because: - It passes through the AONB - The no-bypass option has not been adequately explored. - No Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out. - The route goes through an area used for recreational purposes. - Who will finance the project?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
277	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Although the proposals are well thought out with regard to the Main Conurbation, I cannot support the proposals because of the final bullet point. It seems to me that adding further development to the East of Leighton-Linslade cannot be arranged to 'reduce congestion' in the town, unless it is planned that the new residents will not be working or shopping in Leighton Buzzard. If that is the case, any development should be as close as possible to the southern by-pass to assist in dispersal of traffic towards Luton and Milton Keynes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2973	Dr Michael J Hall	Cumbria	Q. 6	No
Comment: The area to the east of Luton would be defiled by houses and bypasses. Points out that AONBs have now National Park status.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3500	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Q. 6	Yes
Comment: Support the Luton Northern Bypass and its extension eastwards which are badly needed to divert existing traffic away from Stopsley and adjoining areas and to prevent traffic congestion at places such as Stockingstone Road.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				
2909	Mrs J Heath	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
Comment: Northern and Eastern bypasses will harm the landscape bringing more noise and pollution and further ruin quality of life. The northern bypass conflicts with government policy on nationally designated areas and the principles of CS15. The eastern bypass conflicts with Hertfordshire's CC conferred status of a 'scenic route'. The cost of new roads and upgrading of lanes appears to not have been calculated.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2857	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	No
Comment: The village already suffers from commuter and other traffic using the village as a rat run to the bypass to the west of Leighton Linlade and to the A5. Any development to the east of the town will add to the major safety issue that already exists and there are no safeguards in place to prevent this.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2325	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 6	No
Comment: The County Council is also concerned about the effect of development on the A505, which is already under considerable pressure during peak times at the junctions approaching Hitchin. This would be exacerbated with the scale of development proposed to the east of Luton, with the impacts on the A505 and through Hitchin up to the A1(M) being significant. The proposed Luton bypass could also be used as alternative to M1.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2346	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy Issues and Options consultation lacked evidence on the need for and potential alternatives to a bypass, including the non-bypass option and options for improving Vauxhall Way. This deficiency has not been remedied. The County Council has seen no compelling evidence of the need for an east Luton Bypass and has no intention of promoting one.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2360	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: An adequate case has not been made for the northern bypass. If the bypass is to provide an enhanced strategic route then this is matter for the transportation authorities to take forward. The County Council is not a promoter of the scheme nor does it intend to be so. The Core Strategy cannot contain a preferred route option, nor can it make any binding commitment on adjoining authorities to promote or secure funding for it. The circumstances of the east Luton Bypass are similar to those for the North. The County Council has seen no compelling evidence of the need for a Bypass and is not engaged in any process to take it forward (this LDF process cannot). If development to the east of Luton were to be taken forward by North Hertfordshire District Council following adoption of this Core Strategy, it will be for NHDC to engage with the relevant highway authority.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2345	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: A major concern of the County Council is the wider impact that the proposed bypass will have on the A505 east of Luton and in particular the impact of additional traffic on Hitchin. It is unfortunate that the traffic flow diagrams do not include Hitchin. This is a major omission. However, the report by PBA of the non road options includes traffic forecasts for the A505 Beech Hill which shows a significant increase in both local to strategic and strategic to strategic traffic on the A505 as a result of the bypass. The consultants report the increase to be dramatic and comment that the provision of the bypass is changing the role of the A505 to an enhanced strategic route. This is unacceptable.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
2970	Sally Hewitt	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass would destroy the AONB. An alternative route running closer to the edge of Luton conurbation would utilise land earmarked decades ago for such purpose.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1743	Highways Agency	Bedford	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Support as a sustainable and viable strategy. <input type="checkbox"/>Unclear how homes and jobs to 2012 will be reallocated if not delivered. CSPO relies on M1 improvements, A5-M1 link and Jnc 11a, yet to undergo statutory process. If not delivered, CSPO would have a critical impact on the road network. <input type="checkbox"/>The Multi Modal Model is inconsistent with the CSPO (shortfall of 5590 homes and 4806 jobs), lacks information on quality and reliability of data, independent flow validation; lack of a PM peak model; under forecasts M1 future flows; and no demonstration of the Public Transport Models' robustness. It indicates that M1 junction assessments cannot be fully assessed without more data. Park and Ride facilities have not been tested. <input type="checkbox"/>Schemes east of Luton are dependent on NHDC. <input type="checkbox"/>Alternative Options 1 and 2 in the TAD indicate a degree of severance because they are located beyond the M1 and proposed ring roads. The Preferred and Enhanced Preferred Options cannot be fully compared as data sources do not correspond.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3192	Denise Hilder	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: An eastern bypass would create more traffic problems and would be prohibitively expensive to build.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2907	D R Hilder	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Northern and eastern bypasses will only mean greater congestion on the approaches to towns such as Harpenden, Stevenage and Hitchin</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3205	Laura Hinksman	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: It would be more beneficial for the countryside to link the A505 to the M1 through Chase Woods and Bradgers Road and the Bushmead area rather than near Putteridge Bury.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2441	Hitchin & Harpenden Liberal Democrats	Welwyn Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: On the technical side our main objections boil down to these.... There are very serious concerns regarding groundwater and aquifer recharge that may well be sufficient to prevent any development going ahead in this area....</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1739	Holmes Antill	Loughborough	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Taken together with the priorities identified by all Preferred Options CS policies it is our view that further work should now be carried out to determine the most appropriate development framework for the preferred East of Luton Sustainable Urban Extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2512	JM Holmes-Walker	Wheathampstead	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to East Luton Road unacceptable to build road in an AONB Will destroy villages Increased congestion into Hitchin</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2078	Ms Victoria Howlett	St Ippolyts	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: East Luton bypass will cause greater traffic congestion within Hitchin. There has been no study published of the effects of the bypass on Hitchin's infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2987	Miss Patricia Humphreys	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to East of Luton and North of Luton Bypass (Black Route) owing to their impact on the Green Belt and AONB. Also states that the North Luton Bypass (Black Route) will impact on the village of Lilley and the AONB, destroying wildlife too. Suggests that Vauxhall Way could be widened to ease congestion.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2033	Melanie Jarra	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I object strongly to any transport or housing development in this area which should be preserved for the residents of Luton to enjoy.... The suggested infrastructure planned will be of no benefit to current residents and will make traffic problems in the Luton area worse as the plans will take traffic form the A505, A5 and M1 and direct this through North East Luton. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2038	Liam Jarra	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Luton has few areas of recreation which are accessible to all and allow recreation and relaxation in the countryside. One such area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)- Warden and Galley Hills (Chilterns) on the North East boundary of Luton which is also an SSI site. The suggested infrastructure planned will be of no benefit to current residents and will make traffic problems in the Luton area worse as the plans will take traffic form the A505, A5 and M1 and direct this through North East Luton. I strongly object to this proposal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
203	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: All needed now before any more development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3197	Alison Jolley	Kimpton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for a bypass would cut through swathes of countryside and farmland including Lilley Bottom.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1134	Mr Norman Jones	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Plans for the Luton Northern Bypass can go ahead only when the section in Hertfordshire is considered via the North Hertfordshire LDF and the Hertfordshire LTP and agreed. This is a very expensive scheme so is unlikely to occur for many years so developments initially should be planned on the absence of this road.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2847	Dick Jones	Great Offley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Luton northern bypass and an eastern extension through Lilley Bottom. This is not financially viable (the Highways Agency does not support the building of this bypass) and it will destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom. The proposal ignores the advice sought independently which stated that the area would be unsuitable for the proposed development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
709	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I object in the strongest possible terms. The preferred Northern Bypass 'black' route passes mainly through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and conflicts with Government policy on such nationally designated areas. This proposal directly conflicts with Preferred Option CS15 in the Core Strategy to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB. The proposed Eastern Bypass will run through the Lilley Bottom valley which is of high landscape importance, and cannot be justified solely to serve the preferred urban extension East of Luton. It conflicts directly with Preferred Option CS15 to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape. The fact that these two highway options are not expected to attract EU, national or regional funding demonstrates that they cannot be justified on national or regional strategic grounds. The proposed eastern section of the Northern Bypass and the Eastern Bypass should be deleted from Preferred Option CS4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1834	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The eastern and northern bypasses and park and ride facilities are wrong / too damaging to the environment and villages, i.e. the Chilterns AONB and Lilley). The traffic modelling for these and other strategic routes are wrong / inconsistent and should be re-calculated (details included in original response).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
411	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I absolutely object to these proposals. The preferred Northern Bypass "black" route passes mainly through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is in direct conflict with Government policy on these areas and also in conflict with Preferred Option CS15 in the Core Strategy which sets out to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and the character of the countryside and landscape. The proposed Eastern Bypass will run through the Lilley Bottom valley and cannot be justified solely to serve the preferred urban extension East of Luton. As with the Northern Bypass it conflicts directly with Preferred Option CS15 in the Core Strategy. The two highway options are not expected to attract EU, national or regional funding which demonstrates that they cannot be justified on national or regional strategic grounds. The proposed eastern section of the Northern Bypass and the Eastern Bypass should be deleted from Preferred Option CS4.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
1889	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Northern Bypass has no agreed funding and will be dependent upon developer contributions. The preferred route passes through the Chilterns AONB in conflict with CS15. The latter stretch would have to be planned through by North Herts who state they "will resist such allocations in North Hertfordshire at every stage". <input type="checkbox"/> There are no timescales in place for the delivery of the A5-M1 link. The HA has identified European air quality compliance complications and there are issues with rising costs. There must be serious doubt in terms of timing and funding of delivery. <input type="checkbox"/> There is no preferred route for the Eastern Bypass and it is without committed funding. Part of the route lies within North Herts. and will be resisted by their District. <input type="checkbox"/> The reduction in the scale of development for East of Leighton Buzzard from 4,400 to 2,500 must raise concerns, given the 57% reduction in available development to fund such infrastructure which is likely to make the provision of the road unviable.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3402	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Proposals for strategic highway infrastructure are supported in principle. However, the Joint Committee must be aware that employment sites in urban extensions associated with new highway infrastructure may well experience a commercial advantage over existing urban sites which are currently not well served by such infrastructure such as land at French's Avenue, Dunstable.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3262	Ita C Leaver	Preston	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: New roads and bypasses to the north and east of Luton which would bring traffic through North Herts., which would affect congestion in Hitchin. The eastern bypass would impact the open countryside in the Lilley Bottom Valley destroying the character of the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1342	Ms Jennifer Levesley	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I object to the Northern Bypass black route and Eastern bypass route proposals in that they completely contravene the objectives stated in the Core Strategy (Preferred Option CS15) to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
4281	B J Liberty		Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts. in their response dated 27th February 2009. No convenient east-west traffic route so traffic has to go through Hitchin, which is seriously congested. Suggest traffic be encouraged to use: M25 around London, M10 Hemel Hempstead to Hatfield, A428 Northampton to St Neots and A14 (M6) Huntingdon. No requirement for additional east-west link road and an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses. Solution is widening Vauxhall Way, which would link to the M1 via the new roads to the airport and not incur the cost to tunnel under the airport or north of Lilley. Alternatives to bypasses include improving public transport and reducing car use.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible. It is not possible to accommodate all the development needed into existing urban areas.</p>				
3086	David A Livingstone	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Although it may appear that the Northern Bypass and its extension will help Luton, this is far from proven. In addition, How will it be funded without the support of the Highways Agency?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3184	Julie Livingstone	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The eastern bypass route will include a tunnel under the airport when more obvious routes could be found. There is a question over the resulting costs and effects of traffic congestion.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1555	Lesley Lodge	Streatley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Luton Northern Bypass and housing to be built between the bypass and the Luton boundary will clearly impact disproportionately on all of Streatley and cause considerable disruption to the AONB.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1798	London Luton Airport Consultative Committee	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The bypass to the east of Luton will result in aggravated surface access problems making access to the airport more difficult and unreliable.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1319	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Policy CS4 and relevant supporting text in Section 5 - Please see separately submitted documentation.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	<p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>			
JC Reason for Response: The respondent's concerns are be assessed through comment ID 3844				
3844	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Halcrow's Transport Appraisal shows the proposals in the Strategy are far from optimum in delivering the sustainable transportation agenda that is central to its objectives. There is no meaningful correlation between the transportation evidence base which accepts that the Enhanced Emerging Preferred LDF Core Strategy scenario will undermine attempts to encourage trips to be made by sustainable modes, and the wording of the Core Strategy which has maximising sustainable travel patterns as one of its fundamental objectives. The proposed by-passes do little to tackle congestion; whilst undermine the effectiveness of sustainable transport initiatives. The bypasses are likely to bring new strategic trips on to the network, to ensure any benefits are short-term at best.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1910	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No justification given for bypasses. These will increase car use, noise to residents and reduce access to countryside. <input type="checkbox"/> Northern and eastern bypasses would have little effect on Luton town centre traffic. Passing through AONB and affecting SSSI may be illegal and highly expensive. Neither the Government nor the developers would pay for it, nor would the EU. <input type="checkbox"/> Access roads are needed for new housing between the M1 and A6, designed so they cannot be used as a rat run or continuation of the A5-M1 link. <input type="checkbox"/> Transport options that do not damage town and landscapes apply to Luton. <input type="checkbox"/> East of Luton proposals are unacceptable - we cannot take 10,000 extra cars on Hitchin or Crawley Green roads. <input type="checkbox"/> Jnc 1a will cause much damage. New habitats should replace what is lost. <input type="checkbox"/> Woodside link must not go through CWS or SSSI and any route from Poynters Road/Porz Avenue must have an EIA. <input type="checkbox"/> Connect Luton via Dunstable to the west coast mainline so people can come by train. <input type="checkbox"/> A busway deters visitors and prevents this useful opportunity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2082	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Severe levels of congestion because strategic east/west traffic movement. The highway schemes are necessary to enable strategic traffic to be removed from the built up area. Road space should be released along major radial routes, which can be used for increased public transport provision. Improving strategic orbital accessibility will ensure integration and social/ economic cohesion. Removing strategic traffic, through calming measures and positive signing of lorry routes, will bring environmental and safety benefits. Improved accessibility and orbital connectivity will boost attractiveness, competitiveness and inward investment to deliver the job targets. In Leighton Linlade the proposed schemes will be of a more local scale, in keeping with the less strategic development role for the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1925	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses the key issues in the SCS. Concerns over the impact of these schemes (especially the A5-M1 link) on the area and the promotion of sustainable travel. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
2853	Andy MacFarlane	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass would dissect the Chilterns AONB, contrary to Section 12.1 of the Draft Core Strategy which notes the AONB is a significant asset and that no urban extension will be proposed in it. An orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of business in the town. An alternative solution to congestion on the east of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way. Land for the eastern bypass falls within North Hertfordshire and cannot be allocated by this draft Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2395	Mr Maguire	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Although it may appear that that a Northern Luton Bypass and a further eastern extensions will help Luton, this is far from proven. Bypasses of this kind benefit others outside the town much more than they benefit us in Luton. In any case the Highways Agency do not support the building of a Luton northern Bypass so just how will this and the other essential infrastructure be funded?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2231	Mr S Mann	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Oppose 'Black Route' impact on village of Lilley impact on Chilterns AONB impact on biodiversity impact on historical importance of area impact on Hitchin (add to congestion) impact of orbital road on Luton's businesses Alternative is to widen Vauxhall Way</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3519	Joy Mann	Offley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Black route of the Luton Northern Bypass will render the picturesque village of Lilley very unattractive. The route also runs through an AONB. Bats have been seen in St Peters Church. Has a bat survey been commissioned. What provision has the Council made for the construction of the Bypass having to be stopped if any archeologically significant finds are made during construction? There are better options available.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2999	Mrs Alison Manning	Offley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to proposed Luton Northern Bypass (Black Route) and Eastern Luton Bypass owing to the impact on the landscape and impact on Hitchin. States that there are other better alternatives including a widened Vauxhall Way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2164	Markyate Parish Council	Markyate	Q. 6	Yes
Comment: The A5-M1 link road has some importance to Markyate as it could take traffic that currently comes up and down the A5 and through Dunstable.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2165	Markyate Parish Council	Markyate	Q. 6	No
Comment: There needs to be more cooperation with Hertfordshire to assess real transport needs. In addition, Markyate residents could well take up new employment opportunities but there are no proposals to make access easier particularly towards the airport.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
917	Mrs Margaret Marshall	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
Comment: I DO NOT support proposals relating to building two bypasses - the M1 to A505 and the A505 to Airport Way. They would cut through large open areas of green belt land which lies east of Luton.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
251	Mr Blair McGlashan	St Ippolyts	Q. 6	No
Comment: Road improvements bring only temporary relief, and only move the bottlenecks elsewhere. Running a bypass through Lilley Bottom will destroy its beauty and rural character, and we'll just end up with more congestion on local roads around Hitchin due to increased traffic levels.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3780	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockermhoe	Q. 6	No
Comment: Strongly object to the Black Route of the Northern Bypass and to the Eastern Bypass.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3790	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
Comment: Strongly object to the Black Route of the Northern Bypass and to the Eastern Bypass.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2517	W N G Millward	Lilley	Q. 6	No
Comment: Object to Black Route - Northern Bypass and Eastern Bypass				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2377	Ms Janice Moore	Lilley	Q. 6	No
Comment: Objects to the development of the East Luton Bypass on the countryside and villages.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3335	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 6	Yes
Comment: We are in support of this proposal and are pleased that the route would be located to the north of George Wood and the wooden track linking it to the A6. The specific alignment of the road should be determined in conjunction with a detailed masterplanning of the land uses to be provided and should be used to determine whether the bypass forms the new Green Belt boundary or not.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				
3682	Alan Murphy	Luton	Q. 6	No
Comment: Paragraphs 4.71 to 4.76 of the Site development Economic Study cautions against strategic decisions until infrastructure costs have been examined comprehensively. The DTZ study assumes costs of £3.5m/ mile for a 30mph dual carriageway construction and refers to £8.5m/ mile for the Luton northern bypass. Agenda item 7 (20th March 2009) on the Preferred Options for the Luton Northern Bypass and Woodside Connection' gives a construction cost of £22.5m/ mile for the northern bypass black route. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment notes under Clause 1.3 that it made no assumption about the parameters of housing development, while other development including road schemes have generally not been taken into account. No references to any Environmental Sensitivity Assessment for the impact that the east of Luton bypass may have on landscape or biodiversity is evident in the evidence studies or Core Strategy.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3175	Mr and Mrs K J Murray	Preston	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the expansion of the A505 into North Herts. □ Much of the early morning and evening traffic passing through some of our villages is the 'rat run' to and from Luton. Traffic is bound to increase through the villages and through Hitchin, increasing traffic pollution and affecting peaceful recreation.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			
2176	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The LNB routes will have an adverse impact on the CAONB, nature conservation, landscape, biodiversity and recreational interests. Natural England's policy on Landscape (2008) and draft policy on Transport (2009) imply that major transport infrastructure that damages the natural environment should not be built in such environmentally sensitive areas. For further advice, refer to PPS1, paras 21 and 22 of PPS7, Section 28G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, Bedfordshire and Luton Biodiversity Action Plan, Luton and Bedfordshire Green Infrastructure plan, s40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. CS4 is not consistent with CS15 and there are also conflicts with CS14 and CS17. Glad to note that Woodside Connection option 1 has been chosen, however there are some concerns requiring more detailed information to make further comments.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			
1454	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Strongly object to this. The preferred northern by bypass, black route, passes mainly through the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and conflicts with Government policy on such nationally designated areas. This proposal directly conflicts with Preferred Option CS15 in the core strategy to protect, conserve and enhance the Chiltern AONB. The proposed eastern bypass will pass through Lilley Bottom valley which is of high landscape importance and cannot be justified solely to serve the preferred urban extension East of Luton. It conflicts directly with the Preferred Option CS15 to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape. The fact that these two highway options are not expected to attract EU, national or regional funding demonstrates that they cannot be justified on a national or regional strategic grounds. The proposed eastern section of the northern bypass and the eastern bypass should be deleted for the preferred option CS4.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2968	Philip Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. Lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. No convenient east-west traffic route so traffic has to go through Hitchin, which is seriously congested. Suggest traffic be encouraged to use: M25 around London, M10 Hemel Hempstead to Hatfield, A428 Northampton to St Neots and A14 (M6) Huntingdon. No requirement for additional east-west link road and an orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses. Solution is widening Vauxhall Way, which would link to the M1 via the new roads to the airport and not incur the cost to tunnel under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3190	Mrs M Neil	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass would destroy the countryside and increase congestion on the A505 between Luton and Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3206	Mr P Neil	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The bypass proposals would destroy areas of natural beauty. The northern part of the bypass would cut through a designated AONB ad the southern part and houses would mar an equal area of beautiful countryside. There is a query over the thought given to the traffic that will travel east towards Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3003	J W F Newbury	St Ippolyts	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern and eastern bypasses will result on more traffic using the A505 with catastrophic effects on Hitchin's traffic congestion. Where is the study of what the effects will be on Hitchin's infrastructure?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2001	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Overall, NHDC considers the transport assessment as it stands to be entirely inadequate. There has been no assessment of the traffic implications of the potential development sites identified at the Issues and Options stage, with the results of those assessments forming a key input in the preferred site selection process. It appears that the JC had a final outcome in mind from the outset, and that the traffic evidence was gathered subsequently in an attempt to justify the desired outcome.,. It does not even do that well.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals including measures to mitigate impacts and deliver infrastructure.</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Options are based on evaluation of existing evidence at the time, including the Site Assessment Matrix of the 13 areas. Work on the impact of proposals and mitigation measures will continue to refine the proposals towards their submission.</p>				
2000	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: There will be substantial traffic generated by the developments. The A505 will become more attractive for through traffic as part of an east/west route, leading to further congestion in Hitchin. These consequences have not been assessed. □ The need for the bypasses in North Herts has not been justified. The Northern Bypass consultation indicated that a no-bypass solution would have only benefits yet has not been selected as the preferred option. The need for the scheme, the route and its deliverability should be reconsidered. □ A no-bypass solution has not been investigated for an Eastern Bypass. An improved Vauxhall Way would provide an adequate link. It is part of a safeguarded route and there has been no appraisal of this as an alternative. NHDC objects to the proposed Eastern Bypass. There has been no assessment of the traffic implications of the potential development sites at the Issues and Options stage, forming a key input in the preferred site selection process. The Core Strategy is unsound.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1902	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Its objections, summarised below, are set out in the following sections:... Section 4: The viability evidence appears to assess the east of Luton site as viable without taking into account any contribution towards the construction of the proposed East of Luton Bypass. This is particularly critical given the need for costly tunnelling under airport taxiways for part of the route.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1978	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: One of the weaknesses of the study is that costing data does not appear to be available for the proposed Luton Eastern Bypass and its funding does not appear as a factor in the viability of the Preferred Options. Given the likely huge costs of such a scheme, this could have a dramatic effect on the viability of the Preferred Options, thereby casting doubt on their deliverability. This is in marked contrast to the Luton Northern Bypass, for which estimated costs are available, and which therefore has been taken into account in the analysis of viability. Clearly, much further work needs to be done on this aspect before the next stage of the Core Strategy.</p>				
JC Response: Agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1838	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Evidence base is not comprehensive to allow selection of preferred options. <input type="checkbox"/> Transport evidence does not consider a "no bypass" option for the east of the town, given Vauxhall Way and the possibility of it to act as a distributor linking the airport and A505. <input type="checkbox"/> Ecological evidence for sites outside Bedfordshire is missing. Quality of environment east of Luton has not been given due weight. Selection of this site is contrary to the JC's consultants. The methodology applied to the assessment of landscape does not provide a true indication of relative differences between various options. <input type="checkbox"/> Viability evidence for east of Luton does not take into account contribution to the bypass. <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic modelling stops at the Beds/Herts boundary, so implications of growth on traffic in Hitchin and rural Hertfordshire are ignored. The need for both bypasses (northern and eastern) is not justified. Neither has the impact of additional east-west traffic being attracted by extensive new ring roads.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1909	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Clearly the traffic implications of the proposed strategy are one of the key considerations. However, the traffic assessment is the weakest part of the entire evidence base. It appears that the traffic modelling stops at the Beds/Herts boundary, and so the implications of growth on traffic conditions in Hitchin and the rural Hertfordshire roads and further afield are ignored. The need for both bypasses - northern and eastern - is not justified, and the option of a "no eastern bypass" solution has not been assessed. Neither has the impact of additional east-west traffic being attracted to the area by the extensive new ring roads to the conurbation. Any conclusions based on the current transportation evidence must be fundamentally unsound.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1901	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Its objections, summarised below, are set out in the following sections:.... Section 3: The evidence base is not sufficiently comprehensive to allow selection of the preferred options. In particular, the transport evidence does not consider a "no bypass" option for the east of the town, a critical omission given the existence of Vauxhall Way and the possibility of its improvement to act as a main distributor route linking the airport and the A505. Additionally, the ecological evidence for the sites outside Bedfordshire appears to be missing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3083	Councillor Tony Northwood	Barton le Clay	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Support the North Luton Bypass and Eastern Bypass (A6/A505 link) which would relieve traffic. Object to the Eastern bypass across North Herts. It would primarily benefit Luton and should not encroach on North Herts District and the Chilterns AONB. The shortest route, with the least land intake should continue from the A6 termination of the Northern bypass slightly north of Turnpike Drive. It should pass through either a tunnel or cut in the south-west corner of Warden Hill, continuing across Bradgers Hill and then along the reserved route behind Stopsley High School to join Vauxhall Way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2422	Offley Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Traffic to the East of Luton is already at breaking point. There would be substantial increases in traffic on the A505 and surrounding roads. The Transport infrastructure is totally inadequate to satisfy current road traffic demand. The enormous increase in road traffic usage by 5500 houses and a new commercial park will create a totally intolerable situation and will extend gridlocked highways, particularly at peak times.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p>		<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1768	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC recognises the importance of the LNB in achieving improved traffic conditions in the northern part of Luton. □NLC does not consider that the growth agenda and improvement in local highway conditions can be achieved without constructing the LNB between the M1 and the A6. A non-bypass option will provide less traffic relief. The opportunity to enhance public transport provision will arise if the LNB is constructed between the M1 and the A6. □NLC does not consider that the successful implementation of the preferred urban extension to the north of Luton requires the completion of a new road between the M1 and the A505. □NLC object to any suggestion that the urban extension north of Luton has to be supported by a new road constructed in full between the M1 and the A505. We would observe that any developer contributions arising from the North Luton urban extension should only be considered in the context of the LNB between the M1 and the A6.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
3169	Debbie Powell	Stevenage	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: A traffic bypass will not help and would mean more green belt lost.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
1553	Dr R.D Prew	Streatley	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: The need is clear to all who live in Streatley. The selected green and black routes, although less desirable from a village perspective, seem sensible from an environmental and planning point of view. It is absolutely essential that this bypass be completed before any infill development as the present roads could not cope with the extra traffic.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			
352	DR JANE RANSOM	Pirton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposals relating to the building of 2 bypasses ( M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through large areas of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
JC Reason for Response:	Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3200	Stephen Roach	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Suggests rail network linking Stevenage to Luton, Luton to Dunstable, Dunstable to Leighton Buzzard, Leighton Buzzard to Aylesbury and Milton Keynes with a further connection from Luton to Houghton Regis. This would reduce strain on already burdened roads and is an essential need for the area. The Luton-Dunstable Busway is rubbish and no one will use it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: East West Rail consortium consulted on a preferred route for the section between the MML and the ECML. The preferred route that emerged from that work was a route between Stevenage and the south of Luton <input type="checkbox"/> Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector.</p>				
418	Mr Andrew Robson	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3106	Susan Rodger	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Black Route of Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of appropriate consultation. <input type="checkbox"/> No convenient east-west traffic route so traffic has to go through Hitchin which is seriously congested. <input type="checkbox"/> A505 suffers congestion and bottlenecking at library roundabout in Hitchin. <input type="checkbox"/> Suggest traffic encouraged to use: M25 around London, M10 Hemel Hempstead to Hatfield, A428 Northampton to St Neots and A14 (M6) Huntingdon which are pre-existing routes providing good east-west links between M1 and A1. <input type="checkbox"/> No requirement for additional east-west link road. <input type="checkbox"/> Orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses in Luton. <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3104	Dr & Mrs A Rodger	Letchworth	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Black Route of Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of appropriate consultation. <input type="checkbox"/> No convenient east-west traffic route so traffic has to go through Hitchin which is seriously congested. <input type="checkbox"/> A505 suffers congestion and bottlenecking at library roundabout in Hitchin. <input type="checkbox"/> Suggest traffic encouraged to use: M25 around London, M10 Hemel Hempstead to Hatfield, A428 Northampton to St Neots and A14 (M6) Huntingdon which are pre-existing routes providing good east-west links between M1 and A1. <input type="checkbox"/> No requirement for additional east-west link road. <input type="checkbox"/> Orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses in Luton. <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3108	Samuel Rodger	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to Black Route of Luton Northern Bypass owing to impact on landscape, biodiversity and heritage. <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of appropriate consultation. <input type="checkbox"/> No convenient east-west traffic route so traffic has to go through Hitchin which is seriously congested. <input type="checkbox"/> A505 suffers congestion and bottlenecking at library roundabout in Hitchin. <input type="checkbox"/> Suggest traffic encouraged to use: M25 around London, M10 Hemel Hempstead to Hatfield, A428 Northampton to St Neots and A14 (M6) Huntingdon which are pre-existing routes providing good east-west links between M1 and A1. <input type="checkbox"/> No requirement for additional east-west link road. <input type="checkbox"/> Orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses in Luton. <input type="checkbox"/> Alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way which would link effectively to the M1 via the new roads to the airport and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2184	Derek Rogers	Harpenden	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed Luton northern bypass which is not supported by Highways Agency</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2204	Andrew Rogers	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Oppose Luton northern bypass: Lack of Highways Agency support with funding implications negative impact on archaeological sites and wildlife and no supporting independent studies No benefit to Hertfordshire or Luton residents</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
543	Mrs Margaret Rollason	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No I do NOT support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2914	Royal College of Music	London	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass would destroy the AONB. An alternative route running closer to the edge of Luton conurbation would utilise land earmarked decades ago for such purpose.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2965	Neil Ryden	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the North Luton Bypass Black Route as well as the East of Luton Bypass owing to: lack of evidence and consideration to the impact of these schemes and the proposed development to the East of Luton on the road infrastructure in Hitchin and other areas the fact that the "preferred" black route has been chosen based on public consultation (which was reached only because more people are affected by other routes) and does not take account of the impact on the AONB apart from mitigation. the lack of evidence and misleading of the benefit of the Luton Northern Bypass which would devastate the AONB the impact on the picturesque village of Lilley</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3939	Ruth Ryden	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to northern bypass black route and eastern bypass. The schemes are in clear conflict with the strategy's principles</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
186	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2150	Mrs Nicola Sadler	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed East of Luton development will generate a huge amount of traffic in the local area. The Northern and Eastern bypasses connected to the A505 near Lilley will funnel traffic towards Hitchin while the eastern bypass around the outside of the development will not help it to blend in with the rest of the conurbation. In addition, the increase in traffic will go towards Luton town centre creating gridlock on the already congested Hitchin Road.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
294	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: It is now beyond doubt that more roads bring more traffic and do not solve the problem of congestion. Also this proposal would destroy valuable areas of countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2992	Elizabeth Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the destructive impact of the northern and eastern bypasses on Lilley Bottom and the impact of the northern bypass on the Chilterns AONB including the destruction of archaeological remains, the loss of high quality agricultural land, the severance of agricultural tenancies and the adverse effect on recreational use. Both bypasses will result on increased traffic turning eastwards and affecting Hitchin in particular.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3223	Mr H L Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The bypasses will carve the landscape, the AONB from the M1 to the A505 and on round the airport. They will generate extra traffic moving east and west and will create a problem when the extra traffic has reached the A505 which then has to go through Hitchin before it can join the A1. Halcrow's traffic surveys resulted on a choice of bypass route closest to the town from the A6 and joining up with the A505 at the Chase roundabout. This would ease traffic congestion the best while impacting on the surrounding area the least. Other less damaging options have not being properly investigated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2816	R B Simmons	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Northern Bypass would cut through an AONB with disastrous consequences for wildlife and destroy an area of great archaeological interest and value.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3484	Pamela and Raymond Skeggs	St Ippolyts	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed line of the Northern Bypass passes through the Chilterns AONB which is contrary to established national policy. The proposed Eastern Bypass runs through Lilley Bottom which is of high landscape importance. The proposed Northern and Eastern bypasses conflict with preferred option CS15 to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape. The bypasses will also send traffic eastwards resulting in even more traffic and congestion in Hitchin, St Ippolyts and other nearby villages. This would create pressure for a southern bypass around Hitchin in the future.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1533	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: We completely oppose the Luton Northern bypass and the suggestion that work should be done on the Luton Northern bypass in Hertfordshire. The peter Brett Associates report highlighted that a package of measures instead of the road building could reduce car use, help accessibility which is crucial to the local economy , and reduce congestion far more than the road. There should be a programme of reduced speed limits in urban areas along the lines of shared space, so that we can encourage people to walk and cycle.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3370	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Detailed drawings of the A5-M1 link are not yet made available by the Highways Agency but it is submitted that all highway works proposed in respect of the link and the local roads which feed into the link should have regard to the potential change in character that will take place in this area when the urban extension comes forward. There is no provision for the Woodside Connection within the detailed design of the A5-M1 Link, although the Highways Agency have confirmed that the design of the J11A does not preclude a future connection. The Joint Planning Unit should push for a resolution of this matter as part of the background evidence given its relevance to the north of Houghton Regis extension.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
724	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: HRDC support the improvements to the capacity on the M1 and A5-M1 link road which will help remove through traffic from the main conurbation. HRDC will continue to co-ordinate with the JTU and HA to assist the expedient delivery of these. HRDC supports the preferred route for the Woodside Connection. HRDC will continue to work with the JTU and HA to agree a suitable route and form of connection to J11a of the M1. HRDC would support an integrated approach to delivering the Woodside Connection alongside the proposed works at J11a of the M1 and the A5-M1 link road. HRDC believes that some of the urban extension and proposed growth could be accommodated in advance of the proposed strategic highway improvements through limited targeted improvements to the existing highway network. HRDC would welcome the opportunity to continue discussion of this with the JTU to ensure that the evidence base is robust and that the preferred options have been appropriately assessed in terms of highway and transport capacity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2444	St Ippolyts Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The preferred Northern Bypass route passes through the CAONB and conflicts with Government policy on such areas and CS15. The route has been chosen in spite of reservations about landscape, biodiversity and heritage. The 2009 public consultation on the route focused on residents in the main conurbation. The proposed 'cut and cover' tunnels will make it prohibitively expensive. The Eastern Bypass will run through Lilley Bottom (high landscape importance) and cannot be justified solely to serve the urban extension East of Luton. It conflicts with CS15. These two highway options are not expected to attract EU, national or regional funding and cannot be justified on national or regional strategic grounds. These proposals cannot be justified without a study into the effects on Hitchin's infrastructure with related public consultation and should be deleted from CS4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2623	St Paul's Walden Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The preferred northern bypass route passes mainly through the CAONB and conflicts with government policy on such areas and with CS15. The proposed eastern bypass will run through Lilley Bottom valley, which is of high landscape importance, cannot be justified solely to serve the proposed development east of Luton and conflicts with Preferred Option CS15. The two highway options are not expected to attract EU, national or regional funds, demonstrating that they cannot be justified on national or regional strategic grounds. The proposed eastern section of the northern bypass and the eastern bypass should be deleted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1431	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: It is recognised that Junction 10a is considered to be a constraint to development and this is something the Council are seeking to address. As one of the primary landowners affected by the proposed improvements, our client is committed to cooperating with Luton Borough Council as proposals are progressed and to ensure the junction design considers the likely land take and design considerations in bringing forward proposals on our client's land including the Park and Ride site (same as comment for 7.12).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree      Proposed Action: Consider the role of Jnc 10a in delivering the strategic objectives</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of development at Jnc10A is appropriate through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies</p>				
2117	Streaitley Parish Council	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The JPC have not considered the impact of development on villages north of Luton. Jobs will be to the south of the town, when housing will be built to the north. The by-pass will only assist traffic travelling from Dunstable to Hitchin. Alternative transport measures are very low usage in Luton, more consideration is needed to increase their usage. The Northern Bypass has no Government funding. The council and GAPP are united in that Junction 11a should be used for a local bypass and not for access to local roads as this will add to their lorry problem. The cut and cover tunnel will not completely mitigate impact on the SSSI and will be prohibitively expensive. Consultation on the Northern By-Pass received about 800 responses against by-passes. Other less damaging options than the by-pass have not been considered sufficiently. Part of the route falls within North Hertfordshire, who are opposing development within their boundary. The route of the by-pass will direct noise and pollution directly at Streaitley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1361	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Taylor Wimpey supports the proposals for the strategic highway transport infrastructure, in particular the Joint Committee's intention to lobby the Government to ensure the delivery or, at least, commencement of the A5-M1 Link Road scheme by 2011/12.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1504	The Crown Estate	London	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: We particularly support the North Luton Bypass (which between the A6 and A505 crosses part of the Crown Estate landholding) which we regard as an essential part of the package of transport measures necessary to ensure improved, congestion free, accessibility for all (including those on public transport).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1186	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Support Option 1 Woodside Connection as it avoids significant habitats and species in HR Quarry. <input type="checkbox"/> All bypass options would adversely impact biodiversity and landscape. Option 1 (Luton Northern Bypass) would affect six CWS, two SSSI and the CAONB. It would sever habitat links between these sites and surrounding countryside, vital to enable species to move in response to climate change. The Principles of PPS9 state harm should be prevented, especially where other options are available. The Local Nature Reserve is important greenspace and the topography allows views of open countryside adding to the well-being and quality of life of local people. <input type="checkbox"/> No evidence of Luton Northern Bypass being more than a local scheme. <input type="checkbox"/> The tunnel is unlikely to mitigate effects on landscape and biodiversity. <input type="checkbox"/> Due to the degradation of important landscapes and wildlife sites, CS4 conflicts with CS15 and CS17. Policies within the Strategy should be internally consistent or lead to the document being unsound.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2063	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: Support is given for the inclusion of land at Thorn Farm and Berry Corner Farm within a mixed-use development scheme between the A5 and A5120, (Site F). Support is given for the inclusion of a strategic employment area near J11a, also further employment to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis, near the A5/A505 junction. Concerns about the Area of Search being expanded to encompass all the land between the A5-M1 Link and Dunstable and Houghton Regis to the south. Development on these Sites incorporating the A5/M1 Link Road represents a sustainable, comprehensive and deliverable proposal to provide mixed-use development. The intention to promote the Luton &amp; Dunstable Busway through this area would enhance its sustainability in transport terms. A more detailed survey and assessment will clarify much of the detail in the Environmental Sensitivity Report and Site Appraisal Matrix and demonstrate how development can be successful.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Detail extent of urban extensions		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Exact extent of urban extensions has yet to be confirmed. <input type="checkbox"/> Urban extensions north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis will be supported by employment provision.</p>				
2700	Mrs N Thwaites	Derbyshire	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed Luton Northern Bypass would run through North Herfordshire's AONB. The bypass route connecting with Vauxhall way which was part of the North Dunstable and North Luton Consultation on transport proposals earlier in 2009 must be the most sensible option to linking the M1 and airport. The Luton Northern Bypass would exacerbate traffic problems.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2161	Natalie Tracey	Luton	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The road through an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and historic sites such as Galley Hill cannot be justified.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2892	Karen Turner	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Question whether any consideration has been given to the impact of an eastern bypass. The northern bypass will cut up a huge are of countryside which is AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3719	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: I am appalled by the support for the northern bypass black route and the eastern bypass. The rationale behind a full orbital road around Luton should be questioned. It will draw traffic away from the town centre to the detriment of business within the town. An alternative solution to congestion on the east side of Luton is to widen Vauxhall Way which has available land either side and would link well with the M1. It would also not incur the costs and disruption of tunnelling under the airport or through the CAONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2863	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass would dissect the Chilterns AONB, contrary to Section 12.1 of the Draft Core Strategy which notes the AONB is a significant asset and that no urban extension will be proposed in it. The archaeology in the area is likely to have an impact on the construction of the bypass. An orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of business in the town. An alternative solution to congestion on the east of Luton is the widening of Vauxhall Way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
830	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposals relating to building two bypasses (M1 to A505 and A505 to Airport Way) as they would cut through huge swathes of green belt land east of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2010	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: The option fails to specify enabling public transport to create viable rural communities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The option relates to strategic highway infrastructure. Public transport provision in rural areas is covered in CS 5.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2889	Mrs I I Walker	Stanmore	Q. 6	No
Comment: The northern bypass would degrade the status of the AONB, it would encourage far more traffic and it does not appear to be financially viable.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
487	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
Comment: Absolutely NOT. Road building in the Chilterns (AONB) is completely unacceptable. Lilley Bottom is an area of high landscape value and the countryside will NOT be "preserved and enhanced" by such road building. Road building merely serves to increase the volume of road traffic and a more imaginative approach is needed to deter motor vehicle usage rather than encourage it and further destroy the remaining countryside.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
3477	Warden Hill Residents Association	Luton	Q. 6	Yes
Comment: We are particularly pleased to see that the "preferred" route for the Luton northern bypass is now to the north and east of Galley Hill, well away from our residential area and the Warden Hill SSSI.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				
2951	Mrs J A Weller	Cockermhoe	Q. 6	No
Comment: A full orbital road around Luton would have severe economic implications for businesses, killing off the town centre and creating retail parks on the outskirts. Development proposed will increase congestion on the A505 and local roads cannot cope with extra traffic or large vehicles.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
776	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 6	No
Comment: No. The A5-M1 link road may have some merit but in general no new roads are needed. It is better to upgrade the existing roads, such as the A505 Vauxhall Way (which easily has the capacity to be dual carriageway).				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1001	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 6	Yes
<p>Comment: As far as the proposals go, they are good. But again, not a single mention of any traffic alleviation in the Leighton-Linslade area - yet the proposal to put 2500 houses there has the potential to put a further 4000 cars on the local roads!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS4 refers to measures for Leighton Linslade</p>				
3032	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockermhoe	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The Northern Bypass passes mainly through the Chilterns AONB and conflicts with national policy and preferred option CS15. The proposed Eastern Bypass would run through the Lilley Bottom valley which is of high landscape importance, and cannot be justified solely to serve the preferred urban extension East of Luton. Neither are supposed to attract EU, national or regional funding demonstrating they cannot be justified on national or regional grounds. The proposed eastern section of the Northern Bypass and the Eastern Bypass should be deleted from Preferred Option CS4.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
3158	Mrs R Whetnall	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed bypasses would impact directly onto the surrounding rural area and cut a swath through the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2178	Andrew Wiggins	Slip End	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Oppose Luton Northern Bypass which is not supported by Highways Agency</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2851	Thomas Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Luton northern bypass This is not financially viable (the Highways Agency does not support the building of this bypass).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2850	Wendy Wolstencroft	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Luton northern bypass and an eastern extension through Lilley Bottom. This is not financially viable (the Highways Agency does not support the building of this bypass) and it will destroy the outstanding chalk valley of Lilley Bottom.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1104	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The building of major roads to remove traffic from urban areas to acquire capacity for growth in urban traffic appears to be self-defeating. The main impact of the proposed north and east bypasses is to bring long-distance traffic into the area. A more effective strategy would be to design single carriageway "spine roads" through the urban extensions which both provide access from the existing radial routes and have capacity for local traffic to bypass the existing urban road network.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2989	John Wood	Nr. Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The traffic bypasses would not be able to attract away the traffic generated by the east of Luton proposal from the town centre.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
2566	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Main impact of proposed east and north bypasses is that they will bring long-distance traffic into area More effective strategy would be to design single carriageway 'spine roads' through urban extensions, providing access from existing radial routes and capacity for local traffic to bypass existing urban road network</p>				
JC Response: Not agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>			
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2949	Ms Margaret Woods	Lilley	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: Object to the Black Route of the Luton Northern Bypass and the Eastern Luton Bypass owing to impact on the landscape (AONB), biodiversity and heritage and lack of appropriate consultation as stated by North Herts in their response dated 27th February 2009. An orbital road around Luton would draw traffic around the town to the detriment of businesses in Luton. Alternative solution is widening Vauxhall Way would link to the M1 via the new roads to the airport, not disrupt the airport and would not incur the cost to the tunnels under the airport or north of Lilley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
345	Mrs Francesca Wroe	Hitchin	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The proposed routes Luton Northern bypass and Luton Eastern Bypass pass through beautiful countryside and will destroy it. They are not necessary.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
641	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 6	No
<p>Comment: The strategic transport infrastructure includes bypasses built on an AONB. The eastern extension on the Luton northern bypass was not presented to the public in the bypass consultation and if linked with massive housing development may well have changed the public response. This whole integrated bypass situation, including the eastern extension and access to Century Park needs to be studied together and taken to a second more sensible public consultation</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
4025	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 5.52	Yes
<p>Comment: Each of these qualified statements is applicable to infrastructure associated with EoL and is welcomed. The 6th bullet should also reflect close proximity to employment and other key land uses, to minimise the need to travel prior to appropriate requirements for public transport accessibility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Ensure transport strategy highlights the need to locate uses spatially to minimise the need and distance to travel.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a core factor behind modal shift</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2302	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 5.52	No
<p>Comment: PPS 12 states that Core Strategies must be based on sound infrastructure delivery planning. The POCD contains minimal information relating to how major pieces of infrastructure are to be funded and the partners required to bring them forward - this is particularly the case in terms of major transport proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
2187	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 5.52	No
<p>Comment: During the detailed Jan/Feb 09 Bypass consultation, Natural England supported the development of an alternative, non-bypass option and maintains that this option must be explored fully in line with the policy framework stated above. While the need to explore this option is identified in paragraph 5.45 of the current consultation, there is no mention of this work as part of the further measures required for the North Luton Bypass, listed in paragraph 5.52.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Complete further work on non-northern bypass option</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: JC report of 20 March 09 indicated that further work on Luton Northern bypass was required.</p>				
43	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.52	No
<p>Comment: This all sounds great but is meaningless. There is no secured funding or commitment. Developers will ride roughshod over this and the population of Central Bedfordshire will be left to pick up the pieces</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
719	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Para. 5.52	Yes
<p>Comment: Proposed improvements to transport infrastructure and their delivery are of significant importance to the delivery of growth proposed as part of the Core Strategy. Therefore HRDC supports the desire to deliver the proposed improvements in a timely and effective manner to support the proposed growth. HRDC would welcome the opportunity to continue to work closely with the JTU and the Highways Agency to ensure that the proposed highway and public transport infrastructure is delivered within the proposed timescales. There is also the opportunity to investigate the early delivery of parts of the proposed urban extension, which will help to bring forward some of the regeneration benefits ahead of the major transport infrastructure, making best use of the existing infrastructure and services. HRDC would welcome the opportunity to continue discussion of this with the JTU and assess the capacity of existing transport infrastructure to accommodate growth ahead of the delivery of any major transport infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1224	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.52	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the essence of the 4th bullet point, which seeks to ensure infrastructure is delivered "in step with the planned Growth in a timely incremental and phased manner" but feel it should also state "in advance of development where necessary". We feel that the 6th bullet point should specifically mention walking and cycling rather than the over-used and non-specific "and other means of travel other than the private car".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The current approach offers greater flexibility.</p>				
149	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.53	No
<p>Comment: The old Dunstable to Luton branch railway line. Turning this into a modern rail/tram line would offer more success and a greater impact on congestion reduction than a bus route. It would connect the centre of Dunstable and Luton directly to each other, providing a real alternative to the car. <input type="checkbox"/> Saying that car use is not sustainable ignores the reality that car use is certain to increase if 25,000 new homes are added to the area. <input type="checkbox"/> A tram line as well as creating a new route separate and unaffected by road congestion and road works, would be a more desirable alternative to the bus in terms of reliability and status. <input type="checkbox"/> A tram would also fit very well in with the whole future vision of Luton as a 'Green Growth Area'. <input type="checkbox"/> Regarding buses. <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Having separate school buses so that people can travel without the turmoil of loud and verbally aggressive school children would encourage greater bus usage. <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Selling discounted tickets or monthly etc tickets to residents would encourage greater bus usage. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Options of re-opening the old Luton-Dunstable railway as a tram or modern railway were considered extensively at the Public Inquiry into the Bus way, and rejected by the Inspector.</p>				
1784	Stopsley Against Development (SAD)	Luton	Para. 5.53	No
<p>Comment: Transportation movement proposals for the intended population of the East of Luton urban extension are questionable. Both the North and East of Luton proposals are a considerable distance from the conurbation centre. In relation to the East our transport data suggests that the largest amount of movements (36%) will be seeking to access Luton town centre. Due to Area L's location on the periphery, it is not considered appropriate to walk. Cycling is within planning criteria but the journey would still be some distance and the existing road network would prove problematic in incorporating cycle lanes. Cycling is not favourable and very little will attempt to cycle the journey. <input type="checkbox"/> Public transport will help but the existing road network is extremely constricted and again due to the East of Luton's geographical location will be restrained. <input type="checkbox"/> The majority of travel movements will be by car and the capacity and limitation to enhance the existing routes into the town centre are not there.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1226	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.53	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the fact that this para does specifically mention the walking and cycling networks.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
2296	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.55	No
<p>Comment: Reducing parking provision in new developments will lead to people parking on the road causing dangerous obstructions Reducing parking in town centres and workplaces and making them more expensive will impact most on working mothers. Walking and buses are not suitable alternatives for working mothers implying indirect discrimination</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 5.68 further describes the approach to parking provision</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
44	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.55	No
<p>Comment: If you have to force people to travel by means other than car then your strategy has failed. People travel by train, bus, or cycle when they provide a better means of travelling from A to B. When that is the situation such as commuting to London then it is seen that other means of transport are taken up. Failure to provide parking in residential developments does not reduce car ownership it only makes the residential environment poorer and less safe. Cars should be parked off road, not on road. This ensures that pedestrians are more visible. Currently people are forced onto congested and poorly performing public transport. It should be the other way around. Improve the transport infrastructure and people will use it</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The strategy is not forcing people to shift mode of transport, it seeks to make alternative modes more attractive				
643	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.55	No
<p>Comment: Looking at the location of the proposed development east of Luton, there will be no way that private cars will be required less by these residents. Reducing private parking provision will make a nonsense of the living environment in the new urban extension</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 5.68 further describes the approach to parking provision				
2297	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.56	Yes
<p>Comment: Object to any proposal that mixes pedestrians and cyclists without a safety barrier between them. Cyclists are a danger to pedestrians.</p>				
JC Response: Not Agree		Proposed Action: Review all sources of sustainable transport strategy to ensure the Core Strategy facilitates their delivery.		
JC Reason for Response: Design principles will be guided by other, agreed sustainable transport strategies				
1432	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.56	Yes
<p>Comment: Park and Ride schemes were popular with respondents so providing one at M1 Junction 10a as part of a town wide strategy would maximise the potential effectiveness of the strategy. Some 600-1000 parking spaces could be provided at this key gateway site which will intercept both town centre trips and those to the airport and to the employment areas.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Consider the role of Jnc 10a in delivering the strategic objectives		
JC Reason for Response: subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of park and ride at Jnc10A is appropriate through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies				
1433	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.58	Yes
<p>Comment: Our Clients site at Junction 10a of the M1 provides an opportunity to provide frequent and reliable services from a key gateway to the town which is in support of this Policy.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Consider the role of Jnc 10a in delivering the strategic objectives		
JC Reason for Response: subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of services at Jnc10A is appropriate through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies				
644	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.58	No
<p>Comment: The levy levels on developers east of Luton will not even allow the building of the bypasses, let alone subsidising public transport</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
150	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.59	Yes
<p>Comment: These would all help. Other ideas I have are: 1. Having separate school buses so that people can travel without the turmoil of loud and verbally aggressive school children would encourage greater bus usage. 2. Selling discounted tickets or monthly etc tickets to residents would encourage greater bus usage. This works well in London with travel cards etc. You encourage bus usage as you almost see a bus journey as free (although the reality is it's already paid for). 3. Perhaps when the network is up and running to a good capacity, promotions such as free travel to everyone for a month, this would highlight what routes and service is out there and encourage further use of buses after this time as people are now aware.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Discounted season tickets on buses are already available to the public. <input type="checkbox"/> Other incentives are subject to the strategies of service providers</p>				
2298	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.60	Yes
<p>Comment: Lack of rural transport should have been addressed a long time ago. Believe it will be used to persuade rural community to agree to developments</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy seeks to address known issues in the planning area</p>				
2300	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.60	Yes
<p>Comment: It appears that existing natural country footpaths will be covered with tarmac and new ones created. These networks will be extension of urban tarmac. Bridleways must not be lost through downgrading to footpaths and cars should not be allowed to use them</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy does not suggest this.</p>				
3249	Christine Davy	No address	Para. 5.61	No
<p>Comment: the paragraph overemphasises the importance of NCN 6. The emphasis needs to be on improving the local cycle network.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS7 covers approach to improving the network</p>				
45	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.61	No
<p>Comment: Cycle use for short journeys from home to station or leisure are achievable and laudable. However, it will never be possible to carry out a family shop with a young family in tow on a bike! We need sensible transport proposals not political dogma!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy does not expect all trips to be made by bicycle.</p>				
1227	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.61	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome inclusion of this detail. There should be reference to the Cycle Strategy Refresh and the Rights of Way Improvements Plans (and to seeking to deliver the priorities identified within them) at the appropriate point.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Review all sources of sustainable transport strategy to ensure the Core Strategy facilitates their delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All agreed sustainable transport strategies should be supported by the Core Strategy</p>				
151	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.62	Yes
<p>Comment: Agreed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3252	Christine Davy	No address	Para. 5.62	Yes
Comment: This paragraph should mention schools.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The list serves to provide a few examples, not the entire range.				
1230	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.62	Yes
Comment: Although leisure facilities are mentioned, specific reference should be made to linking to green spaces and to the Leighton Linlade "Green Wheel".				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Review all sources of sustainable transport strategy to ensure the Core Strategy facilitates their delivery.				
JC Reason for Response: All agreed sustainable transport strategies should be supported by the Core Strategy				
3254	Christine Davy	No address	Para. 5.63	No
Comment: The paragraph should say appropriate crossing facilities rather than appropriate signalised crossing facilities to allow all types of crossing facility to be considered and the appropriate one introduced.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Design principles will be guided by other, agreed sustainable transport strategies and site-specific circumstances				
2192	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 5.63	Yes
Comment: We welcome the statements made in paragraph 5.63, particularly as they relate to linking the cycle network within the existing urban areas to the surrounding countryside. Similarly we support paragraph 5.64 regarding the expansion of outdoor routes and we welcome the last bullet point regarding walking and cycling routes in Preferred Option CS5.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				
152	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 5.64	Yes
Comment: Cycle ways work best when laid out as in The Netherlands. Here cyclists have their own lane, and do not have to compete with pedestrians. Also at crossings and junctions they are usually given priority over cars so you do not have to keep dismounting or leave the cycle path every time you come to a roundabout. This way they are safer and become a faster, easier alternative to the car. Enforcement of parking in cycle lanes is something that has to go hand-in-hand with having them to get the best impact.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Review all sources of sustainable transport strategy to ensure the Core Strategy facilitates their delivery.				
JC Reason for Response: Design principles will be guided by other, agreed sustainable transport strategies				
2193	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 5.64	Yes
Comment: We welcome the statements made in paragraph 5.63, particularly as they relate to linking the cycle network within the existing urban areas to the surrounding countryside. Similarly we support paragraph 5.64 regarding the expansion of outdoor routes and we welcome the last bullet point regarding walking and cycling routes in Preferred Option CS5.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1264	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.64	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome specific reference to the OAIIP and Luton ROWIP and linking urban areas to the wider countryside, although feel there is an imbalance (both in the text and in Figure 2) with little detail for Leighton Linlade. We would suggest specific reference to the development of the Leighton Linlade Green Wheel (both in the text and in Figure 2). The principle of ensuring people from both existing and new communities, particularly in the proposed urban extensions, have easy and appropriate access to greenspaces and the wider countryside is vital. Development must not cut people off from greenspaces and the countryside - particularly major transport schemes that can have a major impact by severing existing access routes while not creating adequate opportunities to get across them.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Review all sources of sustainable transport strategy to ensure the Core Strategy facilitates their delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All agreed sustainable transport strategies should be supported by the Core Strategy</p>				
645	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 5.64	No
<p>Comment: Somewhat ironic, given the invasion of Green Belt and an AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
3230	Christine Davy	No address	Para. 5.65	No
<p>Comment: This could be stronger and say that travel plans should be produced for all of these and also encourage developers to offer individual travel planning to purchasers of new homes to assist in the education of residents in how they can travel sustainable to locations that they usually travel to. The paragraph does not mention mitigation to ensure that parking is not transferred to the highway. This could increase road safety problems and congestion which in turn could reduce the number of people wishing to use sustainable transport options such as walking and cycling.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Consider the full range of development types that may require transport assessment and travel plans.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Development types can range in size and function, alongside their need to support private car trips.</p>				
1265	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.65	Yes
<p>Comment: The list of land uses should also include green spaces (in addition to leisure facilities - this often implies built/sports facilities).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The list serves to provide a few examples, not the entire range.</p>				
2837	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.66	No
<p>Comment: Travel plan "Proposals of this nature are currently being developed for Leighton Buzzard station". But as yet have produced no changes to car usage!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Current travel plans for Leighton Buzzard station are not a concern of the Core Strategy</p>				
1002	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 5.66	Yes
<p>Comment: "Proposals of this nature are currently being developed for Leighton Buzzard station." But as yet have produced nothing!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Current travel plans for Leighton Buzzard station are not a concern of the Core Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1434	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.67	No
<p>Comment: The provision of new strategic infrastructure should be balanced spatially as well as in terms of its approach. The Core Strategy concentrates development and infrastructure to the north of the town.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			
46	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.68	No
<p>Comment: So once again we supposedly consult and then because the response does not agree with the policy ignore it. People will only reduce car usage when better alternatives exist. It has already been demonstrated in previous clauses that the transport infrastructure will not be in place for some time after development takes place. Cars will still be bought and owned during this period and proper provision for parking of these vehicles should be incorporated</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			
1435	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 5.68	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph Policy: Paragraph 5.68 Support/Object/ Comment : Comment Park and ride sites provide opportunities to remove parking and congestion in town centres. Therefore the provision of a park and ride site at J10a would support Policy 5.58.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Consider the role of Jnc 10a in delivering the strategic objectives</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of park and ride at Jnc10A is appropriate through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies</p>			
1061	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 5.69	Yes
<p>Comment: The policy seeks to locate all types of development in locations that maximise the potential for non-car travel. Slip End is well related to both Dunstable and Luton with frequent bus services connecting to both parts of the conurbation (and beyond). As such, upon review of the most appropriate locations for growth within the Rural Settlements, we consider that Slip End is well placed to accommodate development and should be considered favourably in terms of its relative sustainability.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Consider the role of Slip End in delivering the strategic objectives</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>subject to it being objectively confirmed, without prejudice, that the inclusion of development around Slip End is appropriate through its testing and evaluation in the light of all relevant supporting evidence studies</p>			
1266	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.69	No
<p>Comment: We do not feel this policy will be strong enough to encourage development to be located in places that make using more sustainable forms of transport the preferred option - again, this is something we feel is needed if the area is to truly be a 'Green growth Area'. The third bullet gives the right message, but by only suggesting that "priority will be given" leaves it open to abuse - this should be an essential criteria.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	<p>Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>		
JC Reason for Response:	<p>Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
672	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: yes, in particular because they fit in with the idea of creating a healthier society which most of the other plans appear to run entirely counter.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				
1963	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: The current transport system does not provide good access to employment, particularly for those starting/ finishing work early/ late. Consider how the population can access employment and leisure by public transport to avoid isolation and private transport dependency.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1690	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 7	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy				
2303	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: Support with caveats as referred to in previous comments				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The caveats referred to will be assessed through the respondent's other comments				
2669	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: Building on existing patterns of development could help overcome weaknesses, especially in highway infrastructure, changing the linear Luton-Dunstable axis and generating a more integrated pattern of movement, linking a public transport network to all parts of the conurbation, main railway line and airport. The need for coherent and practical public transport is obvious. Early introduction of such a system would instil confidence in the development proposals and generate a forward-looking, enthusiastic community. It would co-ordinate with increasing pressures on the road network for private transport by incorporating the North Luton Link Route. In this way, future phases of development should be encouraged, enabling land to be brought forward in accordance with the planned timetable.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery				
JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.				
1947	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: This addresses the key issues in the SCS. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1817	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Board not object to Policy CS5 and Figure 2. We note the promotion of walking and cycling and would like to express caution in connection with the identification of new formal routes into and out of the Chilterns AONB. Public rights of way should be provided as part of new development and the provision of green infrastructure is vital to the sustainability of new development. Where roads are encountered such rights of way should be taken over the obstacle on green bridges. This form of infrastructure is not mentioned and should be included as part of this section.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Consider the role of green bridges in providing sustainable travel.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Existing Public Rights of Way will be incorporated into new developments as part of the master-planning of those areas. <input type="checkbox"/> New routes should be directed by existing, agreed strategies.</p>				
860	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposals properly underpin an objective of maximising sustainable travel which when achieved minimises the need for building new roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
2952	Peter Cousins	London	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree that transport links within Luton need to be addressed. There is a great need for the proposed better interchange with major bus routes at the railway station. The best use of the track bed of the Luton-Dunstable railway is a railway or a tramway. Guided busway concept is thoroughly discredited.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The guided bus way has been tested against other options and is a committed delivery with committed funding</p>				
3281	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: Seeking to promote non-car travel and enhance accessibility by encouraging travel by means other than the car is supported. However, there is a clear contradiction of the aims of the Core Strategy and current Government Guidance which seeks the promotion of more sustainable transport choices and reduction of the need to travel, particularly by car.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
1253	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: It ignores the fact that people like to travel in cars rather than cycling</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to encourage a shift from car use by providing a more attractive public transport alternative.</p>				
1577	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: RES Goal 7- Transport seeks to deliver a balanced and sustainable transport system that fully supports sustainable economic growth. EEDA welcomes the approach being taken to accessibility and transport in your preferred options document. By ensuring that the location of new development and existing development is as far as possible accessible by public transport and other alternatives to the private car will contribute significantly to your aspirations to be recognised for 'green growth'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1596	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy</p>				
1645	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there policy for urban / rural / local transport? Partnership working with the Hertfordshire authorities is supported. The Luton-Dunstable Busway is an RFA priority and scheduled for delivery between 2011/12 and 2018/19. The Luton Town Centre Transport Scheme was put back by the Region to ensure that is remained deliverable and the schedule suggests completion by 2012/13. The A5-M1 Link Road (Dunstable Northern Bypass) is scheduled to be delivered by 2014/15.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The approach to urban/ rural/ local transport is covered in CS5</p>				
4026	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: The locational benefit of delivering growth areas, as distinct from the ability to make them accessible and connected, is well reflected within the policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
2785	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the concept of maximizing sustainable transport, but these proposals will have a negligible effect on any proposals for development around Leighton-Linslade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposals are designed to support all development across the planning area.</p>				
1860	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: When constructing new transport infrastructure, seek to reduce flood risk such as through provision of SUDs. M1 surface water run-off should be handled by pollution interceptors and attenuation to improve water quality and flood risk management. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Flood Risk assessment will be undertaken as part of the detailed development of transport schemes and development areas. <input type="checkbox"/> CS15 notes the approach to flood management</p>				
938	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: All proposals to reduce travel by car and promote use of public transport, walking and cycling can only be good for the environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
204	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: The cycle lanes and priorities in Luton are a joke that have been badly implemented, benefit almost no-one and harm everyone else. Remove them!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Cycle lanes could be changed to react to changing needs and character of individual areas</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
710	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: These provisions will diminish the justification for new road provision, particularly the proposed bypasses.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
413	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Supporting these provisions will diminish the justification for new road provision particularly the proposed bypasses.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
3903	John Keys	Unknown	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: There are no adequate proposals put forward for Leighton Linlade, with the investment emphasis directed solely to Luton, Houghton Regis and Dunstable. The proposed 2500 dwellings for Leighton Linlade cannot be integrated into the already congested and inadequate road and rail links.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposals are designed to support all development across the planning area.</p>				
2727	Kings Walden Parish Council	Royston	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: To sprawl-out east into the countryside will ensure that Luton's Town Centre will be far from being central. There will be greater congestion on local roads and lanes and the A505 into Hitchin and Stopsley, while J10 and J10a are already nearing full capacity. Existing country lanes are inadequate to cope with increasing traffic and the uncalculated construction cost would fall on the tax-payer. More highways bring greater destruction to the quality of life causing more noise and pollution.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
1890	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: We support seeking to promote non-car travel and enhancing accessibility by encouraging travel by means other than the car. Unfortunately however we must point out that the Transport Assessment which forms part of the Core Strategy Evidence Base suggests in Paragraph 4.2.3. that "overall growth in public transport based person trips is lower, reflecting the fact that car travel has become relatively easier". Further reliance on new transport infrastructure (roads) will do little, if anything, to maximise sustainable travel.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Core Strategy seeks to achieve a balance between sustainable transport for local trips and bypasses to reduce through traffic and cross-conurbation trips.</p>				
3403	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1912	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: with reservations. We support measures listed in CS5 although more could be included. But these could not counter the massive increase in car use triggered by the approach in CS4. More proactive work with schools is needed to set up Walking Bus schemes and to get more pupils walking and cycling, in order to cut parental car trips. Luton has chosen this as a National Indicator and is not at present living up to it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure strategy facilitates use of travel plans.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: More proactive work would be a matter for individual travel plans or specific locations</p>				
2083	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: The integration of measures for both strategic highway infrastructure and the public transport network will provide a positive context to maximise sustainable travel. Luton Borough and Central Bedfordshire can take this integrated package approach forward as partners, through the LTP, based on DfT requirements. Investment can be supported via the IDP and other potential contributions. An integrated approach to accessibility and travel supports objectives on obesity, healthy lifestyles, pollution, respiratory disease, accidents, and climate change. Improvements to public transport services and walking/cycling networks will present opportunities to benefit local businesses and key growth drivers. Combined with Travel Plan initiatives, these measures will assist businesses in recruiting locally with competitive transport and housing costs.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1926	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses the key issues in the SCS. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
2189	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Preferred Option CS5 - Maximising Opportunities for Sustainable Travel. We welcome the statements made in paragraph 5.63, particularly as they relate to linking the cycle network within the existing urban areas to the surrounding countryside. Similarly we support paragraph 5.64 regarding the expansion of outdoor routes and we welcome the last bullet point regarding walking and cycling routes in Preferred Option CS5.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1459	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockermhoe	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Much needed in this area, long been ignored.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
47	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: The policy is not achievable, is not commensurate with the development programme, and does not respond to the problems that will arise</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3940	Ruth Ryden	Lilley	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: The northern bypass and development east of Luton will increase traffic in the local area and Hitchin, yet no consideration has been made to the effect on Hitchin.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
721	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: The HRDC supports the consideration of sustainable travel opportunities when determining a site's suitability for development. This enables integration between existing and proposed communities, facilities and services. The new communities will be pedestrian and cycle friendly through the proposed street environment and good land use planning which will enable essential facilities and services, including public transport, to be within easy walking distance. A strategy is being developed to encourage sustainable patterns of travel, which will include measures for residents in both the existing and new communities. The HRDC welcomes the opportunity to develop this strategy in collaboration with the JTU.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy</p>				
1436	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: Is the concentration of development to the north of Luton at junction 11a of the M1 the most sustainable 'spatial distribution' of development where significant infrastructure is required to support development? The spatial distribution requires new sustainable transport infrastructure in the form of a parkway station, park and ride sites, new bus services and extensions to the guided busway and is reliant on delivery of this to fulfil the objective to maximise sustainable travel. Yet the key highway infrastructure has been focused on in recent years and therefore has a greater chance of being funded and implemented. More work needs to be undertaken, to prove that the other critical elements of Sustainable Transport Infrastructure can be delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The location of the strategic employment area at Jnc11a is subject to sustainability appraisal.</p>				
2011	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: The option fails to specify enabling public transport to create viable rural communities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: CS7 states an approach to improving public transport provision in rural areas</p>				
488	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 7	Yes
<p>Comment: Increased use of public transport, particularly rail, is to be supported, as it is less environmentally damaging. Cycling and walking should also be incentivised (and motor vehicle use disincentivised) as these are the least environmentally intrusive and least polluting forms of transport (i.e. sustainable).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure strategy facilitates use of travel plans.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Incentives and disincentives would be a matter for individual travel plans or specific locations</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
777	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 7	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy				
1003	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: I support the concept of maximising sustainable transport, but these proposals will have a negligible effect on any proposals for development around Leighton-Linslade.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposals are designed to support all development across the planning area.				
3035	David Gibson Wheatley	Cockermhoe	Q. 7	Yes
Comment: Support				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy				
1105	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 7	No
Comment: The main proposal for travel within the conurbation which is not car-based relies on bus services. At present, many areas have no effective bus service after 6pm. The Core Strategy offers no new mechanisms for addressing this deficiency. It would be a major error to plan new residential areas with the expectation of relatively low levels of car ownership if this problem cannot be surmounted.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure strategy sets-out approach to sustainable transport provision in urban extensions				
JC Reason for Response: Developers promoting the SUEs would be required to fund provision of new services. The Local Transport Act 2009 provides various mechanisms for securing bus services				
2567	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 7	No
Comment: Main proposal for non car based travel relies on bus services when many areas have no effective service after 6pm and the Core Strategy offers no new mechanisms for addressing this deficiency Major error to plan new residential areas with expectations of low car ownership if bus service problem is not addressed				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure strategy sets-out approach to sustainable transport provision in urban extensions				
JC Reason for Response: Developers promoting the SUEs would be required to fund provision of new services. The Local Transport Act 2009 provides various mechanisms for securing bus services				
347	Mrs Francesca Wroe	Hitchin	Q. 7	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not provided supporting text, though is in overall agreement with the strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
647	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 7	No
<p>Comment: The transport sustainability proposals have a degree of merit, but are let down because developments such as the one east of Luton have no travel infrastructure at the outset. It is necessary to focus development to make use of existing transport infrastructure not have to create it from scratch. Cycling and walking provision in the east of Luton is not covered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Further work to be undertaken to finalise the transport infrastructure needed to support growth, to identify appropriate measures to mitigate impact and ensure its timely delivery</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Provision for the level and type of Transport infrastructure that ongoing transport studies demonstrate is needed to support growth will be included in the Core Strategy. The means by which it will be delivered and over what timescales will also be included together with all associated contingency measures. the impacts of delivering growth on other locations is being assessed and will be addressed through appropriate regional level partnership channels.</p>				
667	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 5.70	No
<p>Comment: On the basis of the current road layout and provision for cyclists in Luton I expect nothing other than wilful incompetence.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No information provided to support respondent's view</p>				
823	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.70	Yes
<p>Comment: Bridleways must not be destroyed by downgrading them to footpaths nor by changing them to dangerous all user by-ways. Horse-riding and enjoyment of the natural environment in this organic way is not just an amenity available to the rural community but is also valued by those living in an urban environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Bridleways could be changed to react to changing needs and character of individual areas</p>				
825	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 5.70	Yes
<p>Comment: Bridleways must not be destroyed by downgrading them to footpaths nor by changing them to dangerous all user by-ways. Horse-riding and enjoyment of the natural environment in this organic way is not just an amenity available to the rural community but is also valued by those living in an urban environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Bridleways could be changed to react to changing needs and character of individual areas</p>				
1535	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 5.70	Yes
<p>Comment: It is crucial that the lessons from the Sustainable Demonstration towns are applied and a full programme of smarter choices is applied. New development should follow the model of Leighton Buzzard exemplar sustainable transport development in the South of LB. A proactive approach to bus provision should be taken with proactive marketing of bus use and a partnership with the bus operators so that the LSP can be used to find as sources of funding. There needs to be a step change in bus provision, cycling and walking and in travel planning. The LSP will understand that bus provisions completely supports access to higher education and to a higher quality of life and will work with all partners proactively to improve the bus offer.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure that best practice for sustainable travel is identified and incorporated where practicable.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Best practice should be applied where it fits with agreed strategies and the capacity of organisations, such as the LSP, to take additional responsibility</p>				
1268	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 5.70	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome reference to the Beds &amp; Luton Strategic Green Infrastructure Plan, but reference should also be made to the Luton &amp; South Beds Green Infrastructure Plan, the Luton RoWIP, the OAIIP and the Cycle Strategy Refresh.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Review all sources of sustainable transport strategy to ensure the Core Strategy facilitates their delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: All agreed sustainable transport strategies should be supported by the Core Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
153	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 6.1	No
<p>Comment: Given that the census shows that Luton has a declining population, why do we need to build such a huge amount of new housing? Given that housing in Luton is far more affordable than so much of the South East and that prices have dropped significantly since the start of this plan, wouldn't a revised lower target be far more sensible/practical.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Population estimates support view that population of Luton is rising. Also, the CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
303	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Para. 6.1	No
<p>Comment: There is no "problem" with housing supply in the South East of England. Market forces are working as they should by making housing expensive. Those who cannot afford a house in the area should move to an area which they can afford. Employers should be helped to move outside the south-east of England to make use of the supply of people in other areas who can afford to work for less because they have paid less for their houses. There is no need for the Public Sector to intervene except possibly by helping employers to move.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1062	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.2	No
<p>Comment: There are some inaccuracies in the table at Table 6.2 which require clarification. The amendments should be clarified as follows: Correction: "Total Completions &amp; Potential Supply 200-2021" should read "Total Completions &amp; Potential Supply 2001-2021" Correction: "Additional Housing to be Provided 2021-2031" should presumably read "Additional Housing to be Provided 2001-2021" - i.e. identifying a shortfall of 8,300 dwellings in the Growth Area in the period to 2021 and 400 dwellings in the Residual Area. This would tie up with the text in para 6.9.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: to be actioned</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Typographical error to be corrected</p>				
2233	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 6.2	No
<p>Comment: The POCD is not consistent with the strategic guidance within RSS. It: i. accepts RSS requirements to plan for 26,300 dwellings in the greater conurbation 2001-2021 ii. does not test whether the uncommitted planning assumptions for 2021-2031 should be used to provide the context for removal of land from the Green Belt to provide for further development in that period if that scale of development is subsequently confirmed through a future RSS process. iii. instead simply adds on the uncommitted planning assumption figures for the period 2021-2031 to the 2001-2021 requirements. iv. then adds (paragraph 6.12) on a further 1,400 dwellings to allow flexibility for potential unforeseen delivery constraints to development within urban areas. v. brings the total proposed dwelling provision within the POCD to 43,100 dwellings, 11,000 above RSS/PPS3 requirements (see paragraph 4 below).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Ensure that the Delivery Strategy includes appropriate reference to the as yet undetermined future RSS provision.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The targets set by the RSS are minimums, not maximums. <input type="checkbox"/> MKSMSRS and the context of growth requires the review of Green Belt</p>				
1311	Templeview Developments Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 6.2	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the inclusion of Table 6.1 and the specific recognition of the East of England Plan requirement.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4027	East of Luton Consortium		Table 6.1	Yes
Comment: We support the growth for new housing as advocated through the RSS and MKSMSRS.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
1982	North Hertfordshire District Council		Table 6.1	No
Comment: Firstly, the Core Strategy seeks to allocate growth to meet needs for the whole of the period 2001 to 2031. This is contrary to the Milton Keynes & South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy. That document identifies the additional figures for housing and jobs in the decade 2021 to 2031 as "uncommitted planning assumptions purely for the purpose of Green Belt reviews and will be subject to further review at a future date." It does not require them to be allocated at this stage. They need only to be tested as to whether they should form the basis of longer term Green Belt roll-backs. NHDC accepts that the Core Strategy will need to plan for development through to 2026, to meet the RSS requirements together with those required to show a 15-year housing land supply.				
JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.				
1770	Pegasus Planning Group		Table 6.1	No
Comment: Policy H1 of the EEP states that district allocations should be regarded as minimum targets to be achieved. Paragraph 5.3 of the EEP describes the regional housing provision established at Policy H1 of the EEP as a partial step, noting that the figures are less than forecast household growth. The review of the EEP is expected to put in place "a further step change." Reference to the minimum housing requirements should be incorporated in Table 6.1. Policy 2(b) of the MKSMSRS refers to the importance of raising housing output and that, subject to testing, land should be safeguarded for a further 15,400 houses in the period 2021-2031. These are to be regarded as uncommitted planning assumptions. The Strategy should state that the figure of 43,200 dwellings referred to at Table 6.1 is the minimum requirement arising in the period to 2031. The Strategy should be flexible to accommodate a level of growth that, in the period to 2031, will be greater than the total given at Table 6.1 of the Preferred Options.				
JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.				
1063	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.3	Yes
Comment: I note the assumption that the rate of delivery for the "Rest of South Bedfordshire" is assumed to continue at a rate of 50 dwellings per annum. This seems to be a reasonable assumption in the absence of any further guidance from MKSM or the RSS. This figure should be subject to review as a review of the RSS comes forward.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process				
2239	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 6.4	Yes
Comment: PPS3 (para 53) requires LDFs to plan for 15 year housing growth requirements from the date of adoption of site allocation DPDs. As the Core Strategy is programmed to be adopted in 2010 and the site allocations DPD in July 2010 the 15 year requirement runs broadly to 2025. To conform with Government guidance the LDF needs to provide for housing and associated development for the period to 2025. How the post 2021 additional requirement is to be calculated is set out in the RSS (May 2009)				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
154	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 6.5	Yes
<p>Comment: Absolutely; continued house building within the existing urban area is increasing the number of homes, and some planning for new expansion areas is sensible, but the level proposed is so high and no justification has been given for it other than 'because the Government wants it'. If you are listening to what the consultation is saying and considering the local area and needs then the projections need to be brought down. Having a plan and implementing it are 2 very different things.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1769	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.6	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC agrees with paragraph 6.6 of the Preferred Options which notes that stakeholders identified that the high density development currently being delivered in the urban areas was failing to meet the need to provide for family housing, particularly in Luton where evidence from housing needs assessments pointed to a significant shortfall. That being the case, it is important to ensure that the strategic urban extensions accommodate an adequate element of family housing to respond to the observations to be found at paragraphs 2.4 and 6.6 of the Preferred Options</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: An appropriate policy drawn from the evidence will be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The references given are not pursued into a specific policy</p>				
295	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 6.6	No
<p>Comment: Building on green belt in North Herts is unacceptable. The loss of rural communities and the amenity of the countryside, plus the wildlife diversity is an unacceptable price to pay when plenty of land is available to the north of Dunstable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
3293			Para. 6.7	No
<p>Comment: Object to para. 6.7 implying that that densities in urban extensions should be 40dph. Densities should not be prescriptive but flexible to suit the location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A compromise has to be made between low-density, high land-take and high-density, low land-take while respecting the character of each individual area and the protection of the Green Belt. <input type="checkbox"/>An average density is required to guide development planning.</p>				
1681	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.7	No
<p>Comment: We note the emphasis placed by developers and landowners on the 'deliverability' of sites, but simply because sites are deliverable doesn't mean they are right in terms of a coherent and sustainable development strategy. It is vital that pressure from developers to move forward with particular sites just because they can offer relatively speedy delivery is strongly resisted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Advice on the need for housing sites to be deliverable is set out in PPS3</p>				
4028	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 6.7	Yes
<p>Comment: We propose that a range of densities should be set between 20 and 50 dph, in line with PPS3.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A compromise has to be made between low-density, high land-take and high-density, low land-take while respecting the character of each individual area and the protection of the Green Belt. <input type="checkbox"/>An average density is required to guide development planning.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
280	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.7	No
<p>Comment: The developers and landowner's response is entirely predictable; however the Joint Committee should not allow themselves to be rushed into planning decisions based on current availability of land and the desire of developers and landowners to exploit it. Having followed the consultation of the proposals I am concerned that the 'Preferred Eastern Urban Extension' of Leighton Buzzard has been unduly influenced by a very small (but highly professional) group who have been very successful in selling their ideas to key stakeholders. The purpose of Town Planning is surely to take a holistic view; I question whether this has actually been done in the case of the proposed Leighton Buzzard Eastern Urban Extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The decision on whether or not to propose sites for development lies with the Joint Committee.</p>				
296	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 6.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Developers always want access to green belt land because once they have won access to one tranche they can argue for development of adjacent areas. The developers are contracted to do a job not to dictate terms.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS will establish defensible revised Green Belt boundaries. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
2386	Mr James Wilson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Densities should be kept low so that there is enough recreational open space, wide enough roads and less opportunity for crime. Experience has shown that in Leighton Buzzard, areas that are at a lower density like 'The Planets' estate experience less crime than those built at high densities to increase profits for developers. If densities are kept lower then the actual houses can be built with garages, off street parking and with big enough rooms to accommodate ordinary sized furniture</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A compromise will need to be made between low-density, high land-take and high-density, low land-take while respecting the character of each individual area and the protection of the Green Belt.</p>				
2294	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 6.9	No
<p>Comment: Cross referencing between technical studies is also lacking. Examples include the housing trajectory in the SHLAA which anticipates a revival in the housing market and completions picking up significantly from 2010 on - to higher levels than the recent housing market peak of 2006. This contradicts emerging findings from the SHMA and the DTZ viability study. Another example is the employment land study which was prepared in January 2008, using data from 2007 and earlier. This study needs to be reviewed and updated in light of the current economic climate and cannot be used as a basis for deciding preferred options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy does consider the output of all relevant evidence. The evidence studies have been conducted at different points in time, reflecting different circumstances and using information and assumptions available at that specific point in time.</p>				
2240	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 6.9	No
<p>Comment: Policy 2b of the RSS (MKSMSRS) states that LDDs should plan for a scale of growth in the period 2001-2021. In terms of growth beyond that date the RSS identifies 2021-2031 additional figures for housing and employment which are to be treated as 'uncommitted planning assumptions purely for the purpose of Green Belt reviews and will be subject to further review at an appropriate future date'. Policy 2A states that 'Subject to testing through LDDs, sufficient areas of safeguarded reserve land should also be excluded from the Green Belt to meet needs to 2031'. There is no requirement to provide for housing or employment growth for the period 2021-2031. The LDFs are supposed only to test whether these uncommitted planning assumptions should form the basis for longer term Green Belt releases.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In order to assess the amount of Green Belt required to support development from 2021-2031, it is necessary to understand how much development is likely to take place in that period</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1241	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 6.9	No
<p>Comment: Acknowledging that it is not possible to comment directly on the SHLAA document itself, my clients are disappointed at the lack of detailed assessment published for the sites considered not developable. There is little commentary given on the merits of the sites discounted. For example for my client's site at Beech Road (site 112, page 79 of SHLAA), the text simply states that site is considered to be unsuitable due to its Green Belt location. We would have expected a more thorough comparative analysis of all sites put forward to have been published as part of the evidence base. The site also falls within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There appears to have been no consideration given to the relative landscape or biodiversity quality. This is disappointing to note and in our view is not sufficient evidence to demonstrate that full consideration has been given to the evaluation of the site against others.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The SHLAA is prepared according to government guidance</p>				
1720	CPRE Hertfordshire	Welwyn	Para. 6.10	No
<p>Comment: If the JC applied 60% housing on PDL (instead of 40%), 6,100 dwellings would be needed from urban extensions between 2021 and 2031. This would reduce the housing required from urban extensions from 17,600 to 14,400, only 900 more than the three extensions (other than east of Luton) will deliver.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHLAA is kept up-to-date and employ flexible policies that maximise use of PDL, utilising Green Field sites only when PDL is shown to be unable to meet annualised housing targets.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The comment is logically correct, however the SHLAA indicates that this is not possible</p>				
1985	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 6.10	No
<p>Comment: The assumption that only 60% of new growth will be located within the existing urban areas by 2021 and then only 40% in the period 2021 to 2031 is distinctly unambitious. Given that the spatial strategy for the Luton conurbation is heavily based on the need for regeneration, there is the opportunity to seek and secure greater proportions of new development within the built-up areas, thereby resulting in less land take in the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
1781	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.10	No
<p>Comment: NLC endorses the comment at paragraph 6.10 of the Preferred Options that opportunities to maintain a high rate of dwelling completions in the urban area will become more limited over time. However, there is no substantive evidence available to the JCU to justify the assumption made that 40% of the housing requirement arising in the period 2021-2031 can be met in the existing urban areas. If the achievable capacity is less than that "assumption", further completions will need to be sought from the planned strategic urban extensions, such as North Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
3520	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Para. 6.10	No
<p>Comment: There is no evidence base or any justification for the projected urban capacity in South Bedfordshire and Luton between 2021 and 2031.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In order to assess the amount of Green Belt required to support development from 2021-2031, it is necessary to understand how much development is likely to take place in that period</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2241	Hertfordshire County Council		Table 6.2	No
<p>Comment: 4. Government policy and RSS requirements therefore require LDF processes to make specific provision at the greater conurbation for the period 2001-2025 of 32,100 dwellings [21,900 (residual requirement 2006-2021)/(15x4=5,800+26,300=32,100)], 11,000 less than that proposed within the POCD.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
2244	Hertfordshire County Council		Table 6.2	No
<p>Comment: The SHLAA identifies potential for 5,446 dwellings included within the UCS 2001-2021 which have not been subjected to the Full Assessment of the SHLAA and for which no provision is made within urban area capacity assumptions to 2021. Tables 6.2 and 6.3 make no provision for this potential source of capacity. Even under a very pessimistic scenario that only 50% of this potential to 2021 were to materialise in the form of windfalls, this is a significant scale of development which would reduce the need for Greenfield development and Green Belt releases. Further consideration should be given to assessing the scope to include a proportion of the 5,446 dwelling estimate of windfall capacity or at least enable it to reduce the scale of strategic Greenfield growth through a plan, monitor and manage approach to housing supply.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
2247	Hertfordshire County Council		Table 6.2	No
<p>Comment: The maximum scale of dwelling growth that should be taken forward at the greater conurbation should be 32,100 dwellings. The urban/peripheral split would be: within the urban area: 6,100 + 11,900 + 2,520 (40% of the 6,100 forecast completions in urban areas 2021-2031 of Table 6.3) = 20,520 dwellings. peripheral to the conurbation 32,100 - 20,520 = 11,580 dwellings. the 11,580 dwelling peripheral growth could be significantly reduced were additional urban capacity potential to be accounted for within the CS in accordance with paragraph 9 above. This represents an 8,000 dwelling reduction in the scale of peripheral growth to be planned at the conurbation.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
1774	Pegasus Planning Group		Table 6.2	No
<p>Comment: Table 6.2 indicates 6,400 housing completions were secured in the plan area 2001-2008. Therefore, a minimum of 20,900 units need to be completed in the period 2008-2021 to address the requirements of the East of England Plan. Our strategic assessment of the housing trajectory (September 2008) suggests that the identified sites are unlikely to deliver 12,200 completions in the period 2008-2021 as suggested in Table 6.2. The delivery programme described in the housing trajectory is optimistic and highly unlikely that the completions anticipated at paragraph 4.26 of the SHLAA (April 2009) will arise. In such circumstances, it is important for the Core Strategy to establish a policy framework which does not seek to prevent more than 8,300 dwellings being delivered on the planned sustainable urban extensions prior to 2021.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2245	Hertfordshire County Council		Table 6.3	No
<p>Comment: The SHLAA identifies potential for 5,446 dwellings included within the UCS 2001-2021 which have not been subjected to the Full Assessment of the SHLAA and for which no provision is made within urban area capacity assumptions to 2021. Tables 6.2 and 6.3 make no provision for this potential source of capacity. Even under a pessimistic scenario that only 50% of this potential to 2021 were to materialise in the form of windfalls, 2,700 dwellings is a significant scale of development which would reduce the need for Greenfield development and Green Belt releases. Further consideration should be given to assessing the scope to include a proportion of the 5,446 dwelling estimate of windfall capacity or at least enable it to reduce the scale of strategic Greenfield growth through a plan, monitor and manage approach to housing supply.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
2248	Hertfordshire County Council		Table 6.3	No
<p>Comment: The maximum scale of dwelling growth in the greater conurbation should be 32,100 dwellings. The within urban/peripheral split would be: within the urban area: 6,100 + 11,900 + 2,520 (40% of the 6,100 forecast completions in urban areas 2021-2031 of Table 6.3) = 20,520 dwellings. peripheral to the conurbation 32,100 - 20,520 = 11,580 dwellings. the 11,580 dwelling peripheral growth could be significantly reduced were additional urban capacity potential to be accounted for within the CS in accordance with paragraph 9 above. This represents an 8,000 dwelling reduction in the scale of peripheral growth to be planned at the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
1775	Pegasus Planning Group		Table 6.3	No
<p>Comment: Table 6.3 suggests 15,400 completions should be sought in 2021-2031. This figure is an uncommitted planning assumption set out by the MKSMSRS which was anticipated to be tested through the LDF. The evidence base does not show any assessment of that figure and Table 6.3 should highlight that the assumption is a minimum. NLC objects to the assumption in Table 6.3 that 6,100 completions will be achieved on PDL in 2021-2031. The SHLAA (April 2009) does not justify Table 6.3. Paragraph 7.10 of the SHLAA clearly states that, except for Napier Park, the analysis has not identified any sites likely to deliver housing in the 10-15 year period. The same comment is found at paragraph 7.11 of the SHLAA. There is no evidence to suggest that land can be identified within existing urban areas to secure 6,100 completions in the period 2021-2031. It would be more appropriate to indicate that a greater number of completions will be required from urban extensions in the period 2021-2031 than is assumed at Table 6.3.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
1362	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Para. 6.11	Yes
<p>Comment: The Joint Committee's acknowledgement that the level of housing delivery from within the urban areas is likely to decrease over the plan period is welcomed, however, it is noted that the 40% figure is an assumption. The Core Strategy contains little justification for the adoption of this figure other than to suggest that it is considered 'appropriate' to guide further long term strategic planning for the area. This is not the most persuasive defence and it is recommended that the Joint Committee should consider preparing a more robust justification for adopting this figure in the submission draft Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements.□</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
648	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.11	No
Comment: No statement of how this was derived - we need to see how the urban development targets have been set				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The evidence (SHLAA) sets out how this was calculated				
1721	CPRE Hertfordshire	Welwyn	Para. 6.12	No
Comment: No need to add an 8% contingency as 'plan, monitor and manage' will allow post-2021 housing requirements to be considered well in advance, without the need to plan for large-scale releases of Green Belt land now that may not actually be needed.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Some recognition of the uncertainty of urban capacity delivery is required. However, it is more controllable to offer flexibility in the urban extensions than in existing urban areas.				
2246	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 6.12	No
Comment: The POCD adds on a further 1,400 dwellings to its estimate of peripheral greenfield growth requirements to help ensure that the supply of housing is flexible and capable of accounting for unforeseen delivery constraints that may occur, particularly in the urban area in the period 2021 to 2031. Under the above circumstances the County Council considers this to be inappropriate, arbitrary and inconsistent with guidance within PPG2 Green Belts.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The targets set by the RSS are minimums, not maximums. <input type="checkbox"/> MKSMSRS and the context of growth requires the review of Green Belt				
3683	Alan Murphy	Luton	Para. 6.12	No
Comment: A contingency of an additional 1,400 homes is unacceptable, particularly since a low figure of 40% has been applied to the proportion of housing to be completed in urban areas. The 2008 UCS identifies additional sources of capacity that were not considered: Clauses 5.28 (outstanding planning consents), 5.47 (windfall), 5.48 (redeveloping existing housing), 5.23 (outstanding allocations), 8.2 (employment land). Greenfield land should not be used to compensate for a lack of urban capacity simply on the grounds that data for Brownfield development has not yet been completed.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The targets set by the RSS are minimums, not maximums. <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy seeks 60% development on PDL until 2021. <input type="checkbox"/> SHLAA explains rationale for dismissing certain UCS sites.				
1986	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 6.12	No
Comment: Using the JC's own figures, 17,600 additional dwellings are needed beyond the existing built-up areas to meet the growth needs to 2031. Yet the Core Strategy plans to provide 19,000 dwellings. There is no justification for the extra 1,400 dwellings, and hence no exceptional circumstances warranting the roll-back of Green Belt to accommodate them.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Some recognition of the uncertainty of urban capacity delivery is required. However, it is more controllable to offer flexibility in the urban extensions than in existing urban areas.				
1778	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.12	No
Comment: NLC does not agree with the observation that "there is a need to deliver approximately 17,600 dwellings to 2031 in urban extensions." The figure to be accommodated in such circumstances is likely to be in excess of 20,000 units and NLC supports the content of Table 6.4 which suggests that 19,000 dwellings will be delivered via sustainable urban extensions in the period 2008-2031. That perceived degree of change is likely to prove to be an underestimate and NLC endorses the comment at paragraph 6.14 which notes that the figures in Table 6.4 "are indicative and will be confirmed through further detailed testing."				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Sufficient flexibility has been included				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3365	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Para. 6.12	No
<p>Comment: Concerned over the low level of contingency (just 1,400) as this is under 4% of the 2001-2031 requirements. It is generally accepted practice to apply a minimum 10% non-implementation allowance. We calculate that a contingency of 2,370 should be used post-2021. It is considered that the extension north of Houghton Regis could accept the additional units and this would increase the viability of that scheme in providing required infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
725	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Para. 6.12	No
<p>Comment: HRDC is sceptical about the assumptions for urban capacity between 2008 and 2013. Whether they will be able to be developed at the density and capacity assumed is another issue, particularly in the period up to 2013, as reflected in the Knight Frank Housing Market Assessment and in view of the increasing need and demand for family housing rather than small apartments. HRDC welcomes the need to ensure that "the supply of housing is flexible and capable of accounting for unforeseen delivery constraints." However, it is not considered that this scenario should be limited to the period 2021 - 2031. It is imperative that the housing land supply is not back-loaded to the latter end of the plan period and that the Core Strategy enables the early release of at least one of the sustainable urban extensions (as recommended in paragraph 7.6 of the SHLAA), as it is only in this way that the flexible approach advocated will be applied in practice.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
1363	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Para. 6.12	No
<p>Comment: Whilst this would appear to be a reasonable approach towards lower delivery than forecast within the urban area, it is not a significant cushion against failure to deliver from the identified SUE. In particular the proposed SUE east of Luton in North Hertfordshire District. Whilst a policy framework exists within the MKSM SRS that alludes to provision within North Hertfordshire; the Joint Committee is not the plan making authority for that District and it is feasible that NHDC may take a contrary view to both the scale of the proposed SUE east of Luton and its timeframe for delivery. This alone would suggest that a cushion against non-implementation should be greater than the 1,400 net additional dwellings proposed by the Joint Committee.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
3240	DP9	London	Para. 6.14	No
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy needs to have regard to para 24 of the Supplement to PPS1 and Para 25 which states that "in deciding on areas and sites to identify for development, priority should be given to those that will perform well against the criteria set out in para. 24. Where areas and sites perform poorly, planning authorities should consider whether their performance could be improved. When considering the need to secure sustainable rural development, including employment and affordable housing opportunities to meet the needs of local people, planning authorities should recognise that a site may be acceptable even though it may not be readily accessible other than by the private car."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Elements of these tests are considered through the SA and other evidence relating to the selection of preferred locations of growth. Any development planning will need to respect national-level policy such as the supplement to PPS1</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1296	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.14	Yes
<p>Comment: The limit on new housing to the east of Leighton-Linslade is a sensible reflection of the restricted ability of both the town and the surrounding countryside to absorb a larger development, in addition to the major extensions completed and under construction to the south. The environmental requirements of the strategy (Section 12) will rule out development to the north of Clipstone Brook, towards Heath &amp; Reach village.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: There is appropriate land suitable for development north of Clipstone Brook</p>				
1776	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.14	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC endorses the comment that notes that the figures in Table 6.4 "are indicative and will be confirmed through further detailed testing."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Sufficient flexibility has been included</p>				
49	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.14	No
<p>Comment: There is no mention here of adequate infrastructure to service and support the proposed developments. Currently the areas suffers from inadequate potable water sources</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Review results of the Water Cycle study.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Water utilities have not indicated an issue. However, the Water Cycle study will be confirming adequate supply.</p>				
727	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Para. 6.14	Yes
<p>Comment: HRDC welcomes the statement in paragraph 6.14 that the figures given in Table 6.4 are indicative and will be the subject of detailed testing. On this basis, the Consortium is willing, for the time being, to use the figure of 7,000 dwellings for the urban extension to the north of Houghton Regis and as a starting point for its assessment. However, the assumptions and findings contained within DTZ's Urban Extensions: Site Development Economics Study have been noted and in particular that although the land use budget for the North Dunstable / Houghton Regis site is well within the total site area; this is not the case for the sites North and East of Luton. If there is insufficient land available to accommodate the indicative number of new homes and jobs currently envisaged within the other potential urban extensions, the Joint Committee may wish to consider the scope for further development within the Sustainable Urban Extension to the north of Houghton Regis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The Core Strategy will include a defined boundary for the Strategic Specific Site Allocation in this area.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: There is sufficient developable land in the area to create an appropriate SSSA to accommodate this requirement.</p>				
2304	David Bowles		Table 6.4	No
<p>Comment: Unacceptable that Luton's expansion should be at the expense of N Herts. Family homes as proposed will potentially house at least 22,000 people.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.</p>				
1688	CPRE Bedfordshire		Table 6.4	No
<p>Comment: It would have been helpful to see to what extent each of the 4 urban extension figures have been individually marked up to produce the 19,000 overall figure for planning purposes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy sets out how the total number of dwellings that need to be delivered in urban extensions has been arrived at.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
4029	East of Luton Consortium		Table 6.4	Yes
Comment: We support the delivery of up to 5,500 houses to be delivered to the east of Luton.				
JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
4079	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Table 6.4	No
Comment: Object to development east of Luton. <input type="checkbox"/> Contradicts para. 11.4 and also on Green Belt rated sensitivity Level 1, not recommended for development. Residents of Stopsley, Wigmore and villages do not agree that their quality of life will be improved. <input type="checkbox"/> The assessment notes historic importance likely to be of national importance. <input type="checkbox"/> East of Luton proposals are within North Herts and the Strategy cannot allocate land there. NHDC is against this development, you are wasting public money by pushing the plans forward without support from key local bodies. <input type="checkbox"/> Para 2.5 recognises congestion on the A505, how will more houses and cars resolve this? The assumption that public transport options will inhibit the use of cars is unrealistic. <input type="checkbox"/> Have you adequately consulted the airport authorities? There is concern that the initial costs of a tunnel are inaccurate and will be prohibitively expensive. <input type="checkbox"/> Unconvinced about the supporting infrastructure, particularly capacity and access to educational, health and emergency services.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Progress with identifying recommended Strategic Site Allocations and infrastructure requirements.				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> All evidence streams inform the Core Strategy decision making process which seeks to balance competing interests. The CS can recommend directions of growth for consideration by an Independent Inspector which in turn will inform decision making within North Herts.				
760	Mrs Ann Morton		Table 6.4	No
Comment: Strongly object to the urban extension into another county. Hertfordshire has its own housing allocation to decide where it is best located. Bedfordshire/Luton must not be able to use Hertfordshire land for any of its housing numbers allocation, especially in the case of east of Luton in North Hertfordshire District where it will be inappropriate development of green field Green Belt land. In addition strongly object to any residential development being provided in the flight paths for Luton Airport - both the current and any potential future flight paths areas should be kept free of housing development. Please can we learn from the noise and quality of life issues for residents because housing was built around Heathrow Airport and under its flight paths.				
JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The emerging Core Strategy proposes to allocate such an appropriate amount.				
3185	David Sadler		Table 6.4	No
Comment: The proposal to the east of Luton will be contrary to the intention to create attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life and the vision to be known as a Green Growth Area. The proposal is in Green Belt land rated sensitivity level 1 and include Iron Age and Roman sites likely to be of national importance. It would also have an effect on the biodiversity of the area. The proposal fails to address the impact of the increase of traffic as a result of this development. The proposal falls in North Herts. and the core strategy cannot allocate land for this development. The Joint Committee could choose land to the West of Luton as another option. There are also other Brownfield options such as the Vauxhall site.				
JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. The CS will ensure development is accommodated whilst minimising its impact on all aspects of the environment. All mitigation measures will be deployed to this effect. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3042	Peter Shaw		Table 6.4	No
<p>Comment: Object to building 5,500 houses to the east of Luton. The country lanes cannot handle the associated extra traffic, wildlife will be threatened by such action and the nature of the area would be lost for good. Building 5,500 houses in green belt land with the highest landscape sensitive rating goes against all advise including that of Land Use Consultants who concluded development in this area is not recommended. Build on Brownfield sites such as the soon to be redundant Vauxhall Factory.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. Preferred Options is based on evaluation of existing evidence including transport analysis and viability testing. Further work to be undertaken to test and refine development proposals, including further infrastructure and viability appraisal work. The CS will ensure development is accommodated whilst minimising its impact on all aspects of the environment. All mitigation measures will be deployed to this effect. New development will be integrated into its landscape setting in every way possible.</p>				
2948	Mrs J A Weller		Table 6.4	No
<p>Comment: Object to the allocation of 5,500 to the East of Luton which goes against the Core Strategy's Vision, Principles and environmental aims of section 11</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. In this context appropriate amounts of developable land need to be identified to enable growth to be delivered. The CS will ensure development is accommodated whilst minimising its impact on all aspects of the environment.</p>				
1143	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Para. 6.15	Yes
<p>Comment: One of the intentions of including land within the Green Belt is that its boundaries should endure (PPG2, para 2.8). Green Belt boundaries should therefore only be altered reluctantly and for exceptional reasons. We accept that the major urban extensions represent such an exceptional case. However, inner Green Belt boundaries round the villages should remain largely untouched, with any 'tidying up' revisions to Green Belt boundaries being minimal in order that the original intentions of designating Green Belt land be retained. Whilst we accept that, where new boundaries are exceptionally defined, provision should be made for development to 2031, 'permanence' should mean that the Green Belt endures beyond this date.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: There is a need to review Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the requirements of the RSS. In the villages, the precise boundary of the Green Belt will be the subject of a more detailed Allocations DPD.</p>				
1575	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 6.15	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy seeking to maximise the use of brownfield land and setting a minimum target of 60%? Re-use of previously developed land should be prioritised to the fullest extent for all types of development, as required by policy SS2. Windfall brownfield sites should be developed to their maximum potential, where doing so remains consistent with other RSS policies, in order to protect the environment and landscapes.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No need to repeat Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>				
2838	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.15	No
<p>Comment: Quote "A provides a finite boundary for the Green Belt in the period to 2031 to help ensure its permanence". Well it never seems to have been "permanent" before - so why should people believe it this time?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure that references to the permanence of Green Belt are in the context of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPG2 requires protection of Green Belts as far as can be seen ahead. The LDF seeks to protect remaining Green Belt for the duration of the plan period.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1861	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 6.15	No
<p>Comment: Brownfield land may not be able to be developed first if the risk of flooding is high. Such land could be restored to floodplain with GI opportunities. Sequentially test proposed site allocations using SFRA data. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
2243	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 6.15	No
<p>Comment: The County Council does not agree with the overall growth level. The SA does not identify or assess these and alternative growth levels. <input type="checkbox"/> The maximum scale of growth should be consistent with the specific requirements of the RSS (MKMSRS) alongside PPS3 15-year land supply requirements. That figure is 32,100 dwellings. The remaining post-2008 annual housing delivery requirement at this point in time stands at 1,618 dwellings. <input type="checkbox"/> Higher growth increases land-take, impacts on environmental assets, the carbon footprint of an expanded conurbation, impacts on infrastructure, landscape, archaeological and biodiversity. Within the context of the world recession and housing market collapse the SEA would likely view a PPS3-compliant growth target as a pragmatic approach to growth, with the longer term implications of the economic crisis and the suitability of existing housing targets being addressed by the RSS review already underway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The targets set by the RSS are minimums, not maximums. <input type="checkbox"/> Delivery is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements.</p>				
726	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Para. 6.15	Yes
<p>Comment: The HRDC welcomes the Joint Committee's balanced approach to meeting the housing targets over the plan period, excepting the scale achievable within the existing urban areas up to 2013. There is a need for green belt boundary revision to be the subject of a specific Preferred Option. Urban extensions should be identified on Key Diagram as broad locations for growth and the subject of master plans or SPD with detailed site boundaries. A similar approach should be adopted for the Green Belt boundary review which would identify strategic inner boundaries. The inclusion of planning policy in the Core strategy for the part of the Growth Area within the Green Belt will need to be to be prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: New Green Belt boundaries to be included, associated with the SSSAs and indicative areas of change included elsewhere.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: There is a need for an explicit policy about reviewing the Green Belt. However, the CS will allocate SSSAs where the main Green Belt alterations will also be required.</p>				
1004	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 6.15	No
<p>Comment: "A provides a finite boundary for the Green Belt in the period to 2031 to help ensure its permanence." Well it never seems to have been "permanent" before - so why should people believe it this time?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure that references to the permanence of Green Belt are in the context of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPG2 requires protection of Green Belts as far as can be seen ahead. The LDF seeks to protect remaining Green Belt for a reasonably foreseeable future period.</p>				
649	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.15	No
<p>Comment: Planning to protect the Green Belt in the future, yet destroying the Green Belt now. Look at less intrusive options like west of Luton</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Review West of Luton evidence.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1065	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.16	No
<p>Comment: Preferred Option CS6 should refer to Tables 6.2 and 6.4 rather than 5.2 and 5.4. Major growth in Growth Areas could be delayed and therefore smaller sites around the villages should be brought forward as quickly as possible. Only 5 sites are mentioned in the policy despite there being 7 identified on the key Diagram. Slip End should be included within the policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Thorough proof-read of next edition. <input type="checkbox"/> Clarify the position of Slip End and Heath and Reach.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Clarity is required in the strategy and required village development should be implemented in a timely manner to support sustainable communities</p>				
1862	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 6.16	Yes
<p>Comment: Ensure no conflict between proposed flood storage areas and development sites. Caddington - Sewerage treatment works cannot be expanded and there are sustainability and cost issues with the use of Maple Lodge STW. Transfer to East Hyde STW is not feasible (see Water Cycle Study) Toddington - Area is subject to flooding and Toddington Road has blockage problems. Barton le Clay - Contact Bedford Internal Drainage Board regarding impact on flood storage reservoirs. Hockliffe - Contaminated land at White Horse Farm can be investigated with EA Brampton office. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Review results of Water Cycle Study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Water Cycle Study will be confirming whether or not there will be adequate facility in this area</p>				
1753	Government Office for the East of England	Cambridge	Para. 6.16	No
<p>Comment: Indicate that the first 5 year supply can be provided largely within the urban area and demonstrate the clear need to start bringing greenfield developments forward in the form of urban extensions to deliver your targets over the remainder of the plan period. The urban extensions around the conurbation are dependent on the delivery of key infrastructure projects and it is important that you can show, with a high degree of certainty, the timelines by which these will be delivered. Where you have that certainty you may wish to consider making one or more strategic site allocations in the Core Strategy. Given that you are indicating an 'extra-territorial' urban extension to the east of Luton you may wish to re-examine the robustness of your evidence base and the SA underlining the selection of the preferred options. You will also need to have a contingency plan in the event of any of the urban extensions not being delivered for whatever reason eg delay in constructing the A5/M1 link.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
371	Mrs AC Heymans	Hitchin	Para. 6.16	No
<p>Comment: It is an insult to the people of North Herts that Luton can think it would be acceptable to dump 30% of its urban housing development in the green belt area outside its jurisdiction east of Luton. Alternative sites should be investigated so that this area of Hertfordshire, rich in biodiversity, important to our climate and rural culture, is protected. I am sure the planners and developers see this as a cheap and easy option in meeting their targets. To North Herts it would be a catastrophe.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1243	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 6.16	No
<p>Comment: Concerned that two large urban extensions north of conurbation being proposed which will have devastating effect on landscape/green belt. These developments are reliant upon provision of A5-M1 link and improvements to M1 both with serious funding doubts. Extension in North Herts - joint committee has not direct control over this development therefore unsound. Propose to designate large number of smaller urban extensions, Beech Road to be one such site as it is deliverable and can contribute 350-400 dwellings in a sustainable location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The A5 - M1 route has a reasonable prospect of delivery as required by PPS12. The delivery of East of Luton is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. The site identified is of insufficient size to for a reasonable contingency to major strategic allocations.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1321	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Para. 6.16	No
Comment: Object to Policy CS6 and relevant supporting text in Section 6 - see separately submitted documentation				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Refer to comment ID 3844				
JC Reason for Response: Refers to separate comment supplied by colleague, ID 3844				
297	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 6.16	No
Comment: The permanence of green belt is assured by not building on it, not by building on part of it and 'promising' not to do so again.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Reviews are allowed for in government advice as set out in PPG2.				
3276			Q. 8	No
Comment: The allowance of 19,000 dwellings for urban extensions includes reliance on risky existing commitments, urban capacity that ignores employment and other infrastructure requirements and an unsupported the urban capacity allowance of 6,100 dwellings for 2021-31. Greater contingency should be used, presenting at least 23,700 dwellings required for the urban extensions. Object to East of Luton, North of Luton and Houghton Regis extensions, though support a larger scale development to the east of Leighton Linlade. The list should include Heath and Reach, which is identified as one of the main rural settlements.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements				
3300			Q. 8	Yes
Comment: Able to deliver homes in Caddington within the plan period on land to the northwest of Caddington as per drawings 1 and 2 of the representation document.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Ensure the strategy sets-out how housing delivery in villages will be progressed through the LDF and the use and place of each DPD/ SPD.				
JC Reason for Response: Housing sites for villages will be identified and allocated at a later stage				
677	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 8	No
Comment: I consider it wholly wrong that Luton can satisfy its housing targets by building in another county when Herts has its own targets and when there is appropriate (other than politically) locations in the committee area.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
180	Dr Steve Barley	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
Comment: No. I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be 'dumped' on North Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further investigated to preserve green belt rather than it be used by planners and developers as a cheap and easier option to meet their targets and profits respectively.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1145	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Discrepancy between seven rural settlements shown on the Key Diagram and the list of five in CS6. <input type="checkbox"/> Development in villages is conditional on improved public transport measures, linking them to principal towns. <input type="checkbox"/> Tables 5.2 to 5.4 should read 'Tables 6.2 to 6.4'. <input type="checkbox"/> The choice of villages should not be made merely on their current size. Factors should include: the existing level of local services; the likely effect on the landscape, on biodiversity and on heritage; a village's function in relation to nearby towns and the surrounding area; its individuality, character and separate identity and; distance from towns and employment areas. <input type="checkbox"/> Distance of possible sites from the village centre and from local services is important as people will use their cars even for short-distance trips and exacerbate parking problems in village centres.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Clarify the position of Slip End, Heath and Reach and the principles for development in rural areas.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Clarity is required in the strategy and required village development should support sustainable development principles.</p>				
1693	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: To compensate for the '€conomic effect', on the delivery of new housing, it is recommended that the proposed urban extension that is expected to be delivered in the early phase is made up of a number of sub-sites that are capable of being developed independently in order to fulfil the projected housing growth requirements but will combine to make a coherent urban extension.</p> <p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: This issue will be included within later Local Development Documents</p>				
1067	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Tables 5.2 and 5.4 do not exist. <input type="checkbox"/> Urban extensions may not commence in 2012/13 due to uncertainties over the delivery of infrastructure (e.g. M1 J11A, Luton Northern Bypass and A5-M1 Link) and the need for joint working with NHDC. <input type="checkbox"/> A sustainability appraisal should explain how, of the seven rural settlements in the Key Diagram, only 5 are carried through into CS6. Clarification should be given as to how sites will be selected within the Rural Settlements (i.e. through the Site Allocations DPD). <input type="checkbox"/> Slip End would score well in any SA given it has a good range of services/amenities and is well connected to Luton and Dunstable by public transport. It is unlikely that some of the preferred locations identified in CS6 would score as well as Slip End through SA, particularly Heath &amp; Reach and Hockliffe. <input type="checkbox"/> We promote land north of Front Street and east of New Street, Slip End (site plan attached).</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Action: Thorough proof-read of next edition. <input type="checkbox"/> Clarify the selection of key villages and the principles for development in rural areas.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Clarity is required in the strategy and required village development should support sustainable development principles.</p>				
2306	Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Disagree with the proposal for this number of houses in N Herts rural environment. Unique N Herts villages will disappear, are ignored in the document and are therefore considered of less importance than Bedfordshire villages.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and MKSMSRS. <input type="checkbox"/> Other preferred extensions will have an effect on Bedfordshire villages.</p>				
2409	Chalgrave Parish Council	Tebworth	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Since John Prescott initiated this process the economy has taken a severe downturn. The Future of Vauxhall is uncertain and redundancies likely. The expansion of Luton Airport is questionable, thus the promise of creating new jobs around the airport seems 'pie in the sky'. Yet the policy still exists of building a huge number of people should go and no consideration given to whether they are required or not. One conclusion would be that they are not to house local people with jobs, but to provide homes for commuters.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and MKSMSRS.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2413	Chalgrave Parish Council	Tebworth	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Chalgrave Parish Council is not against building new homes but questions the scale that Central Government is proposing. The council holds the view that decisions concerning the number of houses to be built and where they should go should be made locally by the people who are familiar with the requirements of the local population and employment opportunities available - they are best placed to make sure that any development is sustainable and provides a healthy future for those who live here.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and MKSMSRS. LDF consultation with the local population and supported by firm evidence is guiding the scale and location of housing.</p>				
1814	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Sceptical about reliance on cooperation of neighbouring local planning authority and a Core Strategy based on an assumption that this will be forthcoming. Applies to Policy CS6 which deals with meeting the housing targets, with 5,500 new dwellings being identified in North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is for the Core Strategies of both Authorities to establish the delivery of development required.</p>				
3604	Ellie Clarke	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be dumped on North Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites should be investigated to preserve green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
3351	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: General support for the proposed housing distribution although the level of contingency is on the low side given the significant overall housing requirement. In order to meet the test of soundness there should be a 10% allowance of the overall requirement. This could be accommodated in the north of Luton urban extension were development allowed on both sides of the bypass along its western section between the M1 and Sundon Wood utilising both Connolly Homes and AXA's land within the allocated outline site area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
224	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Bedfordshire quotas for housing should be fulfilled with housing in Bedfordshire. Residents of Hertfordshire are not being allowed their democratic right to vote for or against councillors who wish to completely change the environment in which they live. You are attempting to impose what your councillors want onto Hertfordshire residents and yet they are not afforded the right to remove your ability to do so by using their vote.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is for the Core Strategies of both Authorities to establish the delivery of development required.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
155	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: This paper does not present any evidence as to why we need so many new houses to built in this area. It does not demonstrate or justify these high figures. Their only basis seems to be on a wider national government aim and not on actual local need or desire. Nearby small towns such as Flitwick I can see benefiting from increased size through more facilities. At present there is very little more than a Tesco there. But Luton is already well represented with shopping and health facilities and I don't see this very big and rapid increase in housing/population creating more services or employment than it would reduce with increased demand and competition for them.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1722	CPRE Hertfordshire	Welwyn	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: First bullet should read, 'Utilise tables 6.2 to 6.4'. The target of 19,000 dwellings from urban extensions should be reduced significantly and the 5,500 from east of Luton should be deleted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Typographical error to be corrected</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Typographical error to be corrected. There is a need to accommodate the requirements of the Growth Agenda.</p>				
1524	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Residents in any development in NHDC's administrative area will pay council tax to them and Hertfordshire but would look for services (voluntary or other) to Luton as the nearest conurbation. This will cause confusion unless agreement is reached between the authorities. Alternatively, there will be an increase in traffic as journeys are made to facilities in Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It will be for both Authorities to manage their respective responsibilities to the area. Impact of traffic generation is being taken into account.</p>				
3228	DP9	London	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the flexibility that the over provision of housing land supplies to take account the fact that the housing targets are minimum and to account for potential proposals for higher growth during the period 2011 to 2021. Recommends that AAPs be prepared for North Houghton Regis as per advice in paragraph 5.4 in PPS12.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure the strategy sets-out how housing delivery will be progressed through the LDF and the use and place of each DPD/ SPD and any AAPs.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Detailed plans for the delivery of urban extensions can be provided through a range of planning documents.</p>				
3284	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Non delivery or slow delivery of housing will have consequences for the housing market and affordability. The Core Strategy fails to develop suitable or flexible policies and implementation strategies to ensure that sufficient and suitable land is available to achieve the housing targets. The SHLAA is not sufficiently robust as account has not been taken of the economic downturn and no detailed review of sites with planning permission has been undertaken. The projected completions are significantly higher than previous and unrealistic given past completions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and MKSMSRS. <input type="checkbox"/> CS7 provides a flexible approach to delivery.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1254	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
Comment: Leighton Linslade cannot support any more housing.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposal offers opportunity for a range of housing requirements within the Growth Area to be offered. It is considered that the allocation will support local facilities.				
3497	Drivers Jonas	London	Q. 8	Yes
Comment: The CS study area is located within the wider Milton Keynes South Midlands Growth Area, and has been allocated 19,000 dwellings up to 2031 (Preferred Option CS6). USS supports this as it seeks to provide sufficient demand for the existing and future retail floorspace provision.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy				
923	Mr Colin Dye	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
Comment: I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be 'dumped' on North Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further investigated to preserve green belt and if such sites cannot be found then this fact should be reported back up the planning chain for further deliberation. I may seek to extend my house but I'm sure that building my extension in my neighbour's garden would not be allowed and may possibly be unlawful so why is this proposal any different?				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
1630	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 8	Yes
Comment: Is the East of England Plan housing target met? Is there a 15 year plan for housing delivery? The growth of Luton within the boundary of North Hertfordshire was envisaged when the MKSM strategy and the East of England plan were developed. Growth rates to 2021 were identified by the MKSM strategy but precise numbers for each district were not identified. The East of England Plan does not identify the number of homes allocated to the North Hertfordshire part of the resultant Luton growth and excludes this growth from their allocation in policy H1.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It is for the Core Strategies of both Authorities to establish the scale of development required.				
1597	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 8	Yes
Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Responses to be reviewed (this process) to identify and respond to concerns.				
JC Reason for Response: LDF must be aligned with RSS				
4031	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 8	Yes
Comment: We support working with NHDC to deliver housing to the east of Luton.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with the strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2114	Edlesborough Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Providing New Homes - The word Affordable is used a lot but not defined, what is it? What proportion of new houses will be social houses. The number of new houses exceeds that of new jobs being created, what are the assumptions for the age and occupancy of residents? Our Economy and Employment Needs - Your stated aim is "increase the self containment" of the conurbation. As mentioned proposed housing numbers will outweigh jobs created and given changing working practises (65+ employees), the number of jobs seems inadequate. The results will impact on transport infrastructure. What proportion of jobs will go to Leighton Buzzard to support the 2500 new homes? Housing should be built to support job growth, not the other way round.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The definitions are included in the evidence (SHLAA and Employment land and Premises Review). The targets are supplied from the Regional Spatial Strategy.</p>				
2786	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: On the basis that there's no evidence that the local market requires these houses! New/recent builds to the centre and south of Leighton are still awaiting completion/sale. No, these are the wrong type of houses - in the wrong place!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and MKSMSRS. The LDF seeks to deliver the right type of housing in the right place</p>				
1865	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: Development will require a matched increase in sewerage, waste and water supply infrastructure. This should be located as outlined in sections 3 and 4 of the EA Groundwater Protection: Policy and Practice (part 4). (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
939	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard will have produced over 5,000 new builds in the south of the town and 'infills' and planned developments throughout the town: supplying local residents with housing needs. Leighton Linslade has Victorian/Edwardian spine roads that will be unable to sustain an increase in traffic flow that will result with yet more gross development. Local residents will abandon the town centre and shop in Milton Keynes, as they will not be able to access the LB town centre. The quickest way to 'kill off' our historic town centre, is to impose more housing growth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposal offers opportunity for a range of housing requirements within the Growth Area to be offered. It is considered that the allocation will support local facilities.</p>				
341	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Not the target to the east of Luton affecting Herts;</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
122	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Reasons previously given</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Other comments provided by respondent detail the concerns</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
354	Mrs Amanda Goodman	Pirton	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I object to the proposed 5,500 dwellings to the East of Luton (in North Herts). I live in Herts and this extensive irreversible proposal will swallow up rural land and kill the villages that it will need to include. Whilst the East of England plan suggests that Herts have to accommodate 15,800 homes by 2021, they are intending on doing this by expanding Stevenage with many other homes built within existing towns and villages - not taking up extra countryside that is not within their boundaries. If Beds authorities cannot meet their own targets within their boundaries, then they should say they can't not propose a detrimental solution on land that would never have been proposed by Herts. The existing road infrastructure would also have to be amended to accommodate increased traffic, and this will mean further requirement of land to build bypasses, again ruining the Chiltern countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
3688	Mr Ken Green	Tebworth	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Consultation has been where, not if, houses should be built. <input type="checkbox"/> Why are these houses needed? It is fantasy to suggest building houses will produce employment. Who is going to live in these houses? Not existing communities or commuters. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not inevitable that the houses will all be built. <input type="checkbox"/> Need some housing, low cost sale and social rent, not the scale proposed. <input type="checkbox"/> Consider Judicial Review like Herts CC. <input type="checkbox"/> Start from realistic growth in population and jobs and then how many houses we need. <input type="checkbox"/> Object to development between A5 and A5120. It stresses sustainability but present density is hardly sustainable. It takes 20 to 30 minutes to get up Bidwell Hill and the same to Dunstable through the A5 chalk cutting. The plan shows houses here before the A5 M1 link road is built. <input type="checkbox"/> Rail links cannot expand to cope with the increase in commuting. <input type="checkbox"/> Government state they want local decision making, yet ignore pleas to save green belt. <input type="checkbox"/> Parish Councils, individually and through GAPP/BCPC, have pointed out the folly of the policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy and spatial options are the subject of sustainability appraisal.</p>				
847	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Further growth in LB is inappropriate for reasons stated above.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Other comments provided by respondent detail the concerns</p>				
2124	Hertfordshire County Council	St. Ippolyts	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I object in the strongest possible terms. Hertfordshire has enough problems fulfilling it's own quota of houses without other authorities adding to this. I support the arguments of both Lilley Parish Council and Kings Walden Parish Council. I can't state enough, that most of the area concerned is Grade 1, the highest level of natural beauty. The infrastructure is a major area of concern and would appear to have had scant consideration. It would appear little consideration has been given to building the housing requirement within your own boundaries. It is a very sorry episode and I'm totally against it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Prepare a specific boundary for recommendation as a SSSA taking account of landscape concerns.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
2242	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The POCD is misleading in the manner in which it expresses development requirements. It fails to make any distinction between the RSS development requirement to 2021, the role of uncommitted planning assumptions 2021-2031 set out in RSS (MKSMSRS), the PPS3 15-year land supply requirements and the growth option put forward.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraphs 6.2 and 6.4 explain this and provide references should the reader wish to investigate further</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2251	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The County Council understands there is an undetermined planning application for 4,400 dwellings and a range of other uses to the east of Leighton Linlade. East of Leighton Linlade is a preferred location for strategic growth within the POCD but only for 2,500 dwellings. The fact is that it is an extant planning proposal and the Council is surprised there is no reference to this alternative scale of growth proposed at this location. Were this scale of growth considered to be acceptable at this location this would clearly have significant implications for the scale of peripheral growth required elsewhere.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy supports the preferred size of 2,500 dwellings</p>				
2559	Holwell Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The area east of Luton is in beautiful countryside, indistinguishable from the neighbouring AONB. Its use for housing on any scale is no less outrageous than if were in the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and MKSMSRS. Evidence on the location of development is informed by landscape assessments.</p>				
1815	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Figure 1 identifies Slip End as having potential to accommodate development yet this is omitted from the list of villages in POC56. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policy to be amended</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The list will be expanded accordingly</p>				
304	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: No more new homes should be built at all in the overcrowded South-East of England. You should be concentrated your efforts on fighting and overturning the claimed need to build more houses in this overcrowded area. Any growth should go anywhere but the South East of England. Allow market forces to drive people and employers elsewhere.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1131	Mr Norman Jones	Hemel Hempstead	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I think the North Hertfordshire LDF should look at the housing target for land in its area rather than having an imposed figure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is for the Core Strategies of both Authorities to establish the delivery of development required.</p>				
414	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I won't support a proposal for any more additional housing in North Hertfordshire. The Government have already imposed their own housing targets for North Hertfordshire which are more than enough without Luton and South Bedfordshire council having the arrogance to assume they can impose some of their own housing targets on North Hertfordshire. I believe the idea is that your housing targets are met in your area and not in someone else's. Luton and South Bedfordshire council might wish to remind themselves of this fact and if they feel that they can't meet the targets in their own area then maybe they should let the Government know rather than try to force more housing into North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The requirements for affordable housing have been established within the housing requirements studies and will be confirmed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1891	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy does not contain appropriately flexible policies to ensure satisfactory delivery or address potential infrastructure delivery issues relating to urban extensions. <input type="checkbox"/> The site West of Linslade is available now, offers a sustainable location and a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered within 5 years. <input type="checkbox"/> Paragraph 4.3 of the SHLAA (inclusion of sites within the 5 year land supply) is contrary to the advice in paragraphs 59 and 59 of PPS3. <input type="checkbox"/> The SHLAA is questionable as the sites identified cannot now necessarily be considered available or achievable due to the severe decline in house prices. We do not consider the proposed Sustainable Urban Extensions deliverable or achievable for similar economic/infrastructure reasons.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree      Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies to overcome potential constraints to the five-year supply of housing land</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Strategy does require flexible policies. <input type="checkbox"/> SHLAA was correct at time of investigations, future updates will reflect changing circumstances</p>				
3404	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: Subject to giving priority to the redevelopment of existing urban sites over the release of land identified within the proposed urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy aims to maximise the use of PDL</p>				
1297	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: The limitations of sites outside the main conurbation are recognised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action - respondent is in general support of the policy approach</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Limitations of urban extensions and village sites are being/ will be identified</p>				
1322	Luton & Central Beds Economic and Development Partnership Ltd	Stevenage	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Object to Policy CS6 and relevant supporting text in Section 6 - see separately submitted documentation</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: Refer to comment ID 3844</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Refers to separate comment supplied by colleague, ID 3844</p>				
1914	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: It is not the function of Bedfordshire to house key workers for London. Luton's policy of favouring local people for new housing should continue. Luton is suffering badly from town cramming. Urban development should not use some of the last, precious little patches of peaceful, undisturbed environment. 1000 homes throughout rural areas would be appropriate if it were not for the proposal to sacrifice integrity for a large number of homes in the growth areas. Towns and infrastructure based on need and opportunity normally evolve at a slower pace. It is harder to do this quickly in an environmentally and socially sustainable way.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
2084	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: LBC supports the targets set out in East of England Plan as a means of delivering balanced growth and regeneration. There is an enormous need for new housing; Luton's Housing Needs Register currently lists 5,434 households plus 1,000 transfers and 700 homeless households and there are approximately 1,600 listed households in southern Bedfordshire. LBC also supports the principles of delivering as much of this housing as possible within the Borough to secure sustainable regeneration through recycling land and buildings. Luton is one of the most densely populated urban areas in England, and it needs to be recognised that there is public concern about ever increasing density intensification. With anticipated green field releases in close proximity to the existing built up area, there are opportunities to integrate and support the regeneration of the conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Strategy seeks to attend to the issues raised</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
511	Professor Maureen MacLellan	Geat Offley	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: How is it that planners can run roughshod over previous decrees to protect green belt, while members of the public would be refused permission? <input type="checkbox"/> One part of the plan states that East of Luton will contain 5,500 homes while further-on is a statement inferring that planners will "work with NHDC to deliver housing in the preferred location to the East of Luton to ensure the delivery of 19,000 homes". This number will swamp local areas, completely alter the landscape and the lives of existing residents. <input type="checkbox"/> The road system is not capable of sustaining such population growth. This presumably means: (1) You will proceed to damage the countryside further by building more major roads, whilst disrupting the lives of local people and rendering their environment 'suburban', without a thought for the fact that residents have chosen to live here for the standard of living the area offers; (2) You will recognise that this particular development is against all principles of sustainability and abandon the project.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area requiring Green belt review as set by the MKSMSRS. <input type="checkbox"/> People's lives and landscapes will change.</p>				
918	Mrs Margaret Marshall	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I DO NOT support recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) of the urban housing expansion for Luton should be dumped on North Hertfordshire green belt land east of Luton. Other sites must be available in or around Luton and should be investigated so that the green belt is preserved. Planners and developers are regarding it as a cheap and easy option to meet targets and profits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
252	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I cannot accept that the urban centre of Luton sprawling towards Hitchin across rural green belt is the best option. North Hertfordshire has a rural character, and urban expansion into it is totally inappropriate. Hitchin is already being squeezed from the East by Stevenage expansion. You are also proposing to build large numbers of houses in the full knowledge that these will be impacted by the increasing noise and pollution from the airport. Surely the environment for these new residents would be a lot more pleasant away from unburned hydrocarbons, various other noxious emissions, and excessive noise from jet aircraft taking off and landing every several times an hour?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. The SSSA will be defined taking into account the constraints imposed by proximity to the Airport.</p>				
3336	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: The contingency of 1,400 units might be a little light given the high overall requirement for this Growth Area, which will need a significant step change in the annual rate of building if it is to be delivered. A greater rate of contingency would help ensure that the Core strategy is suitably flexible. Support the scale of housing proposed in for north of Luton and north of Houghton Regis. Support the inclusion of Barton Le Clay and Caddington (Slip End) as identified in the key diagram.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3569	Mr and Mrs Richard Nash	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the "Core Strategy - Preferred Option" proposal, involving the provision of an urban extension to the east of Leighton Linlade. The number of houses to be provided in this area could be increased from 2,500, for two principle reasons. 1. Problems associated with the proposed allocation of 5,500 houses to the east of Luton, both technical and administrative. 2. The Core Strategy proposes a substantial number of dwellings to be provided within the existing urban areas as flats and apartments. This sector of the housing market experiencing problems so is unrealistic to expect these schemes to come forward. Could these developments provide the housing numbers suggested, whilst at the same time accommodating complimentary facilities. All of these facilities could be provided to the east of Leighton Buzzard and suggest that the allocation for this Strategic Urban Extension could be increased to around 5,000 houses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
2194	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Potential adverse environmental impacts could include the loss/depletion/fragmentation of habitats, the deterioration of landscape character, damage to soils structure/quality and water pollution, particularly during construction." We look to see it demonstrated through the proposed detailed masterplanning that adverse environmental impacts can be avoided, or adequately mitigated and that development to the north of Luton can be accommodated without adverse impacts on the Chilterns AONB (in line with Preferred Options CS15 and CS17).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Avoidance and/ or mitigation of adverse environmental impact is a key concern to the sustainability of the LDF</p>				
1465	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: I support in principal that there is a shortage of affordable housing but to cram so many in such a small area is ridiculous. There are far too many empty properties in this area, both residential and commercial.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The requirements for affordable housing have been established within the housing requirements studies and will be confirmed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>				
3356	O'Neill Homes Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the clear advice given in this policy to steer future DPDs and the inclusion of Toddington in the list of villages to be the focus of development in the rural area. O'Neill's site at Luton Road, Toddington could enhance the sustainability of Toddington as a whole and make an important contribution towards the housing required in the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Ensure the strategy sets-out how housing delivery in villages will be progressed through the LDF and the use and place of each DPD/ SPD.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Housing sites for villages will be identified and allocated at a later stage</p>				
1751	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: NLC does not agree with the content of Tables 6.2 - 6.4 and there is no justification that 6,200 dwellings will be achieved within existing urban areas post-2021. Support the observation that the number of dwellings to be delivered at the preferred urban extensions will be refined and confirmed through detailed master planning. We consider that a greater number of dwellings will need to be accommodated at the preferred strategic urban extensions. Suggest it will be possible to accommodate more than 4,000 dwellings to the north of Luton, assuming that the revised green belt boundary to the north of Luton will be drawn along the chosen route of the LNB between the M1 and the A6.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies that can attend to the issue of more, or less, capacity from PDL over the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Capacity on PDL will be reviewed through the SHLAA</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
353	DR JANE RANSOM	Pirton	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton should be built on N. Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further explored and developed to preserve the green belt which benefits Luton residents as much as those of N. Hertfordshire. The green belt should not be used by planners and developers as a cheap and easy option to meet their targets and enhance their profits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
50	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The targets do not reflect or take account of how these targets can be sustained</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies to overcome potential constraints to the supply of housing land.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This subject is considered elsewhere in the document. <input type="checkbox"/> The SA assesses the sustainability of the plans.</p>				
417	Mr Andrew Robson	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be 'dumped' on North Hertfordshire green belt land to the east of Luton. Hertfordshire has its own targets for new housing. It is inequitable for it to be required to provide yet further new housing for Luton and Bedfordshire. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further investigated to preserve green belt rather than it be used by planners and developers as a cheap and easier option to meet their targets and profits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
544	Mrs Margaret Rollason	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: No I do NOT support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be "dumped" on North Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further investigated to preserve green belt rather than it be used by planners and developers as a cheap and easier option to meet their targets and profits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
185	Mr Mark Sadler	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be 'dumped' on North Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further investigated to preserve green belt rather than it be used by planners and developers as a cheap and easier option to meet their targets and profits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
298	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Building in rural areas east of Luton is unacceptable destruction of an area of great beauty.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3364	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Concerns over the low level of contingency and flexibility. The contingency figure is just 3.4% of the requirement between 2001 and 2031, in contrast with the generally accepted practice to apply a minimum of 10% non implementation allowance. Given the estimated scale of the post 2021 estimate: 10% allowance = 2,370. The extension to the north of Houghton Regis could appropriately accommodate the additional 1,000. This would also assist the viability of the extension area which as noted by DTZ's viability assessment, is the location providing the least developer return due to infrastructure requirements. Additional units would assist in this respect.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
728	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: It is essential that the indicative housing split be kept under review, in order that the findings of the more detailed assessments can be used to ensure a flexible approach to allocation targets. This is a long term project which requires a flexible approach to housing provision. Targets should not therefore be seen as fixed and the policy should acknowledge that these may change over time. A better reflection of the actions which may need to be taken would be to state "refine and revise, as appropriate these figures ."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Typographical error to be corrected</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Typographical error will be corrected. A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
1364	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: Subject to the caveats noted in our comment for paragraph 6.12 in relation to risk of non-implementation, this option is supported.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
2127	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The scale of development proposed for east of Luton is variously quoted in your documents as 7,000 and 5,500 homes. The shape and extent of site L varies between different documents. <input type="checkbox"/> It is unacceptable that persons reading the main consultation will be led to believe that the lower figure is proposed when in fact the substantially (27%) higher figure has clearly been considered and 'signed off' in supplementary documents. <input type="checkbox"/> If you cannot be clear about the size of the development or its geographical extent, how can any faith be placed in this consultation?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Prepare a specific boundary for recommendation as a SSSA taking account of landscape concerns.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The scale and extent of urban extensions has evolved over time, through the collection of evidence and consultation responses. <input type="checkbox"/> The information in the Preferred Options is the latest evolution of the plans.</p>				
2065	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the allocation to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis between the A5 and M1. This could be increased for two reasons. First, the Strategy relies on 5,500 houses to the East of Luton that NHDC is likely to object to. Secondly, the Strategy proposes a large amount of dwellings in the existing urban areas. The market for flats and high density development is over saturated therefore the projected completions in the Housing Trajectory are highly unrealistic especially for Luton over the next 4-5 years. Capacity from PDL from 2021 - 31 is very ambitious given these sites have not been identified. <input type="checkbox"/> We also support the inclusion of land at Thorn Farm and Berry Corner Farm within a comprehensive development scheme between the A5 and A5120, which will stretch from the existing urban area to the new A5-M1 link. It will offer a good opportunity to accommodate further development should there be a shortfall in the delivery of houses across the growth area more generally.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies to overcome potential constraints to the supply of housing land. <input type="checkbox"/> Maintain SHLAA to identify changes in the capacity of PDL.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support provided for preferred option north of Houghton Regis.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2066	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Larger potential role - the allocation of 7,000 houses to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis could be increased for two reasons. First, the Core Strategy relies on the allocation of 5,500 houses to the East of Luton in North Hertfordshire. North Hertfordshire District Council has concerns regarding this proposal and is likely to object to this allocation. Secondly, the Core Strategy proposes a large amount of dwellings in the existing urban areas. It is considered that such high density development has over saturated the market, making the projected completions unrealistic. Also, that 40% of the 15,400 dwellings from 2021-31 is ambitious given that sites have not been identified. In Areas to the north of the A5-M1 link road between the A5 and A5120 offer an opportunity to accommodate further development should there be a shortfall in delivery.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements. □</p>				
1341	Toddington Estates Ltd	Cambridge	Q. 8	Yes
<p>Comment: We generally support the proposed housing targets, but of the selected rural settlements we consider Toddington to be particularly appropriate to cater for some additional development because of its range of facilities and geographical location</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Already included in the list of rural settlements capable of accommodating development</p>				
831	Mr John Urwin	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: No. I do not support the proposal recommending that nearly 30% (5,500 dwellings) out of the urban housing expansion of 19,000 dwellings for Luton are to be 'dumped' on North Herts green belt land to the east of Luton. Alternative sites in and around Luton should be further investigated to preserve green belt rather than it be used by planners and developers as a cheap and easier option to meet their targets and profits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
2024	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: It is not clear how many houses will be built in rural areas or over the entire growth area. The numbers presented are confusing as they switch between different targets (MKSM, RSS, already built, etc.) and they are rounded-up.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is appropriate to reflect the composite elements of the growth requirements.</p>				
489	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: No new dwellings in rural areas, villages or Green Belt. All development to be confined to town centres by increasing population density. No development in North Hertfordshire, which is already under attack from Stevenage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
375	Mr Andrew Weber	Knebworth	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: I don't support the proposals because of their intention to build houses and infrastructure on North Hertfordshire District Council green belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
778	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: So, first you say "5,500 homes East of Luton", then it's upped as NHDC will be helping you to achieve the 19,000 target whatever happens; so if you don't meet it elsewhere, it will all go East of Luton anyway! They'll be using our roads and services and be paying their Council Tax to NHDC! Staggering! I don't believe it's necessary. It will ruin the character of the area, destroy an area of outstanding natural beauty, make a mockery of the "Green Belt" and paralyse Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: it is not part of this CS to promote a development exceeding 5.500. The precise allocation will be a matter for consideration by NHDC's LDF.</p>				
1005	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: On the basis that there's no evidence that the local market requires these houses! New/recent builds to the centre and south of Leighton are still awaiting completion/sale so who's going to buy the 2500 other new houses? No, these are the wrong type of houses - in the wrong place!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Whilst it is recognised that delivery in the recent period is slow, the CS is a plan for the next 20 years and it is appropriate to incorporate the town into the wider Growth Area</p>				
93	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has provided no supporting text. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent is not in support of this preferred option.</p>				
3885	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: It is unlikely that Luton Borough will be able to achieve these very high completion rates in the period 2008-2019. It is recommended that they are reduced over the next few years to no more than the 375 per annum as evidenced over the last 8 years which would equate to 4,1525 dwellings over the 2008/9 to 2018/9 period (as opposed to the 6,195 dwellings assumed by the Council) However, even this reduced figure is still likely to be an over-estimate, given the move away from higher density urban schemes as result of dwellings not demanded by the market. Objections are also raised to the lack of any detailed explanation used to calculate the projected completions in the urban areas between 2019 and 2031. The attached concept plan supports 2,500 homes to the east of Leighton Linlade including an allowance of dwellings to be built within the local centre. CS6 notes this capacity can be confirmed and refined through the future master planning exercises.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
348	Mrs Francesca Wroe	Hitchin	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: Housing needs are being confused with housing wishes. Many people would wish to move to a development to the East of Luton but there is no need for this housing. If the housing needs of Luton were reassessed now, in this current economic climate, much of the need would have found to have disappeared. This is evident from the amount of property changing hands at the moment. Luton council has no moral right to build on the land of another county. This green space is so precious, once it has gone it will be gone forever. I was born in Luton and lived for 20 years in Putteridge, Stopsley. The area to the east of Luton was my green space, my school cross country course, where I rode my bike as a child, went for many walks, and where I take my children now when we visit my parents.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
650	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 8	No
<p>Comment: The housing targets need to be revised downwards in the current climate. The extent of urban priority building needs to be increased and more family homes built within the towns. There are areas other than those stated that are better fitted to development outside the urban areas. The 5,500 homes to the east of Luton is disproportionate even if the development there is to go ahead.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Plan is for a period of 20 years and should not plan in a manner derived from the current unprecedented economic conditions. The direction of growth in this area has been defined as an area of search in the RSS and is considered in the CS to be an appropriate candidate for allocation by NHDC.</p>				
1066	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.17	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph 6.17 suggests that delivery of Preferred Policy CS6 will be secured via the allocation of urban extensions by the Core Strategy and by identifying sites within the urban area and villages in the Site Allocations DPD. This policy will form an important consideration when determining locations for growth within the rural settlements (both which settlements and where within those settlements) and as such the rationale between those settlements identified needs to be clearly articulated (see comments on Preferred Option CS6).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The rationale for the identification of rural settlements is set out.</p>				
1733	Bloor Homes	Derbyshire	Para. 6.17	No
<p>Comment: The Joint Committee have recognised a need to identify contingency strategies to deal with possible delays in the delivery of growth. PPS12 requires such strategies are clearly set out within the Core Strategies and it is necessary for public consultation to be carried out on the potential contingency strategies. We do not consider that it would be appropriate to proceed directly to a Submission Version of the Core Strategy without having done so, as this would put the council at risk of proceeding with an unsound document. I would draw the Council's attention to the advice in the planning Advisory Service's Plan Making Manual in relation to the publication and submission of Core Strategies. In particular the advice regarding post publication changes. <input type="checkbox"/> An appropriate contingency plan would involve the release of selected sites identified in the Site Allocations DPD where a shortfall in the housing trajectory is identified in the Annual Monitoring Report, in accordance with the advice in PPS3 paragraphs 60-67.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: There will be an opportunity to comment on the contingency arrangements at the pre-submission representations stage following publication of the Core Strategy</p>				
1783	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.17	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC supports paragraphs 6.17 which states that the preferred urban extensions will be allocated in the Core Strategy and their delivery will be enabled via the preparation of detailed Masterplan SPDs. We have noted that Table 3 in the Local Development Scheme (April 2009) refers to the preparation of an Urban Extension SPD to provide a planning framework and further guidance to inform and secure the comprehensive delivery of the proposed urban extensions. However, the preparation of such SPDs is not shown on Figure 1 or described in Appendix 2 of the Local Development Scheme. NLC hopes that the content of the LDS (April 2009) is sufficiently robust to assist the implementation of the objective outlined at paragraph 6.17 of the Preferred Options</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS will include SSSAs which will set the context for future Local Development Documents to be prepared.</p>				
3362	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Para. 6.17	Yes
<p>Comment: The provision in this paragraph is a welcomed way of seeking to move the process forward quickly.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3884	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Para. 6.17	Yes
Comment: Support the desire to move straight from the Core Strategy to the preparation of Masterplan SPDs which is potentially a more streamlined process.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure the strategy sets-out how housing delivery will be progressed through the LDF and the use and place of each DPD/ SPD				
JC Reason for Response: Other DPD work may first be required				
3242	DP9	London	Para. 6.20	Yes
Comment: Supports the reference to the importance of financial viability of housing development, particularly in relation to the delivery of strategic urban extensions.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy				
156	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 6.21	Yes
Comment: I agree all housing development should not be completed until all the road infrastructure and social amenities are in place. I can not comment on Leighton Buzzard as I am not familiar with the area, but the only place in the wider Luton conurbation that I can see absorbing housing demand before then is Caddington as it already has a village centre and shops, and is well located for existing main road links, M1 and A5; whilst also being near the main hospital (L&D) and town centre.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: The sequence of housing delivery is a matter for the Housing Delivery Strategy and sufficient housing land can be programmed accordingly.				
651	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.21	No
Comment: There is to be no M1 widening. This states that delivery of at least 1 urban extension should be in 2009 - just what does this mean?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Ensure next stage of CS does not repeat higher-level policies and ambitions but covers the latest understanding of local need and deliverability.				
JC Reason for Response: The paragraph simply states the expectations of the MKSMSRS.				
1069	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.22	No
Comment: Paragraph 6.22 suggests that "there is a sufficient range of deliverable land within the urban area for housing to meet the targets over the coming 5 years." Paragraph 7.7 of the SHLAA identifies that there is a deficit of 113 dwellings over the coming 5 year period against the housing targets in the RSS for the "Rest of Southern Bedfordshire". It is considered that this leaves the Council at risk of planning by appeal given the content of paras 69-72 of PPS3. As such, the Council should be seeking the early identification of sites through sensitive Green Belt release, as supported by Policy CS6. Our client's land at Slip End would be well placed to deliver a sensitive development through Green Belt release.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: There is a need to deliver the Core Strategy as soon as possible to avoid "planning by appeal." However, it is expected that only planned urban extensions should be supported and the proposed site is not required.				
3405	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Para. 6.22	No
Comment: The robustness of the conclusions with regard to future sites identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is questioned. The Joint Committee fails to consider the potential of land at French's Avenue, Dunstable (See comment CSOP 3398) and to recognise the site's designation within a Category II employment area (Policy E2 (previously adopted local plan)) rather than a main employment area (Policy E1).				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The site was identified by the ELR as 'amber' (employment uses remain viable but future interventions may be required). The SHLAA only investigated 'red' sites (suitable for release from employment use).				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
653	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.22	No
Comment: So why the undue haste stated in 6.22				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Representation is unclear				
1070	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.24	No
Comment: Paragraph 6.24 recognises the impact of the recession on the deliverability and viability of sites. It suggests that in market conditions similar to those experienced in 2007, the housing sources identified will be viable and can be delivered. Current market intelligence suggests that 2007 values may not be achieved until at least 2015. As such, this may seriously undermine viability in the intervening period, contrary to the suggestion of 2012 in para 6.26.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Whilst it is recognised that delivery in the recent period is slow, the CS is a plan for the next 20 years and it is appropriate to Plan for growth under normal economic conditions.				
1691	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.25	No
Comment: The statement that 'delivery could start on the urban extensions to the east of Leighton Buzzard and/or the north of Luton in 2012/13, with the other two urban extensions to commence shortly after' is inconsistent with the statement in paragraph 4.6 that states that priority will be given to the main conurbation before Leighton Buzzard and Linslade.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: There is a need to show more clearly the Delivery Strategy to avoid inconsistency.				
4032	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 6.25	No
Comment: We object to the specific timings for delivery of SUEs. Delivery of SUEs should be led by commitment to proceed, economic viability, feasibility and deliverability as well as more detailed scrutiny through the planning application process. EoL is well advanced and can likely be delivered in advance of the other SUEs. There is also disparity between the delivery dates set-out in this paragraph and 6.21.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure use and consistency of delivery timings				
JC Reason for Response: Delivery of major housing sites will need to be timed, considering the delivery of required infrastructure.				
1785	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.25	Yes
Comment: NLC endorses the comment at paragraph 6.25 of the Preferred Options which states that initial testing of the delivery of the urban extensions shows that implementation could start on land at East Leighton Buzzard and North Luton in 2012/13 "with the other two urban extensions to commence shortly after." Work already undertaken by NLC demonstrates that it is possible for delivery of the North Luton urban extension to start in 2012/13. This suggestion is achievable.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: There is a need to show more clearly the Delivery Strategy to avoid inconsistency.				
3359	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Para. 6.25	No
Comment: The earlier the urban extension sites can commence, the more likely it is that delivery targets will be achieved and the greater flexibility there will be in terms of the strategy's ability to adapt. It should be clarified that the early delivery of urban extensions will be encouraged and that the councils will not seek to hold back on any one area if it can bring forward the necessary infrastructure. Smaller-scale, early releases of urban extension sites should be enabled where these are close to the existing urban areas.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Major housing sites will need to be phased, considering the delivery of required infrastructure.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
654	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.25	No
Comment: The suggested dates here differ from the intent expressed in 6.21				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: 6.21 reflects the old ambitions of the MKSMSRS, while 6.25 takes a more considered and up-to-date view.				
1694	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.28	No
Comment: We are not clear on the precise meaning of the sentence "The Joint Committee will also identify a threshold figure below the housing targets which would trigger the need for additional sites to be allocated". We presume the Submission version will provide clarification.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will need to monitor the actual delivery of housing and release further sites through the Review process should they be required.				
1863	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 6.29	No
Comment: Mention water services infrastructure. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure that provision of water services is considered alongside all other infrastructure concerns.				
JC Reason for Response: Water infrastructure is an important element to delivering housing				
1787	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 6.29	Yes
Comment: NLC supports the observation at paragraph 6.29 of the Preferred Options to the effect that the Joint Committee is committed to securing a constant supply of housing land "and the early and speedy delivery of the strategic urban extensions to maximise their wider benefits to the area in terms of supporting infrastructure and facilities."				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.				
655	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.29	No
Comment: This is stating what previous comments have said - why not revise text from 6.21 to here?				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: This is explaining why the MKSMSRS ambitions have not been met.				
3287			Q. 9	No
Comment: There is no evidence to support the viability of and affordable housing provision of 35% of the total. At this level, there is evidence that developments will not be delivered. There needs to be more flexibility and recognition of the viability assessment of individual schemes and that lower levels of affordable housing are required at Leighton Linlade than at Luton.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHMA outputs are incorporated into the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: The viability of affordable housing targets will be established by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Flexibility is provided by CS8 - the requirement for individual site viability analysis				
1695	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 9	Yes
Comment: Yes - due to the diversity of the area and time period covered by the document, it should have built-in a degree of flexibility in order to ensure an appropriate level housing is provided, and in order to meet this growth it may be necessary to incorporate reserve sites which can come forward if the threshold figure dropped below a predetermined level that would result in an overall shortfall.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1071	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: Greater clarity needed to show how the Council will respond if housing delivery does not keep up with targets. The plan is overly reliant early on in the plan period on PDL development which will be significantly reduced in the current climate. Small scale Green Belt reviews around the villages should therefore take place releasing sites that could be developed quickly.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Consider and clarify flexible policies to overcome potential constraints to the supply of housing land.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS will include a housing delivery strategy which will include contingency arrangements.</p>				
1948	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Clarify that the 'constant supply' relates to proposals from the Core Strategy and is not an open-ended commitment. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.</p>				
3352	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Endorses the Joint Committee's commitment to working in partnership and the principle of identifying a threshold of housing completions below the housing targets which would trigger the need to allocate new sites.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
227	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: You are being too unspecific to gain any agreement to this question. Delivery of a constant supply of housing land, where? Probably in Hertfordshire not in Bedfordshire and I do not believe you should have the right to do this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1525	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Providing this falls within the Luton and South Beds boundaries alone.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The MKSMSRS and policy H1 of the RSS allow for growth into North Hertfordshire.</p>				
3285	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: Delivery is of the utmost importance and the Strategy must ensure sufficient deliverable land and consider additional options to ensure this is achieved. The Strategy does not provide a realistic timescale for the commencement of the preferred sites and we do not consider that a 5 year effective supply can be maintained. If the Strategy is to rely on a limited number of sites to deliver the housing requirement, it will need to be based on evidence that those sites will deliver the expected number in the plan period and have regard to relatively unencumbered sites elsewhere to maintain the supply. The west Linslade extension offers a viable alternative and offers flexibility of being able to be developed quickly in response to possible land supply issues. Development of this site would help to maintain housing supply.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies to overcome potential constraints to the supply of housing land</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence on the delivery of preferred extensions is progressing, with issues being identified and resolved.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1598	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Responses to be reviewed (this process) to identify and respond to concerns.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: LDF must be aligned with RSS</p>				
1631	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the East of England Plan housing target met? Is there a 15 year plan for housing delivery? The growth of Luton within the boundary of North Hertfordshire was envisaged when the MKSM strategy and the East of England plan were developed. Growth rates to 2021 were identified by the MKSM strategy but precise numbers for each district were not identified. The East of England Plan does not identify the number of homes allocated to the North Hertfordshire part of the resultant Luton growth and excludes this growth from their allocation in policy H1.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is for the Core Strategies of both Authorities to establish the scale of development required.</p>				
1674	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: Are there any policies dealing with implementation and monitoring? Implementation of growth options within North Hertfordshire relies on the co-operation of the district in the adoption of the suggested allocations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.</p>				
4033	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Emphasise deliverability of housing sites in overall terms rather than restrict or constrain housing delivery sites through the use of specific timings/ phasing of sites. Timely development of the SUEs will require early grant of outline planning consent.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Major housing sites will need to be phased, considering the delivery of required infrastructure.</p>				
2787	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: No-one denies that a constant supply of land is required to house an increasing population. But the scale of the proposals is wrong. Lots of small "organic" growth would perhaps render the small, more rural communities affected as more sustainable communities. But grafting on a whole new community to Leighton Buzzard isn't going to make it more sustainable - no more than Billington Park or Sandhills has!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 4.22 explains the approach taken</p>				
940	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: But not in Leighton Buzzard. We are saturated in new housing, with builders here unable to sell properties. So why say that this urban extension would be sustainable, as there are so many unsold dwellings, and yet more being constructed in the south of Leighton?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Whilst it is recognised that delivery in the recent period is slow, the CS is a plan for the next 20 years and it is appropriate to incorporate the town into the wider Growth Area</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
123	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 9	No
Comment:				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has provided no supporting text. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent is not in support of this preferred option.				
1816	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 9	No
Comment: Housing delivery appears to be paramount and it is concerning that required community infrastructure will be bypassed by the need to deliver. Urban extensions should not go ahead before brownfield sites.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: There will be a need to deliver both urban extensions and Brownfield sites to meet the growth requirement. Associated community infrastructure will be a matter for later Local Development Documents and the Development Management processes.				
305	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 9	No
Comment: This is just a way of saying we should build on the Green Belt. We should not. The South-East is full and we should allow market forces to guide people elsewhere.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
1892	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 9	No
Comment: The Strategy does not achieve a constant supply of housing delivery as it does not provide a realistic timescale for the Preferred Options sites. We consider the delivery of housing on such sites before 2016 to be unrealistic due to infrastructure and economic/viability constraints. <input type="checkbox"/> The reliance on a limited number of sites to deliver the housing requirement is unrealistic. The evidence does not sustain that those sites will be able to deliver the expected number of homes in the plan period. Regard must be had to potential unencumbered sites elsewhere. <input type="checkbox"/> West of Linslade offers a viable and deliverable alternative to facilitate a constant supply of housing land. It offers the flexibility of being able to be developed quickly as a response to possible land supply issues. It does not require any public sector spending, as it does not require any major infrastructure investment.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies to overcome potential constraints to the constant supply of housing land				
JC Reason for Response: Strategy does require flexible policies.				
1916	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 9	No
Comment: Constant growth is unsustainable. Housing should be distributed more evenly throughout the UK. Brownfield sites and office roofs are part of future planning but CS7 assumes an infinite supply of land.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
2085	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 9	Yes
Comment: The Borough Council supports a balanced and clearly phased delivery of housing with employment, necessary transport and community infrastructure. This phased approach must respect the need to maintain a 5-year supply and a 15-year planning horizon or trajectory, in accordance with Government guidance - PPS3 Housing. Phased housing development will ensure that transport, and social and community infrastructure, does not become overloaded before any necessary new or enhanced existing provision can be delivered. Overall - a continuous supply of housing land will enable the urban extensions and the supporting infrastructure to be planned, developed and delivered more effectively.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1927	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Clarify that the 'constant supply' relates to proposals from the Core Strategy and is not an open-ended commitment. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.</p>				
253	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: A "constant supply" may not meet the needs of people in the future. The supply should be adjusted to reflect the needs of the time, not like some discredited communist five year plan.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A review of the Core Strategy is part of the LDF process. Government advice is that a the Plan looks forward to providing a constant supply. However, this is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
3337	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: Working in partnership with the Local Delivery Vehicle, land owners and developers is a suitable approach to deliver the policies. It is considered that major proposals such as the urban extensions meet the deliverability expectations in PPS12. The principle of identifying a threshold of completions, below which would trigger the bringing forward of further allocated land is considered to respond to the need for flexibility required to ensure the soundness of the core strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
2195	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: The spatial strategy establishes an 'urban area first' principle as the preferred regarding the delivery of new development with 60% of all new residential development taking place in these areas up to 2021 and 40% thereafter to 2031. Yet this preferred option for delivering a constant supply of housing concentrates almost entirely on progressing the proposed urban extensions. Natural England considers that greater emphasis should be placed on resolving issues in bringing forward sites within the urban areas as a priority.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible policies that can attend to the issue of more, or less, capacity from PDL over the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Capacity on PDL will be reviewed through the SHLAA</p>				
1466	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 9	No
<p>Comment: Fine to use brownfield sites. PLEASE do not take away the beautiful countryside FOREVER</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
1789	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC supports Preferred Option CS7 which outlines the Joint Committee's preferred approach which is to work in partnership with landowners/developers to maintain a constant supply of suitable and deliverable housing sites, including the implementation of the preferred strategic urban extensions. NLC agrees with the approach which seeks to ensure the timely development of the urban extensions "with the first urban extension to be commenced no later than 2012/13."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
51	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 9	No
Comment: The text suggests that sustainability will be sacrificed for delivery targets, i.e. housing before infrastructure				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is mindful of the link between necessary infrastructure and the delivery of housing.				
750	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 9	Yes
Comment: HRDC welcomes the intention to work in partnership to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of deliverable sites, including strategic urban extensions. HRDC reiterate its willingness to work on the formulation of a shared vision for Houghton Regis North. By collaborating in this way it will be possible to ensure the timely development of the urban extension, which could be the first implemented. HRDC is concerned to note the final bullet point. Paragraph 53 of PPS3 requires that LPAs identify broad locations and specific sites to enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years. To maintain a flexible and responsive supply of land and a five year supply for housing, paragraph 60 requires that authorities draw upon the "allocated sites, as necessary, to update the five year supply of deliverable sites." By adopting this approach the delays associated with the allocation of additional sites as part of the review and / or revision of development plans can be avoided.				
JC Response: Partially Agree				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It is possible that additional sites will be required and the strategy should allow for such a situation				
1365	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 9	No
Comment: The effective commitment to plan, monitor and manage, is a reflection of Government guidance and a means by which the success or otherwise of housing delivery may be measured and suitable actions taken in response to identified difficulties. Unfortunately, whilst worthy of support in principle, the approach is lacking in detail, e.g. no indication is given as to the threshold that will be adopted upon which the Joint Committee will initiate a process of identifying and allocating additional housing sites. A process that itself will be time consuming. Given the lack of detail, the suggested approach may not be sufficiently robust in practice; our recommendation in our comment on paragraph 6.12 to include a non-implementation allowance of a greater scale than proposed would assist in a more robust planning framework than that which is being promulgated by the Joint Committee.				
JC Response: Partially agree				
Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice. However, it is considered that the "allowance" given is sufficiently robust				
2012	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 9	Yes
Comment: We support CS7				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
810	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 9	No
Comment: No Greenfield sites should be utilised. Development should be confined to town centres.				
JC Response: Not agree				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
779	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 9	No
Comment: "Constant Supply" assumes something in production. As Mark Twain said, "Buy land , they're not making it anymore" No to Urban Expansion!				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF				
Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1006	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: No one denies that a constant supply of land is required to house an increasing population. But the scale of the proposals is wrong. Lots of small "organic" growth would render the more rural communities affected as probably more sustainable communities. But IMHO, suddenly grafting on a whole new community just isn't going to work!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.</p>				
656	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: It's hard to disagree with this laudable aim. The detail of how the aim is to be delivered is not as laudable and is contrary to common sense, since the land provision has to be as far as possible using existing infrastructure and not having to use entirely new and prohibitively expensive new infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No details provided as to the concern over delivery. <input type="checkbox"/> New developments will seek to utilise and add to existing infrastructure.</p>				
48	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 9	Yes
<p>Comment: It's hard to disagree with this laudable aim. The detail of how the aim is to be delivered is not as laudable and is contrary to common sense, since the land provision has to be as far as possible using existing infrastructure and not having to use entirely new and prohibitively expensive new infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No details provided as to the concern over delivery. <input type="checkbox"/> New developments will seek to utilise and add to existing infrastructure.</p>				
1072	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 6.30	No
<p>Comment: Paragraph 6.30 suggests that the Submission Core Strategy and Development Management DPD will provide additional detail on such a mechanism as eluded to in Preferred Option CS7. I would suggest that the mechanism to ensure a 5 year supply of housing will be a regular review of housing delivery through the Annual Monitoring Report and through the regular review of the Council's SHLAA. The Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPD should also ensure a flexible approach to allocating sites to ensure early delivery of housing before the Sustainable Urban Extensions commence delivery of housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Preparation of the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor that will be dealt with in the Housing Delivery Strategy section of the Core Strategy. There is a mechanism within PPS12 for dealing with contingency arrangements</p>				
1864	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 6.30	Yes
<p>Comment: Use the infrastructure timeline and developer checklist from the Water Cycle Study. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Feed into Integrated Development Programme</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Infrastructure delivery evidence</p>				
2307	Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 6.32	Yes
<p>Comment: Understand the particular needs of aged, infirm and disabled. However there should be no discrimination in the provision of housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHMA outputs are incorporated into the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Strategic Housing Market Assessment will consider such needs.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
834	Ms Priscilla Cullen	Breachwood Green	Para. 6.32	No
<p>Comment: While I can understand that aged people have specific housing needs with regard to access, services and facilities I fail to understand how the other groups mentioned have needs different from the majority population. We all need roofs over our heads, food on our tables, jobs and reasonable access to public services. There should be no discrimination in these provisions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
94	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.32	No
<p>Comment: How about meeting the needs of young people who are not "ethnic" ? i.e. white, British. Why do gypsies and travellers need housing ? - clue is in the name, they travel. This attitude will promote a "them and us" culture, with new developments becoming ethnic islands, rather than integrated communities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
657	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.32	No
<p>Comment: The development east of Luton is unlikely to be suitable for the proportion of affordable housing that is being envisaged. This type of housing comes hand-in-hand with a need to mostly unskilled or semi-skilled jobs and a good public transport provision. East of Luton simply does not figure well in the light of such an analysis</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A full range of affordable housing will be expected in all of the proposed urban extensions. However, this will be a matter for NHDC to address in liaison with the Joint Committee</p>				
1026	Mr Bruce Hallam	no address	Para. 6.34	Yes
<p>Comment: Re the Gypsy and traveller pitches - potential must have the full support of the respective Town Council, its residents in particular those residents near to potential sites as well as the respective Gypsy and Traveller organisations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To be considered in the Gypsy and Travellers DPD</p>				
95	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.34	No
<p>Comment: This undemocratic approach by the Plan, will only increase a NIMBY attitude amongst people who will have to live alongside these sites.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
659	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.34	No
<p>Comment: This will be unsupportable in the east of Luton development. If developer levies are to be used to fund infrastructure then this makes the necessary infrastructure not just unaffordable for the developer but impossible without a major public funds contribution. Luton has yet to complete its studies of traveller and other groups provision in its area</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1964	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Para. 6.35	No
Comment: We question some of the population assumptions and the implications of these on the required services.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Population estimates support view that population of Luton is rising. Also, the CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review.				
2839	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 6.36	No
Comment: If this statement is true, why is no notice being taken of the results of that consultation?				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The statement is reflected in CS8				
1007	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 6.36	No
Comment: If this statement is true, why is no notice being taken of the results of that consultation?				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The statement is reflected in CS8				
660	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.36	No
Comment: This puts a caveat on what is said in 6.34, but does not tell us what levels will be planned for east of Luton.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 6.40 explains how the targets will be set.				
661	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 6.37	No
Comment: See comments against 6.34 - even the starting level of 35% will make levies at a point where east of Luton infrastructure cost provision is impossible for a developer.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: A full range of affordable housing will be expected in all of the proposed urban extensions. It is considered that the provision expected is reasonable and viable. However, this will be a matter for NHDC to address the detail later in liaison with the Joint Committee				
1965	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Para. 6.38	No
Comment: Social housing for a wide range of people, including those with a disability or mental health need should be part of the plan, in addition to 'extra care' houses.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Review wording in the Core Strategy				
JC Reason for Response: Where appropriate, any future reference to special housing types will refer to all.				
1025	Mr Bruce Hallam	no address	Para. 6.39	Yes
Comment: Press release earlier this year identified three locations within Houghton Regis that were to become Traveller sites; Kingsland Campus; Sandringham Drive & Thorn End. Residents and the Town Council were not aware of such decisions, as no consultation has taken place with the Town and its residents. The particular locations are unacceptable as two of the sites will become surrounded by the new housing.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: To be considered in the Gypsy and Travellers DPD				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3289			Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: There is no evidence to support the viability of and affordable housing provision of 35% of the total. At this level, there is evidence that developments will not be delivered. There needs to be more flexibility and recognition of the viability assessment of individual schemes and that lower levels of affordable housing are required at Leighton Linlade than at Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHMA outputs are incorporated into the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The viability of affordable housing targets will be established by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Flexibility is provided by CS8 - the requirement for individual site viability analysis</p>				
681	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: Not a yes or no answer but given the seemingly limitless requirement for developer contributions it's hard to see how any of the housing can be "affordable".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A full range of affordable housing will be expected in all of the proposed urban extensions. It is considered that the provision expected is reasonable and viable. However, this will be a matter for NHDC to address the detail later in liaison with the Joint Committee</p>				
1146	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Agree with intention to set an ambitious target for affordable housing. Disappointed that threshold site sizes have not been set out. It is important that these are set low enough to ensure affordable housing is provided on smaller sites within urban and rural areas. PPS3 para 29 permits local authorities to set lower thresholds than a site size of 15 dwellings, and this is important in the rural area where sites tend to be smaller. The rural area threshold should not be higher than 5 dwellings, and a case may be made for this to be reduced to 3 as is the practice in some rural authorities. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure affordable housing commitments are delivered. It is not much help if affordable housing is the last on site or, having met other planning obligations, a developer complains there is no money left to meet the requirements, as was the recent case in Grange Road, Barton-le-Clay. <input type="checkbox"/> A range of affordable housing and forms of tenure should be provided, not merely RSL rented, with provision for key workers, local needs etc.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Progress work on the requirements for affordable housing delivery; thresholds and tenure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Thresholds will be sought for the final Core Strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> Housing needs studies should inform the range of housing required</p>				
1697	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Yes - in considering individual housing schemes it is important to assess the viability issues and that they are deliverable within an appropriate timescale to ensure a constant supply of housing to meet the needs of the Borough's residents. In addition, it is important that a viable housing proposal is not made unviable by either providing too much affordable housing or requiring excessive S106 contributions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A full range of affordable housing will be expected in all of the proposed urban extensions. It is considered that the provision expected is reasonable and viable.</p>				
1076	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: Greater clarity on the Council's position in respect of the Policy approach to "Providing Housing for All Needs" should be provided. The policy wording is very generalised at present and does not indicate the likely approach to establishing a policy on affordable housing, including the percentage of affordable, likely tenure mix and potential contributions for off-site provision. It is difficult to comment until further clarification is given. I do however welcome the suggested approach of allowing departures from the affordable housing target where site viability analysis proves this to be necessary to bring forward development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Progress work on the requirements for affordable housing delivery; percentage, tenure mix and off-site contributions</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: RSS guidance used until evidence is completed.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1949	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: We support a minimum of 35% affordable housing, extra care homes and 'lifetime' homes. Amend the policy to incorporate housing affordability and sufficiency in villages, as identified by the SCS. State the need for community safety incorporating the 'secure by design' standards. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The detail requested will be relevant to the consideration of Local Development Documents beyond the Core Strategy</p>				
1824	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Board does not object to Policy CS8 as long as any gypsy and traveller sites that are identified are located outside of AONB and its setting</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To be dealt with in the Gypsy and Travellers DPD</p>				
225	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: I would not be having to comment at all if, as a Hertfordshire resident, I was not being affected by Bedfordshire council. You do not deserve the right to build on land for which I cannot use the power of my vote to have my say.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The matter is addressed in the LDF for North Hertfordshire area.</p>				
3243	DP9	London	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports flexible approach to affordable housing contributions and use of grant funding as well as use of individual site viability assessments where a departure from the relevant affordable housing target is sought.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy</p>				
3288	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: PNNH consider that a flexible approach needs to be considered in view of the current economic climate.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Flexibility is provided by CS8 - the requirement for individual site viability analysis</p>				
1599	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Responses to be reviewed (this process) to identify and respond to concerns.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: LDF must be aligned with RSS</p>				
1633	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there an affordable housing policy and does it meet the East of England Plan target?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Yes, the proposal is in conformity with the RSS</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1634	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there policy to address the accommodation needs of Gypsies and Travellers? Whilst there is a commitment to allocate sites for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation, no detail is included in the Core Strategy. Emerging regional policy indicates that Luton should provide 15 pitches and Central Bedfordshire should provide 80 pitches for Gypsies and Travellers between 2006 and 2011, so sites will need to be brought forward through separate consultation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To be dealt with in the Gypsy and Travellers DPD</p>				
4034	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: We support in principle CS8. We object to 35% affordable housing as a starting point and submit that 35% should be set as a maximum, in line with the RSS Implementation Plan and that each case must be considered in its own merits. This also applies to North Hertfordshire's requirements. We support the requirements for individual site viability to ensure that delivery does not prejudice the meeting of housing targets.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHMA outputs are incorporated into the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The viability of affordable housing targets will be established by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Flexibility is provided by CS8 - the requirement for individual site viability analysis</p>				
2788	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Broadly, this is a very 'socially aware' provision. But providing the desired mix of private and affordable social housing doesn't appear on the face of it to be financially viable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHMA outputs are incorporated into the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The viability of affordable housing targets will be established by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>				
942	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: Just as there is a massive need for housing for older people in the community (care homes etc.) there is a growing need for young people and families to be housed, especially in council rented accommodation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
124	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: no action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has provided no supporting text. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent is in support of this preferred option.</p>				
2855	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: There is a requirement for limited affordable housing within the village but the Core Strategy does nothing to ensure that any development will provide this within small schemes. As the village has already experienced, increasing housing supply does not bring house process down and the reverse has been true resulting in the village losing its younger family population as local housing becomes too expensive.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure SHMA outputs are incorporated into the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The approach to affordable housing delivery in rural areas will be reviewed by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1818	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: The reference to Gypsy and Traveller accommodation is very vague, providing no guidance or assurance for such communities and existing local communities. Expand this text to provide guidance on integration of communities and supporting infrastructure such as public transport, schools and medical services. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To be dealt with in the Gypsy and Travellers DPD</p>				
306	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 10	No
<p>Comment: Not the way you have described it. Provision of housing should be achieved by a mixture of converting and upgrading older properties, and helping people to move to areas where they can afford housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A full range of house types is required</p>				
1893	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: This submission provides both formal objections and representations. It has been prepared by Kirkby and Diamond on behalf of Mr Anthony Kimble, the principal landowner of the proposed site known as West of Linslade Urban Extension. We support the provision of housing for all needs. we have no objection in principle to the provision of reasonable levels of affordable housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Noted</p>				
1917	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: It would be hard to say no to the list in CS8. Waiting lists also contain many diverse groups not just families including single, couples, students, elderly, homeless and learning disabled groups.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2086	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: The SHMA demonstrates that this is a vital objective for regenerating the town and conurbation. The Core Strategy emphasis in addressing the range of demand for affordable housing will help to ensure that the right types and quantities of housing for each tenure needed is delivered. If this is not secured, local communities will suffer deprivation and overcrowding, support networks will be undermined as families are forced to seek cheaper and inappropriate accommodation elsewhere outside the Borough/conurbation thereby impacting adversely on adjacent areas. There would also be implications regarding commuting, support services and the ability for businesses within Luton to recruit local skills. There is also the need for a mixed tenure approach from a community sustainability perspective.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Progress work on the requirements for affordable housing delivery; mixed tenures</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support given for preferred option</p>				
1928	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 10	Yes
<p>Comment: We support a minimum of 35% affordable housing, extra care homes and 'lifetime' homes. Amend the policy to incorporate housing affordability and sufficiency in villages, as identified by the SCS. State the need for community safety incorporating the 'secure by design' standards. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The detail requested will be relevant to the consideration of Local Development Documents beyond the Core Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
254	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 10	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: no action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent has provided no supporting text. <input type="checkbox"/> Respondent is in support of this preferred option.				
52	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: All of the objectives seem fair and reasonable				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Noted				
751	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: Concerned with specific target of 35% as starting point especially as evidence not complete. Pleas to note financial contributions towards off-site AH might be acceptable in certain circumstances. In light of the importance attached to regeneration of existing areas, reference should be made to the possibility of securing financial contribution towards the refurbishment/replacement of existing stock in lieu of on-site provision. HRDC notes the stated need for individual site viability analysis when a departure from the AH target being sought.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Progress work on the requirements for affordable housing delivery; percentage and off-site contributions				
JC Reason for Response: RSS guidance used until evidence is completed.				
3525	Dr Jennifer Stewart	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: I recognise the need for affordable housing growth to meet local need.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with strategy				
1366	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: This is considered to represent a flexible approach by the Joint Committee, albeit further work is in hand that will inform the final submission draft Core Strategy. This approach is generally supported by Taylor Wimpey.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Noted				
2013	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	No
Comment: We support a minimum of 35% affordable housing, extra care homes and 'lifetime' homes. Amend the policy to address housing affordability and sufficiency in villages to sustain viable rural communities. Incorporate specific reference to community safety including 'secure by design' standards.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The detail requested will be relevant to the consideration of Local Development Documents beyond the Core Strategy				
1008	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: Broadly, this is a very 'socially aware' provision. But I just cannot see it as financially viable/sustainable by the developers!!				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Noted				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
96	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 10	No
Comment: I do not support the provision of housing for gypsies and travellers.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: This is a requirement of government advice.				
3887	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Cirencester	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: The flexibility inherent in CS8 generally supported. Housing need is greater in the Luton areas. As such, the urban extension at Leighton Linlade should meet its own town's needs but not the wider affordable housing needs of the whole growth area which would be better located in the areas of greatest need.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: While Luton does have a large need for affordable housing, southern Bedfordshire will require suitable provision in-line with the area's population growth forecasts.				
662	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 10	Yes
Comment: This is again a laudable aim and engineered as a question to secure a "Yes" answer. The concern is that with at least a 35% provision of affordable housing it will be impossible for a developer to provide the necessary infrastructure in an east of Luton development. It will also make east of Luton non-affordable houses much less desirable.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: A full range of affordable housing will be expected in all of the proposed urban extensions. It is considered that the provision expected is reasonable and viable. However, this will be a matter for NHDC to address the detail later in liaison with the Joint Committee				
3639	Vivien Nutt	Dunstable	Para. 7.1	No
Comment:				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure planning policy is considerate of other economic development strategies				
JC Reason for Response: Planning policy is part of a wider package of measures such as setting of business rates and car parking initiatives				
1269	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 7.2	Yes
Comment: Reference should be made to the Greensand Ridge Local Development Strategy (2008) which highlights the issues of creating sustainable rural economic growth, based on green tourism and local produce. It highlights current issues around the rural economy of the area, which can be masked by more general statistics. There is also an equivalent document for the Chilterns Local Action Group, which has similar objectives. Much of the area covered by this Core Strategy is covered by one or other of these strategies.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Include a policy in the Core Strategy addressing the economic needs of rural areas.				
JC Reason for Response: It is important for the Core Strategy to ensure that rural areas remain economically vital and vibrant.				
1696	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.3	No
Comment: We remain highly sceptical of the prospects for achieving the jobs growth target, especially given the proximity of Milton Keynes, which will have its own ambitious jobs growth agenda.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
316	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.3	No
<p>Comment: Elsewhere in the document the restricted employment opportunities in Leighton-Linslade, and the limited opportunities for employment growth, are noted. The recent developments to the South of Leighton-Linslade show no signs of having been co-ordinated with growth in employment opportunity, I assume therefore that the majority of these new residents commute to their place of employment. The proposed urban expansion of Leighton Buzzard would require generation of Ca. 2250 new jobs (using the figures in section 7.3); to this should be added the deficit in employment generated by the recent housing development. This is what would be needed for residential growth in the town to be considered 'sustainable' by the terms of reference used in this document. I suggest this is unachievable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda. In the light of this background the Core Strategy ensures that an appropriate mix of development is delivered across the Luton and southern Bedfordshire area in order to ensure sustainable communities are delivered.</p>				
2657	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: The vague statement 'increasing the employment opportunities' is not good enough. In view of the loss of a number of the main employers in Leighton Linslade, an action plan must be in place and commitments from new employers to the town be obtained, before any new housing is considered.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Ensure planning policy is considerate of other economic development strategies</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3615	Mr Barry Brownell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3590	M J Carr	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: The closure of large employers in Leighton Buzzard has led to greater out-commuting and the strategy fails to address the significant jobs growth needed in the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2840	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: There may have been 5,600 new jobs created, but there were perhaps 5,800 job losses over the same period! The local jobs market has been broadly neutral over the period - and with the current economic outlook the prospects for new jobs looks particularly complex.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The paragraph refers to a net gain (taking into account losses).</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3616	Mr Keith Fish	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2219	Mr Christopher Gravett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard has already seen the closure of large firms so further job losses would make the Eastern Development proposals even more unsustainable</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Consider the effect of preferred options over a range of economic scenarios including further job losses/recessions. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure suitable employment land provided in locations accessible to urban extensions.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3538	Jon Green	Eggington	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: The closure of large employers in Leighton Buzzard has led to greater out-commuting and the strategy fails to address the significant jobs growth needed in the town.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2160	Ms Jayne Green	Eggington	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: The closure of large employers in Leighton Buzzard has led to greater out-commuting and the strategy fails to address the significant jobs growth needed in the town.</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision in Leighton-Linslade, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
2370	Edith Griffith	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: Bringing yet more potential employees to an area like Leighton Buzzard where businesses are closing down and employment is limited is not a sensible course of action</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Consider the effect of preferred options over a range of economic scenarios including further job losses/recessions. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure suitable employment land provided in locations accessible to urban extensions.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3618	Linda Holbrook	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3612	Leighton-Linslade Opposes Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2545	Mrs G Lopez	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: Where are the additional people going to work? They will go to Milton Keynes or Dunstable, taking revenue with them. Or, vie for the ever decreasing volume of local jobs available in this town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008. <input type="checkbox"/> Milton Keynes and the Luton conurbation are known employment markets that compete with Leighton Linslade.</p>				
2639	Andrea Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: Not clear where these thousands of people will work as there are few large employers left with the loss of Lancer, Gossards, Liptons and Camdens. In the present economic climate, more smaller companies are also being lost</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area.</p>				
2535	Brian Patton	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: There is no work in the town. All the large employers have gone.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Economic strategies are susceptible and need to respond to changes in employment markets</p>				
3610	Mr C Shane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2311	Cindy Sharp	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: There is a scarcity of jobs in Leighton Buzzard so newcomers will commute to larger centres to work meaning that the local economy will see little benefit</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Ensure suitable employment land provided in locations accessible to urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2749	Stephen Sheppard	Eggington	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: Over the last few years, many of Leighton's main employers have closed or moved elsewhere. This has resulted in the majority (70%) of residents commuting out of town for employment. You are stating 'some limited new job growth will be encouraged to support the additional housing', this will only bring about a 'dormitory town' status for Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree      Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2751	Sue Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: Over the last few years, many of Leighton's main employers have closed or moved elsewhere. This has resulted in the majority (70%) of residents commuting out of town for employment. You are stating 'some limited new job growth will be encouraged to support the additional housing', this will only bring about a 'dormitory town' status for Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree      Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3620	Mr David Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3619	Edward Syrett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Recently many major employers have closed or moved elsewhere e.g. Liptons, Gossard &amp; Camdens This means that the majority of residents commute elsewhere to work The limited new jobs growth outlined in the CS will not meet the demand for new jobs prompted by the new development</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Such employment loss may have reduced the levels of in-commuting <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008 <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
2425	Mr Gary Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
<p>Comment: Not clear whether there are any plans to encourage new businesses to come to the town to support the local economy after the loss of Boss Trucks, Gossards, Liptons, Woolworths and Camdens. In terms of retail employment, the town centre is dominated by charity shops and hairdressers and lacks vitality and choice</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree      Proposed Action: Ensure planning policy is considerate of other economic development strategies</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area. <input type="checkbox"/> CS9 and CS11 see the revitalisation of town centres.</p>				
2679	Sheila Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	No
<p>Comment: No employment growth is being offered in Leighton Buzzard to meet the growth in proposed population.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Employment Land Review (2008) considers the proposed population growth</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2730	Carrie Tyas	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.4	Yes
Comment: How will it be possible to provide employment to all these new residence?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Ensure planning policy is considerate of other economic development strategies				
JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area				
1009	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 7.4	No
Comment: But there may have been 5,600 new jobs created, but there were 5,800 job losses over the same period! So the jobs market has been neutral over the period - and with the current economic outlook the prospects for new jobs looks particularly complex.				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1698	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.5	No
Comment: The statement that accessibility and connectivity to other parts of the UK and Europe are principal competitive advantages for Luton and southern Bedfordshire could equally be applied to Milton Keynes, apart from the fact that Luton and southern Bedfordshire has closer proximity to Luton Airport. It seems to us, therefore, that the jobs growth potential for Luton and southern Bedfordshire in the transport and business service sectors may not be robust as is being assumed.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.				
1437	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 7.6	Yes
Comment: We support the commitments as set out at paragraph 7.6 as important requirements required to deliver the job targets in the East of England Plan, to include: "An increase in the quantity and quality of well located employment land and premise, An increase in the skills and entrepreneurship of the workforce, and An increase in the scale of inward investment." Our client's site at Junction 10A of the M1 is strategically located on an important gateway site which can contribute to these objectives. It can also positively contribute to the image of Luton and provide a quality first impression of the town to arrivals from the M1. Sustainable transport improvements and a sensitive mix of employment opportunities can ensure the development contributes positively and fully integrates with the Luton-Dunstable conurbation (see comments under Policy CS3, CS4 & CS5 and Sites Submission Statement - to follow in hard copy format).				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The delivery of preferred locations for employment is a risk factor that will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy element of the employment chapter. The site identified is currently not preferred as it has not been adequately demonstrated that it is a genuinely sustainable option.				
3320			Para. 7.7	No
Comment: There are doubts about whether the proposed hectares of employment land can be met. It omits critical aspects of the employment land review in relation to the need for land at J10A for airport and high technology related uses.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, considering scenarios of delayed and early delivery of required infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/> Determine role of Jnc10A sites regarding strategic delivery of employment land.				
JC Reason for Response: Delivery of employment land, especially strategic sites, can be dependant on supporting infrastructure delivery.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2309	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: Object to expansion of Luton airport into rural and agricultural land. There is no reference to any assessment of suitability of this extension into N Herts.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Ensure expansion of airport-related activities are focussed on PDL where possible and that impact assessments have regard for the environment of North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The RSS supports increased airport capacity, in line with the Air Transport White Paper.</p>				
3698	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: Object to proposed employment site (Century Park): Would vandalise and urbanise prime agricultural and abolish footpaths used by residents of Wigmore, Darley Hall and Breachwood Green. It would pollute the skyline and open views and generate traffic which would rat run through villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure impact assessments have regard for the environment of North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: These concerns apply to many large schemes involving development of green field land.</p>				
4035	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Para. 7.7	Yes
<p>Comment: Support for strategic employment sites near to the airport.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with preferred option</p>				
2841	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: This appears to accept that there are only limited prospects for job creation in the Leighton area. Yet the proposals are for at least 2,500 new residents (more likely 4000, if working wives are included). The facts and figures don't stand up!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Evidence on the scale of future employment land and premises is described on pages 103 and 108 of the Employment Land Review 2008</p>				
739	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 7.7	Yes
<p>Comment: We note reference in paragraph 7.7 to "the future scale of expansion at London Luton airport". Such expansion could take on a number of different forms, but the physical enlargement of the airport, including a new or extended runway, is likely to have a significant impact on the historic environment surrounding that part of Luton. This includes Someries Castle Scheduled Monument and the Grade II* Registered Historic Park and Garden at Luton Hoo (which includes the Grade I listed mansion house).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The means by which the airport is going to expand are still being developed. There are known environmental constraints in the vicinity of the airport and these will be appropriately considered.</p>				
1031	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: We need more than 'limited' new job growth in Leighton Linslade as 1,300 new dwellings are already being constructed in southern Leighton. We need employment for the residents of 3,800 new dwellings!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
317	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: New job growth in Leighton-Linslade should be encouraged to balance the growth in the town that has already been allowed to take place, before further expansion is allowed. If that balance cannot be achieved (and it will be challenging) no further expansion (i.e. the proposed Eastern Urban extension) should be permitted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.</p>				
3490	Mrs G Nash	Eggington	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: Many of Leighton's main employers have moved out of the town, resulting in the majority (70%) of residents commuting out of town. 'Limited job growth' will only bring about a 'dormitory town' status for Leighton Linslade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
1438	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: The ELR finds favourably in respect of land adjoining Junction 10A. It states: "The Land at Jct 10a is outside the areas of search in the MKSMSRS but could potentially provide good accessibility to the airport and the wider strategic transport network. In terms of potential, it is very similar to Area M and should be seen as a good location for aviation-related businesses and a B1/business park location with good transport accessibility". It is assumed this refers to land south of the M1 spur, however the same principles would apply to our client's land at Junction 10A, given the previous Local Plan allocation and it's exclusion from the Green Belt. Given the impact of adjoining infrastructure, in particular the M1, the site is not considered to be of particular landscape value. Such employment development could support a stadium for LTFC or a Strategic Employment site in its own right on this important gateway site to Luton. The site is well located to provide Airport related employment growth.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Detail approach to the development of such sites through the LDF</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Agreement with the general principles of the comment. This site has been allocated for such uses to support the provision of sports facilities through the Luton Local Plan</p>				
1010	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: This appears to accept that there are only limited prospects for job creation in the Leighton area. Yet the proposals are for at least 2500 new residents (more likely 4000, if working wives are included!). The facts and figures don't stand up!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda. In the light of this background the Core Strategy ensures that an appropriate mix of development is delivered across the Luton and southern Bedfordshire area in order to ensure sustainable communities are delivered.</p>				
1106	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy appears to continue to rely upon Airport expansion as a driver of employment. Even before the current recession, productivity growth in the aviation industry, together with economies of scale at Luton Airport, was reducing predictions of future employment growth. Recent projections (see www.ladacan.org) suggest that, even if there is further investment at the Airport and passenger traffic grows in line with Government expectations (i.e. about 70 per cent between 2008 and 2015) there will be no significant growth in aviation-related employment locally. Recent pronouncements from the Airport operator indicate that there is unlikely to be investment in expanded capacity at the Airport so it would be wise to base the Core Strategy on declining employment in aviation and supporting industries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review. It also relates to the contents of the Government's Aviation White paper which identifies the airport as one where expansion is anticipated.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2569	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: Core Strategy continues to rely on Airport expansion as a driver of employment when predictions and projections suggest no significant growth in aviation related employment locally. Recent pronouncements from Airport operator indicate unlikely investment in expansion of airport capacity so Core Strategy should be based on declining employment in aviation and supporting industries.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree      Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the aviation-related employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The RSS supports increased airport capacity, in line with the Air Transport White Paper.</p>				
663	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 7.7	No
<p>Comment: It is assumed that the employment area near the Airport is Century Park. This has severe accessibility issues and neither the new eastern extension to the proposed Luton northern bypass (black route) nor local roads seem to provide a solution.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.</p>				
3414	JS Carlina	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.9	No
<p>Comment: Employment - Leighton Buzzard has already lost most of its large employers, so where will the people work who live in the additional housing? Although the wish is for a 'cycle friendly' town, most people will choose to either use their cars to drive to other towns for work, or to the town's railway station (limited parking) which will put extra pressure on our already congested roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree      Proposed Action: Ensure suitable employment land provided in locations accessible to urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy must facilitate car use in the most sustainable way practicable.</p>				
3413	KS Carlina	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.9	No
<p>Comment: Employment - Leighton Buzzard has already lost most of its large employers, so where will the people work who live in he additional housing? Although the wish is for a 'cycle friendly' town, most people will choose to either use their cars to drive to other towns for work, or to the town's railway station (limited parking) which will put extra pressure on our already congested roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree      Proposed Action: Ensure suitable employment land provided in locations accessible to urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy must facilitate car use in the most sustainable way practicable.</p>				
1032	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.9	Yes
<p>Comment: All the more reason not to build mass new housing if job opportunities do not exist locally!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
318	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.9	No
<p>Comment: I suggest this planning exercise is working back-to-front; the ability of Leighton-Linslade to accommodate growth should start with an assessment of growth in employment opportunity, then a related assessment of housing required to support that growth. That would be sustainable. However, for all the worthy statements in the report regarding public transport &amp; cycling, it appears to accept that commuting by car is both necessary and 'sustainable'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda. In the light of this background the Core Strategy ensures that an appropriate distribution of development is delivered.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1271	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 7.9	No
Comment: The comment that Leighton is relatively isolated from the strategic transport network highlights the bias towards road-based transport - it is on mainline rail!				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Leighton Buzzard has a station on the West Coast Main line.				
3392	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Para. 7.9	No
Comment: Over the last few years, many of Leighton -Linslade main employers have closed or moved elsewhere. this has resulted in roughly 70% of residents now commuting out for their employment. The document states that 'some limited new job growth will be encouraged' - this can only further endorse the 'dormitory town' status of Leighton and its surrounding communities.				
JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.				
JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area				
3321			Para. 7.10	Yes
Comment: Support the views expressed and note the strong desire to provide job opportunities and for flexibility in planning for employment land.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with preferred option				
3322			Para. 7.11	No
Comment: This reference excludes the views of stakeholders to the south of west Luton.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Relates to proposals to allocate land at junction 10A for strategic employment use. Issues covered by other comments made by the respondent (e.g. comment ID 3320)				
2310	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 7.11	Yes
Comment: Support the proposal for commercial development around proposed Junction 11a on the M1				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent is in agreement with preferred option				
1747	David Lock Associates	Milton Keynes	Para. 7.11	Yes
Comment: We support the acknowledgement of the importance of and demand for warehouse and distribution premises and of the suitability of land around the proposed Junction 11a for this type of employment development. We also support the specific acknowledgment of the potential development of the former Sundon Quarry for a rail freight interchange subject to appropriate road and rail access.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS. It aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry.				
1650	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 7.11	No
Comment: Are any major transport generators covered by appropriate policies?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Relates to RSS policies E7 and T12 (airport growth and access to airport). These issues are covered in CS1, CS3 and CS9				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1648	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 7.11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is freight movement addressed? Development of a rail freight interchange (at Sundon Quarry) is supported by this policy, especially if no restoration conditions apply to the quarry.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry.</p>				
1439	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 7.12	Yes
<p>Comment: It is recognised that Junction 10A is considered to be a constraint to development and this is something the Council are seeking to address. As one of the primary landowners affected by the proposed improvements, our client is committed to cooperating with Luton Borough Council as proposals are progressed and to ensure the junction design considers the likely land take and design considerations in bringing forward proposals on our client's land.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy recognises the issues surrounding Junction 10a from the point of view of enabling the delivery of the preferred Core Strategy as a whole.</p>				
2842	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.13	No
<p>Comment: "...should support and enable the delivery of additional retail and leisure opportunities, the expansion of cultural facilities and the promotion of tourism to help reach the job figures in the East of England Plan". This is ridiculously over-optimistic. With the exception of the Narrow Gauge Railway (which will be adversely affected by the proposed development to the East of Leighton) there's no tourism in Leighton Buzzard!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: Determine future role of Narrow Gauge Railway and policy approach to supporting that role.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A balanced range of jobs and services are required to reduce risks and maximise opportunities associated with fluctuations in employment markets.</p>				
1270	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 7.13	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the mention of the need to create additional leisure opportunities, the expansion of cultural facilities and the promotion of tourism. However, these still need to be delivered in a sustainable way. The Greensand Ridge Local Development Strategy provides such a framework (as does the equivalent strategy produced by the Chilterns Local Action Group) and should be referenced here as a tool for helping to achieve both the targets and sustainability. The 'strap line' for the Greensand Ridge LDS is "Creating Bedfordshire's Green Lung" - this is highly consistent with the 'Green Growth Area' aspiration.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Include appropriate policy material relating to delivering leisure opportunities in the 'green environment'.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy should include more policy material at an appropriate place relating to the delivery of leisure opportunities in the 'green environment'.</p>				
1011	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 7.13	No
<p>Comment: "...should support and enable the delivery of additional retail and leisure opportunities, the expansion of cultural facilities and the promotion of tourism to help reach the job figures in the East of England Plan." This is a joke - isn't it? Are we supposed to look at this seriously?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1819	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Para. 7.14	Yes
Comment: Amend text to state that there are also low skill levels in Houghton Regis. (Late submission, not duly made)				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The text in the paragraph applies at a strategic level across Luton and former South Bedfordshire District. In so far as smaller areas of the former South Bedfordshire District differ from this overview will be addressed in the subsequent Site Allocations and Development management DPDs as appropriate.				
1440	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 7.14	Yes
Comment: The proposed Strategic Employment site on land at Junction 10a could accommodate small premises to encourage innovation and new businesses. The exact mix of development would be the subject of further discussion with officers of the Council to ensure the development mix is tailored to the needs of Luton and southern Bedfordshire.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The delivery of preferred locations for employment is a risk factor that will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy element of the employment chapter. The site identified is currently not preferred as it has not been adequately demonstrated that it is a genuinely sustainable option.				
664	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 7.15	No
Comment: Butterfield Green Technology Park is very poorly developed, with low occupancy rates, more convenient to Hitchin than it is to Luton people				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Butterfield Technology Park offers employment opportunities to the community at large.				
1699	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.16	No
Comment: There are very serious issues to be addressed relating to the ability of Luton and southern Bedfordshire to support, in employment terms, the housing and population growth for the area. We cannot subscribe to the view that the jobs target set out in 7.3, whilst 'ambitious' are somehow at the same time 'realistic'. The Joint Committee should have raised stronger concerns relating to the feasibility of these targets. The current economic downturn, and the fall out affecting motor manufacturing and aviation industries (both of key importance to this area) underlines the vulnerability of local economies to events over which there is little local control. This points to the need for caution - not ambition - in assessing the potential for jobs growth in this area over the time span of the strategy.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda.				
3324			Para. 7.17	Yes
Comment: In light of the delay in the delivery of Century Park (Wigmore), the linked East of Luton urban extension, the recognition of the importance of Luton Airport and the proposed road infrastructure improvements as an important means of attracting investment into the area, high priority should be given to allocating land south west of J10A for strategic employment development in accordance to the employment land review.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, considering scenarios of delayed and early delivery of required infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/> Determine role of Jnc10A sites regarding strategic delivery of employment land.				
JC Reason for Response: Delivery of employment land, especially strategic sites, can be dependant on supporting infrastructure delivery.				
665	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 7.17	No
Comment: The issues are access to Century Park - it is likely that previous planning applications for access via local roads in the east of Luton will be resurrected and these were previously vigorously opposed mainly on traffic impact grounds				
JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1807	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Para. 7.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Board considers that very careful attention will need to be given to the strategic employment site at J11a on the M1 as this may affect the setting and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB particularly in the vicinity of Sundon.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Ensure appropriate references and policy are included in the Core Strategy that adequately protect the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS. Development will be accompanied by appropriate environmental mitigation measures and will have regard to designated landscapes such as the AONB.</p>				
1702	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.18	No
<p>Comment: The proposal for a warehousing and distribution development at Sundon Quarry seems to have come out of the blue. We strongly oppose such a development at this location because: it involves appropriating Green Belt outside the proposed alignment of the Luton Northern Bypass, which ought to form the defensible future Green Belt boundary. of the inevitable impact on the adjoining SSSI, which in our view will not be capable of satisfactory mitigation. of the inevitable impact on the adjoining County Wildlife Site, which again we say will not be capable of satisfactory mitigation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS. It aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry. Development will be accompanied by appropriate environmental mitigation measures.</p>				
1748	David Lock Associates	Milton Keynes	Para. 7.18	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the commitment of the Joint Committee to the provision of new strategic employment land around Junction 11a. We also welcome the acknowledgement of the support of the Joint Committee, subject to appropriate rail and road access and appropriate mitigation of impact on the neighbouring SSSI, for the development of part of the former Sundon Quarry for a rail freight interchange for B8 type warehousing and distribution development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS. It aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry. Development will be accompanied by appropriate environmental mitigation measures.</p>				
1647	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 7.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Is freight movement addressed? Development of a rail freight interchange (at Sundon Quarry) is supported by this policy, especially if no restoration conditions apply to the quarry.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry.</p>				
1754	Government Office for the East of England	Cambridge	Para. 7.18	No
<p>Comment: In relation to the economy we would have expected the important role of the airport to have received greater attention. Given that the future expansion may take place there you may wish to incorporate a specific reference to that. Future expansion at the airport will have impacts and you need to demonstrate that you have considered these. This office secured Growth Area funding for a Luton Economic Vision study in which the airport was identified as the key driver in the local economy. This study was complete circa 2006 and you may mind that helpful if you haven't already seen it - Laura Church will have a copy if you need one.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Include more specific text and specific policy material relating to London Luton Airport in the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy needs to include more specific references to London Luton Airport, including more specific policy references. The airport is recognised as being of strategic importance to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire area.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1187	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 7.18	No
<p>Comment: Sundon Chalk Quarry SSSI contains nationally important wetland and calcareous grassland habitats. We advise that the rail freight interchange which is proposed should only be permitted if there is no impact on the SSSI or County Wildlife Site (CWS). PPS9 (paragraph 8) states that: "Where a proposed development on land within or outside an SSSI is likely to have an adverse effect on an SSSI (either individually or in combination with other developments), planning permission should not normally be granted." The wording in this section of the Core Strategy should be changed from '€appropriate mitigation of impact' to '€no impact' in line with PPS9. In agreement with Preferred Option CS17 - Biodiversity and Geology, Sundon Chalk Pits CWS (which extends beyond the SSSI) should also be recognised and protected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Strengthen the text referring to mitigation of any environmental impact on the SSSI in accordance with PPS9.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS. It aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry. Development will be accompanied by appropriate environmental mitigation measures.</p>				
3241			Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Broadly support CS9 which states that preferred sustainable urban extensions around M1 Junction 11A should accommodate strategic employment sites as understand it to include AXA's land within Area J. The Key Diagram should be amended to reflect this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Detail extent to urban extensions</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Exact extent of urban extensions has yet to be confirmed.</p>				
3330			Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Object to the inclusion of a blanket requirement to safeguard existing sites which is not consistent with the Regional Spatial Strategy which provides more flexibility and allows for some redevelopment of existing sites to non-residential uses. There are a number of sites which no longer meet good business needs. The preferred option should be amended to: "Safeguard existing sites where they meet good business needs. Where sites no longer meet good business needs or are no longer suitably located, a sequential approach to their redevelopment for non employment generating uses will be adopted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Strategy to protect existing sites where they meet business needs. <input type="checkbox"/> Consider approach to release of sites not meeting current or future need.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The text strategic approach requires clarification</p>				
3323			Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Support proposals to provide a supportive employment framework but do not feel that they have properly taken into account the recommendations of the employment land review and the difficulties of promoting the east of Luton urban extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, considering scenarios of delayed and early delivery of required infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/> Ensure approved recommendations of ELR are fully incorporated into the strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivery of employment land, especially strategic sites, can be dependant on supporting infrastructure delivery.</p>				
691	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: because it is built on fanciful estimates. perhaps we should look at their estimates of employment for the last few years against actual employment to see the value in any forecasts. Given the precision in numbers, I can only assume that Luton saw the recession coming.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of the targets set by the MKSMSRS.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
684	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Because they appear to rest on building lots of roads ("because that's what developers told us") in an AONB and in environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review.</p>				
3253	Barton Willmore	Reading	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: We object to the inclusion of a blanket requirement to safeguard existing sites, which is inconsistent with the RSS. There are a number of sites which no longer meet good business needs due to their location or size and as such are incongruous within their context. We suggest that the preferred option should be amended to: "Safeguard existing sites where they meet good business needs. Where sites no longer form meet good business needs or are no longer suitably located a sequential approach to their redevelopment for non employment generating uses will be adopted." This will provide the flexibility for sites which are not longer required to be redeveloped, taking into account sustainability objectives.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Strategy to protect existing sites where they meet business needs. <input type="checkbox"/> Consider approach to release of sites not meeting current or future need.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The text strategic approach requires clarification</p>				
1147	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Whilst we cannot disagree in principle with the bullet-point in CS9 at the top of p.69, there is a level of inconsistency with para 7.9: '€In the rural areas, evidence shows that new employment land opportunities are also likely to be limited owing to the constraints of Green Belt policy and poor accessibility.' Conversions and small-scale employment opportunities appropriate to a rural area would generally be welcomed, provided that these were not of a scale or nature that would be likely to attract reverse commuting out from the urban areas.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: The Core Strategy should make it clear that small scale green belt reviews are likely to be necessary at larger rural settlements and that this will be addressed in detail through the subsequent Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. Appropriate small scale reviews of green belt boundaries are likely to be necessary at some large rural settlements to allow for an appropriate level of development to take place.</p>				
1700	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: appears to be flexible and balanced approach to meeting the various employments needs of the Borough.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2173	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Luton Airport will not be a major employer</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of the Government's Aviation White paper which identifies the airport as one where expansion is anticipated.</p>				
2045	Mrs Dorothy Brinklow	Tebworth	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Serious consideration should also be given to the employment situation, so many of the large manufacturers have also moved away and with Vauxhall under threat the problem could not be more fragile.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Continue to refine the employment strategy to ensure the optimum approach is delivered.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Ensuring future employment provision is a key element of the Core Strategy in the light of the requirements set out in the RSS</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1950	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Incorporate the LSPs ambitions to develop centres of excellence for construction and sustainable design, to develop mass renewables markets and to promote the sourcing of renewable and manufactured materials locally, so creating local employment and sustainable procurement. Amend the title to reflect the economic and employment aspect of the approach. State the need for community safety incorporating the 'secure by design' standards. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JLU)</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Include appropriate references to centres of excellence for construction and design if it has been demonstrated that such centres are deliverable in the plan period. If this cannot be demonstrated no action should be taken.		
JC Reason for Response:	Such centres of excellence are highly desirable in principal. That said, the Core Strategy should only include or should make reference to development that has a high likelihood of being deliverable in the plan period by demonstrable means. If it can be demonstrated by the LSP and any other appropriate partners that such centres are indeed deliverable the Core Strategy should make reference to them and how they are to be delivered. If this cannot be demonstrated at this stage it is not the role of the Core Strategy to engage in speculation and in such circumstances reference to them should not be included.			
2408	Chalgrave Parish Council	Tebworth	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Since John Prescott initiated this process the economy has taken a severe downturn. The Future of Vauxhall is uncertain and redundancies likely. The expansion of Luton Airport is questionable, thus the promise of creating new jobs around the airport seems 'pie in the sky'. Yet the policy still exists of building a huge number of people should go and no consideration given to whether they are required or not. One conclusion would be that they are not to house local people with jobs, but to provide homes for commuters.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially Agree	Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.		
JC Reason for Response:	Economic strategies need to respond to changes in employment markets			
1825	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Board objects to CS9 and the identification of land at Sundon Quarry for employment purposes as it considers that: - this will have a detrimental impact on the landscape in the setting of the Chilterns AONB - will affect the quiet enjoyment of the AONB in the area around Sundon Hills Country Park - lead to limited employment provision</p>				
JC Response:	Not agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Appropriate urban design techniques will be deployed to mitigate any impacts on the AONB from this proposed employment site. Such an approach will enable the site to be successfully developed for employment purposes whilst safeguarding the acknowledged qualities of the AONB			
209	Church Commissioners for England	c/o Agent	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the fact that the policy makes provision for new employment development in and around Leighton-Linslade. It is important that some employment development is directed away from the main conurbation to Leighton-Linslade in order to provide for the new housing that is being provided here. In considering sites for new employment development, proximity to existing employment areas and good transport links are important factors and should be referred to in the policy.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review.			
3354	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Support in principle the identification of land at Sundon Quarry as a location for a strategic location site and endorses a master planning approach to an urban extension north of Luton to incorporate strategic employment at Sundon Quarry, along with residential development, the northern bypass and green infrastructure including the historic Sundon Park. This combines rail freight access with proximity to the national road network at the proposed new M1 Junction 11A.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Respondent is in agreement with strategy			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
226	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: You are appearing to wish to change the character of villages by developed.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy considers the size and scale of each settlement when considering the amount of growth it could sustain.</p>				
1167	Costco Wholesale UK Ltd (Costco)	London	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Include definition of uses that recognise sui generis uses appropriate on employment land to provide clarity and flexibility to bring forward suitable employment generating uses to meet SO3. This is in accordance with draft PPS 4, May 2009 (page 55). Such a statement could be, "Appropriate uses for employment land are those uses within the Use Class B1, B2 and B8 and closely related uses not falling within a use class, i.e. sui generis, (such as warehouse clubs, cash and carry businesses and builders merchants) but which are commonly found in employment areas." <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Policy EM 1 of the Luton Local Plan recognises viable employment uses exist outside the B1, B2 and B8 definition. The Local Plan also recognises that warehouse clubs are a sui generis use in paragraph 7.29. <input type="checkbox"/> If considered necessary, also include criteria similar to that adopted in EM1.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy allocates strategic land for employment. More detailed variations within that use will be addressed through more detailed framework/master planning later in the policy development process.</p>				
157	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: No supporting text provided - respondent is in overall agreement</p>				
1746	David Lock Associates	Milton Keynes	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Promoting a Rail Freight Interchange on part of the site of Sundon Quarry. <input type="checkbox"/> This proposed development site is 50ha gross, previously connected to Midland Main Line and could include B8 (1.8m sq.ft), intermodal facility to rail sidings and minerals distribution depot (6.6ha). <input type="checkbox"/> The site meets the Strategic Rail Authority criteria for the unique locational characteristics needed for such facilities. <input type="checkbox"/> SSSI and CWS which be conserved. <input type="checkbox"/> The potential development of this site as a rail served distribution node should be protected in accordance with planning policy and included on the Key Diagram. The site is deliverable and developable as a rail served distribution node once the new strategic highway works are underway. <input type="checkbox"/> The logistics and distribution sector is well placed to maximise the strategic accessibility from which the Luton and South Bedfordshire area benefits. <input type="checkbox"/> The opportunity for a minerals/aggregates depot could enable the release of two town centre sites in Luton.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry.</p>				
1526	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Yet again, this assumes continuing expansion into Hertfordshire, which has its own needs.</p> <p>JC Response: Not Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Green Belt review is in line with direction provided by the MKSMSRS. Sustainable urban extensions need to be supported with employment provision.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3290	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: PNNH support the safeguarding, enhancement and improvement of existing employment areas and the approach to redevelopment of existing employment sites. However, PNNH have concerns over the reliance on proposed urban extensions to provide employment land. As stated previously, PNNH have serious concerns over the deliverability of the strategic transport infrastructure, which the delivery of the preferred option urban extensions are inextricably linked.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially Agree	Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, considering scenarios of delayed and early delivery of required infrastructure.		
JC Reason for Response:	Delivery of employment land, especially strategic sites, can be dependant on supporting infrastructure delivery.			
1257	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Jobs and employment arrive gradually, they will not appear overnight.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	The Core Strategy is planning across a 20 plus year period.			
1583	East Of England Development Agency	Cambridge	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: The approach seems a balanced and logical response to your vision and the ambitions of the RES and should ensure a more self contained economy and reduce out-commuting. EEDA welcomes the fact that CS9 recognises the need to work with partners identifying sites for start-up and small businesses, research and technology developments and innovation centres. This approach should ensure that the plan makes a positive contribution to the delivery of RES Goals 5 and 6.</p>				
JC Response:	Agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Consultee in agreement with strategy			
1627	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is tourism supported / promoted?</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: Ensure that local tourist attractions are protected and promoted through the LDF.		
JC Reason for Response:	Tourism is not a major concern in the general planning area, though is relevant to locally specific sites			
1604	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: The document does address the growth needs with the administrative areas of Luton and South Bedfordshire including new infrastructure. However, the treatment of allocations, including infrastructure, to North Hertfordshire District, without a joint approach being taken, does not accord with the spirit of the MKSM or with policy SS8 of the East of England Plan. In reviewing the strategy, the allocations in North Hertfordshire were considered as assumptions rather than as firm allocations.</p>				
JC Response:	Partially agree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy. The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the RSS and its review. The Core Strategy makes it clear that it is for the North Hertfordshire Core Strategy to plan and ensure the delivery of the preferred direction of growth to the East of Luton.			
1652	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Are any major transport generators covered by appropriate policies?</p>				
JC Response:	Statement with which neither agree nor disagree	Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response:	Relates to RSS policies E7 and T12 (airport growth and access to airport). These issues are covered in CS1, CS3 and CS9			

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1621	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the East of England Plan employment target met? Regional policy on employment around Luton is limited. Policy E1 sets a target for this area of 23,000 jobs between 2001 and 2021; the document supports and continues this approach. The preferred policies allocate a strategic employment site east of Luton in the district of North Hertfordshire. The MKSM strategy refers to the growth of Luton airport and the East of England Plan refers to the need to make provision for direct and indirect employment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review.</p>				
1609	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the role of city and town centres clear? Is there a clear retail hierarchy? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1626	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is employment land protected?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Ensure existing, good quality sites and future employment land are protected through policy and proposal map allocations.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The LDF will protect existing, good quality sites and future employment land through policy and proposal map allocations.</p>				
1619	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with the green belt? Local policy should protect the integrity of the green belt and enhance the character of the urban fringe. The panel report on the East of England Plan identified the potential for compensatory green belt extensions for the Luton (para. 4.24). However, the Secretary of State noted that all of rural South Bedfordshire is already greenbelt and that no extension was required (GO-East (2006) page 15). The adopted East of England Plan notes that the previous structure plan provides a sound basis for redefining boundaries (para.3.34). This policy included extension to the boundary in North Hertfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: There is a need to review Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the requirements of the RSS. Appropriate compensatory green belt is an issue to handle on at least a sub regional basis as there are no opportunities to designate compensatory Green Belt in the Luton and former South Bedfordshire area.</p>				
1600	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
4036	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Propose redraft to make clear that an employment site located within a SUE should not prejudice the delivery of the east of Luton SUE and delivery of housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: This is a risk factor which will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2789	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: The extra jobs will be needed across the whole area: however we consider the goal of providing 23,000 additional jobs by 2021 to be 'fanciful' - after all, there haven't been that many jobs created locally in the last 20 years!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Economic strategies need to respond to changes in employment markets</p>				
740	English Heritage	Cambridge	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Preferred Option CS9: Providing a Supportive Framework With regards to the sixth bullet point in the draft policy, it should be noted that the conversion of existing buildings for employment purpose should only be permitted where it accords with conservation principles as set out in PPG15 and other documents. This would prevent the unsympathetic alteration of listed and other historic rural buildings. English Heritage has produced guidance on this issue, which can be found at <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/category.19599">www.helm.org.uk/server/show/category.19599</a>.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Ensure that conservation is referred to in the policy alongside design principles.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Conservation principles need to be reflected when dealing with buildings of historic importance.</p>				
1866	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Include a statement to allocate new industrial sites outside groundwater Source Protection Zones, in areas of lower groundwater sensitivity. Refer to EA Ground water Protection: Policy and Practice for advice. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Wherever possible such zones will be kept free from such development. If this is not possible appropriate mitigation measures will be deployed to ensure water quality is maintained.</p>				
3202	Mr Ralph Ford	Cockermhoe	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: The proposed location for the industrial units (as per East of Luton proposal) is very close to that indicated during the discussions for the London Luton 2030 Airport expansion project in 2006.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No information provided as to why this might be considered right or wrong.</p>				
1033	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Because, without employment opportunities and planned new Business Estates created, Luton and south Bedfordshire will end up with mass unemployment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS.</p>				
425	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: CS9 is generally well thought out; my sole reason for not supporting it is the fourth main bullet point. To plan an increase in housing in Leighton Buzzard and then attempt to retro-fit employment opportunities can hardly be considered good town planning practice. As stated elsewhere in my comments, the Eastern Urban Expansion of Leighton Buzzard is not sustainable (using the terms used in this report) unless the new inhabitants are able to find employment in the immediate area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS. This approach applies as much in Leighton Buzzard as it does anywhere else.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2714	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Harlington has little internal employment. While the RSS uses the generally accepted figure of one (2 pts) job per house, the plans for Luton and the MKSMMMS accept far fewer jobs than the number of houses justifies. These are additional jobs for the housing increase and don't take into account the jobs lost in the current economic crisis. The only source of additional jobs would be out commuting e.g. to MK or London. However, MK jobs are already expected to cope with MK expansion. The lack of jobs relative to house numbers can only lead to more traffic, and a proportion of that will be through Harlington, especially if the north Luton bypass is not built.</p>				
JC Response: Partially Agree		Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.		
JC Reason for Response: Economic strategies need to respond to changes in employment markets				
2860	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that local jobs will be created in sufficient volume to sustain the scale of possible development. Historically Leighton Linlade and the surrounding villages have largely been commuter based whether to Milton Keynes, London, Luton or other large conurbations.</p>				
JC Response: Partially Agree		Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.		
JC Reason for Response: Economic strategies need to respond to changes in employment markets				
3193	Denise Hilder	Breachwood Green	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Warehousing and commercial buildings would be out of keeping with the rural environment of North Hertfordshire. Land between Luton and the M1 with easy access to the new airport road would be a better alternative to the employment proposal to the east of Luton.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The delivery of preferred locations for employment is a risk factor that will be addressed in the employment delivery strategy element of the employment chapter. Land between Luton and M1 is currently not preferred as it has not been adequately demonstrated that it is a genuinely sustainable option.				
2513	JM Holmes-Walker	Wheathampstead	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Do not support a new industrial complex east of Century Park which would extend into rural countryside. Should find areas within Luton conurbation</p>				
JC Response: Partially Agree		Proposed Action: Ensure impact assessments have regard for the environment of North Hertfordshire.		
JC Reason for Response: These concerns apply to many large schemes involving development of green field land.				
1820	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: There is considerably less emphasis on job creation than housing delivery. The strategy should be equally supportive of employment creation to safeguard the economic well-being of the community. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda. Appropriate emphasis is placed on all types of development in the context of these background documents with the overarching aim of delivering sustainable communities at the heart of this approach.				
1392	Mr Martin Howes	Luton	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: High-speed broadband internet access is becoming increasingly important to modern businesses. There should be a target for the provision of infrastructure for high-speed internet access at speeds of 20Mbps or greater across the area. I support the other proposals but feel that this matter should be included.</p>				
JC Response: Not agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: Though this may be desirable it is not the role of the Core Strategy to influence this matter.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
307	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: I only support the transport objective. Apart from that, the best way of delivering jobs is to reduce the Public Sector, reduce taxes and allow the private sector to create jobs in a low-tax low-barrier environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS.</p>				
3904	John Keys	Unknown	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Over the last few years, many of Leighton's main employers have closed or moved elsewhere i.e. Liptons, Lancer Boss, Woolworths, Gossards, Camdens; this has resulted in the majority (70%) of residents commuting out of town for employment. You are stating "some limited new job growth is encouraged to support the additional housing", this will only bring about a "dormitory town" status for Leighton Buzzard and Linslade.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
3406	Land Securities Group PLC	London	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: The new employment land releases will be favoured by developers and will put land owners of employment land in inferior locations at a disadvantage in attracting investment when it comes to redevelopment. We trust the Joint Committee will revisit land at French's Avenue which is in an area becoming increasingly residential in character and which is considered no longer suited for employment development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure the Core Strategy contains the correct level of detail on the scale and location of employment land, with clear indications of how other DPDs will provide further detail.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: More clarity over scale and location of employment land provision will provide more certainty to those involved in the delivery of growth.</p>				
1298	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: The recognition of the future importance of the cultural, leisure and tourism sectors is welcomed. Development should not be allowed to harm any existing assets in these areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review.</p>				
2108	London Luton Airport	Luton	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Policy could be created concerning the protection and enabling of the international gateway to be developed. CS9 could be amended to include "Support and safeguard the operation of London Luton Airport and work within London Luton Airport Operations Limited to develop a masterplan to bring forward growth in line with the Air Transport White Paper." LLAOL anticipates the amendment will be underpinned by policies in the Development Management Policies DPD and is reassured the JTU shares this view and is committed to consulting LLAOL in developing these policies. □LLAOL support the objectives for sustainable employment and housing growth, provided the relevant impacts for all proposed sites are examined. It is imperative that surface access is appropriately considered and mitigated and the effects of aircraft noise and flight paths are assessed. It is vitally important that they do not prejudice, but compliment current operations and future growth of the airport, as identified in regional and national policy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Ensure the strategy permits development of the airport in-line with the Air Transport White Paper.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Airport development aims from the Aviation White paper should be supported by the strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1981	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Indicate how sustainable jobs would be developed. There are links to the SCS but "enhancing skills for the employability and entrepreneurship, and reducing differences in achievement levels" is, "not an issue for the core strategy" (Forum 11 June, appendix to B McGowan report). Contradiction to exclude training and skills, as these are under the national average. <input type="checkbox"/> The number of jobs being planned for is fewer than the number of homes. This will increase unemployment and instability. Detail about job creations is scant - too focused on big business, too few sectors, to represent a sustainable strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> The jobs would be in the wrong place. Present plans would cause too much car commuting. Little attempt has been made to create a more sustainable community by making growth areas more self sufficient. Car use must be cut. <input type="checkbox"/> Reservations about cost, value for money and impact of major infrastructure proposed. Want to see more detail about 11a plans before we could offer support. We do not support the bypasses.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 7.19 summarises the approach to delivering sustainable jobs. Further details will be provided through local and regional economic strategies. <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy has been prepared in accordance with MKSMSRS targets. <input type="checkbox"/> The strategy must balance the provision of non-car alternatives whilst also facilitating the movement of cars for those who choose to travel by such mode. <input type="checkbox"/> Details for J11a will be provided through a Site Allocations DPD</p>				
2087	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: The Borough Council specifically sought to increase the employment targets to ensure the balanced, sustainable regeneration of the town. A key component is to support the designation of strategic employment areas. One is near to the Airport to take advantage of this regionally significant growth driver with significant local benefits. Another is proposed near to the M1 proposed J11a in order to address the high levels of commuting which currently takes place. The Core Strategy will be complemented by the IDP, which has identified the need for remedial action on ageing industrial estates. The ELR (2008) which has also helped to identify significant opportunities for recycling land and regeneration of sites for other uses, including mixed uses for employment and housing.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent in agreement with strategy</p>				
1929	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Incorporate the LSPs ambitions to develop centres of excellence for construction and sustainable design, to develop mass renewables markets and to promote the sourcing of renewable and manufactured materials locally, so creating local employment and sustainable procurement. Amend the title to reflect the economic and employment aspect of the approach. State the need for community safety incorporating the 'secure by design' standards. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure that the aims of the LSP that can be dealt with spatially are all appropriately included and handled in the Core Strategy, with appropriate links to other documents and places included where necessary and practicable.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy seeks to address those ambitions of the LSPs that can be addressed at a spatial planning level. Regarding those ambitions that do not lend themselves to being dealt with by spatial planning means, the Core Strategy will seek to provide links to where it is appropriate to deal with them.</p>				
255	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: There should be a stated preference to favour re-use of existing under-utilised industrial sites before new sites are even considered. With the continued contraction of the vehicle industry in and around Luton very likely, there is a vast amount of re-usable brownfield space. New development should be concentrated to the west of Luton to reduce additional congestion from those travelling across Luton from the M1, and in Hitchin from those travelling from the A1. Further industrial development to the east will serve to increase congestion on the A505 through Hitchin (already terrible), and serve to increase pollution and the areas carbon footprint.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key feature of the Core Strategy is to ensure wherever possible to re-use of under-utilised existing employment land for employment purposes. Supporting transport related evidence demonstrates that the distribution of new employment provision can be delivered and congestion appropriately managed.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3338	Mouchel Ltd on behalf of the former Bedfordshire County Council	Manchester	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: The submission version of the Core Strategy needs to outline areas for the urban extensions which would need to be properly masterplanned to secure an appropriate mix and balance between residential and employment development as not all of the new jobs will be created from redevelopment of existing sites in the existing urban area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Detail extent to urban extensions</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Exact extent of urban extensions has yet to be confirmed.</p>				
3684	Alan Murphy	Luton	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: The Core Strategy does not indicate on which Employment Scenario it is based, but it is assumed to be ELR Scenario 4, relating to constrained airport expansion. Page 98 of the ELR indicates that the RSS requires at least one strategic employment site to be provided. Land within and adjoining the urban extensions north-west and north of Houghton Regis does appear to be strategically well located provided there is a genuine need for its use and that the SSSI is fully protected. Page 108 of the ELR notes that land east of Luton would compete with Butterfield Green and Wigmore/ Century Park and is not considered a future strategic employment location in the short-to-medium term. Longer term consideration would need to reflect on the success or otherwise of the areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision, considering various scenarios of employment markets.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Delivery of employment land, especially strategic sites, can be susceptible to changes in employment market scenarios.</p>				
2196	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Parts of Sundon Quarry are notified as a SSSI and all of the supporting habitat within the quarry is designated as a County Wildlife Site. Natural England highlight the conflict between this policy, and your authority's duties in relation to SSSIs (s8G of the Wildlife and Countryside Act) and biodiversity (s40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act). Additionally there is the issue of 'soundness' in relation to CS14. Natural England therefore objects to CS9 and recommends that all references to development within Sundon Quarry are removed, or clarified to indicate that acceptability depends on avoidance of impacts to both the SSSI and County Wildlife Site's biodiversity.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Strengthen the text referring to mitigation of any environmental impact on the SSSI in accordance with PPS9.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS. It aims to encourage movement of freight by rail which will be facilitated by delivering the rail freight interchange at Sundon Quarry. Development will be accompanied by appropriate environmental mitigation measures.</p>				
1790	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC supports the intention of the Joint Committee, described at Preferred Option CS9, to achieve further employment opportunities within the preferred sustainable urban extensions and at Sundon Quarry, subject to suitable access arrangements. New employment opportunities will be provided within the proposed North Luton urban extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: An important role of the Core Strategy is to ensure appropriate new employment opportunities are provided as part of the delivery of growth</p>				
53	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Because this must happen to support the housing growth. That is not to say that it will happen</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Consider flexible approach to employment land provision should the employment market change over the course of the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: While the Strategy aims to achieve targets, a wide range of scenarios can lead to early or delayed delivery.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2993	Elizabeth Sheppard	Lilley	Q. 11	No
Comment: Object to the destructive impact of the proposed enlarged employment area adjacent to Luton Airport.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Ensure impact assessments have regard for the environment of North Hertfordshire.				
JC Reason for Response: These concerns apply to many large schemes involving development of green field land.				
1536	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	No
Comment: There is no regard for the Sustainable Community strategy for South Beds. This talks of centres of excellence in construction and mass market renewables as well as Sourcing renewable and manufactured goods locally so creating local employment and considering sustainable procurement. There is a desperate need for the strategy to address climate change and the new technologies will create many skilled jobs and this document should set out policies to do this.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Examine the Core Strategy to ensure it appropriately addresses the issue of climate change making full use of additional technical evidence to help with this.				
JC Reason for Response: The Sustainable Community Strategies have been influential in the formulation of the Core Strategy. There is the need to re-examine the extent to which the Core Strategy addresses the matter of climate change. Additional evidence being gathered will provide guidance on this matter.				
3371	Southern & Regional Developments Ltd.	Bedford	Q. 11	Yes
Comment: Given that the north of Houghton Regis extension is the largest of the four proposals, a higher amount of employment land should be focussed towards this area. The draft submission core strategy should provide more detail as to the proportional split of employment land within the different areas in a similar way to the housing. New employment opportunities should not be in the form of 'big sheds' close to the M1 junction. There should be provision of a varying scale and type with smaller localised office style development integrated as part of housing areas.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure the Core Strategy contains the correct level of detail on the scale and type of employment land, with clear indications of how other DPDs will provide further detail.				
JC Reason for Response: More clarity over scale of employment land provision will provide more certainty to those involved in the delivery of growth.				
754	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 11	Yes
Comment: HRDC is willing to incorporate a mix of land uses within the sustainable urban extension to the north of Houghton Regis, which will include an appropriate amount of employment / business uses in order to provide local residents the opportunity to work close to their homes. In considering how these employment uses can be incorporated into the urban extension, due regard has been had to the findings of the Joint Employment Land Review and its analysis of Houghton Regis and the land to the north (Site G) in particular. HRDC looks forward to working with the JTU on this element of the Plan.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee looks forward to working with the consortium on such matters.				
1441	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 11	No
Comment: J10A provides sustainable location for development - not in green belt and should therefore be considered as preferable for development. Site should be identified. Full details of proposed scheme have been submitted. Important gateway site that could make positive contribution to Luton and for employment. Suggest amended policy wording for inclusion of J10A site Preferred locations for growth are all in green belt and heavily reliant on infrastructure.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Determine role of Jnc10A sites regarding strategic delivery of employment land.				
JC Reason for Response: Site has not been formally appraised for sustainability and suitability				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3895	Marc Taylor	Unknown	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: I have seen no plans to attract employers to Leighton Buzzard and away from the towns and cities where the people who are to live in the proposed future development currently live. This means that instead of reducing travel to and from work as the government says must happen in order to meet this country's environment improvement commitments we will be increasing our travel and so working in direct opposition to this country's environmental goals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy is seeking to provide an attractive environment and sufficient, well-housed workforce to draw business into the area</p>				
1368	Taylor Wimpey plc	Leicester	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: To maximise sustainable development within the growth area it will be important to deliver new jobs alongside the new housing. In this regard there must be some concern at the potential delay for delivery of the proposed strategic development sites, where delivery falls outside the control of the Joint Committee and / or there are significant environmental constraints to be addressed. Neither is it clear from the Core Strategy whether the proposed net additional employment land is to provide for all the required jobs or a proportion of these given that much employment is derived from non-B Class land. In a similar vein, it is common practice to plan for a considerable theoretical over-supply of employment land to provide flexibility and choice in sites for new employment development. Again, the preferred option is not at all clear on this point. Taylor Wimpey therefore objects to Preferred Option CS9.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Include appropriate details from the employment land delivery trajectory in the Core Strategy so that users of the document can see how employment requirements are to be met in the plan period.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is necessary to ensure new jobs are delivered in areas where they will offer sustainable deliverable and local employment opportunities. The preferred strategic employment sites are capable of delivery in the timescales outlined. The development of an employment delivery programme schedule will enable data to be included in the Core Strategy outlining how it is proposed to ensure employment requirements are to be met during the plan period. It is appropriate to consider how flexibility can be built into the supply of employment land. However this should not take the form of planning for a theoretical 'over-supply' of such land.</p>				
1506	The Crown Estate	London	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: On the whole we are supportive but we believe that land around Butterfield should be released for employment development before 2021. Unlike a new site, Butterfield is already a successful employment area with existing infrastructure and its own development momentum. If that momentum leads to additional land being required before 2021 its expansion should not be frustrated due to this "not before" date. The Green Belt will also need to be reviewed around Butterfield at this review.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Ensure that the employment delivery programme</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is acknowledged that the expansion of the employment site at Butterfield is desirable in principal. However, the employment delivery programme needs to reflect the practical issues relating to this matter: of key importance is the transport infrastructure required to access such an extension and when such access infrastructure will be deliverable. The employment delivery programme will inform the Core Strategy to this effect.</p>				
2067	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the inclusion of land at Thorn Farm and Berry Corner Farm within a comprehensive development scheme that can deliver employment. We support the inclusion of a strategic employment area near Junction 11a M1, but we also believe that there could be further appropriate employment opportunities to the north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis, potentially near the A5/A505 junction for instance which will also benefit from good access to the Strategic Road Network.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Detail extent to urban extensions</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Exact extent of urban extensions has yet to be confirmed. <input type="checkbox"/> Urban extensions north of Dunstable and Houghton Regis will be supported by employment provision.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2014	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Incorporate the third sector ambitions to develop mass renewables markets and to promote the sourcing of renewable and manufactured materials locally, so creating local employment and sustainable procurement. Amend the title to reflect the economic and employment aspect of the approach.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a growth area as set by the RSS review. This in turn is set within the Government's Sustainable Communities agenda.</p>				
2059	David Watts	Wingfield	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: There are no new jobs in the area to sustain new workers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Continue to refine the employment strategy to ensure the optimum approach is delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS.</p>				
2048	Angela Watts	Wingfield	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: There are no new jobs in the area to sustain new workers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Continue to refine the employment strategy to ensure the optimum approach is delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS.</p>				
2054	Edward Watts	Wingfield	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: There are no new jobs in the area to sustain new workers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Continue to refine the employment strategy to ensure the optimum approach is delivered.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS.</p>				
1012	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 11	No
<p>Comment: Yes, we need extra jobs in the area - but Get Real!! 23,000 'extra' new jobs by 2021????</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Continue to refine the employment strategy to ensure the optimum approach is delivered and accords with the RSS.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS.</p>				
666	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 11	Yes
<p>Comment: Provision of employment land near to an M1 junction is clearly preferable. Increasing employment land near to the Airport (Century Park) is only acceptable if access issues have been resolved and the plan should not include this area unless such access concerns have been addressed</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A key role of the Core Strategy is to ensure new employment is available across the area in accordance with the RSS. The approach taken in the strategy should be deliverable and the evidence supporting the document demonstrates this is the case.</p>				
1390	Mr Martin Howes	Luton	Para. 7.19	No
<p>Comment: From my recent experience, it appears that council officers have a poor understanding of the type, tenure and quality of business accommodation that small high tech companies require. The Joint Committee and its partners should consult directly with people who run small businesses. Consultation should not be limited to self-appointed experts and unrepresentative business organisations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is based on a wide base of evidence relating to this matter</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2843	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 7.20	No
Comment: And if the targets are not being met...??				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Describe action to be taken when employment (and other) targets are not being met				
JC Reason for Response: Details need to be provided on what will be done if targets are not being met				
1013	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 7.20	Yes
Comment: And if they're not being met ....???				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Describe action to be taken when employment (and other) targets are not being met				
JC Reason for Response: Details need to be provided on what will be done if targets are not being met				
1299	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.1	Yes
Comment: The interests and future wellbeing of existing voluntary and community bodies must be protected through the planning process.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 commits to exploring the establishment of community trusts and similar models. This will particularly help the voluntary sector which normally deliver the social infrastructure.				
3436	Anthony Smalldridge	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.1	
Comment: With such a significant increase in the town's population there must be a question mark over whether the current infrastructure can sustain such an explosion in terms of high street shopping, supermarkets, schools, doctors and dentists. Although the plans show reserved sites for a community hospital, nursing homes and leisure centre there is no guarantee that they will ever be built. One only has to look at Sandhills, Billington Park and Pages Priory developments to see how quickly amenities follow housing.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 commits to setting priorities for social and community infrastructure in the immediate 5 years (pre-urban extensions) and in subsequent 5 year periods. To match both housing and infrastructure delivery. The Core Strategy will be accompanied by a Delivery Plan detailing infrastructure programs, funding and commitment from infrastructure providers. This will be tested at the Examination in Public as part of the overall deliverability of the Core Strategy.				
668	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 8.1	No
Comment: The east of Luton community would depend upon the services of Luton. It is not envisaged as being well served in terms of access and even the extended guided busway (if it is provided by North Herts) will not, for example, serve the new aquatic centre.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The level of facilities and exact location of social and community infrastructure with regards to urban extensions will be part of their master plan work. Details of infrastructure allocation and delivery will be supporting the forthcoming Core Strategy submission document.				
3412	JS Carline	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.2	No
Comment: Lack of infrastructure - this was previously promised for Billington Park and Sandhills but not provided. Schools, doctors etc experienced great difficulties in accommodating the increase in population caused by these housing developments.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy submission document will be supported by a delivery plan including funding sources, delivery commitments and timings to be tested at the Examination in Public. One of the aspects the Planning Inspector will examine is whether there is sufficient and deliverable infrastructure to support the strategy.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3411	KS Carline	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.2	No
<p>Comment: Lack of infrastructure - this was previously promised for Billington Park and Sandhills but not provided. Schools, doctors etc experienced great difficulties in accommodating the increase in population caused by these housing developments.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy submission document will be supported by a delivery plan including funding sources, delivery commitments and timings to be tested at the Examination in Public. One of the aspects the Planning Inspector will examine is whether there is sufficient and deliverable infrastructure to support the strategy.</p>				
1821	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Para. 8.2	Yes
<p>Comment: Clarify how town and parish councils can feed into the IDP to identify local needs. Clarify how community infrastructure funding will be secured. Concerned that outside urban extensions, there will not be enough critical mass to ensure contributions.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is a spatial planning document and not the place to clarify this.</p>				
54	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.5	No
<p>Comment: In this instance partnership is not what is wanted. Surely if developers want to develop then they must fund the extra infrastructure required. The existing stakeholders responsibility is to fund their operation and maintenance</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Working in partnership to ensure plans and investment priorities are aligned is essential to ensure the timely delivery of social and community infrastructure.</p>				
669	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 8.5	No
<p>Comment: There is no indication what this means in terms of additional local taxation burden on Luton residents, who will not benefit from such provision for the new urban extensions</p> <p>JC Response: Not a spatial matter, therefore not relevant to the LDF Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1030	Bedfordshire and Luton Community Foundation	Old Warden	Para. 8.7	Yes
<p>Comment: The Foundation welcomes the understanding shown of the value of community assets. However, this should in our opinion be widened as a concept. There are many examples of assets being provided to the community without the means to sustain them in the long term. RTP's director of policy has recently lauded the concept of using part of Section 106 funding and/or other funds to establish a community held endowed fund, a percentage of which could be used to provide ongoing revenue funding in conjunction with the community asset. There are examples of this work throughout the UK and it would seem to us to strengthen the project to consider this possibility.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add cross reference to forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 8.7 acknowledges the need to address community infrastructure from capital investment and revenue perspectives. This will be developed further in the forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD. Referencing future work on planning obligations within supporting text to policy CS10 will help to clarify the delivery mechanisms for community infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
260	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 8.8	Yes
<p>Comment: While a swimming pool would be nice, I can not agree with a plan that would mean demolishing, closing or reducing the current level of sports facilities at the Luton Regional Sports Centre. A step backwards in available sports facilities in the short and long term would be a mistake. Any swimming sports facility should be designed so that it adds to the facilities in Luton, not diminishes. I think planners should give top priority to safeguarding/achieving this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Luton Borough Council commissioned the Luton Aquatics Centre Project – Feasibility Study Report (2008) to establish whether a 50 m 'Olympic' pool and diving training centre to replace the Wardown Swimming and Leisure Centre is a viable prospect for Luton. The report concluded that the Aquatics Centre is viable and that the Luton Regional Sports Centre is a suitable site for the development.</p>				
357	Sport England	Bedford	Para. 8.8	Yes
<p>Comment: The recognition that there is still a need to explore ways to provide additional sports facilities for the other parts of the main conurbation and improved swimming and sports facilities in Leighton Buzzard and Linslade is welcomed. The emerging Luton sports facility and playing pitch strategies and the adopted sports facility and playing pitch strategies for the former South Bedfordshire area together with continued consultation between the local authorities and sports bodies should be used to identify the most appropriate ways of meeting sports facility needs across the area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
358	Sport England	Bedford	Para. 8.8	Yes
<p>Comment: The recognition of the continuing need to safeguard a site for Luton Town FC is welcomed as this is a strategic issue for the Luton/South Bedfordshire area which needs to be addressed through the core strategy instead of through individual planning applications due to scale and nature of the site required and the likelihood that suitable sites would currently be in the Green Belt.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1443	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 8.8	No
<p>Comment: The safeguarding of land adjoining J10A needs to have regard to the delivery of the site in the event that the proposed stadium use does not prove viable in this location. Detailed recommendations for Policy amendments are suggested under policies CS9 and CS10.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 does not prevent the identification of sites for new and existing facilities and therefore it would not preclude a suitable site coming forward in the event described.</p>				
74	The Football Association	London	Para. 8.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Site identification by the local authority important for a new stadium to tackle planning hurdles that exist, examples include Milton Keynes. Stadia have been delivered by enabling development of commercial, residential and retail development. Examples where stadium development acted as catalyst for major economic development, for example Pride Park in Derby. Possible location north of Luton due to J10a issues and range of green infrastructure available there. Possibility to locate stadium in country park, like in Germany.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee is committed to the relocation of Luton Football Club provided that the club can find a suitable site. The Committee continues to safeguard land for a new football stadium near junction 10A in line with Luton's Local Plan (2011)</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
670	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 8.8	No
<p>Comment: It is hard to see how these will be provided without a large public funding initiative. No indication is given of the likely cost or affordability. No evidence has been presented where such additional facilities will be located in the proposed urban extensions</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The level of facilities and exact location of social and community infrastructure with regards to urban extensions will be part of their master plan work. Details of infrastructure provision and delivery will be supporting the forthcoming Core Strategy submission document.</p>				
2405	Charlotte Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: No indication as to how the set aside amenity areas will be funded or built suggesting that the housing will be built first without this provision This lack of facilities will add to the pressure on the existing ones including shops and schools Quality of life is already in decline in the town with its lack of shops and facilities The only beneficiaries of this plan will be the developers - what is already in Leighton Buzzard needs to be regenerated first before new housing is built</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Further details on the allocation of land for amenity and other social and community uses, developer contributions and design will be contained in the masterplanning of towns and urban extensions and the forthcoming SPDs on design and planning obligations to support the wider strategic policies in the Core Strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> A schedule of infrastructure and its funding is contained in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) and the Integrated Delivery Programme supporting the Core Strategy.</p>				
2404	Charles F Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: No indication as to how the set aside amenity areas will be funded or built suggesting that the housing will be built first without this provision This lack of facilities will add to the pressure on the existing ones including shops and schools Quality of life is already in decline in the town with its lack of shops and facilities The only beneficiaries of this plan will be the developers - what is already in Leighton Buzzard needs to be regenerated first before new housing is built</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Further details on the allocation of land for amenity and other social and community uses, developer contributions and design will be contained in the masterplanning of towns and urban extensions and the forthcoming SPDs on design and planning obligations to support the wider strategic policies in the Core Strategy. <input type="checkbox"/> A schedule of infrastructure and its funding is contained in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) and the Integrated Delivery Programme supporting the Core Strategy.</p>				
2655	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Leighton Linlade has experienced high levels of recent and ongoing housing development with little infrastructure development and none seemingly in the pipeline to address the current shortfall. No further development should even be considered until the shortfall has been addressed.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status.</p>				
2606	Mr Christopher Bartlett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: There are insufficient schools. The health service is already stretched to the limit. The town centre is adequate for what we have now but with several thousand more families I doubt it.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2337	Mr and Mrs John Bettle	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: Building of new houses should be suspended until the infrastructure in the town is improved The infrastructure promised with each new housing development has not materialised</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2504	Mr Chris Bosworth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: LB's infrastructure is totally inadequate to support further growth e.g. sports facilities insufficient and traffic already intolerable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing social and infrastructure needs through a range of initiatives and funding sources and also addresses future need by committing to identify with partners infrastructure priorities in 5 year tranches to ensure that the provision of new houses is aligned with infrastructure provision.</p>				
2322	Mr David Collins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Ideas for additional infrastructure put forward Increased use of the river and the canal and the creation of a lake around which shops, offices and recreational facilities could be built to attract further investment into the town Large supermarkets could provide the investment for this sort of venture The town was 'offered up' for development to enable the delivery of increased infrastructure but this did not materialise</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2601	Mrs Joan Costello	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: There already are not enough jobs, schools, etc to cope with any of the extra housing that is proposed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status.</p>				
2537	Martin Davey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: The addition of so many houses will put unsustainable pressure on the town's basic infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2225	Mr Christopher Gravett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: Contends that the argument that more facilities and services will be enabled by development is a fallacy as they are not prioritised by developers. Identifies facilities for young people at night as particular problem. General point made that the existing infrastructure in the town cannot cope and it is not clear how additional infrastructure will be financed particularly in the current economic downturn</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to ensure that infrastructure accompanies the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help the strategy to minimise the effect of the economic downturn and ease the reliance on developers contributions. In addition, the Core Strategy will be supported by a forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p>				
2367	Edith Griffith	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard is at maximum capacity for all services. No faith that promised community infrastructure will be delivered</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2391	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: A large number of houses have already been built in Leighton Buzzard without the provision of additional facilities</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2364	Mr & Mrs John Hastwell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Extra doctors, dentists and other services will be needed as the existing services are overstretched</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
2590	Sue Hill	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: The town has grown at an enormous rate in recent years but no corresponding facilities have been developed. This is unfair to all those who have moved here with the promise of schools, shops, leisure facilities and health centres. If the proposed development to the east of LB goes ahead then the delivery of the proposed infrastructure must be viewed with scepticism because of this</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2591	Mr David Hill	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: The town has grown at an enormous rate in recent years but no corresponding facilities have been developed This is unfair to all those who have moved here with the promise of schools, shops, leisure facilities and health centres If the proposed development to the east of LB goes ahead then the delivery of the proposed infrastructure must be viewed with scepticism because of this</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2349	Mrs Jean Holmes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: No additional infrastructure has been delivered despite the considerable development that has taken place in Leighton Buzzard</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2575	Anne Lathwell	Eggington	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: We have seen our Health centres and Surgeries stretched to breaking point.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) and the Integrated Development Programme identify existing infrastructure deficiencies in Luton and South Bedfordshire and it is the intention of Policy CS10 to set up a schedule of priorities with service providers and stakeholders to address them.</p>				
2544	Mrs G Lopez	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: The current housing estates are poorly equipped with regards to the usual facilities required in such areas - shops, dentists, doctors, schools, youth centres etc.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) and the Integrated Development Programme identify existing infrastructure deficiencies in Luton and South Bedfordshire and it is the intention of Policy CS10 to set up a schedule of priorities with service providers and stakeholders to address them.</p>				
2625	Mr Robert McAlister	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: This town has almost quadrupled in size within living memory without any significant increase in physical or social infrastructure or public services. I object on the grounds that the town is now creaking at the seams and needs a period of consolidation to catch up with necessary infrastructure and facilities.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status. Policy CS10 proposes to align housing and social and community infrastructure provision by identifying priorities sin five year tranches. This will help to address the consolidation period referred in the comment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2593	Andrea Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Over the past 20-30 years the town has doubled in size but the infrastructure has not kept pace with the population increase particularly in recent years with the development of the Sandhills and Billington Park</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing deficiencies and future needs in response to evidence identified in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008)</p>				
2731	Mr Nigel Mould	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: This little market town cannot sustain this increase in population on our roads, rails, sewage, and essential services.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing deficiencies and future needs in response to evidence identified in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008)</p>				
2648	Mr Christopher Ree	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: This development is not necessary as substantial housing developments are already completed and in progress of completion in Leighton Buzzard and there is inadequate infrastructure to accommodate the existing developments.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status.</p>				
2232	Nicola Roberts	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Insufficient infrastructure has been provided in line with the increase in housing over recent years in Leighton Buzzard. There will be a need for schools, doctors, dentists, leisure and shopping facilities. There is a particular need for a hospital in the town. School classes are also overstretched.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure which does reflect a great need for health facilities in South Bedfordshire and other facilities. Policy CS11 commits to identifying priorities with partners in five year tranches. Therefore providing for current needs first.</p>				
2383	Mr Martyn Robinson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: No thought has been given to the amenities that will be required to support families that move into the area. Beaudesert Lower School does have some capacity but the middle and upper schools do not. Indeed Brooklands Middle School was recently threatened with closure which if carried out would worsen the education provision in the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status.</p>				





ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2471	Jacqui Sparks	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: No additional infrastructure has been put in place to meet the demands of a fast growing community It is difficult to get a dentist, the doctor surgeries are at capacity, there is no hospital and the leisure centre is very small There have been promises from developers that these sorts of facilities will be delivered, but nothing has been forthcoming</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
360	Sport England	Bedford	Para. 8.9	Yes
<p>Comment: The principle of safeguarding land for Luton Town FC is welcome but consideration must be given to the enabling development that will probably be necessary. If Junction 10A is not a suitable site for this enabling development then an alternative should be considered in consultation with LFC. This site should maximise the opportunity for a range of travel modes. Recent best practice schemes where stadia meeting the needs of both football clubs and the wider community have been delivered through close working between the local authorities and the clubs should be used as an approach..</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
359	Sport England	Bedford	Para. 8.9	Yes
<p>Comment: Preferred option CS10 is welcomed in principle as it takes a strategic approach to community infrastructure provision, considers the need for interim facilities to be provided and encourages co-location of facilities which is pertinent for sports facilities which are suitable for provision on education or other community facility sites. The specific reference to delivering a new swimming pool is welcomed as this demonstrates that this facility is of strategic importance to the whole Luton/South Beds area and confirms the importance that the local authority places on the delivery of the facility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
2420	Mr Gary Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: No visible benefits to the town were delivered following development at Sandhills and Billington Park The town is overcrowded at its current size</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
2676	Sheila Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: There is no guarantee of any infrastructure development, only the offer of land with a time limit on its availability. There is a lack of any track record of promised infrastructure development actually occurring. To date the track record is one of 100% broken promises.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) identifies existing and future social and infrastructure including school capacity. This study and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan list the schedule of infrastructure needed and its current funding status.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2640	Mr Michael Turton	Linslade	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Before any further housing is inflicted on the town the local infrastructure should be improved (a new hospital, surgery, leisure centre, better rail capacity, etc) to the level it should be to cope with the existing estates that have mushroomed in the last few years.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing deficiencies and future needs in response to evidence identified in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008)</p>				
2726	Carrie Tyas	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: I find it hard to understand how this development will sustain the proposed influx in housing. We have only a few local shops in this area which are always very busy. We have no GP surgeries over this end of town and no petrol stations for car users.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing deficiencies and future needs in response to evidence identified in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008)</p>				
2333	Mr Martin Walker	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: The plan allows for the construction of housing but only sets aside land for other infrastructure like community facilities and schools rather than committing to actually build them</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is not the role of the planning system to build neither houses nor facilities but to set out a strategy and working arrangements by which all those involved in the process work towards using our resources and accommodate growth in the most sustainable manner.</p>				
2630	Mr Ray Watkins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	
<p>Comment: Recent developments in Leighton Buzzard, such as Sandhills and Billington Park, have seen very little in the way of accompanying infrastructure, despite promise from the developers.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing deficiencies and future needs in response to evidence identified in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008)</p>				
2430	Andy Wood	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: New developments around LB have delivered little in the way of infrastructure. Some refer to the traffic flow improvements and the increase of car parking capacity at the station as examples of 'future proofing' for further housing development but considered that these improvements were long overdue and needed to accommodate the needs of the existing population. Nothing in either the PO Document or the publicity from the developers, gives anything other than 'fig-leaf' commitment to infrastructure improvements</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2741	G Woodhall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.9	No
<p>Comment: There is no good reason to enlarge the town when the additional housing cannot be supported by jobs and services.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 sets a policy framework to address existing social and community infrastructure deficiencies and to provide for future need. The Policy is supported by the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) which will form the basis for the prioritisation of infrastructure by the local planning authorities, the service providers and any other stakeholders involved with delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
689	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: For the reason of this: "Continue to safeguard land for a new football stadium for Luton Town Football Club near Junction 10A" Football grounds should be in town centres where they are easily accessible to rail. Out of town stadiums are just an opportunity for developers to cross sell and hope that the club goes out of business.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Stadia and major sports developments should be located in areas with good access to public transport. However, the provision of the football club is unlikely to take place without some enabling development and this requires the availability of large sites. Land near Junction 10A is therefore considered suitable for the club's relocation.</p>				
1148	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Some reference to the provision of facilities for young people, preferably including staffed youth services, would be helpful here.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add text referencing evidence base and highlighting priority provision for social and community infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy contains high level policies and strategies setting the parameters for LDF documents dealing with specific details and therefore it cannot list all the facilities which will be provided to address deficiencies or support growth. However, the Core Strategy would be enhanced by cross referencing the Social and Community Needs study (2008) which supports the preparation of the strategy and does list all infrastructure needed.</p>				
1701	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent has not supplied supporting text though is an agreement with the strategy</p>				
2046	Mrs Dorothy Brinklow	Tebworth	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Another major concern must be the capability of the Luton and Dunstable Hospital to deal with an increased population. There is no future room for expansion and the waiting lists are already at a premium, while some of the schools are over subscribed.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study notes that there are £8 million being invested in capital programmes for 2008/09 and that there are growth funds to the NHS towards secondary healthcare (hospitals).</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1951	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Clearly state social infrastructure needs with a specific comment to, 'work closely with service providers and other stakeholders to provide social infrastructure for organisations and activities that enable people to create, run and sustain voluntary opportunities and networks'. Reinstate a previous draft bullet, 'Improve or replace existing facilities which have been identified as being of sub standard quality using grants as well as developer contributions from new developments'. Ensure everyone has access to community infrastructure such as health, education, life-long learning, leisure and culture within a 15-minute journey. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add details on priority infrastructure and reference to forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10's first bullet point covers partnership working and commits to explore additional funding opportunities for social infrastructure which is the type of infrastructure normally provided by the voluntary sector. There is no need to enter into more policy detail at strategic level given that the policy would be supported by a forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD. However, it is acknowledged that chapter 8 would benefit from containing more detail on infrastructure priorities.</p>				
2410	Chalgrave Parish Council	Tebworth	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: South Bedfordshire is already subject to heavy congestion on its road and rail networks. Services such as hospitals, Doctors and dentists are over subscribed. New schools are vital. This entire new infrastructure should be in place before any building begins.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1826	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Board objects that Green Infrastructure provision is not specifically mentioned as part of Chap 8 and CS10 which deals with the provision of social and community infrastructure. GI is a key component of sustainable development and should be mentioned at this point.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add cross referencing to Green Infrastructure within the supporting text to CS10.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Green Infrastructure is an asset to the community and can in some instances form part of social and community infrastructure when it comprises sport and leisure facilities. However, Green Infrastructure is not always social and community infrastructure and has a wider remit and specific aims. That is why it has its own section/strategy. Nevertheless, Chapter 8 would benefit from the addition of cross referencing to Green Infrastructure and by highlighting its importance to the community.</p>				
261	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Yes with the following proviso. While a swimming pool would be nice. I can not agree with a plan that would mean demolishing, closing or reducing the current level of sports facilities at the Luton Regional Sports Centre. A step backwards in available sports facilities in the short and long term would be a mistake. Any swimming sports facility should be designed so that it adds to the facilities in Luton, not diminishes. I think planners should give top priority to safeguarding/achieving this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Luton Borough Council commissioned the Luton Aquatics Centre Project – Feasibility Study Report (2008) to establish whether a 50 m 'Olympic' pool and diving training centre to replace the Wardown Swimming and Leisure Centre is a viable prospect for Luton. The report concluded that the Aquatics Centre is viable and that the Luton Regional Sports Centre is a suitable site for the development.</p>				
3292	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: PNIH encourage proposals that would increase or improve the quality and accessibility of social and community infrastructure in Luton and South Bedfordshire.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1258	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: There are no facilities for any form of motor racing.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Motor racing is not covered by community and social infrastructure.</p>				
1638	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with culture and leisure?</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policies CS10, 11 and 16 cover this</p>				
1601	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a clear drive for sustainable development? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent in agreement with the strategy and its conformity with RSS policy</p>				
1639	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there a policy dealing with culture and leisure?</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policies CS10, 11 and 16 cover this</p>				
4037	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Support the delivery of new facilities in preferred SUEs to meet the needs of new and existing communities. This is also supported by PPG13, paragraph 19. The Social and Community Infrastructure Study concluded that east of Luton SUE is very well connected to Wiggmore and Stopsley centres and a number of schools and it will enable new facilities to make significant contribution to meeting the needs of the existing urban area.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
2790	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Except there's no 'apparent' provision for anything outside of Luton!! Where's the Social and Community infrastructure for the remainder of South Bedfordshire?</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The support for policy CS10 is welcomed. The policy makes specific reference to the football stadium and 50 metre swimming pool in Luton because of the strategic nature of the facilities not its location. An schedule of social and community infrastructure for Luton and South Bedfordshire is contained within the Community Infrastructure Needs study (2008) supporting the Core Strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1867	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: This completely misses the vital link between green and social/ community infrastructure. GI engages communities with the environment and supports their ownership of it. GI improves social integration, education and health. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add cross referencing to Green Infrastructure within the supporting text to CS10.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Green Infrastructure is an asset to the community and can in some instances form part of social and community infrastructure when it comprises sport and leisure facilities. However, Green Infrastructure is not always social and community infrastructure and has a wider remit and specific aims. That is why it has its own section/strategy. Nevertheless, Chapter 8 would benefit from the addition of cross referencing to Green Infrastructure and by highlighting its importance to the community.</p>				
1034	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: But in Leighton Linslade we have a deficit of social and community infrastructure, and need to have this rectified BEFORE any additional new housing takes place.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 commits to setting priorities for social and community infrastructure in the immediate 5 years (pre-urban extensions) and in subsequent 5 year periods. Therefore, it responds to existing need first.</p>				
125	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
2859	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	
<p>Comment: The Parish Council considers that any developments without adequate infrastructure provision before and at the early stages of any building, for example schools, community facilities, business premises, local shops, bus services; will result in them being unsustainable. Early stage communities will be in danger of being isolated, being reliant on their own transport therefore rendering local services unviable and employment being found outside the local area. Leighton Linslade and the surrounding villages are already struggling with the population growth of the last ten years and does not have the ability to absorb more, particularly if key infrastructure provision lags behind house building.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 sets a policy framework to address existing social and community infrastructure deficiencies and to provide for future need. The Policy is supported by the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) which will form the basis for the prioritisation of infrastructure by the local planning authorities, the service providers and any other stakeholders involved with delivery of infrastructure.</p>				
2561	Holwell Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: There is no mention of the infrastructure required to support the development east of Luton and it would be wrong to assume it is a problem for North Herts to solve.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 provides a comprehensive policy framework for the provision of social and community infrastructure across the Core Strategy's area. It commits to collaborative working between the local planning authorities, developers and service providers which is the key to the delivery of infrastructure in the different need areas. In the case of East of Luton, the cross boundary issues makes necessary the involvement of a greater number of local planning authorities, service providers and regional stakeholders to ensure delivery. The Core Strategy in its forthcoming submission stage will be accompanied by a delivery plan/strategy building on the current Integrated Development Programme. Ultimately, it will be the Inspector who decides whether the policies and proposals are sufficiently backed up by deliverable infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1822	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: 'Interim facilities' could lead to a poor environment and a feel of deprivation for those in high density housing. Clarify 'interim facilities'. Clarify what guarantees there will be to deliver permanent facilities (or these may not materialise). The last two bullets seem very specific for a strategic document. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add supporting text providing detail on interim provision and cross reference to the master planning of urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 would benefit from the addition of supporting text providing more detail on interim facilities and referring to the masterplanning of urban extensions. <input type="checkbox"/> Stadia and Olympic size swimming pools are strategic sport facilities and therefore should be dealt with at strategic level.</p>				
308	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Swimming pool - yes. Rest - there should be no development, but if there is, the developer of every new home should pay a major contribution to the delivery of infrastructure. For example, the Bushmead estate was built without any contribution towards the expansions of schools, road improvement, or supply of drinking water. This may reduce the case for building new homes - good thing too, as they are otherwise getting a free ride on the back of whoever already lives there.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
1300	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: It would be nice to think that this represents a recognition of past mistakes--can the policy please be applied retrospectively to our neighbours in the Billington Park and Sandhills estates in Leighton Buzzard?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 intends to address existing deficiencies and future needs in response to evidence identified in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008)</p>				
1561	Leighton Linlade Churches	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study, Section 6.11 (Places of Worship) only warrants one page and considers that it should be progressed through a separate study or on a case by case basis. This is an unacceptable position and the Core Strategy should take account of the needs of faith groups. Cambridgeshire Horizons did research on faith facilities in new communities and made a series of recommendations (see attached). It is vital that infrastructure needs are met at the early stages of development so that those in the first phases of any development are not left isolated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The note of caution in the Social and Community Infrastructure Study regarding the potential to overlook religious denominations is well founded. Policy CS10 provides a policy framework for the provision of social and community infrastructure including places of worship independently of their denomination. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy CS10 proposes the identification of priorities for social and community infrastructure in the immediate 5 years and in subsequent 5 year periods up to 2031. This prioritisation will help ensuring that the phasing of housing development is accompanied by the required infrastructure. <input type="checkbox"/></p>				
1983	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Building community infrastructure is welcome if there is adequate consultation with communities. We are worried that not enough thought has yet gone into this, and there may be too much focus on bricks, mortar and land, rather than finding out what is really needed. There is a commitment to "work closely with service providers, developers and stakeholders" - it is vital that this net is cast as widely as possible to include grass roots, bottom up discussions to develop the IDP. Commitment is needed to ensure everyone has access to community infrastructure e.g. parks, health, lifelong learning, leisure and culture within a 15 minute journey.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Infrastructure Development Plan is an evolving document which will progress with the Core Strategy and beyond. Any social and community groups are welcomed to provide comments on the IDP at any stage by contacting the Joint Technical Unit.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2088	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Important that local facilities are accessible, within walking distance of homes. The Council's current Review of its Relationship with the Third Sector will provide further opportunities for joined up action and support for social and community infrastructure. The Council supports the strategy as delivering the best overall approach to achieving sustainable communities. The Council wishes to work closely with the Joint Committee in updating the policy basis for S106 contributions to ensure that new development contributes sufficient resources to enable increased and improved community infrastructure to be provided in a timely manner to meet the extra demands this growth will bring.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its review</p>				
2464	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Is unconvinced that the adequacy of supporting infrastructure and provision of social and public services, particularly in terms of capacity and access to educational, health and emergency services.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments.</p>				
1930	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Clearly state social infrastructure needs with a specific comment to, 'work closely with service providers and other stakeholders to provide social infrastructure for organisations and activities that enable people to create, run and sustain voluntary opportunities and networks'. Reinstate a previous draft bullet, 'Improve or replace existing facilities which have been identified as being of sub standard quality using grants as well as developer contributions from new developments'. Ensure everyone has access to community infrastructure such as health, education, life-long learning, leisure and culture within a 15-minute journey. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTu)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add details on priority infrastructure and reference to forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10's first bullet point covers partnership working and commits to explore additional funding opportunities for social infrastructure which is the type of infrastructure normally provided by the voluntary sector. There is no need to enter into more policy detail at strategic level given that the policy would be supported by a forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD. However, it is acknowledged that chapter 8 would benefit from containing more detail on infrastructure priorities.</p>				
1273	Luton, Dunstable and Leighton Buzzard Congregations of Jehovah's Witnesses	Hitchin	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: object as consider the preferred option weighted too heavily in favour of the development of co-located multi-purpose facilities - potentially discriminates against wide range of community groups who require dedicated resources for their community activities</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 clearly states that part of the preferred option is to identify sites for new and existing facilities.</p>				
55	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Because as set out here it will not be deliverable. Already, mention was made in section 6 that early development will be sanctioned without suitable infrastructure. Funding for the required infrastructure should be in place before any new development is granted permission. If not it will never be provided. The Luton Pool being a prime example. The original facility was demolished years ago and its replacement is still a wish not a fact</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will be supported by an implementation plan/delivery strategy which will be tested at examination in public. If policies/proposals were thought to be undeliverable because of lack of infrastructure commitment or other factors, the Inspector will recommend changes to the strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1445	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: site at J10A - identify as gateway site and location for strategic employment either as enabling development for football or on its own. J10A highway improvements - land take therefore viability issues for football club delivery Flexibility required in policy to allow site to come forward for employment should it be proven that propose football stadium not viable</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 refers to the requirements within Luton Local Plan which allows for an enabling development of a proportionate scale therefore addressing viability issues. The site identified is currently not preferred as it has not been adequately demonstrated that it is a genuinely sustainable option.</p>				
3896	Marc Taylor	Unknown	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: There is a lack of any commitment to the building of civic amenities although land is being made available, but only on a limited availability term, after which it will revert to the developers for further housing development. Leighton-Linslade has an abysmal record for the building of civic amenities, despite their promise, going back to the development of Bideford Green. Hospital, leisure centre, shops all promised but as with all subsequent promises never fulfilled.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10 proposes an array of measures to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure by working with service providers and stakeholders in the identification of priorities in 5 year tranches to align infrastructure with the phasing of housing; exploring additional funding mechanisms and maximise the co-location of facilities when appropriate. This combination of measures will help a stronger infrastructure delivery. <input type="checkbox"/>The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needs and funding commitments. The ability of the strategy to deliver its proposals including infrastructure will be tested at the Examination in Public. This testing will help ensuring that the necessary facilities accompany development within the plan period.</p>				
3597	The Theatres Trust	London	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Presumably Preferred Option CS10 refers to all these community facilities but the accompanying text specifies only health, education and sport. The policy and the text should use the term 'community facilities' which should then be described in an entry in the Glossary for clarity.... Local facilities, whether publicly or privately owned, can be subject to development pressures from alternative uses. It is therefore important that where appropriate, such facilities are retained within the local community and this should be stated in the policy. A wide range of cultural activities offers something for everyone and there is good quality scientific evidence that regular participation in cultural activities.....should therefore be seen as an essential prerequisite for a healthy population, rather than an additional but nonessential component of life and should be specifically cited in the policy and the accompanying text.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add supporting text to Policy CS10 providing a definition of community infrastructure and the strategic implications of losing existing infrastructure.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A definition of community facilities/infrastructure would bring clarity to CS10 and its interpretation. Chapter 8 could refer to retention of community infrastructure when in a strategic context while the management of pressures which may lead to loss of community infrastructure should be covered in the forthcoming Development Management DPD.</p>				
2015	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Add a specific option to, 'provide social infrastructure for organisations and activities that enable people to create, run and sustain voluntary opportunities and networks'. On the second bullet, cut, 'Complete the IDP' and copy this to the beginning of the third bullet. Reinstate a previous draft bullet, 'improve or replace existing facilities which have been identified as being of sub standard quality using grants as well as developer contributions from new developments'. Ensure everyone has access to community infrastructure such as health, education, life-long learning, leisure and culture within a 15-minute journey. Incorporate specific reference to community safety including 'secure by design' standards.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Add details on priority infrastructure and reference to forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10's first bullet point covers partnership working and commits to explore additional funding opportunities for social infrastructure which is the type of infrastructure normally provided by the voluntary sector. There is no need to enter into more policy detail at strategic level given that the policy would be supported by a forthcoming Planning Obligations SPD. However, it is acknowledged that chapter 8 would benefit from containing more detail on infrastructure priorities.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2050	Angela Watts	Wingfield	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Estates are currently being built with insufficient infrastructure provision, i.e. schools, doctors, dentists and shops, etc... The Local hospitals are already overloaded with the communities that they serve.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The objections do not relate to the ability of CS10 to provide social and community infrastructure. Policy CS10 commits to setting priorities for social and community infrastructure in the immediate 5 years and in subsequent 5 year periods. The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needed and whether funding for its delivery is already committed. With regards to hospital care, there are £8 million being invested in capital programmes for 2008/09 and there are growth funds to the NHS towards secondary healthcare</p>				
2060	David Watts	Wingfield	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Estates are currently being built with insufficient infrastructure provision, i.e. schools, doctors, dentists and shops, etc; and The Local hospitals are already overloaded with the communities that they serve.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The objections do not relate to the ability of CS10 to provide social and community infrastructure. Policy CS10 commits to setting priorities for social and community infrastructure in the immediate 5 years and in subsequent 5 year periods. The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needed and whether funding for its delivery is already committed. With regards to hospital care, there are £8 million being invested in capital programmes for 2008/09 and there are growth funds to the NHS towards secondary healthcare</p>				
2053	Edward Watts	Wingfield	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Estates are currently being built with insufficient infrastructure provision, i.e. schools, doctors, dentists and shops, etc... The Local hospitals are already overloaded with the communities that they serve.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The objections do not relate to the ability of CS10 to provide social and community infrastructure. Policy CS10 commits to setting priorities for social and community infrastructure in the immediate 5 years and in subsequent 5 year periods. The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needed and whether funding for its delivery is already committed. With regards to hospital care, there are £8 million being invested in capital programmes for 2008/09 and there are growth funds to the NHS towards secondary healthcare</p>				
781	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Building the pool at the RSC entails building a 2-mile long road around green space, which will instantly be earmarked for development. This must not be allowed to happen!</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Luton Borough Council commissioned the Luton Aquatics Centre Project – Feasibility Study Report (2008) to establish whether a 50 m ‘Olympic’ pool and diving training centre to replace the Wardown Swimming and Leisure Centre is a viable prospect for Luton. The report concluded that the Aquatics Centre is viable and that the Luton Regional Sports Centre is a suitable site for the development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1015	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: But where's the Social and Community infrastructure for south west Bedfordshire? It's all Luton in the above.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Add cross reference to the evidence base.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The support for Policy CS10 is welcomed. The policy makes specific reference to the football stadium and 50 metre swimming pool in Luton because of the strategic nature of the facilities not their location. An schedule of social and community infrastructure for Luton and South Bedfordshire is contained within the Community Infrastructure Needs study (2008) supporting the Core Strategy.</p>				
1014	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: Except there's no 'apparent' provision for anything outside of Luton!!</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Add cross reference to the evidence base.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The support for policy CS10 is welcomed. The policy makes specific reference to the football stadium and 50 metre swimming pool in Luton because of the strategic nature of the facilities not their location. An schedule of social and community infrastructure for Luton and South Bedfordshire is contained within the Community Infrastructure Needs study (2008) supporting the Core Strategy.</p>				
3769	Mr G Willis	Tebworth	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Where are the plans for the necessary infrastructure including a hospital because the L&amp;D could not cope with more people?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Social and Community Infrastructure Study (2008) contains a schedule of infrastructure needed and whether funding for its delivery is already committed. With regards to hospital care, there are £8 million being invested in capital programmes for 2008/09 and there are growth funds to the NHS towards secondary healthcare</p>				
1107	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Locating a football stadium near to Junction 10a of the M1 is unwise as this area suffers from a significant risk of aircraft crash.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The area falls outside the airport's designated public safety zone.</p>				
2570	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 12	No
<p>Comment: Locating a football stadium near to Junction 10a of the M1 is unwise as the area suffers from a significant risk of aircraft crash</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The area falls outside the airport's designated public safety zone.</p>				
671	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 12	Yes
<p>Comment: The aim is laudable. The issue is where and at what cost to whom. Developers will not be able to fund this type of facility provision.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The level of facilities and exact location of social and community infrastructure with regards to urban extensions will be part of their master plan work. Details of infrastructure provision and delivery will be supporting the forthcoming Core Strategy submission document.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1952	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Include a commitment to provide continued funding and support to external groups to implement measures that meet the social infrastructure needs of new and existing communities (similar to the delivery in chapter 12). (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10's first bullet point covers partnership working and commits to explore additional funding opportunities for social infrastructure which is the type of infrastructure normally provided by the voluntary sector. The implementation of Policy CS10 will be amended as additional sources of funding become feasible.</p>				
1931	Luton Forum	Luton	Para. 8.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Include a commitment to provide continued funding and support to external groups to implement measures that meet the social infrastructure needs of new and existing communities (similar to the delivery in chapter 12). (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10's first bullet point covers partnership working and commits to explore additional funding opportunities for social infrastructure which is the type of infrastructure normally provided by the voluntary sector. The implementation of Policy CS10 will be amended as additional sources of funding become feasible.</p>				
3585	The Theatres Trust	London	Para. 8.10	No
<p>Comment: The first sentence at 8.1 on page 70 describes facilities for health education and sport as being important for the quality of life of the community. For the purposes of this policy, local services and community facilities must also include libraries, museums, cultural facilities, emergency services, advice centres, facilities for clubs, societies, churches, sports and leisure activities, youth facilities and community centres. Presumably Preferred Option CS10 refers to all these community facilities but the accompanying text specifies only health, education and sport. The policy and the text should use the term 'community facilities' which should then be described in an entry in the Glossary for clarity.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: See response to ID no. 3597</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: See response to ID no. 3597</p>				
2016	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 8.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Include a commitment to provide continued funding and support to external groups such as the third sector to implement measures that meet the social infrastructure needs of new and existing communities (similar to the delivery in chapter 12).</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS10's first bullet point covers partnership working and commits to explore additional funding opportunities for social infrastructure which is the type of infrastructure normally provided by the voluntary sector. The implementation of Policy CS10 will be amended as additional sources of funding become feasible.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1490	Development Planning Partnership	London	Improving the Town Centres 9	No
<p>Comment: This section does not take into consideration the Council's recent retail study update. It fails to reflect the quantitative and qualitative need identified for a convenience food store in the Marsh Road area. □ Paragraph 8.43 of the Retail Study Update identifies capacity for an additional 2,000 sqm net of convenience floor space up to 2016 in addition to a new main food store as part of the Power Court development and the provision of a new food store of 2,500 sqm net as part of Growth Area L. Paragraph 6.32 of the Study also recognises that the Marsh Road area is a potential area of deficiency in terms of main food store provision, which can not be accommodated within the existing District Centre. □ CS11 should recognise the need to provide additional convenience provision in the Marsh Road area of Luton, subject to complying with the retail policy tests contained within current Government guidance, in order to meet the quantitative and qualitative need identified within the Council's Retail Study.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Amend supporting text to Policy CS11 to clarify the Joint Committee's strategy regarding provision and location of retail floor space for both convenience and comparison goods.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy would benefit from presenting retail floor space needs in more detail to make clear the link between floor space need and the preferred strategy. □ □ With regards to convenience need in the Marsh Road area, the retail study (2009) clearly states that the need in the area is not acute, that there is no capacity within the district centre to accommodate such need and that provision of an out of centre store would undermine the centre and have effects on the viability of convenience provision proposed in the town centre (Power Court) and Growth Area L. This would be contrary to the preferred option recommended by this study. Furthermore, the study adds that there is no need to positively plan for all the capacity identified and that any proposal coming forward to 2016 can be considered against the usual policy tests and the strategy outlined in the study.</p>				
741	English Heritage	Cambridge	Improving the Town Centres 9	
<p>Comment: Preparation of master plans and development briefs for town centres and their adoption as SPDs is welcomed, and we hope that English Heritage will be involved in these documents where appropriate. The urban extensions with the Growth Area complements and benefits the existing town centres, rather than undermine their vitality. They should not be isolated from the centres, with retail, employment and other activities occurring at the edges and outside of the conurbation. Within Luton town centre, English Heritage has expressed major concerns regarding the Northern Gateway scheme that impacts on the Plaiters Lea Conservation Area and has argued for the historic environment to form a central part of any regeneration and retail scheme. The Luton Town Centre Development Framework currently has status as Supplementary Planning Guidance and is tied into the existing Luton Local Plan. It is largely positive with regards to the historic environment and should be brought forward as / revised to form an SPD in the LDF.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Continue working with English Heritage to ensure that: a) development proposals protect and enhance the historic environment; and b) Core Strategy policies and subsequent LDF documents reflect and bring together proposals, aims and objectives affecting the historic environment which are contained in other partner documents.  Rearranging the presentation of the core policies of the Core Strategy in a more spatial manner will help us illustrating the overall effect of proposals and strategies on the towns' fabric, their land uses and designations and the objectives the strategy aims to fulfil.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The historic environment is an assets to the town centres and has an important role to play within the LDF objectives for the town centres' enhancement and regeneration.</p>				
1474	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 9.1	
<p>Comment: This comment is true. I never go to Luton to shop or for entertainment. Not a safe place to be.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2844	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 9.4	No
<p>Comment: The Joint Committee "identified that the majority of the new comparison retail floor-space demand being generated as a result of growth, should be located within Luton Town Centre", leaving next to nothing in any other area! "...with an appropriate scale of such development provided in the other major Town Centres to ensure their vitality and viability". - Will this therefore be similar to what they've done in Dunstable?!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy pays equal attention to all town centres with a paragraph for each town on the supporting text to Policy CS11 and a section each in the policy itself.</p>				
56	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 9.4	No
<p>Comment: This is not correct. For the Leighton Buzzard / Linslade and surrounding areas, the major regional Shopping Centre is Milton Keynes. Both road and public transport links support this traffic not to Luton which has poor road links, no railway and extremely poor bus links</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The intention of the paragraph is to introduce the most appropriate retail hierarchy for the town centres to help them consolidate their position, sustain a good 'health' and to prevent further loss of Luton to competing sub-regional centres. The shopping patterns referred to in this comment are part of the sub-regional shopping hierarchy illustrated in the Retail Study Update (2009) which informed the preparation of the Core Strategy.</p>				
1016	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 9.4	No
<p>Comment: Again, the Joint Committee "identified that the majority of the new comparison retail floorspace demand being generated as a result of growth, should be located within Luton town centre, " and next to nothing in any other area ! "... with an appropriate scale of such development provided in the other major town centres to ensure their vitality and viability." - like they've done in Dunstable!!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy pays equal attention to all town centres with a paragraph for each town on the supporting text to Policy CS11 and a section each in the policy itself.</p>				
3609	The Theatres Trust	London	Para. 9.7	Yes
<p>Comment: We are pleased to see that the Grove Theatre in Dunstable is given prominence in the document as a successful cultural venue which is a little hard on Luton's two theatres which aren't mentioned but do provide solid cultural outlets for residents and visitors. Theatre use should be valued because a thriving theatre sector is a mark of a culturally enriched society and The Theatres Trust is particularly concerned that current provision of cultural facilities is protected and enhanced to meet existing and new populations and that any new facilities for theatre presentation are of the highest quality to provide opportunities for the greatest operational sustainability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add supporting text in Section 8 referring to the strategic elements of protecting and enhancing community facilities.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome support for Policy CS11. Protection and enhancement of community facilities will be planned for at strategic level in Section 8 of the Core Strategy and at management level in the forthcoming Development Management DPD.</p>				
2635	Mr Ray Watkins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 9.8	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard is already fighting to compete commercially with larger, readily-accessible centres such as Milton Keynes. The additional congestion arising from the new development will mean that it takes so long to reach our town centre that people will simply travel to Milton Keynes instead. As a consequence, the town centre will die as a commercially viable area.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The issue of congestion was given a great deal of consideration when assessing the different strategies for the town centres as part of the Retail Study Update (2009). This is one of the reasons the preferred strategy and the proposed levels of retail provision for the town centres other than Luton is to consolidate their position and help sustain their retail offer based on maintaining existing market share levels.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3115	Anonymous	not given	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: Isn't it time you looked to lowering business rates to encourage small businesses into the area? Even before the current recessionary period, our town centre was beginning to look like a ghost town! What a disgrace that you have done nothing to halt this decline. What not also offer free parking for the first 2 hours? I can understand a reluctance to encourage people parking all day and then going off elsewhere (and who could blame them with the limited selection we have to offer) but a period of two hours would, perhaps, encourage people in and use the few shops we have left.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The health of town centres depends on a wide variety of factors and planning for their future involves working in partnership to deliver a joint vision or each centre. The different actions which may include looking at business rates and parking pricing are implemented by different partners. In the case of the Core Strategy the actions include those related to land use and the built environment (allocating land for retail, employment, safeguarding land, setting up design standards etc.). Town Centre Partnerships and Economic Development Partnerships bring together all actions from different partners (including Council's planning departments) setting up strategies for the town centres such as Delivering Economic Growth in Bedfordshire and Luton (2008).</p>				
1966	Bedfordshire and Luton Mental Health and Social Care Partnership NHS Trust	Luton	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Concern that Dunstable and Houghton Regis town centres will struggle to survive as Luton becomes the main shopping centre.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The support for Policy CS11 is welcomed. With regards to possible competition from Luton, the 2009 retail study recommends that comparison goods capacity to 2016 above that proposed to be met at Power Court and Northern Gateway do not need to be positively planned for over this period. It is unrealistic to predict with certainty floor space needs beyond more than a five year period and subsequent updates to the retail study and the LDF annual monitoring report will help ensuring that all centres in the area sustain their role in the retail hierarchy. The Joint Planning Committee will also appraise the situation of the town centres along with the implementation of the strategies set out in the master plans for Leighton Buzzard, Dunstable and Houghton Regis.</p>				
1703	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1953	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Please explain why additional retail floor space is specified for Luton but not for other towns. Concerned over the scale/ location of retail development, the possible negative impact of town centre development on local areas and the likely impact of the Luton-Dunstable guided bus way. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The support for Policy CS11 is welcomed. With regards to scope and impact of retail development, the 2009 retail study recommends that comparison goods capacity to 2016 above that proposed to be met at Power Court and Northern Gateway do not need to be positively planned for over this period. It is unrealistic to predict with certainty floor space needs beyond more than a five year period and subsequent updates to the retail study and the LDF annual monitoring report will help ensuring that all centres in the area sustain their role in the retail hierarchy. The Joint Planning Committee will also appraise the situation of the town centres along with the implementation of the strategies set out in the master plans for Leighton Buzzard, Dunstable and Houghton Regis.</p>				
228	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
262	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 13	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
423	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 13	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A (Duplicate comment)				
3244	DP9	London	Q. 13	
Comment: It is important that a Masterplan SPS does not lead the formation of a DPD document. Government guidance indicates that SPDs should be in general conformity to DPDs and not vice versa.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Comment noted. Town centre Master plans will be SPDs and will conform to the CS				
3521	Drivers Jonas	London	Q. 13	No
Comment: Objects to Preferred Option CS11 as the amount of floorspace to be provided within Dunstable is not set out. The current Capacity is set out for Luton, but is not set out for Dunstable. USS is keen to ensure that this capacity is not lost to Luton. This will provide sufficient retail floorspace to support the emerging town Centre Masterplan (Para 9.12). Therefore, the first bullet under the Dunstable section should read: "Deliver approximately 21,300 sq.m of additional comparison and 2,082 sq.m of additional convenience retail floorspace by 2021". USS notes that the policy seeks to identify key development sites within or adjacent to the centre. White Lion Retail Park should be identified as one of these sites due to the existing retail offer, and USS's continued strategy to improve the attractiveness for future tenants resulting in the retail park playing an important role in Dunstable as a whole.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add floor space need figures for all the towns to support Policy CS11.				
JC Reason for Response: The level of floor space need for each of the towns identified in the latest retail study is relevant information which should be available in Policy CS11 or its supporting text.				
3278	Drivers Jonas for and on behalf of Universities Superannuation Scheme		Q. 13	No
Comment: The floorspace to be provided within Dunstable is not set out. The White Young Green study (2009) states capacity for 21, 300 sq.m of comparison and 2,082 sq.m of convenience retail floorspace up to 2021 in Dunstable. This capacity should not be lost to Luton. It will support the emerging town centre Masterplan . Suggest the first bullet point under the Dunstable section should read: "Deliver approximately 21,300 sq.m of additional comparison and 2,082 sq. m of additional convenience retail floorspace by 2021." Suggests that White Lion Retail Park be identified as a key development site within and adjacent to the centre of Dunstable.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: There is scope to rearrange the structure of the Core Strategy in such way that the different proposals, opportunities and constraints of different areas including town centres could be easily identified.				
JC Reason for Response: It is important that the Core Strategy shows area based (spatial) consequences of its policies/proposals but this needs to be done by creating a more area base strategy overall rather than changing one aspect of one section of the strategy. The Retail Study 2009 recommends to identify sites in Dunstable through the master plan process and to restrict out of centre comparison goods floor space and this is what the Core Strategy should reflect.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1605	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: The document does address the growth needs with the administrative areas of Luton and South Bedfordshire including new infrastructure. However, the treatment of allocations, including infrastructure, to North Hertfordshire District, without a joint approach being taken, does not accord with the spirit of the MKSM or with policy SS8 of the East of England Plan. In reviewing the strategy, the allocations in North Hertfordshire were considered as assumptions rather than as firm allocations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Review working relationship with NHDC</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Working arrangements with NHDC require firming-up</p>				
1608	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the role of city and town centres clear? Is there a clear retail hierarchy? Where local policy has been referenced against relevant RSS policy and there is no comment, it is considered to be in general conformity</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1664	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Is the achievement of a high quality built environment addressed?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Consider adding design principles to the Core Strategy which would commit proposals to the delivery of a high quality built environment as well as setting the principles for future design related LDF documents.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The support for policy CS11 is welcomed. With regards to the reference to high quality built environment, there is scope in the strategy to emphasise key design quality principles and incorporate a level of cross referencing to any relevant documents addressing design matters.</p>				
4038	East of Luton Consortium	Manchester	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Propose additional wording to include local and district centres after town centres, given that new centres should be created in urban extensions. Policy support should be given to shopping development in the SUEs and the creation of appropriate centres as identified in the Retail Study. The exact scale of such provisions should be scrutinised further when more specific proposals are prepared.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add a graphic depicting the retail hierarchy to help interpreting policy CS11. Add cross referencing to retail provision for the daily needs of the urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Section 9 would benefit from some cross referencing to shopping facilities to support the Strategic Urban Extensions and some clarification on the retail hierarchy across the strategy's area.</p>				
2791	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: The whole area needs this now , regardless of the proposed growth! However, we can't see Leighton-Linslade's aspirations being realised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The support for policy CS11 is welcomed. With regards to the realisation of the plans for the town centres, it needs to be bore in mind that although there will be obstacles to achieve the aims in Policy CS11, which may look difficult to solve in the short term, the Core Strategy is a long term strategy with strong commitments to work with partners on delivery.</p>				
742	English Heritage	Cambridge	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: With regards to the draft policy, we recommend reference to protecting and enhancing the historic environment of all of the town centres (and not just Leighton Buzzard). The historic environment is central to the "appeal" of the town centres and needs to be properly recognised. We assume that reference to the "Luton Development Framework" in the second paragraph means the Town Centre Development Framework.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy pays equal attention to all town centres with a paragraph for each town on the supporting text to Policy CS11 and a section each in the policy itself.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1868	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: Recommendations from SFRA (level 1) need to be adequately cross-referenced. Promote a river restoration plan for the Lea. Bullets relating to Luton should include, 'De-culvert and restore the river Lea, ensuring that this watercourse is seen as a central feature to the sustainable redevelopment of this town centre'. Attractive natural environments increase public and private investment. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: There is scope to revisit the structure of the Core Strategy to better illustrate the opportunities and constraints of policies and strategies on specific areas (in this case town centres).</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 10 on Adapting to and Mitigating Climate change is the appropriate place for the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment details. However, it is recognised that if the Core Strategy sections were presented in a more spatial manner it would be possible to illustrate the opportunities and constraints (including flood risk) of policies and proposals.</p>				
1035	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: But as we already have a much larger population in Leighton Linlade than Dunstable and we also need to attract a few major stores to the town to help support smaller retail outlets. Without such major retail stores (such as M &amp; S), the local population will shop in Milton Keynes, killing off the town centre.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
126	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: However, in Leighton Buzzard this needs to be achieved now, with the current level of housing growth, and not dependent on the proposed additional housing being built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1823	Houghton Regis Town Council	Houghton Regis	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: The last paragraph should refer to 'redevelopment' instead of 'refurbishment'. (Late submission, not duly made)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: There is scope to revisit the text of the Core Strategy at the pre submission stage</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will address Bedford Square in an appropriate manner</p>				
3271	Indigo Planning for and on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd		Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Strongly support the aspirations for Dunstable extending the town centre boundary and believe that the boundary would be extended north and east, through the emerging Town Centre Masterplan. Considers the proposals important to achieving consolidation of the town's role as a major district centre. Extension of the boundary to the north and east will bring the town centre closer to the proposed Luton - Dunstable busway providing a major link into Dunstable town centre and enhancing linkages and accessibility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Welcome support for Policy CS11 in relation to Dunstable.</p>				
309	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: The proposals largely miss the point; the centres are all dying because of congestion created by badly designed traffic schemes, lack of low-priced parking, and concrete deserts created by unnecessary pedestrianisation. The worst example of this is the 3 million wasted on St George's Square. Re-open most of the roads, switch off most of the traffic lights, and re-introduce on-street parking.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The issue of congestion was given a great deal of consideration when assessing the different strategies for the town centres as part of the Retail Study Update (2009).</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1984	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: Big business is favoured: small independent or community businesses are not encouraged and they should be. Plans for an un-needed inner ring road and 7 storey car park will encourage car use, against regional policy. A bus terminal by Luton Station would close Station Road and make access for drop offs very difficult, encouraging people to use cars for the whole journey rather than leave them at the station. Another hotel is planned which will ruin open views. George Square is not enough as a town centre "green space". Power Court is a shopping centre which is unwise in the recession and will be a large traffic generator. Development here offers a potential to open the river. There is another opportunity for this behind the Mall. The town centre needs to be more viable and attractive, with more emphasis on small independent shops. Rationalise town centre development to improve balance with shopping centres across the urban area, appropriate to local communities, where there are a few "health food deserts".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Current national and regional town centre policy focus on planning for the growth and development of existing centres as well as promoting and enhancing these centres by focusing development in them. <input type="checkbox"/>Policy CS11 responds to national and regional objectives, helps carrying through the vision and development principles in the Core Strategy by maximising the potential of existing urban areas and helping regeneration as well as sustaining the town centres position in the retail hierarchy which is crucial to ensure competition from other centres does not detrimentally affect their vitality and viability. <input type="checkbox"/>This is also supported by emerging national policy which brings together town centre policy and economic prosperity (Draft PPS4, 2009)<input type="checkbox"/>Policy CS11 does not prevent development in other centres which is appropriate to their role in the retail hierarchy and plans for the urban extensions to satisfy their daily needs in situ.</p>				
2089	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposals provide a very supportive policy context for the continuing regeneration of the town centres. Reference is made to regional planning guidance. Reference could be made to the fairly recent Luton town centre study by consultants, and possibly link this with the 2009 Retail Study, and ongoing projects. Consideration should be given to elaborating the role of the major town centre sites in delivering the overall spatial strategy. As for national policy, PPS6, it appears that the Competition Commission are going to further research the problematic 'competition test', with results by October, this may have implications. The recession has led to the Secretary of State suggesting a raft of measures to encourage business activity, a view may need to be expressed about these concepts in ongoing policy formulation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Add relevant cross-referencing to evidence base and partner documents. <input type="checkbox"/>Amend text to emphasise the role of policy CS11 in delivering the overall strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A greater level of cross-referencing with evidence base, other sections of the Core Strategy and partner documents would provide greater clarity and strengthen the town centre policy.</p>				
1932	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Please explain why additional retail floor space is specified for Luton but not for other towns. Concerned over the scale/ location of retail development, the possible negative impact of town centre development on local areas and the likely impact of the Luton-Dunstable guided bus way. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The support for Policy CS11 is welcomed. With regards to scope and impact of retail development, the 2009 retail study recommends that comparison goods capacity to 2016 above that proposed to be met at Power Court and Northern Gateway do not need to be positively planned for over this period. It is unrealistic to predict with certainty floor space needs beyond more than a five year period and subsequent updates to the retail study and the LDF annual monitoring report will help ensuring that all centres in the area sustain their role in the retail hierarchy. The Joint Planning Committee will also appraise the situation of the town centres along with the implementation of the strategies set out in the master plans for Leighton Buzzard, Dunstable and Houghton Regis.</p>				
256	Mr Blair McGlashan	St. Ippolyts	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1472	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Luton is an embarrassment. It has been added to with all different types of building truly out of context. The shopping centre needs a complete re-build. The road system is a mess with no continuity with the one way system and too many sets of traffic lights.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
57	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: Again, if achieved would benefit all the local population. Not convinced that it will happen. This is more a wish list than an achievable plan</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2017	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: We support CS11</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
780	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: They don't go far enough. And we don't need more retail space when the ones we already have are filled with discount stores and betting shops. We need decent workspaces; offices and light industrial units (by which I mean hi-tech, not metal-bashing)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: There is scope to revisit the structure of the Core Strategy to better illustrate the contributions of each policy and proposals towards achieving the Core Strategy's vision.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The strategy aims at providing healthy town centres with an appropriate level and type of retail and other facilities. The town centre section should not be read in isolation given its relevance to sections such as Building Communities and Our Economic and Employment Needs. Nevertheless, there may be room to emphasise these links by rearranging the presentation of the core policies of the Core Strategy in a more spatial manner.</p>				
1017	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 13	Yes
<p>Comment: The whole are needs this now, regardless of the proposed growth. But I just can't see the Town's aspirations being realised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The support for policy CS11 is welcomed. With regards to the realisation of the plans for the town centres, it needs to be bore in mind that although there will be obstacles to achieve the aims in Policy CS11, which may look difficult to solve in the short term, the Core Strategy is a long term strategy with strong commitments to work with partners on delivery.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2572	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: The location of the preferred urban extensions will push Luton town centre further south. Luton already suffers from poor accessibility, difficult to improve because it is in a valley Better strategy would be to establish a new centre for retail, leisure and culture more centrally in the conurbation and redevelop old town centre for employment uses based on University campus.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Current national and regional town centre policy focus on planning for the growth and development of existing centres as well as promoting and enhancing these centres by focusing development in them. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy CS11 responds to national and regional objectives, helps carrying through the vision and development principles in the Core Strategy by maximising the potential of existing urban areas and helping regeneration as well as sustaining the town centres position in the retail hierarchy which is crucial to ensure competition from other centres does not detrimentally affect their vitality and viability. <input type="checkbox"/> This is also supported by emerging national policy which brings together town centre policy and economic prosperity (Draft PPS4, 2009) <input type="checkbox"/> The retail, cultural and leisure activities associated with town centres do not necessarily compete with employment uses for transport infrastructure given that their peak times normally take place at different times during the day and different days of the week. The evening entertainment and weekend shopping can be healthily supported by daily expenditure from those working in the <input type="checkbox"/> town centre and using existing facilities at lunch time during the <input type="checkbox"/> week. An attractive town and vital town centre will be able to make <input type="checkbox"/> use of its historical assets (listed buildings and conservation areas) which are perfectly suitable for employment on the <input type="checkbox"/> educational/technological sector as well as retail and other facilities.</p>				
1108	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: The location of the preferred urban extensions will push Luton town centre even further into the southern fringe of the conurbation. It already suffers from poor accessibility which is difficult to improve because it lies in a deep valley. It would be a better strategy to establish a new centre for retail, cultural and leisure activity more centrally within the conurbation and to redevelop the old town centre for employment uses based on the University campus.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Current national and regional policy focuses on planning for the growth, promotion, enhancement and development of existing centres. <input type="checkbox"/> CS11 helps carry-through the vision and development principles by maximising the potential of existing urban areas, helping regeneration as well as sustaining the town centre's position in the retail hierarchy. This ensures competition from other centres does not affect their vitality and viability. <input type="checkbox"/> The retail, cultural and leisure activities associated with town centres do not compete with employment uses for transport infrastructure given that their peak times normally take place at different times and days of the week. The evening entertainment and weekend shopping can be healthily supported by daily expenditure from those working in the town centre and using facilities at lunch time. An attractive town centre will be able to make use of its historical assets which are perfectly suitable for employment on the educational/technological sector as well as retail and other facilities.</p>				
673	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 13	No
<p>Comment: The central Luton proposals have already been criticised by local councillors and the east of Luton existing areas - Stopsley &amp; Wigmore - are not to be served by the guided busway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Core route of the Luton Dunstable Bus way does not serve the Stopsley and Wigmore areas. However these areas can be served by a combination of services operating on Bus way extensions to serve the east of Luton development together with P&amp;R services.</p>				
2845	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 9.13	No
<p>Comment: And if they're not met/maintained - what happens?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will be supported by an implementation plan/delivery strategy which will be tested at examination in public. If policies/proposals were thought to be undeliverable the Inspector will recommend changes to the strategy.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1018	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Para. 9.13	No
Comment: And if they're not met/maintained - what happens?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy will be supported by an implementation plan/delivery strategy which will be tested at examination in public. If policies/proposals were thought to be undeliverable the Inspector will recommend changes to the strategy.				
3387	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Adapting to and Mitigating Climat	No
Comment: The region has an overall shortage of water. building a large number of houses will put further strain on this fundamental resource. The application must be rejected on the grounds that it is not sustainable.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Phase 1 of the Water Cycle Study indicates that there is sufficient water resource to meet the needs of future development.				
2200	Natural England	Peterborough	Adapting to and Mitigating Climat	Yes
Comment: Whilst we generally support the content of this chapter, it should include a wider range of guidance and policies. We recommend more detailed guidance on renewable energy, biodiversity and climate change, sustainable design and construction. The approach to renewable energy should include provision for protecting the natural environment We recommend a policy that covers the adaptation of natural systems to climate change. It would involve increasing the network of green corridors and linking isolated nature sites to aid the dispersal of species that will need to move as climate change renders their existing habitat unsuitable. Climate change can be planned for by preventing any further development on floodplain and creating natural flood water sinks such as wet woodlands. Although CS12 includes guidance on energy water efficiency, this should be broadened to include other sustainable design and construction measures such as use of recycled building materials and sustainable urban drainage.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy				
1188	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Adapting to and Mitigating Climat	No
Comment: This chapter covers resource efficiency and mitigation of flood risk only. These are essential but tackling climate change is a much broader issue. This section should be expanded to recognise sustainable design and construction along with energy and water efficiency and allowing biodiversity to adapt to climate change through the protection and enhancement of habitat networks. High quality, wildlife friendly corridors between areas rich in biodiversity will allow species to move as the climate changes and existing habitats become unsuitable. This could be covered by this chapter and linked to chapter 10. Protecting floodplains is vitally important as the climate changes. Preventing development in these areas and creating natural storage areas for floodwater will also benefit wildlife. Renewable energy policies should also be included. The Spatial Portrait identifies only a small percentage of the areas energy requirements supplied from renewable sources. This should be expanded in this section.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2312	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 10.1	No
<p>Comment: And paras 10.2, 10.3 41,700 new homes is not sustainable when considering water efficiency. It will increase sewerage, rubbish and carbon emissions It is impossible to introduce new households and simultaneously reduce energy use, waste and carbon emissions</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is recognised that energy and water use will increase with an increased population. However Paragraph 10.3 refers to the aim of reducing consumption per capita.</p>				
2324	Mr David Collins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.1	No
<p>Comment: It is important to consider the need for food production with the threat of climate change and so arable land should be safeguarded from development; insufficient detail provided in CS document as to how sustainable development will be achieved and climate change combated; green building technology should be incorporated into the new development proposed (details provided in representation of specific design related suggestions); and a roof tax should be imposed on new development to push the green agenda and to encourage sustainable design</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
1446	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 10.1	No
<p>Comment: Further to our comments in relation to the Spatial Vision, it is considered that references to Luton &amp; southern Bedfordshire forming a "Green Growth Area" appear to be a little clichéd. The thrust of planning policy as set out in Planning Policy Statements requires a sustainable approach to development and as such this reference does not add anything distinctive to the vision for the conurbation. Requirements for sustainable construction, resource efficiency, including energy and water efficiency, management of waste and use of minerals are all requirements that are universally applicable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
1537	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.4	No
<p>Comment: They referred to the RSS setting a target of 10% of the region's ENERGY coming from renewables by 2010 and 17% by 2020. This is incorrect. It is of course 10%/17% of the region's ELECTRICITY production from renewables (excluding off shore wind). This is a very big mistake indeed for an official document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy ENG2 of the East of England Plan clearly states that 10% of the regions energy should be produced from renewable sources by 2010 with 17% by 2020, excluding off-shore wind</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3246	DP9	London	Para. 10.6	Yes
<p>Comment: Supports the acknowledgement of feasibility and viability of energy efficiency is welcomed. It is considered that the Draft Core Strategy should identify that carbon reduction, renewable energy and BREEM requirements should be negotiated in the context of individual site constraints, development viability and other scheme benefits, rather than as blanket requirements. Reducing carbon emissions should not come at the expense of delivering development, and so project viability should always be at the heart of energy and climate change policies.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS12 recognises that such targets must be suitable, viable and achievable. Negotiation on a site by site basis can take place through the development management process</p>				
1447	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 10.6	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the requirements for standards in sustainable construction and energy efficiency to have regard to feasibility and viability of development, particularly given the current recession.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				
1272	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 10.6	No
<p>Comment: Whilst we recognise the need for realistic aspirations, this paragraph completely undermines any credentials for a 'Green Growth Area'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Local targets have to be both feasible and viable if they are to be successfully implemented.</p>				
1869	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 10.7	No
<p>Comment: Mention that climate change will decrease the amount of water available in summer, impacting on watercourses. State CfSH water usage levels. Retrofitting is the ONLY way to address the impact on water resources. Non-residential development should achieve an excellent BREEM rating. Recognise that decreased water usage reduces the need for energy-intensive water treatment. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee have recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
1671	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Para. 10.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Are there policies dealing with waste management? The Joint Committee's involvement with the Bedfordshire Energy and Recycling Project is welcomed. Policy provision should be made for the design of new development to enable source separation and collection of waste materials and to minimise the generation of waste in construction activity within the Core Strategy. Measures to use energy (including heat) from waste should be supported and explored.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee have recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1870	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 10.8	Yes
<p>Comment: Community composting and other waste-handling facilities should form part of essential infrastructure. Such facilities should be of high quality. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee have recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
1448	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 10.11	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the thrust of Policy CS12, providing that the policies have sufficient regard to development viability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				
1706	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				
1077	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Preferred Option CS12 Yes/No: No Comments: I consider the caption "Green Growth Area" to be misleading as the requirements for sustainability as required by PPS1 and supplementary PPS1 on climate change, PPS3, PPS7, PPS11, PPS22 and PPS25 and other documents such as guidance on the Code for Sustainable Homes all provide requirements to meet targets on sustainability and reducing carbon footprint. As such, it does not appear that Luton and southern Bedfordshire is preparing anything of particular merit to warrant such a title, rather it is meeting the increasingly demanding requirements to achieve sustainable design. The policy will need to ensure targets are set that are compliant with targets set in other Planning Authorities in accordance with national and regional targets. Greater clarity is required on the likely targets and such targets need to have regard to development viability.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1954	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Must include clearer commitment to tackling climate change that underpins the strategic proposals. Reflect the SCS clarity of meeting CfSH level 4 by 2012 and level 6 by 2014. Reflect the SCS ambition to make Luton and South Bedfordshire a national leader in renewable energy and efficiency (60% by 2025). Reflect the SCS ambition for increased recycling (inc. commercial waste and plastics, composting or anaerobic digestion) exceeding national targets to reduce household waste by 45% by 2020. Reflect the SCS ambition to exceed national targets for household waste recycling (&gt;40% by 2010, 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020). Reflect the SCS ambition to deliver improvements to the environmental performance of existing housing stock through schemes with energy suppliers (don't simply explore the potential). Reflect the SCS ambition to exceed the EU target of 20% of energy sourced from renewables by 2020 with the remaining fossil-fuel sources replaced by CHP. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
JC Response: Partially Agree		Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. Increasing modal shift away from the use of the private car is covered by Preferred Option CS3.</p>				
1827	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: Board supports principle of CS12 though some of the other proposals, particularly bypass routes through the Chilterns AONB, seem to run counter to principles of a 'green growth area'. However, the Board objects to the fact that the policy is not explicit about what measures should be included in new development and what measures should be encouraged to be implemented in existing development. The basic requirements for new development should include all of the following: - use of locally made building materials - inclusion of appropriate renewable energy technologies (primarily solar hot water and solar photovoltaic) - use of highest standards of design to minimise summer solar gain and max winter solar gain, grey water recycling, rainwater harvesting. Use green roofs and other measures to retain water on site and highest level of insulation to reduce energy demands. Similar measures should be encouraged in connection with existing development, which makes up the vast majority of the built housing stock.</p>				
JC Response: Partially Agree		Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
229	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				
263	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: With Luton, the Airport and the M1 are also big environmental polluters, in terms of fumes and noise. As 2 big local impacts these should be remembered when considering any wider environmental studies, and impacts on new housing/communities.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The impact of the M1 and Luton Airport on new development is a consideration that has been taken into account.</p>				
3294	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: PNNH are supportive of the Core Strategies objectives that require new developments to meet higher levels of sustainable construction and resource efficiency</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1259	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	No
Comment: Mass housing will pollute the area more, even if it is 'efficient'.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy must be in conformity with the East of England Plan.				
1667	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 14	Yes
Comment: Is there a policy dealing with the reduction of CO2 emissions? Although energy efficiency measures and use of energy from renewable sources are noted, there is no target for provision of renewable energy. ENG2 includes the aim that by 2010 10% of the region's energy and by 2020 17% of the region's energy should come from renewable sources. This should also be reflected in the Core Strategy; The Council is encouraged to set ambitious local targets for carbon reduction and provision of renewable energy.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy				
1668	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 14	Yes
Comment: Although energy efficiency measures and use of energy from renewable sources are noted, there is no target for provision of renewable energy. ENG2 includes the aim that by 2010 10% of the region's energy and by 2020 17% of the region's energy should come from renewable sources. This should also be reflected in the Core Strategy; The Council is encouraged to set ambitious local targets for carbon reduction and provision of renewable energy.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy				
1665	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 14	Yes
Comment: Is there a policy dealing with sustainable construction? All development should exceed minimum targets and timescales for sustainable construction where viable. Account should be made of the aim towards zero-carbon homes by 2016 and all other buildings by 2019.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2115	Edlesborough Parish Council	Edlesborough	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Adapting to and Mitigating Climate Change - The low amount of renewable energy in the area is recognised and is likely to remain so, but an opportunity has been missed. There is limited or no ambition to provide energy efficient homes or advanced features to make positive contributions to energy requirements. "Retro-fitted" is a way of leaving the problem for subsequent generations an strategic plans. You recognise the need but seem unwilling or unable to implement.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. Increasing modal shift away from the use of the private car is covered by Preferred Option CS3.</p>				
2792	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: We need to be adopting this simply to meet our expectations under climate change!!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				
743	English Heritage	Cambridge	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: We note the emphasis on retrofitting existing development to improve its impact on climate change. English Heritage has produced extensive guidance on climate change matters, including issues relating to retrofitting. This information can be found online at <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk/climatechange">www.helm.org.uk/climatechange</a> .</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The guidance will be utilised at relevant stages throughout the preparation of the Local Development Framework.</p>				
1871	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Discuss adaptation as well as mitigation. Refer to UK Climate Impacts Programme (UKCIP09) for implications to development near to rivers. Flood risk is not a minor issue in the area, with 3,500 properties at risk. Explain the high risk of flooding from a variety of sources. Wording should seek to 'reduce' rather than 'minimise' risk, in accordance to PPS25. Include reference to the Catchment Flood management Plans of the Thames and Great Ouse so that development achieves the goals of these plans. Refer to the need to work with the EA to deliver a flood storage scheme on the Houghton Brook. Developer contributions can be used to reduce flood risk from new developments and help existing communities adapt to the impacts of climate change. Require that developments are built to avoid overheating. Include the requirement for development to be designed to incorporate the need for space and corridors for wildlife as a result of the long-term impacts of climate change. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
1036	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: It's the only responsible way to build in this day and age, and will help preserve the planet for future generations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
127	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: But what about the effect of building on water meadows and flood plains?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1382	Mr Martin Howes	Luton	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: I support the proposals as far as they go but feel that they are not sufficiently ambitious.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
310	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Resource efficiency is a good thing but the focus on so-called Climate Change and CO2 is just a passing fad. The real facts are that 1) It has only got a little cyclically warmer since it was last cyclically cool in the Middle Ages (otherwise how come the Romans grew grapes in Northern England?), 2) There is no proof that any increase in caused by increasing CO2, 3) even if we want to reduce CO2 there is no proof that we can, 4) Even if we try to spend billions on reducing CO2 there needs to be a discussion on what this is trying to achieve and whether more lives can be saved by spending on something else e.g. clean water in Africa.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The PPS1 supplement indicates that climate change is a significant threat that needs to be addressed through Local Development Frameworks. The Core Strategy must adhere to national guidance.</p>				
1987	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Climate Change is hardly mentioned with any vision of how a switch to renewable energy would be achieved. For climate impacts to be seen only in terms of renewable energy suggests ignorance or denial when car use in Luton is 12% above average and we have a major airport, from which emissions and activities must be reduced. Resource efficiency measures and how to bring them about, are not described. Park and ride sites and a new station are the only transport policies that might contribute, the costly busway would not. A comprehensive set of travel plans is vital, but there is no detail or commitment. Bypasses would undermine all other gains. Policies are needed on energy, food, reducing consumption and imported goods, code 5 housing and incentives to make 99% of existing homes more efficient and encourage uptake of renewables. Drought may be a bigger threat than flooding. Workplaces and homes should be sustainably built to the highest energy efficient standards, and existing homes retrofitted.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. Increasing modal shift away from the use of the private car is covered by Preferred Option CS3.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2090	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: RECOMMENDATION(S) 1. Executive is recommended to approve the proposed response to the consultation by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: Preferred Options as set out at Appendix A to this report. The MKSM Implementation Plan and the intention to work towards sustainable construction techniques, including energy use and maintenance of buildings, should be included. Recently, research has been commissioned to provide an evidence base for supporting renewable and decentralised energy within the urban extensions. This will help to ensure that area-wide and site-specific targets and contributions can be made.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				
1933	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Must include clearer commitment to tackling climate change that underpins the strategic proposals. Reflect the SCS clarity of meeting CfSH level 4 by 2012 and level 6 by 2014. Reflect the SCS ambition to make Luton and South Bedfordshire a national leader in renewable energy and efficiency (60% by 2025). Reflect the SCS ambition for increased recycling (inc. commercial waste and plastics, composting or anaerobic digestion) exceeding national targets to reduce household waste by 45% by 2020. Reflect the SCS ambition to exceed national targets for household waste recycling (&gt;40% by 2010, 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020). Reflect the SCS ambition to deliver improvements to the environmental performance of existing housing stock through schemes with energy suppliers (don't simply explore the potential). Reflect the SCS ambition to exceed the EU target of 20% of energy sourced from renewables by 2020 with the remaining fossil-fuel sources replaced by CHP. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. Increasing modal shift away from the use of the private car is covered by Preferred Option CS3.</p>				
58	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: This is the only part of the Core Strategy that has any teeth and a reasonable chance of success. But again any possibility of developers attempting to water down their obligations must be resisted</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The soundness of the Core Strategy will be tested at examination. Developers will be expected to meet any targets or requirements unless they can demonstrate that this would not be viable. Negotiation on a site by site basis can take place through the development management process</p>				
1538	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: This does not go nearly far enough in reducing Co2 emissions and risks not complying with the climate Act and the PPS1 and the supplement on climate change and on PPS22. The community strategy for South beds has a policy of 60% cuts in Co2 emissions by 2025 , all new developments to code level 6 by 2014, exceed EU target of 20% of all energy from renewable sources by 2020, and local food and local procurement. The SCS should be followed on this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1275	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: They are not far-reaching enough to earn the area "Green Growth Area" status, and will achieve no more than anywhere else.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
2018	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Reflect the SCS clarity of meeting CfSH level 4 by 2012 and level 6 by 2014. Reflect the SCS ambition to make Luton and South Bedfordshire a national leader in renewable energy and efficiency (60% by 2025). Reflect the SCS ambition for increased recycling (inc. commercial waste and plastics, composting or anaerobic digestion) exceeding national targets to reduce household waste by 45% by 2020. Reflect the SCS ambition to exceed national targets for household waste recycling and composting (&gt;40% by 2010, 45% by 2015 and 50% by 2020). Reflect the SCS ambition to deliver improvements to the environmental performance of existing housing stock through schemes with energy suppliers (don't simply explore the potential). Reflect the SCS ambition to exceed the EU target of 20% of energy sourced from renewables by 2020 with the remaining fossil-fuel sources replaced by CHP.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
812	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: Green growth can not be achieved by building in rural and Green Belt areas and by road building.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy must be in conformity with the East of England Plan.</p>				
782	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 14	No
<p>Comment: The proposals are "greenwash"! Where are the renewable energy proposals? Where are the recycling initiatives?</p> <p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: Policies and supporting text to be amended to reflect recommendations and targets contained within the completed technical study</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy</p>				
1019	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment: We need to be adopting this just to meet our expectations under climate change!!</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				
674	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 14	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2313	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 10.14	No
<p>Comment: The greatest flood risk is building hard surfaces. Excessive building development contributes to flooding, lowering of the water table and a decrease in available groundwater. It is disingenuous to pretend flooding is just due to climate change.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy must be in conformity with the East of England Plan.</p>				
783	Mr John Wells	Luton	Para. 10.14	No
<p>Comment: We live on top of a hill and get flooded because of too much urbanisation. The infrastructure cannot cope and will be overloaded if additional areas are urbanised.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Both the Phase 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and Phase 1 Water Cycle Study identify areas that are at risk from flooding. The Core Strategy and future master plans for the urban extensions will take the findings of these technical studies in to account. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development.</p>				
97	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.14	Yes
<p>Comment: Whilst what you say here is mostly correct, you are ignoring the fact that most of the recent severe flooding events in the U.K were due to a lack of maintenance of drains, watercourses etc. but most importantly due to water run-off where there is now a reduced amount of land, particularly traditional floodplain, that would of soaked a larger amount of water than is now possible. Again, clue is in the name - floodplain is exactly that and should not be built on.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1872	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 10.15	Yes
<p>Comment: The PPS also includes advice on adaptation. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The PPS has been taken into account</p>				
1873	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 10.16	No
<p>Comment: Although flood risk across the whole district may not be high, the consequences of flooding can be devastating. Re-word the paragraph to reflect the seriousness of flooding. SUDs should be encouraged to benefit flood mitigation, biodiversity, recreation and water quality. Highlight that climate change and increased development can make flooding worse and that solutions must be sought before planning applications are submitted. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: PPS25 makes it clear that flooding is a serious issue. There is no need to repeat national guidance. Preferred Option CS13 indicates that policies will be developed flood mitigation measures are incorporated into development schemes. It is a requirement for developers to submit a flood risk assessment as part of any planning application.</p>				
1874	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 10.17	No
<p>Comment: Explain the risk of flooding from wastewater treatment works. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Amend text to include explanation</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Suggest explanation of text</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2402	Charlotte Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Building on the flood plain will lead to a greater risk of flooding in low-lying areas like Cotefield Drive because rainfall will be unable to soak away naturally causing surface run-off ; and in periods of heavy rain, houses and gardens in these sorts of areas already experience flooding and this can only worsen if natural drainage is lost</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2401	Charles F Barral	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Building on the flood plain will lead to a greater risk of flooding in low-lying areas like Cotefield Drive because rainfall will be unable to soak away naturally causing surface run-off ; and in periods of heavy rain, houses and gardens in these sorts of areas already experience flooding and this can only worsen if natural drainage is lost</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2658	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Requisite finance must be allocated for flood containment and a plan in place to ensure that all housing that your proposal allocate to the flood plain adjacent Clipstone Brook, are fully protected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2503	Mr Chris Bosworth	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: There is no justification for building on the flood plain; there are already flooding issues with Clipstone Brook which is in the vicinity of the site - it almost broke its banks last year; and any further development would increase this risk of flooding</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3627	Mr Barry Brownsell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3418	JS Carline	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Floodplain - we understand that some of the proposed housing is to be built on flood plain and this obviously has the potential to cause flooding in thousands of homes in the future. This has already been evidenced in various parts of the country in homes previously built on the flood plain.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3417	KS Carline	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Floodplain - we understand that some of the proposed housing is to be built on flood plain and this obviously has the potential to cause flooding in thousands of homes in the future. This has already been evidenced in various parts of the country in homes previously built on the flood plain.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3592	M J Carr	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Not enough detail is given about the necessary flood mitigation needed for the Eastern Expansion Area which would be adjacent to Clipstone Brook.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2580	Mrs Joan Costello	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: I believe there are plans to build on the flood plains. How exactly would that affect the existing housing given wetter summers we appear to be experiencing?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3626	Mr Keith Fish	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2227	Mr Christopher Gravett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Part of the Eastern Development site is Flood Plain and therefore will threaten both existing properties and the occupiers of the new housing; and an application for a hospital was refused on the site in the late 70s early 80s due to flood risk so not clear how residential development of this site is justified</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2162	Ms Jayne Green	Eggington	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Not enough detail is given about the necessary flood mitigation needed for the Eastern Expansion Area which would be adjacent to Clipstone Brook.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3539	Jon Green	Eggington	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Not enough detail is given about the necessary flood mitigation needed for the Eastern Expansion Area which would be adjacent to Clipstone Brook.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2389	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Concern about building on the flood plain and the risk of flooding in the Planets and Meadow Way areas of Leighton Buzzard</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2362	Mr & Mrs John Hastwell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Building on flood plain will badly affect both existing residents and new residents; and insurance and repair costs will be high and borne by Council tax payers</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3625	Linda Holbrook	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2339	Mrs Jean Holmes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: It is wrong to build on a flood plain as the excess water will have nowhere to drain away; and homes built in these areas suffer increased insurance premiums</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3628	Leighton-Linslade Opposes Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2548	Mrs G Lopez	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: I understand that the proposed area is on a potential flood plain. Is this going to have a detrimental effect on houses in the area?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2626	Mr Robert McAlister	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: I also have great concerns that this expansion will cause flooding. I am concerned about not only flooding local to the direct vicinity of the proposed development itself but also about the 'knock in' effect to the rest of the town.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2774	Mr Robert Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: I have seen the Clipstone Brook on frequent occasions burst its banks during periods of heavy rainfall. The proposed development in a rain catchment area may well lead to flooding of homes.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2638	Andrea Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: It is proposed that the development is built on the flood plain which would bring risk of flooding not only to the new housing but also to the properties downstream on the 'Planets' estate</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2734	Mr Nigel Mould	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Have you considered the floodplain area on either side of Clipstone Brook as we have experienced serious floods in the past.</p> <p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2534	Brian Patton	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Many of the proposed new houses will be built on flood plains, putting new and existing houses at risk.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2645	Mr Christopher Ree	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: The development is unacceptable as there is a possibility of flooding due to building on the flood plain.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2382	Mr Martyn Robinson	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Clipstone Brook runs close to the representor's property and already reaches very high levels during heavy rain; and contends that if the flood plain were to be built upon further upstream, then properties adjacent to the brook would be liable to flood</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3737	Lorraine Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: The loss of undeveloped flood plain will place housing near to Clipstone Brook at great risk. At present heavy rain brings the brook perilously close to overflowing. If the development goes ahead the brook will probably flood and put the Planets Estate at risk.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2529	Brian Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: The loss of undeveloped flood plain will place housing near to Clipstone Brook at great risk. At present heavy rain brings the brook perilously close to overflowing. If the development goes ahead the brook will probably flood and put the Planets Estate at risk.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3630	Mr C Shane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2318	Cindy Sharp	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposed site is on a notorious flood plain and so is not a good location for housing development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2752	Stephen Sheppard	Eggington	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposed development site is on either side of Clipstone Brook. This is a known floodplain area and has caused serious flooding in the recent past.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2281	Mrs Christine Simmonds	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: There are already issues with flooding on the 'Planets' estate in Leighton Buzzard and difficulties with obtaining home insurance because of this; and increased levels of housing on the floodplain will not allow any excess rainwater to soak away and will lead to increased flooding</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3433	Anthony Smallbridge	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Clipstone Brook area is designated flood plain by the EA and yet the proposals show houses will be built along this brook at the back of Hydrus Drive and Jupiter Drive and across the other side of the brook, albeit with a green corridor running through. Do we need more houses on land which could be liable to flooding? also it is well known that increased residential building removes natural drainage therefore increasing risk of flooding to existing properties.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2475	Jacqui Sparks	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Building on the flood plain in LB is short-sighted and dangerous</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2588	Mr John Spencer	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Concern expressed about the increased risk of flooding of his and his neighbours' properties; property is around 40 metres from Clipstone Brook and although there is some flood barriers, in times of severe rainfall, the brook breaches its banks and is hardly retained by this; as such several large insurance companies will not insure properties in this area; building on the northern slopes of the Clipstone Brook and the inevitable increase in non-permeable hard surfaces will not allow water to drain away naturally and will increase the risk of flooding particularly to Hydrus, Phoenix and Columbia Closes</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3623	Mr David Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2753	Sue Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposed development site is on either side of Clipstone Brook. This is a known floodplain area and has caused serious flooding in the recent past.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3624	Edward Syrett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Eastern Development area falls within the floodplain and there is no detail given in the document about how this risk will be mitigated</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2424	Mr Gary Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: To build on flood plain on the eastern side of the town will cause problems for both the new houses and existing housing; and the values of existing houses in this area will be affected due to the higher risk of flooding</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2677	Sheila Taylor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Building on flood plain despite government ruling that this should not happen.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2698	Carrie Tyas	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: I have great concerns that if this development goes ahead my property will be at risk of flooding; I live in very close proximity to the River Ouzel, which often has flood alerts which will no doubt increase if homes are built on the flood plains.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2336	Mr Martin Walker	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The Clipstone Brook level rises very close to flood point so with further development on the fields that currently act as flood plain will lead to flooding. The cost of any flood damage is borne by householders so the risk that the Council are taking will be challenged by those affected</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 10.19 correctly indicates that flooding is not a widespread problem in Luton and southern Bedfordshire as a whole. However, it is recognised that there have been instances of flooding from Clipstone Brook in previous years. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against. Preferred Option CS13 also states that the Joint Committee will seek contributions for the creation and maintenance of flood defences along Clipstone Brook.</p>				
2634	Mr Ray Watkins	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Surely the Council is aware that the land alongside Clipstone Brook is a flood plain? As a local resident, I am deeply concerned that development of this land will significantly increase the flood risk to nearby properties, and I find this completely unacceptable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
3393	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Para. 10.18	No
<p>Comment: Proposed site for the eastern development at Leighton shows building taking place on either side of Clipstone Brook. This is a known floodplain area and has suffered serious flooding in recent years. Government policy shows it to be against building in areas known to be at risk of flooding, yet there is nothing of substance in the document to show that all the necessary steps will be in place to resolve this issue.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
98	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Correct. Flooding is already a very real risk for people living alongside Clipstone Brook, and the protracted delay in building a defence scheme has added to that risk. Flooding events have increased in recent years in this area, and this has impacted on property prices and the provision of suitable, affordable property insurance. The land that was originally designated by the E.Agency as a site for a flood defence scheme, is now included in the Eastern development plan, and therefore it will probably never be built.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS13 states that contributions for the creation and maintenance of flood defences will be sought, particularly along the Upper Lea and Clipstone Brook.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2434	Andy Wood	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: Proposed area for development in LB includes the watershed for Clipstone Brook which is already prone to running high and occasional flooding; given the impact of climate change which will bring more extreme rainfall events, it is probable that the brook will be pushed to capacity and will flood; more development will also increase the problem of surface run-off; and the elevated risk will not just be borne by those living in the new development but also by those existing occupiers of properties downstream</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
2739	G Woodhall	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.18	Yes
<p>Comment: The 'Big Plan' for Leighton Buzzard states that the flood plain is retained as open space and the use of sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS) with surface water balancing areas will help reduce the risk of flooding in the town. I understand that SUDS will not impact upon the flood risk to the town, implying that they will neither increase or reduce the risk of flooding because it is the fluvial water and not rain run-off water that the SUDS are to control. The flood risk would remain the same. The flood plain is not retained, they are proposing to build upon it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1274	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 10.19	No
<p>Comment: To state that "flooding is not a widespread problem in the area" ignores the impact of future development and the impact of climate change - there needs to be a degree of 'future proofing'.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS13 identifies various measures through which the impact of future development and climate change can be mitigated against.</p>				
99	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 10.19	No
<p>Comment: Wrong. Flooding is a serious problem already to the east of L.Buzzard, which is why the E.Agency wanted to build a flood defence scheme there in the first place. Also, the E.Agency objected strongly to the eastern development as it is mostly to be built on FLOODPLAIN. It is also rumoured that the Assoc. of British Insurers stated that they would refuse to provide cover for any homes built there, unless flood protection was provided.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 10.19 correctly indicates that flooding is not a widespread problem in Luton and southern Bedfordshire as a whole. However, it is recognised that there have been instances of flooding from Clipstone Brook in previous years. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against. Preferred Option CS13 also states that the Joint Committee will seek contributions for the creation and maintenance of flood defences along Clipstone Brook.</p>				
1875	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 10.20	No
<p>Comment: Replace 'minimise' with 'reduce'. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTLU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Replace 'minimise' with 'reduce'.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: More appropriate wording suggested</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1079	Bidwells (on behalf of Luton Hoo Estate)	Northampton	Para. 10.21	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				
1276	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 10.21	No
Comment: The statement "Prepare Surface Water Management Plans for the area if identified to be necessary" is weak without an indication of what is "necessary"? The likelihood is that few SWMPs will be produced, as they will not be proven to be necessary without strict criteria, resulting in ad-hoc surface water management and likely exacerbated flooding. Bullet points 3 and 4 mention safeguarding areas identified by the EA as possible locations for flood management measures, and safeguarding floodplains. This needs to be taken further, so that such schemes not only create vital flood protection infrastructure, but also provide multi-functional benefits - for example by creating green spaces that people can use and wetland habitats. Even if such green spaces are not accessible all year, they will provide a valuable addition to the Green Infrastructure network.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned Phase 2 of the Water Cycle Study while will identify whether a Surface Water Management Plan is required for Luton. It is recognised that flood management schemes can produce wider benefits such as the creation of green spaces. This will be explored further when such schemes come forward.				
1707	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: agree that new development should be directed to the areas that are least likely to flood (zone 1), and all sizeable developments should assess their impacts to both surface water and foul water run-off				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				
1955	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				
264	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 15	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent provided no supporting text though is in agreement with Strategy				
3295	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: PNNH supports CS13 but has concerns over the Preferred Options Strategic Urban extensions and potential flood risk with areas chosen for development which have potential flooding issues as highlighted in the evidence base documents. There is a need to steer new development to areas at the lowest risk of flooding. However this does not seem to be the case with regards to the location of the Preferred Options Strategic Urban extensions. In comparison the PNNH site to the west of Leighton Linslade is rated as having low existing flood risk and good for development.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1261	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: All building on floodplains will increase the risk of flooding... Common sense.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1669	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: Is there policy ensuring water efficiency?</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee has recently commissioned a study that will look at all aspects of resource efficiency and adapting to climate change including water efficiency, sustainable design, renewable energy and waste. It is intended that this study will inform the policies contained within this chapter of the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. Increasing modal shift away from the use of the private car is covered by Preferred Option CS3.</p>				
2794	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: But the development to the east of Leighton sits astride Clipstone brook - which has flooded twice within the past 5 years, affecting existing housing. Due to lack of funds, the EA have had to put their Flood Alleviation proposals on hold which renders much of the proposed area of development directly 'at risk'. Government castigates developers and planners for allowing development in such areas! Who's going to provide Buildings Insurance for houses built on a flood plain?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1876	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: Heading should include adaptation as well as mitigation. Adopt a strategic approach to mitigating flood risk, looking at catchment scale opportunities. Expand green infrastructure to mitigate of flood risk. 5th bullet should state, 'Seek contributions for the creation and maintenance of river restoration and habitat creation programmes that will also manage flood risk'. The term 'flood defence' is no longer acceptable. 6th bullet should read, 'Develop waste water and foul network solutions that minimise and where possible reduce flood risk'. Final bullet should replace 'minimise' with 'reduce'. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Amend policy to reflect suggested wording</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: More appropriate wording suggested</p>				
1037	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: Do not build on flood plains or the higher ground 'run offs' adjacent to them. I live adjacent to Clipstone Brook and when 'flash flooding' occurs to the rear of my property, my garden becomes part of a 'gigantic lake'. The Environment Agency (EA) stress that building on existing flood plains and adjacent land which soaks up surface water should be avoided 'at all costs'. The EA recommend that such land be left to flood naturally, cutting 'flash flooding' to a minimum.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
128	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: Flood plains!				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.				
426	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: Protection of Leighton-Linslade from flooding is best achieved by protecting the catchment areas upstream as noted. The most cost-effective way of doing this is to leave those areas undeveloped.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.				
792	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	No
Comment: Because I think that in order to remove the risk of flooding of peoples houses, building should not be considered on the flood plain. I do not think enough consideration has been given to the risks involved in building on the flood plain in Leighton Buzzard. I think that there are several contradicting statements in this document . For instance , it has already been recognised that this region is in an area of 'Serious Water Stress' , and that there is also a risk of flooding in the same area and yet proposals for the house building continue, without a clear statement of what would be done and put in place BEFORE any plans are submitted.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.				
2438	Hitchin & Harpenden Liberal Democrats	Welwyn Garden City	Q. 15	No
Comment: There are very serious concerns regarding groundwater and aquifer recharge that may well be sufficient to prevent any development going ahead in this area....				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: A Flood Risk Assessment and Water Cycle Study have informed the drafting of the Core Strategy and provide the detail to policies in the Core Strategy.				
1384	Mr Martin Howes	Luton	Q. 15	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent provided no supporting text though is in agreement with Strategy				
311	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 15	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Respondent provided no supporting text though is in agreement with Strategy				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3905	John Keys	Unknown	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: The proposed site for the Eastern Development is for building on either side of Clipstone Brook. This is a known floodplain area and has caused serious flooding in the recent past. There is nothing of substance in the Document to show that all necessary steps, including funding, is in place to resolve this important issue.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linlade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1894	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: We support Preferred Option Cs13 - Mitigating Flood Risk. Housing development should be built on sites of low risk and a sequential risk based approach undertaken to determine the suitability of land for development. We do have serious concerns over the Preferred Urban Extensions and potential flood risk. The Strategy does not follow the advice in PPS25 to minimise flood risk in terms of the location of the Preferred Urban Extensions. Additionally, the Phase 1 Water Cycle Study reveals that of the 4 preferred options, the one to the North of Dunstable and Houghton Regis and East of Leighton Buzzard are rated as having high risk and are classified as restricted with regard to suitability for development. The proposed Urban Extension to the North of Luton is rated as having low existing flood risk and it is stated as being fair to restricted for development. In comparison the site the west of Leighton Linlade is rated as having low existing flood risk and good for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Phase 1 of the Water Cycle Study is a high level assessment only. More detailed work is currently being undertaken which will inform the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. The Site Assessment Matrix indicates that the preferred urban extensions to the north of Houghton Regis and east of Leighton Linlade contain small areas that are within the flood zone. However the evidence demonstrates that this can be mitigated against.</p>				
1301	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: Flooding from Clipstone Brook could cause serious damage to the infrastructure of the Leighton Buzzard Railway, with consequent disruption to its business. HM Railway Inspectorate are already aware of the possible safety implications.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linlade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
1991	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: Because the Environment Agency staff are working hard through the Luton Forum to promote them. we hope planners can become much more proactive in enforcing SUDS (including green roofs and porous driveways) in both new and existing developments; also in creating new ponds to hold floodwater and planting more trees along the river corridor.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Amend policy CS13 to refer specifically to SUDS</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee recognises that SUDS play an important part in mitigating flood risk. The Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy should actively support their provision.</p>				
2091	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: RECOMMENDATION(S) 1. Executive is recommended to approve the proposed response to the consultation by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: Preferred Options as set out at Appendix A to this report.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee recognises that such schemes can benefit existing urban areas.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1934	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				
3491	Mrs G Nash	Eggington	Q. 15	No
Comment: There is nothing of substance in the strategy to show that all necessary steps and funds are in place to resolve flooding around the Clipstone brook.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS13 states that contributions for the creation and maintenance of flood defences will be sought, particularly along the Upper Lea and Clipstone Brook.				
59	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
Comment: These development constraints are an important element of ensuring that developments are sustainable. Again any attempts to vary these constraints must be resisted				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Support Welcomed				
753	SSRPlanning	Northampton	Q. 15	No
Comment: The Consortium is concerned to note the 'conservative approach' which the authors of the Water Cycle Strategy adopt in respect of flooding. The approach adopted in the Water Cycle Strategy is potentially very misleading, particularly as the area at risk of flooding within Site G is a miniscule part of the total site area. This view is confirmed by the Site Assessment Matrix for Site G. The development of this site in a coordinated manner offers significant potential to relieve flood risk within Luton. This has resulted in principles being agreed with the Environment Agency regarding use of the land, drainage, public open space, ecological enhancement, flood mitigation, SUDs and an appropriate management regime. It is requested that the sequential test is applied sensibly in order not to prejudice the development of the most sustainable urban extension to the north of Houghton Regis.				
JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Phase 1 of the Water Cycle Study is a high level assessment only. More detailed work is currently being undertaken which will inform the Pre-Submission stage Core Strategy. However, it is considered that Preferred Option CS13 is reflective of national policy guidance in stating that priority must be given to sites in Flood Zone 1 when applying the sequential test				
3897	Marc Taylor	Unknown	Q. 15	No
Comment: The strategy uses flood plains for building - despite a government report that flood plains should not be built on. If built on who will pay the insurance to cover flood damage when it occurs? The question of flood damage is not an 'if' but a 'when' as it already occurs to housing in Eastern Leighton Buzzard. No insurance company will provide housing insurance at an affordable price, which means that the taxpayer / council taxpayer will end up paying the bill.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2148	Thames Water Property Services	Reading	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: Ensure adequate utilities infrastructure, particularly water and sewerage is in place prior to development to avoid environmental impacts, i.e. sewage flooding of commercial and residential properties, water shortages and pollution of water courses. New policy text is proposed by respondent. Given the difference in timescales, include a new policy to support development and expansion of water and waste water facilities and accommodate growth, wording is as follows: New policy text is proposed by respondent. Water Cycle Study - The recommendations of this report must be taken seriously, as it investigates the sewage treatment needs of the area and any mitigation or upgrades that are needed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is not the role of the Core Strategy to include non-strategic policies such as those suggested in this representation. Policies of this nature may be included within the forthcoming Development Management Policies DPD. It is agreed that the Water Cycle Study forms a key part of the evidence base</p>				
1277	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: There is a need to ensure that SWMPs are produced much more than they are currently. The proposals need to be more visionary - building flood protection schemes into the wider green infrastructure network so that they create additional benefits for wildlife and people.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS13 states that Surface Water Management Plans will be prepared if they are identified to be necessary. The Joint Committee are aware that flood protection schemes have the potential to provide wider benefits</p>				
2019	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Respondent provided no supporting text though is in agreement with Strategy</p>				
784	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: Because it's all about policies and plans and not about actual engineering solutions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is a policy document that has been prepared in line with national guidance.</p>				
1020	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: But developing to the east of Leighton sits astride the Clipstone brook - which has flooded within the past 5 years and flooded existing housing. The EA have had to put the Flood Alleviation scheme on hold as they have no money to put their scheme into effect. This renders much of the proposed area of development directly in Flood plain. Yet Government castigates developers and planners for allowing such development! And who's going to provide Buildings Insurance for houses built in a flood plain area?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
206	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: Because the present eastern part of Leighton Buzzard is already subject to flooding. Yet the proposed area for development sits astride this current 'at risk' area. The developers show no sign of any plan to protect the proposed area, choosing to leave it the Environment Agency who have abandoned their previous plans to protect Leighton Buzzard through lack of funds!</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
100	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 15	No
<p>Comment: A significant part of the proposed development area to the east of L.Buzzard is on existing floodplain. Building on this land may not, with mitigating systems, add to the risk of properties in the new developments, but this approach will serve to significantly increase the risk to existing properties downstream along the brook's course. This is unacceptable to the people already living with this risk.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The role of the Core Strategy is to identify the locations of strategic development sites. Preferred Option CS13 states that floodplains will be safeguarded from development. It is recognised that part of the site to the east of Leighton Linslade falls within Flood Zone 3b. However, it will be the role of forthcoming master plans to show how this will be mitigated against.</p>				
675	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 15	Yes
<p>Comment: No mention is made of potential flooding problems in Lilley Bottom, an area where the eastern extension to the northern Luton bypass (Black route) may run.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Phase 1 of the Water Cycle Study identifies Site L to the East of Luton as being at low risk from flooding</p>				
3385	Susan Bradley	Eggington	Green Infrastructure and Space 1	No
<p>Comment: In the Bedfordshire and Luton Green Infrastructure Plan, February 2007, the land to the east of Leighton Buzzard is identified as part of the strategic green infrastructure, see <a href="http://www.bedsandlutongreeninfrastructure.org.uk">www.bedsandlutongreeninfrastructure.org.uk</a>, and figure 3, p 113. Para 3.7.8 is quoted from document. Figure F4 of this document identifies areas of search for new building land and shows that the land identified in the planning application sites over the east of Leighton Buzzard as strategic green infrastructure. The importance of green space to the well-being of people is well documented. Without it the diversity of wildlife and plant life will be diminished. It the application is allowed there will be a great loss of amenity to the community of Leighton Buzzard and surrounding villages; a loss of historic landscape and environment; and a loss of flora and habitat for wildlife. The Green Infrastructure Plan should be adopted and the planning application rejected.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The provision, enhancement and maintenance of green infrastructure and space is very important for both the existing urban areas and for the proposed sustainable urban extensions including the area to the East of Leighton Buzzard as identified in the Bedfordshire and Luton GI Plan and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan.</p>				
1828	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Green Infrastructure and Space 1	Yes
<p>Comment: Board welcomes Cha 11 though considers that this should take much greater prominence in Cha 8 as it is fundamental part of infrastructure provision as part of new development and should not be divorced from other forms of infrastructure in the way that it has been here. Board is interested in this issues and would be grateful for more information on any proposals that occur within the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References will be established between these two sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Green infrastructure is an important component in the provision of sustainable communities.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
744	English Heritage	Cambridge	Green Infrastructure and Space 1	Yes
Comment: We welcome the references to the historic environment within this chapter, which forms an integral part of green infrastructure.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1421	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Green Infrastructure and Space 1	Yes
Comment: What green space is going to be left when it is a concrete jungle??				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.				
502	Dr John Noble	Letchworth Garden City	Green Infrastructure and Space 1	No
Comment: As a senior Government Official I can recognise [expletive deleted] when I see it. The words in this section bear no relation to the reality. How can covering fields and hillsides with houses, shops, schools and roads provide for a net increase in "green spaces" and "green infrastructure"? And how can it be achieved without detriment to the wider environment and climate? It does not, and cannot. The proposal will cause irreversible damage to the environment, locally and more generally.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.				
101	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Green Infrastructure and Space 1	No
Comment: This is pointless. The Green Belt was introduced to protect the countryside, provide a buffer zone between conurbations and so act as these so-called green corridors. If you want to protect the environment and green space, and minimise impact on wildlife, then do not build on it!				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.				
3791	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 1.1.1	Yes
Comment: The East of Luton scheme is in direct conflict with the Strategy's own principles and vision which states that "The Luton & Beds Infrastructure plan... will provide... attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life". A development of 5,500 houses running the length of a 4 lane highway, with the associated noise and pollution, will not provide an attractive place to live or visit and neither will it offer a good quality of life.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3781	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 11.1	Yes
<p>Comment: The East of Luton scheme is in direct conflict with the Strategy's own principles and vision which states that "The Luton &amp; Beds Infrastructure plan... will provide... attractive places to live and visit and a good quality of life". A development of 5,500 houses running the length of a 4 lane highway, with the associated noise and pollution, will not provide an attractive place to live or visit and neither will it offer a good quality of life.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				
1496	Mr Jim Smith	Brandon	Para. 11.1	Yes
<p>Comment: The Forestry Commission supports this section on Green Infrastructure and adoption of the Luton and Bedfordshire Green Infrastructure Plan in to the Core Strategy. The Commission is also supportive of the Green Space SPD. The 'Upper Lea River Valley Corridor', woodland linkage and enhancement is identified by ENV5 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and should be mentioned in this section.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference will be made to the Upper Lea River Valley Corridor in the Pre-Submission Strategy. Reference will also be made to the recently adopted Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009.</p>				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1293	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 11.1	No
<p>Comment: The para does reflect the fact that there are 5 themes within GI (green spaces, access routes, landscape, biodiversity and heritage), although to be exact greenspaces should be 'accessible greenspaces' and heritage should be 'historic environment'. It might be necessary to spell this out more clearly - elsewhere there has been confusion between GI and accessible greenspaces for example. An entry for GI should also be contained within the glossary.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References to Green Infrastructure and Space will be clarified and an entry in the glossary will be added.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: References to Green Infrastructure and Space will be clarified.</p>				
3720	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Para. 11.1	No
<p>Comment: It is impossible to imagine how a 5,500 housing development that runs the length of a 4-land highway, with the associated noise, can either be attractive or offer quality of life. The opposite is much more likely.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				
1498	Mr Jim Smith	Brandon	Para. 11.2	Yes
<p>Comment: The Commission supports this section and is also supportive of the Green Space SPD. The "Upper Lea River Valley Corridor", woodland linkage and enhancement is identified by ENV5 of the Regional Spatial Strategy and should be mentioned in this section.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference will be made to the Upper Lea River Valley Corridor in the Pre-Submission Strategy. Reference will also be made to the recently adopted Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009.</p>				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2314	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Para. 1 1.4	No
<p>Comment: And para 11.5 Country parks are no replacement for natural environment. They limit biodiversity and reduce habitat diversity. The natural environment cannot be 'enhanced' as interference renders it unnatural.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In addition to the promotion of country parks, green infrastructure and space provision will be required in all new development and connected with existing green spaces and the countryside. CS14 requires existing green spaces to be enhanced to benefit biodiversity and wildlife habitat.</p>				
2459	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Para. 1 1.4	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton contradicts Para. 11.4 and are on Green Belt rated sensitivity Level 1, not recommended for development. Residents of Stopsley, Wigmore and villages do not agree their quality of life will improve. Site L include sites likely to be of national importance, these are a material constraint to development. East of Luton proposals are within North Herts and the Core Strategy cannot allocate land there for development. NHDC is against this development; the concern is that you are wasting money by pushing the plans without support from key local bodies. Para 2.5 recognises congestion on the A505, how will more houses and cars resolve this? The assumption that public transport will inhibit the use of cars is unrealistic. Proposals include building a road around or under the airport - have you consulted the airport authorities or have confidence in the costs of a tunnel? Unconvinced over infrastructure, particularly capacity and access to educational, health and emergency services.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment did report that development in the East of Luton would need to respect the distinctive landscape and topography, be well related to the existing settlement edge and ensure the protection of existing natural features. Mitigation measures would need to include the provision of Gl. Archaeological sites will be conserved and mitigation measures will be implemented in accordance with CS16. The CS is prepared in the context of lying within a Growth Area as set by the Regional Spatial Strategy and its Review. This identified East of Luton as an area of search for development. Policy CS4 seeks to work with the Herfordshire authorities to ensure the delivery of essential infrastructure and the design of development to reduce congestion and to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel. Policy CS10 seeks to work closely with service providers to ensure the delivery of social and community infrastructure.</p>				
3794	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 1 1.4	Yes
<p>Comment: This expresses "overall support for the protection of ... areas that support biodiversity". The LUC notes that the whole east of Luton area forms part of the Chilterns agricultural landscape which is known to be important for national priority farmland bird species. The EoL scheme would destroy this landscape. Bats have been seen in St Peter's Church and around Mangrove Green. Bats and their roosts are protected in England and any development would have a devastating consequence on these roosts. Dormice nest around Mangrove Green and these are also a protected species in England.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3784	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 11.4	Yes
<p>Comment: This expresses "overall support for the protection of ... areas that support biodiversity". The LUC notes that the whole east of Luton area forms part of the Chilterns agricultural landscape which is known to be important for national priority farmland bird species. The EoL scheme would destroy this landscape. Bats have been seen in St Peter's Church and around Mangrove Green. Bats and their roosts are protected in England and any development would have a devastating consequence on these roosts. Dormice nest around Mangrove Green and these are also a protected species in England.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				
3721	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Para. 11.4	No
<p>Comment: The EoL scheme demonstrates no intention to protect these areas.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				
1704	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 11.5	No
<p>Comment: Some greater definition and clarity would be helpful at the Submission stage as to the land boundaries associated with the proposed 60 acre 'Chalk Arc' country park.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 and the Chalk Arc Consultation Paper, July 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1302	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 11.5	Yes
<p>Comment: It is reassuring to see the area to the east of Leighton-Linslade designated as Strategic Green Infrastructure, even though this is at odds with the housing location proposals.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1449	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 11.5	No
<p>Comment: Figure 3 provides a visual representation of the Council's GI provision. Whilst embracing the need for Green Infrastructure to accompany growth of the conurbation, this plan is misleading given the existing allocation of our client's land adjoining J10A for development and the Council's proposal to continue to safeguard the land for development. We comment on the proposed use of this land in our other representations to policies CS1, CS9 and CS10 in particular, and through the enclosed Site Submission Statement (hard copy to follow). Whilst it is considered there are numerous opportunities for ensuring linkages to open space and for environmental enhancement through development of this site, greater clarity should be given in the Core Strategy on figure 3 and as set out in our comments in respect of the Core Strategy Key Diagram, which should include identification of this site for development. The current plan does not make clear the acceptance of the principle of development in this location.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy recognises the issues surrounding Junction 10a from the point of view of enabling the delivery of the preferred Core Strategy as a whole. Figure 3 identifies the strategic green infrastructure network for Luton and southern Bedfordshire and does not prevent the development of sites within the strategic GI network.</p>				
1278	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 11.5	Yes
<p>Comment: Specific reference is required for the "Luton and South Bedfordshire Green Infrastructure Plan". It is being completed in line with the Core Strategy process, and will provide additional detail not provided by the strategic plan. The reference to a "60ha Country Park" being created as part of the Chalk Arc corridor requires some revision. The Chalk Arc Initiative now covers the whole of the Core Strategy area, with specific priority areas. Work is ongoing to identify potential locations for this 60ha greenspace. It may be possible to include a map showing the GI corridors, Chalk Arc priority areas and potential areas identified for the 60ha greenspace. Parish level GI plans are also in existence for some of the villages in the area - the existence of these (not necessarily individual plans) should be referenced, along with the fact that they provide a valuable level of local input (they have been produced with parish councils and input from wider communities).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 and the Chalk Arc Consultation Paper, July 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1279	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 11.6	Yes
<p>Comment: We very much welcome this specific reference to the GI Plan for Luton and South Bedfordshire, but it should be consistently referenced throughout the document (wherever GI Plans are mentioned). We understand that there is not yet full knowledge of it as it is not completed. When it is completed, there will be a network map that may be used alongside or instead of the county level map shown in figure 3.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 and the Chalk Arc Consultation Paper, July 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
676	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 11.6	No
<p>Comment: The plans are still being developed - these need to be completed to have a valid response to this section of the strategy</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 and the Chalk Arc Consultation Paper, July 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				





ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1877	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 1.1.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Seek opportunities to link GI and green space with strategic SUDs to deliver shared benefits. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References between GI and green space with strategic SUDs will be made within the Pre-Submission Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3653	Mr Keith Fish	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1.10	No
<p>Comment: While high quality open space and green linkages are proposed at the same time Green Belt land will be developed to accommodate new housing This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				
3652	Linda Holbrook	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1.10	No
<p>Comment: While high quality open space and green linkages are proposed at the same time Green Belt land will be developed to accommodate new housing This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				
3657	Leighton-Linlade Opposes Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1.10	No
<p>Comment: While high quality open space and green linkages are proposed at the same time Green Belt land will be developed to accommodate new housing This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				
3659	Mr C Shane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1.10	No
<p>Comment: While high quality open space and green linkages are proposed at the same time Green Belt land will be developed to accommodate new housing This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1450	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 1.1.10	Yes
<p>Comment: We support he need to ensure Green Infrastructure as an accompaniment to the planned Growth of the conurbation. In respect of our client's land adjoining Stockwood Park, it is considered there are numerous opportunities to ensure development of the site can truly integrate with the open countryside and Green Belt beyond and ensure linkages with Stockwood Park. The site is not considered to be of particular landscape quality due to the impact of surrounding highways and other infrastructure. We consider that sensitive development will enable enhancement of the urban fringe (in accordance with Figure L2 of the Green Infrastructure Plan) and ensure a sensitive relationship between the built edge of Luton and the landscape beyond. There will also be opportunities to enhance linkages between the site and Stockwood Park. We consider that development of the site could also lead to enhancement of biodiversity as set out on the enclosed Site Submission Statement (hard copy to follow).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy recognises the issues surrounding Junction 10a from the point of view of enabling the delivery of the preferred Core Strategy as a whole. This site does lie within a identified strategic GI network in Luton and southern Bedfordshire and thus opportunities to enhance GI will be sought.</p>				
3646	Mr David Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1.10	No
<p>Comment: While high quality open space and green linkages are proposed at the same time Green Belt land will be developed to accommodate new housing This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				
3650	Edward Syrett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 1.1.10	No
<p>Comment: While high quality open space and green linkages are proposed at the same time Green Belt land will be developed to accommodate new housing This is a contradiction and will lessen the quality of life for all residents</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14, new development will be required to contribute to the delivery of new green infrastructure and the priority areas for GI will be taken forward in order to enhance, maintain and deliver new green infrastructure.</p>				
1283	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 1.1.10	Yes
<p>Comment: Bullet 2 should also reference the Luton and South Beds GI Plan. Bullet 3 should make specific reference to the provision of GI in advance of development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy and references to ensure that GI is provided in advance of development will also be sought.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan was completed in September 2009.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
692	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Again not a yes or no but merely noting that NHDC is excluded from the plan which allows them to build on it. More pertinently, development will significantly reduce the leisure options of those currently living in east Luton with no alternative appreciable benefit.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy aims to work closely with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the urban extensions are sustainable. Policy CS16 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure including green space is delivered and maintained across the Growth Area and that existing green space and infrastructure is enhanced to that it will be more attractive to users.</p>				
1149	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: However, it is important that urban extensions have ready access to green infrastructure without having to access it by car. North of Luton, particularly, the Luton Northern Bypass should not cause such severance that it represents a barrier to direct non-car access from the urban extension to the countryside beyond.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that new developments contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure and the management of a connected network of new and enhanced open spaces and corridors.</p>				
1709	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2671	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Strong and defensible green buffers should separate smaller settlements from larger towns to preserve independent character. This is not made sufficiently clear. A site could be found immediately to the west of the M1 to act as a permanent buffer. A second country park area in the Wardown hills may also be desirable.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies CS14 and 15 seek to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside as well as maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure including existing green space and infrastructure. The Chalk Arc Initiative Consultation Paper, July 2009, identifies potential Country Parks.</p>				
1956	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS. Provide more detail about how the aspirations will be achieved, drawing on the Green Infrastructure Strategy. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The delivery section will detail how the aspirations will be achieved.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1829	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: Objects to final bullet point of CS14 and suggests that it should be strengthened to require full delivery and management of new GI instead of just seeking contributions towards the delivery. Without strong policy background it is unlikely that developers will accept the requirements for GI provision and maintenance.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that new developments contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure and the management of a connected network of new open spaces and corridors. This would be through the provision and maintenance of green infrastructure on and off site.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
210	Church Commissioners for England	c/o Agent	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the Ouzel River Corridor as a priority area for enhancement and provision of green infrastructure. The accompanying text, which refers to the future recreational use of the restored Grovebury Quarry, needs policy to make specific reference to this.</p> <p>The large scale of recreational space available at Grovebury Quarry offers a unique opportunity to provide new strategic green space and support the wider growth. Grovebury Quarry could incorporate a wide range of formal and informal recreation and built leisure facilities. Grovebury Quarry lies entirely within the Green Belt, so a specific policy approach to delivering the facility will be required. This could be via the removal of the site from the Green Belt, through a specific policy designation allowing appropriate forms of development (our preference), or through the production of an Area Action Plan. In any instance, the Core Strategy needs to set the framework for this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 11 makes reference to the Bedfordshire and Luton GI Plan which identifies the Ouzel River Corridor as a priority area. The recently completed Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan provides more detail into the aspirations for GI in the Ouzel River Corridor and provides details for two indicative projects for this priority area.</p>				
3353	Connolly Homes	Bedford	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Invites express reference to the restoration of Sundon Park as a key Green Infrastructure asset within the North Luton urban extension proposal with the context of Policy CS14 and its associated written justification.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 11 makes reference to the Bedfordshire and Luton GI Plan which identifies the Chalk Arc Corridor as a priority area. The recently completed Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan provides more detail into the aspirations for GI in the Chalk Arc and provides details of an indicative project in the Sundon Hills; Sundon Hills Enhancement.</p>				
265	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Interesting given the scale of urban expansion this plan is proposing. Yes I support the establishment of structured green spaces in the new urban extensions - parks and play areas, and support the idea of preserving larger areas for quality countryside and possible country park. Maintaining and enhancing existing green spaces and parks is also a good goal.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1394	Councillor Jenny Davies	Luton	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: Because the plan does not enhance green space - how can it when it wipes out a swathe of Green Belt?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1527	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 16	Yes
Comment: The proposed expansion into North Herts is not in accord with this.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS1 states that initially new development will be primarily focused within the existing urban areas in the conurbation on Brownfield sites. However, given the number of new homes to be provided sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the green belt. The green belt boundary will be redrawn around these urban extensions to prevent ad-hoc development in the future. Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure and space is provided for in the sustainable urban extensions. Existing green space will be maintained and enhanced where possible.				
3296	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 16	Yes
Comment: PNNH support the proposals that new development will be expected to aid the delivery and management of Green Infrastructure by ensuring that green space is provided for and that the conservation and enhancement of existing Green Infrastructure will be supported.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1263	Mr Graham Drake	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	No
Comment: Green Space will only remain as Green Space if it is not built on!				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure including green space is delivered and maintained across the Growth Area and that existing green space and infrastructure is enhanced to that it will be more attractive to users.				
1656	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 16	Yes
Comment: Is there a policy dealing with green infrastructure?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 deals with green infrastructure.				
1670	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 16	Yes
Comment: Are there policies dealing with integrated water management and with sustainable drainage technologies? Is there a policy dealing with flood risk management?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policy CS13 deals with mitigating flood risk.				
2796	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: N/A				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1878	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: Lacks any detailed reference to rivers, floodplains and SUDs. Support development of a river restoration plan for the Lea as stated in SFRA level 1. Emphasise importance of river restoration and de-culverting. River corridor improvements should be promoted on non-culverted sections of the river throughout Luton. SUDs are important to the provision of green infrastructure. Mention the proposed flood storage reservoirs on the Lea's tributaries. Recognise the potential of parks and open spaces on the Upper Lea corridor and the barrier currently caused by culverts. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 10: Adapting to and Mitigating Climate Change deals with the mitigation of flood risk.</p>				
1039	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: But in Leighton Buzzard there will be little green belt land left in the east of the town to provide green infrastructure after mass new estates have been constructed, along with an Eastern Distributor Road cutting the small 'pockets of 'green land' in half. There will be little green land left to support the Badgers, Foxes etc that inhabit this lovely green belt east of LB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure including green space is delivered and maintained across the Growth Area, including east of Leighton Buzzard and that existing green space and infrastructure is enhanced to that it will be more attractive to users. Together with Policy CS17, which seeks to enhance biodiversity resources, wildlife habitats can ensure greater protection.</p>				
342	Mrs Vicky Gillan	Offley	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: I think this is a joke to have something like this included when 5,500 of your houses will destroy huge sections of green land around Lilley/ Putteridge etc. Just not acceptable.... do as you say, not just what you say.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure including green space is delivered and maintained across the Growth Area, including East of Luton and that existing green space and infrastructure is enhanced to that it will be more attractive to users.</p>				
129	Mrs. Ann Gomersall	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: The importance of maintaining good access to green space for residents cannot be overstated. It is necessary to a sense of well-being and mitigates against the problems of high density housing. However, this provision - or the conservation - of existing green space should not depend on further housing development. It is necessary for the current population.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure including green space is delivered and maintained across the Growth Area and that existing green space and infrastructure is enhanced to that it will be more attractive to users.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1120	Miss Sally Gray	Houghton Regis	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: People are more likely to benefit from and participate in community activities in local green spaces than those to which they have to travel by car. Small local green spaces are good for health, fresh air and community life. Allotments are also an important asset in community cohesion and space should be found for these in each local community. Country parks, by and large have to be accessed by car, therefore I favour local small green spaces properly maintained for the pleasure and benefit of people and wildlife. I only use the car to go to Sundon Hills Country Park when I feel I can't face the rubbish strewn all over the nearby green spaces, in the stream and hawthorn bushes, with plastic shredded by lawn mowers scattered over the lawns. I agree that historic green spaces should be preserved because once bulldozed, the wildlife does not return to landscaped and manicured artificial green spaces. Hedges especially are a valued resource as sound protection for us, and a shelter for wildlife.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure the maintenance, enhancement and delivery of new green infrastructure including green open space at appropriate scales throughout the Growth Area.</p>				
427	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: For the past 40 years Leighton Buzzard has had a tourist attraction in the form of the Narrow Gauge Railway. Despite being a recreational facility, during those 40 years housing development has been allowed to eliminate much of the green space through which it once ran. If (and only if) these proposals can be developed to give protection to the context within which the railway runs, they will have my support.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Greater reference will be made to the Narrow Gauge Railway.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 12 makes reference to the Growth Area's countryside, landscape, heritage and townscape which provides an opportunity for sustainable leisure and tourism. The policies in this section seek to protect and conserve these features as the Narrow Gauge Railway is an important historic feature of Leighton Linlade.</p>				
881	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: LB is sadly lacking in green space, particularly to the East This needs to be addressed. If expansion to the east goes ahead we should have a significant public open space as a buffer between the exiting and new development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure including green space is delivered and maintained across the Growth Area and that existing green space and infrastructure is enhanced to that it will be more attractive to users.</p>				
2715	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: Because the new urbanisation will extend up to Sundon, this means that Harlington will become a sort of 'green leisure centre' for those looking to access 'green lungs'. Harlington is already the unwilling recipient of Luton's motocross club and the clay pigeon shoot.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In accordance with Policy CS14 new developments will be required to contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure and open space and the management of a connected network of new and enhanced open spaces and corridors.</p>				
3506	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: This section conveniently omits any reference to the proposed East of Luton development, presumably on the basis that this development does not conform to the grand statements made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: References with working closely with Hertfordshire authorities to ensure that green infrastructure will be maintained, enhanced and delivered will be included in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is intended to work closely with neighbouring authorities to ensure that the strategic green infrastructure network is maintained, enhanced and delivered across the Growth Area.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2041	Houghton Regis Allotments and Leisure Gardeners Association	Not Known	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Please include provision of Allotments in all current an future development plans in Houghton Regis. The national Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners Limited describe allotment Gardening as offering health, social and environmental benefits.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Paragraph 11.3 makes reference to allotments as green spaces which all new developments will be required to contribute towards.</p>				
1385	Mr Martin Howes	Luton	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1028	Mr Andrew Hull	Stevenage	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Objection noted. The provision, maintenance, enhancement and delivery of new green infrastructure including green open space across the Growth Area is considered to improve the natural environment of the urban and rural area.</p>				
1029	Mr Andrew Hull	Stevenage	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: How can the introduction of sport and recreation pitches be a benefit to people and wildlife. What haven is a sport pitch going to provide birds, insect and animals that survive naturally in hedgerows and untouched countryside. This is totally illogical. The deer that roam freely in the countryside in the HERTFORDSHIRE green belt, what are they going to do, survive on a football pitch. Your tapering with nature, which supports our well being. We already live in a cultural of fast food, lack of exercise and binge drinking. If we cannot get people now to lose weight and get outside an exercise, how will this help, when you intend to destroy fantastic beautiful countryside, ideal for walking, running, biking and great for viewing wildlife. Think twice, before you the sanction the erosion of a countryside that has stood much longer then you and I will ever, and will still be there when we're gone</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that new developments contributes towards the delivery of new green infrastructure in order to maintain, enhance and deliver new GI, including green open space throughout the Growth Area, including the urban extensions.</p>				
312	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1836	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: The SA makes recommendations which have not been weighted. The JC was incorrect in selecting Area 1 for the following: (a) greenbelt where development is not generally allowed. The special circumstances have not been met. (b) Loss in identity of existing villages which are likely to coalesce in contradiction to Green Belt policy. (c) Loss of open countryside, ecological diversity and high agricultural value. (d) The infrastructure cannot be provided without significant public funding. (e) The impact by the Eastern Bypass and other development with associated infrastructure on Lilley Bottom.</p> <p>The northern bypass will impact on the Chilterns AONB including destruction of archaeological remains, severance of established agricultural tenancies and adverse effect on recreational uses.</p> <p>Loss of the rural character of Lilley as a result of the bypasses and park and ride facilities which result in increased noise and air pollution and the destruction of existing properties.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy allows for the special circumstances for development of the green belt. Policy CS14 seeks to maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure throughout the Growth Area. Policies in Chapter 12 seek to protect, conserve and enhance the countryside, landscape, historic environment and biodiversity.</p>				
1895	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: This submission provides both formal objections and representations. It has been prepared by Kirkby and Diamond on behalf of Mr Anthony Kimble, the principal landowner of the proposed site known as West of Linslade Urban Extension. We support the proposals that new development will be expected to aid the delivery and management of Green Infrastructure by ensuring that green space is provided for and that the conservation and enhancement of existing Green Infrastructure be supported.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
JC Reason for Response: N/A				
1303	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: Would like to see specific protection for Shenley Hill, as the southern extremity of the Greensand Ridge, and a high point visible from miles around.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Shenly Hill is located within the Ouzel River corridor an identified priority area for the enhancement and protection of the GI resource within the Bedfordshire and Luton GI Plan.</p>				
1992	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: A sustainable community should start with GI, protecting biodiversity and allocating recreational greenspace close to every home. Opportunities are suggested but no policies followed through. Plans must show the importance of existing GI; how to maintain and create green corridors; how countryside and recreational space is to be retained providing accessibility for all. Chapter 11 shows the low priority given to GI while housing and bypasses dominate. Roads sever vital wildlife corridors. No indication as to how this would be avoided or how landowners would provide new rights of way, wildlife corridors, or the buffer zones the Woodland Trust demands. Approach to provide further high quality open space and green infrastructure linkages at Leighton Buzzard should apply to Luton. The GI map has no local detail. We are losing habitats in urban areas through town cramming and remaining pockets must be protected. Building above office blocks with roof gardens can create more dwellings and habitat.</p>				
JC Response: Partially agree		Proposed Action: References to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan will be made in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure whilst Policy CS17 seeks to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity. The delivery of new green infrastructure is sought across with Growth Area in all existing urban areas and new developments. The Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan does provide more local detail regarding the GI resource.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2092	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: RECOMMENDATION(S) 1. Executive is recommended to approve the proposed response to the consultation by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: Preferred Options as set out at Appendix A to this report. The proposals reflect the priorities for green infrastructure and green space provision that the Council supports, particularly with regard to the Chalk Arc and River Lea Corridors. The existing Rights Of Way network in and around Luton needs to be incorporated into the Master Planning of the sustainable urban extensions, which will encourage walking and cycling both within the urban area, and recreational journeys into the surrounding countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Rights of Way network with regards to the urban extensions will be part of the master planning work.</p>				
1935	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS. Provide more detail about how the aspirations will be achieved, drawing on the Green Infrastructure Strategy. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The delivery section will detail how the aspirations will be achieved.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2121	National Grid PLC	Warwick	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Land beneath or adjacent to the overhead line network should be designated as open space, landscaping or car parking. National Grid in Association with David Lock Associates has produce "A Sense of Place" guidelines concerning creating development near overhead lines.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: This comment and reference will be noted in particular for master planning.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2201	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Natural England supports and encourages green infrastructure and CS14. GI is a fundamental concept underpinning the whole approach to green and public open space. We particularly welcome the wording in the policy that aims to achieve a net gain in green infrastructure. Development should not be permitted that would compromise the integrity of the overall green infrastructure network. Whilst supportive of encouraging green infrastructure we believe this should be more clearly linked to the provision of open spaces. Natural England would support a proactive approach to provision of open spaces. We believe that development proposals should improve the quality and quantity of accessible green space, where appropriate. All development should incorporate sufficient new green space in accordance with Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standards (ANGSt) and it would be useful to make specific reference to these within the policy, as well as those contained within the emerging Green Space Strategy SPD.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to Natural England Accessible Natural Green Space Standards will be noted.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1477	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: There is plenty of beautiful, natural country side around Luton that the towns people can enjoy without having to travel far.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that existing green infrastructure, including green space, is maintained and enhanced so that it will be more attractive to users.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1839	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: All 13 (bar 1) of the sites considered at the Issues and Options stage are currently designated as Green Belt. It would appear therefore that this national designation has not been a factor in selection. However, such an approach is unsound, in that it ignores the purposes which led to designation in the first place. In particular, one of the purposes is to prevent urban sprawl leading to coalescence with nearby settlements. For the East of Luton site, the proposed development would lead to the loss of the individual identity of Mangrove Green, Cockernhoe and Tea Green. None of the other proposed urban extensions result in coalescence with existing villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy allows for the special circumstances for development of the green belt. Policy CS14 seeks to maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure throughout the Growth Area. Policies in Chapter 12 seek to protect, conserve and enhance the countryside, landscape, historic environment and biodiversity.</p>				
2419	Offley Parish Council	Harpenden	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: The land is designated as Green Belt, which is in place to prevent urban sprawl and coalescence. It is totally inappropriate to build on this beautiful part of the countryside forming North Hertfordshire's boundary with Luton. This area is a lovely piece of Chalk escarpment with arable farming and oak woodland and is home to a huge range of wildlife. We would lose one of the most attractive areas of countryside in the District forever Little regard has appears to have been paid towards the Independent Environmental Assessment (December 2008) at public expense. This states that Lilley Bottom is a sensitive area of outstanding Beauty and is designated Grade 1, i.e. not suitable for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy allows for the special circumstances for development of the green belt. Environmental Sensitivity Assessment states that development in area to east of Luton (area L) appropriate provided sufficient mitigation implemented.</p>				
1793	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC supports Preferred Option CS14 which requires new development, in particular the preferred sustainable urban extensions, to contribute towards the delivery of new green infrastructure and the management of a connected network of new and enhanced open spaces and corridors. These objectives/aspirations can fully and properly be addressed through the medium of the anticipated Masterplan SPDs described at paragraph 6.17 of the Preferred Options document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
60	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: The implementation of this option will enhance the area and provide some return for the loss of amenity occasioned by the proposed developments</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The delivery section will detail how the aspirations will be achieved.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1539	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: There should be much more proactive support of biodiversity in light of the consultation responses and the NERC Act.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in Chapter 12 deal with biodiversity.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1285	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: We would wish to see consistent reference to the Luton and S Beds GI Plan, town and parish GI plans, and to the principle of providing GI in advance of development. We do recognise the inclusion of a specific GI chapter within this strategy, and on the whole it is relatively strong.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
1189	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: The Wildlife Trust supports Preferred Option CS14 to maintain, enhance and deliver new green infrastructure. We would advise that the design of the urban extensions is moulded into the existing landscape by identifying, retaining and connecting existing green infrastructure assets. The policy could include a commitment to consider green infrastructure early on in the planning of the proposed urban extensions to ensure that it does not become imposed onto an existing housing plan.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References to ensure that GI is provided in advance of development will also be sought.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
2020	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
813	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: Need to prioritise the rural amenity for wildlife habitat and engage in tree and hedge planting.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Chapter 12 deals with policies relating to seeking to preserve, conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p>				
2052	Edward Watts	Wingfield	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: I'm horrified that this is going ahead, what happened to the policy of retaining Green Belt land for future generations. Once this development is allowed, it will open the floodgates for people to build on any available I truly believe there is enough brown Site land in all of our local towns and villages that could be used far more productively than to churn up green fields. There are presently several sites in Dunstable, Hockliffe, Luton and Toddington, which are incomplete building sites due to the present financial situation. Why are you undertaking such developments, which have little hope of being completed, when it is both unnecessary and unwanted? Where are the people who need the housing? Are the Locals on benefit?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS1 states that initially new development will be primarily focused within the existing urban areas in the conurbation on Brownfield sites. However, given the number of new homes to be provided sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the green belt. The green belt boundary will be redrawn around these urban extensions to prevent ad-hoc development in the future. Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure and space is provided for in the sustainable urban extensions. Existing green space will be maintained and enhanced where possible.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2061	David Watts	Wingfield	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: I'm horrified that this is going ahead, what happened to the policy of retaining Green Belt land for future generations. Once this development is allowed, it will open the floodgates for people to build on any available I truly believe there is enough brown Site land in all of our local towns and villages that could be used far more productively than to churn up green fields. There are presently several sites in Dunstable, Hockliffe, Luton and Toddington, which are incomplete building sites due to the present financial situation. Why are you undertaking such developments, which have little hope of being completed, when it is both unnecessary and unwanted? Where are the people who need the housing? Are the Locals on benefit?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS1 states that initially new development will be primarily focused within the existing urban areas in the conurbation on Brownfield sites. However, given the number of new homes to be provided sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the green belt. The green belt boundary will be redrawn around these urban extensions to prevent ad-hoc development in the future. Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure and space is provided for in the sustainable urban extensions. Existing green space will be maintained and enhanced where possible.</p>				
2049	Angela Watts	Wingfield	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: I'm horrified that this is going ahead, what happened to the policy of retaining Green Belt land for future generations. Once this development is allowed, it will open the floodgates for people to build on any available I truly believe there is enough brown Site land in all of our local towns and villages that could be used far more productively than to churn up green fields. There are presently several sites in Dunstable, Hockliffe, Luton and Toddington, which are incomplete building sites due to the present financial situation. Why are you undertaking such developments, which have little hope of being completed, when it is both unnecessary and unwanted? Where are the people who need the housing? Are the Locals on benefit?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS1 states that initially new development will be primarily focused within the existing urban areas in the conurbation on Brownfield sites. However, given the number of new homes to be provided sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the green belt. The green belt boundary will be redrawn around these urban extensions to prevent ad-hoc development in the future. Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that green infrastructure and space is provided for in the sustainable urban extensions. Existing green space will be maintained and enhanced where possible.</p>				
1021	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: N/A</p>				
3395	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Q. 16	No
<p>Comment: The proposals for the urban extensions take over the designated greenbelt land to accommodate the development. This contradiction can only lessen the quality of life for all the local residents .</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed sustainable urban extensions will be developed on existing fields however in accordance with Policy CS14 the developments will comprise green infrastructure and space through maintaining linkages with existing green spaces and the countryside and will be required to enhance existing and new green space, biodiversity and landscape.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
678	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 16	Yes
<p>Comment: There is a need to see what is being planned for the growth areas, particularly since existing Green Belt land is being removed.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policy CS14 seeks to ensure that new green infrastructure is maintained, enhanced and delivered across the Growth Area including new developments.</p>				
1286	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 11.11	Yes
<p>Comment: 2nd bullet - correct title is "Luton and South Bedfordshire Green Infrastructure Plan". Should also include reference to Strategic GI plan and monitoring mechanisms associated with this. Reference should be made to working closely with town and parish councils as well, particularly with regard to delivering the aspirations of town and parish level GI plans. 3rd bullet should specify that provision should be in advance of or during the early stages of development.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Luton and southern Bedfordshire GI Plan, September 2009 will be made in the Pre-Submission version of the Core Strategy and references to ensure that GI is provided in advance of development will also be sought.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Luton and southern Bedfordshire Green Infrastructure Plan was published in September 2009 and will be referenced in the Pre-Submission Core Strategy.</p>				
3508	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Preserving and Enhancing our Co	No
<p>Comment: Considering the proposed East of Luton development area does not belong to Luton or South Bedfordshire, queries whether the Assessments referred to in this section were as rigorous and detailed as those done for other areas and if so, were the findings acceptable to North Herts?</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 does include an assessment of land to the East of Luton.</p>				
2145	Mrs Nicola Sadler	Lilley	Preserving and Enhancing our Co	Yes
<p>Comment: It is farcical that the County Council state on their website about the importance of preserving the local environment for future generations. These preferred options will destroy local biodiversity, rural communities and an AONB.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
1289	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Preserving and Enhancing our Co	Yes
<p>Comment: Because the "countryside" and "heritage" are elements within Green Infrastructure, should an explanation be given to why there are 2 separate chapters?</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References will be established between these two sections.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Green infrastructure is an important component in the provision of sustainable communities.</p>				
3415	KS Carline	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Loss of greenbelt land - there is a resultants threat to the indigenous wildlife and a detrimental impact on the quality of life for local residents.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3416	JS Carline	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.1	Yes
<p>Comment: Loss of greenbelt land - there is a resultant threat to the indigenous wildlife and a detrimental impact on the quality of life for local residents.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
2214	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 12.1	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the inclusion of references within paragraphs 12.4-6 to the conclusions and recommendations of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment of the Growth Area report and look to see these addressed in forthcoming masterplanning exercises.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
2209	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 12.1	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the content of paragraphs 12.1 and 12.2 which explain the national importance of the Chilterns AONB. However, Natural England suggests that they should go further and explain that, under s85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, local authorities have a duty to "have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty". Furthermore, under s84 of the Act, local authorities have powers to "to take all such action as appears to them expedient for the accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty".</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 will be made.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The protection, conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns AONB is important in the Luton and southern Bedfordshire Growth Area.</p>				
1480	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 12.1	No
<p>Comment: If your wacky plan goes ahead it is going to wipe out the beautiful villages and we will all be living in a concrete jungle. It truly is a significant asset - let's keep it that way.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS16 seeks to ensure the continued promotion, preservation and enhancement of the area's rich historic environment.</p>				
299	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 12.1	No
<p>Comment: This section does not mention the countryside of North Herts and yet the plan proposes to build over a large swathe of particularly attractive countryside. This is hypocritical and unacceptable.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: More reference to the countryside of North Hertfordshire will be made.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment does include an assessment of land to the East of Luton.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3431	Anthony	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.1	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposed plans will mean a substantial loss of green belt area and farming land on the eastern side of the town with its resultant impact on wildlife and the farming community. Whilst some loss of green belt is not doubt unavoidable in today's climate the proposed application involving so many hectares of land, most of which is on green belt, can only have a detrimental affect on the countryside and attractive surrounding of the market town of Leighton Buzzard.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
3396	Ms Jennifer Westbury	Eggington	Para. 12.1	No
<p>Comment: Leighton has already taken two large areas out of Eggington Parish. The current proposals would have this urban extension of Leighton move to within a stone's throw of the village.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS16 seeks to ensure the continued promotion, preservation and enhancement of the area's rich historic environment, which includes the villages.</p>				
679	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 12.1	No
<p>Comment: It is bizarre that this is highlighted when the Luton northern bypass (Black route) is impinging on the AONB, a potentially illegal planning decision.. The area to the east of Luton is of at least equal value as its neighbouring AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The East of Luton preferred urban extension is not located within the AONB. The proposed Luton northern bypass, as indicated by the Joint Committee Report 20 March 2009, is subject to the refinement of further evidence and has been subject to public consultation.</p>				
833	Mr Eastwood	Hitchin	Para. 12.2	No
<p>Comment: If the AONB is a significant asset, why are you proposing to build on it and irreparably damage it?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: No preferred urban extension is proposed in the Chilterns AONB and Preferred Option CS15 seeks to ensure that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact on the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
2716	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Para. 12.2	No
<p>Comment: While there is no intention to locate urban extensions in the AONB, this does not specifically exclude building up to or adjacent to the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS15 seeks to ensure that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3785	Mrs Kate McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 12.2	No
<p>Comment: The Strategy states that "Luton and South Bedfordshire... includes large areas of the CAONB. This is a significant asset for the area... accordingly no preferred sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the CAONB". In addition, government policy is to protect AONB. The preferred "Black Route" of the Northern Bypass would dissect the Chilterns AONB running along the picturesque and historic village of Lilley. To claim that this policy is being adhered to because no houses are being built in the AONB, only the 4 lane highway, is completely false.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The route for the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
3795	Miss Ella McPherson	Cockernhoe	Para. 12.2	No
<p>Comment: The Strategy states that "Luton and South Bedfordshire... includes large areas of the CAONB. This is a significant asset for the area... accordingly no preferred sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the CAONB". In addition, government policy is to protect AONB. The preferred "Black Route" of the Northern Bypass would dissect the Chilterns AONB running along the picturesque and historic village of Lilley. To claim that this policy is being adhered to because no houses are being built in the AONB, only the 4 lane highway, is completely false.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The route for the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
2211	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 12.2	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the content of paragraphs 12.1 and 12.2 which explains the national importance of the Chilterns AONB. However, Natural England suggests that they should go further and explain that, under s85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, local authorities have a duty to "have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty". Furthermore, under s84 of the Act, local authorities have powers to take all such action as appears to them expedient for the accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. It is right that no preferred sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the Chilterns AONB (final sentence of paragraph 12.2). However, we are very concerned that no reference is made in this context to the preferred alignment for the proposed Luton Northern Bypass.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Chapters in the Core Strategy are being redrafted and omissions will be corrected.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: A report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported that the alignment of this route as subject to refinements on the evidence base.</p>				
1993	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 12.2	No
<p>Comment: The A505 forms an arbitrary southern boundary to the Chilterns AONB and so the Preferred Options site adjoins the AONB. Indeed Lilley Bottom to the south of the A505 is a continuation of a dry valley within the AONB. The quality of the landscape within the Preferred Options site is at least on a par with that within the AONB. Whilst it does not benefit from the national designation, it fully deserves to and this reason alone justifies the strongest objections being lodged to the development being advocated by the JC.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the East of Luton is located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement, conservation and maintenance of the environment and Chilterns AONB.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1795	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 12.2	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC acknowledges the observation at paragraph 12.2 of the Preferred Options document that no preferred sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the Chilterns AONB. Paragraph 12.9 indicates that the quality/attractiveness of the countryside and landscape in the Luton area has been the key consideration in the identification of the location of the preferred urban extensions. The Joint Committee has noted that "by avoiding the development of urban extensions in the AONB and limiting development in other sensitive areas of landscape, the impact of development on valuable landscape areas has been minimised."</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
3722	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Para. 12.2	No
<p>Comment: The preferred Black Route of the northern bypass, which supports and is linked with the EoL scheme, dissects the CAONB. The claim that 4-lane highway (even with cut and cover tunnels) does not impact on this outstanding area is entirely ridiculous. The widespread support for the Black Route simply reflects the greater number of respondents living around the "inner route" who voted to have the bypass as far away as possible. It cannot be interpreted as a vote in favour of the desecration of the AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The route for the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
1482	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Para. 12.3	No
<p>Comment: So why are you encroaching this development into Hertfordshire?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the East of Luton is located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement, conservation and maintenance of the environment and Chilterns AONB.</p>				
300	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 12.3	No
<p>Comment: So, don't build on North Herts countryside which is of exceptional beauty and contains many tranquil communities and quiet walks and roadways used as amenities,</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the East of Luton is located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement, conservation and maintenance of the environment and Chilterns AONB.</p>				
2260	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 12.4	No
<p>Comment: The County Council is aware that the North Hertfordshire District Council response to the POCD will be accompanied by a critique (by The Landscape Partnership) of how landscape/environmental sensitivity study technical work has been carried out and the extent to which it has properly informed decisions. The Report finds a series of shortcomings in the ESS carried out by Bedfordshire County Council and the supplementary study subsequently prepared by LUC looking at land outside of Bedfordshire and the Site Assessment Matrix. The County Council supports these conclusions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 undertook an assessment using the methodology undertaken to assess the potential urban extensions within South Bedfordshire. The Joint Committee considers that this report provides a sufficient assessment on environmental sensitivity.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1244	Impala Limited	Wallingford	Para. 12.4	No
<p>Comment: My clients note that this states that the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment of the Growth Area identified the least and most sensitive areas of the countryside to development. However it fails to mention that the ESA was not a comprehensive analysis of the entire countryside around the conurbation. There were parts of the countryside excluded, for example land to the west of the A5 to the immediate south of Dunstable whilst land to the east was included although other sites within the Green Belt were included. In our view therefore the evidence base is incomplete without full consideration of the Beech Road site.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertook an assessment of the 13 potential areas identified in the Core Strategy Issues and Options Document.</p>				
2212	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 12.4	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the inclusion of references within paragraphs 12.4-6 to the conclusions and recommendations of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment of the Growth Area report and look to see these addressed in forthcoming masterplanning exercises.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
680	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 12.4	No
<p>Comment: These studies showed that the area to the east of Luton was particularly sensitive, yet it has still been identified as a preferred option</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the East of Luton is located in greenbelt land however the assessments undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement, conservation and maintenance of the environment and Chilterns AONB.</p>				
2213	Natural England	Peterborough	Para. 12.5	Yes
<p>Comment: We welcome the inclusion of references within paragraphs 12.4-6 to the conclusions and recommendations of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment of the Growth Area report and look to see these addressed in forthcoming masterplanning exercises.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1052	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.6	No
<p>Comment: This lovely countryside to the east of Leighton Buzzard has panoramic views along Vandyke Road across fields and ridges supporting wild animals, sheep and cattle; and the 'Lion' at Whipsnade can be viewed on clear days when travelling along the Leighton Buzzard Narrow Gauge Railway (LBNGR). The LBNGR is the major tourist attraction for Leighton Buzzard, and to loose the 'open countryside' aspect to this lovely railway if the developers get their way just can't happen . The Green Belt was put there to preserve these lovely views; keep land permanently open or undeveloped.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the East of Leighton Linlade is located in greenbelt land and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
428	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.6	Yes
<p>Comment: I agree wholeheartedly with the observations regarding the sensitivity of the land to the east of Leighton-Linslade to impact on the landscape. This is a very strong reason for reconsidering the preferred eastward extension of the town.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
2717	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Para. 12.6	No
<p>Comment: There is no evidence that the AONB north of Luton and Houghton Regis is less sensitive than elsewhere and 'mitigation' is all that is needed to preserve the landscape quality. Any development adjacent to and AONB is, by law, required to be treated as if it were within the AONB. Development, if at all, must conserve and enhance the AONB. Mere reduction of the impact is not enough. Justification of allowing damaging development to the AONB around Sundon and east of Luton is likely to be used by developers in the future for building in and around the AONB adjacent to Harlington.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land and not in AONB. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment and Chilterns AONB.</p>				
1304	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.6	Yes
<p>Comment: The recognition of the value of the countryside to the east of Leighton-Linslade is welcomed, as are the requirements for any development in the area to mitigate potential negative effects. The future survival of the Leighton Buzzard Railway depends on these provisions being enforced.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1794	Pegasus Planning Group	Cambridge	Para. 12.6	Yes
<p>Comment: NLC endorses the observation at paragraph 12.6 of the Preferred Options document that the evidence base shows that the land to the north of the Luton, Dunstable and Houghton Regis conurbation is the least sensitive in terms of impact upon the character and quality of the existing landscape. The assessments already undertaken by NLC support the observation that new development can be accommodated to the north of Luton, between the M1 and the A6, without having an adverse impact upon the perception of present landscape character/quality. The achievement of a sustainable urban extension, within the parameters anticipated at paragraph 6.17 of the Preferred Options document, can arise as appropriate mitigation can be brought forward to protect the amenity of the general area to the north of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
693	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: This is explicitly not the case and the environmental report advised against development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
20	Mr Kamal Bengougam	Lilley Bottom	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: this is a destruction of AONB when the West of Luton has pylons. this is shameful and should be scrapped.</p> <p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
266	Cottrell	Luton	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: I don't see how the scale of housing (5,000) plus can co-exist successfully with this aim of rural character and existing settlement edge, as the current conurbations here are very small.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape in the Growth Area is preserved, enhanced and conserved by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
1708	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: We consider the assertion in the ESA that, east of Luton, 'development would be appropriate provided that sufficient mitigation measures were implemented' to be totally without credibility, given that housing development would not only engulf existing settlements but would also entail a Luton Eastern Bypass intruding into the beauty and tranquillity of the Lilley Valley. No amount of 'mitigation' can possibly offset this kind of damage. We take this opportunity to re-state that we are absolutely opposed to any development in the east of Luton area.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 considered that development would be appropriate provided sufficient mitigation measures would be implemented. These mitigation measures would lessen the impact of this development on the landscape.</p>				
1727	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: This description does no justice to the area. What measures could be taken that would adequately mitigate the impact of the proposed development and bypass on the landscape and biodiversity of the east of Luton? How can such large-scale development protect existing natural features? Providing green infrastructure (as defined in chapter 11) cannot compensate for the loss of high quality landscape and biodiversity. The Sustainability Appraisal's view is that the greatest levels of incompatibility are in respect to the natural environment. This is particularly true of the east of Luton area. The JC is not doing enough to provide sufficient protection for areas of high local landscape value that lie outside of nationally designated areas (contradicting PPS7). East of Luton (Lilley Bottom valley in particular) acts as a green lung and recreational area for the people of Luton and so the authorities should secure environmental benefits and maximise the range of beneficial uses for it, in-line with PPS7.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: More reference will be made to the protection of key areas in the preferred urban extensions and linkages with Green Infrastructure.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
130	Mr Eastwood	Hitchin	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: How on earth can building on Green Belt land and destroying villages "respect the distinctive landscape and topography, be well related to the existing settlement edge and ensure the protection of existing natural features" ??? A truly mendacious statement indeed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape in the Growth Area is preserved, enhanced and conserved by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
2562	Holwell Parish Council	Hitchin	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: You cannot hope to preserve and protect the distinctive landscape character with the scale of development envisaged.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape in the Growth Area is preserved, enhanced and conserved by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
910	Mr Anthony Moss	Luton	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: It is obvious that development to the north of the conurbation is the least sensitive in terms of impact on the landscape. However, the area to the east of Luton is exactly the opposite. The impact of thousands of houses could not be mitigated at all. The result would be the destruction of a distinctive rural environment. This area is a huge asset to people in the area and to the people of east Luton. Proposed mitigation measure would be completely nonsensical and ineffective. There are quite clearly no sufficient mitigation measures in this case.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
3685	Alan	Luton	Para. 12.7	Yes
<p>Comment: The Supplementary Environmental Sensitivity Report (Dec 2008) considers the area east of Luton as not appropriate for development (area L1), though some small scale development may be appropriate (area L). Whilst limited and sensitive development within area L may be appropriate if there is genuine and proven need, the development proposals for the east of Luton could not be considered 'small scale' or appropriate. The main Environmental Sensitivity Assessment states under section 1.5 that the total area out forward for development is in excess of what is required, without the inclusion of land in adjacent counties or village expansion areas. The land proposed by the second stage study may allow for the reduced use, or even the removal, of outlying areas identified within the initial report.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are located in greenbelt land and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1990	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton is extremely high quality landscape, amongst the best in Hertfordshire. The existing boundary of Luton is well located in relation to landform and the town is largely invisible from the east until one enters the built-up area. This applies both on the approach along the A505 and on the narrow country lanes. The transition between town and country is sharp. There is little or no urban fringe problem. The existing urban edge is good. NHDC does not disagree with the conclusions of Land Use Consultants regarding the plateau area. There is scope for small-scale development provided that landscape mitigation measures are also undertaken. The character of this area means that development on the scale proposed is inappropriate and unacceptable. NHDC does not disagree with the conclusions of Land Use Consultants regarding Lilley Bottom. It is tranquil, of considerable interest and of high quality. It is inappropriate to locate any development here.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development.</p>				
3941	Ruth Ryden	Lilley	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: This relates only to a very small part of the area east of Luton (area L) although no reference is made to this, implying that the recommendation covers the full area (L and L1).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development.</p>				
301	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: The building of 4,500 houses east of Luton would obliterate these communities. Talk of mitigation is farcical. The whole beauty of the countryside there and the communities is their relative isolation and tranquility.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape, including the historic environment, in the Growth Area is preserved, enhanced and conserved by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
2574	Mrs JEA Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: Conclusion that development would be appropriate provided that sufficient mitigation measures were implemented is in direct contradiction to the conclusion of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment which concluded that significant constraints and high sensitivity of the landscape means development is not considered appropriate.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1109	Dr Roger Wood	Breachwood Green	Para. 12.7	No
<p>Comment: The conclusion that "development would be appropriate provided that sufficient mitigation measures were implemented" appears to be in direct contradiction to the conclusion of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment prepared by Land Use Consultants (December 2008) which concludes: "There are significant constraints such that it is not considered appropriate for development to take place" and "Given the high sensitivity of this landscape development is not recommended".</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environment Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 assessed the area to the east of Luton. Area L1 comprised to area for development and was assessed as being appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, a wider area surrounding Area L and where no development is proposed was assessed as not being appropriate for development.</p>				
836	Mr Eastwood	Hitchin	Para. 12.8	No
<p>Comment: "it was found that development would be appropriate provided that sufficient mitigation measures were implemented" Really? The best mitigation measure to retaining a distinctive character is not to build on it.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
1713	CPRE Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.9	No
<p>Comment: Preferred Option CS15 is profoundly unsatisfactory. Of the 3 bull points listed, the first two are fundamentally inconsistent, in that one talks of 'protection', conservation and enhancement" and the other talks of 'mitigation to reduce impact'. As for the third, this talks of protecting, conserving and enhancing the Chilterns AONB, whilst everywhere the Strategy promotes a dual-carriageway bypass straight through it. If the Joint Committee is serious about protection of the countryside, it needs to address the fundamental inconsistencies and inadequacies in its Preferred Option on the subject as presently drafted.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The route for the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
3509	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 12.9	No
<p>Comment: Cannot believe Core Strategy is seriously suggesting that the quality and attractiveness of other locations is superior to that of proposed East of Luton development site.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3325	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Para. 12.9	
<p>Comment: L&amp;G challenged the Landscape Assessment undertaken by Allen Pike associates in their representations to the consultation in relation to this document in June 2007. The L&amp;G land is within an area which is degraded by adjacent highways and electricity network infrastructure and visually well contained by surrounding topography and vegetation, where there is capacity to integrate appropriate development in accordance with local needs and the character guidelines. The core strategy should therefore recognise that the L&amp;G land south of junction 10/1A is appropriate for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In determining the preferred locations for growth, a number of assessments and studies were undertaken to seek the most sustainable location. The Landscape Assessment is one such type of assessment.</p>				
1451	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 12.9	No
<p>Comment: The Council's Environmental Sensitivity Assessment 2008 (April 2008 as updated December 2008) does not consider the area of land allocated for development in Local Plan Policy SA1.</p>				
<p>CS10 proposes to continue to safeguard the land for development for a stadium for Luton Town Football Club. We make clear our client's position in respect of the development of this site through our objections to policies CS9 and CS10. However, there is an implied acceptance of the principle of development and that the design can have regard to the impact to open countryside beyond.</p>				
<p>The design of any development will be carefully considered and a full Landscape Visual Impact Assessment would be prepared to ensure the relationship of any proposed development has regard to potential impact on the landscape beyond. Given the nature of the site and the impact of the surrounding road infrastructure, it is considered that sensitive development of this site would not give rise to any insurmountable landscape objections.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Report undertook an assessment of the landscape, biodiversity and archaeology for the preferred urban extensions. Other studies and assessments, such as the Sustainability Appraisal and Transport Assessments, have also guided the allocation of these areas for development.</p>				
682	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 12.9	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development east of Luton is in no way being safeguarded by the proposals and the Chiltern AONB is being compromised</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
694	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: The current strategy absolutely fails to do this and instead proposes close to uncontrolled (and certainly undetailed) development in an AONB and in the grade 1 land of Lilley Bottom. Again I note that the emphasis is on preserving Luton and southern Bedfordshire so development in NHDC is OK on that basis.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2035	Melanie Barry	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Luton has few areas of recreation which are accessible to all and allow recreation and relaxation in the countryside. One such area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)- Warden and Galley Hills (Chilterns) on the North East boundary of Luton which is also an SSI site. I object to the Spatial planning Strategy of building thousands of homes outside the current boundaries of Luton town. I strongly object to this proposal. I object to the South Beds authority claiming the moral high ground in respect of preserving the countryside while actively seeking to decimate the countryside on the outskirts of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
2028	Noel Barry	Not Known	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: The new plan for roads and housing would cut through country side which is designated as an area of outstanding natural beauty-warden and galley hills. The added volume of traffic directed through this area would make driving in north Luton nearly impossible The</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment. The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
1150	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: This is strongly supported.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1710	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
2315	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Support this intention, however concerned about belief that appropriate development in the countryside is the only alternative to inappropriate development. Any development permanently destroys countryside. Also concerned about belief that rural village landscapes can be 'improved' by manicuring the natural environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape, including the historic environment, in the Growth Area is preserved, enhanced and conserved by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2169	Breachwood Green Society	Breachwood Green	Q. 17	No
Comment: The Environmental Sensitivity Report does not apply to land in North Herts				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Environment Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 does include an assessment of land to the East of Luton.				
2044	Mrs Dorothy Brinklow	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	No
Comment: The countryside is part of our heritage and should be protected for future generations not decimated by housing proposals.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.				
2675	Caddington, Hyde and Slip End Parish Councils	Slip End	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: A strategy of consolidating development on the northern edge of the conurbation would offer the best means of protecting the character of the landscape generally (especially CAONB) and the character of existing settlements in the countryside.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
1957	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS. Provide more detail about how the aspirations will be achieved. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The details of implementing the aspiration in particular with this section will be covered in greater detail in master planning work for the preferred urban extensions.				
JC Reason for Response: It is important that the policy objectives of the Core Strategy can be delivered to protect, enhance and conserve the countryside.				
1830	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: The board is disappointed that the issue of preserving and enhancing the countryside and heritage is relegated to the end of the Strategy. AONBs are recognised as having the HIGHEST quality landscape and are protected at national level. The protection afforded to the AONB through CS15 is supported and welcomed but it appears to conflict with other policies in the Strategy that seek major developments in the AONB and its setting (bypass routes and urban extensions). The Council should consistently refer to the need to 'conserve and enhance the beauty' of the AONB and its setting in order to comply with the legislation mentioned above and the final bullet points of CS15 and paragraph 12.10 should be amended accordingly.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the east of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment. The route for the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on proposed alignment would be required on refining the evidence base.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
861	Mr Paul Cooper	Hitchin	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposals do well to underpin an objective to protect, conserve and enhance countryside and heritage. These proposals will sit far more comfortably with the plan as a whole when certain other aspects such as a bypass through an AONB and massive building on greenbelt in North Herts have been removed.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment. The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
222	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Clever aren't you. When it comes to talking about protecting the countryside, you only mention about Bedfordshire. There is no mention of the countryside East of Luton which is of very high quality. So whilst I obviously support proposals to protect the countryside, I would like you to note that I find this question VERY BIASED. Why don't you want to protect the countryside East of Luton. Why do you only mention Bedfordshire at this point?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in the emerging Core Strategy for North Hertfordshire will cover the conservation and enhancement of the countryside and landscape, similar to the preferred option policies in section 12 of the Core Strategy: Preferred Option for Luton and southern Bedfordshire.</p>				
268	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1728	CPRE Hertfordshire	Hertfordshire	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: We support the first and third bullet points. We support the second bullet point but do not believe that it is possible to deliver appropriate mitigation for the impact on the countryside caused by the proposed east of Luton urban extension.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Mitigation measures for the proposed East of Luton urban extension will be investigated in the master planning work and will be required in line with the policies in the Core Strategy to mitigate against any impact on the countryside.</p>				
1528	Mr Colin Davies	Hitchin	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposed expansion into North Herts is not in accord with this.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although is located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1396	Councillor Jenny Davies	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Because the entire plan is designed to destroy a huge swathe of beautiful countryside this in now way protects, conserves or enhances our countryside and heritage. Only a fool or a hypocrite would claim that it does.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape, including the historic environment, in the Growth Area is preserved, enhanced and conserved by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
3297	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: PNNH support objective to protect and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape and consider that development should be directed to suitable locations which do not contain nationally designated sites to protect them from development. PNNH are concerned that the choice of route of the Luton Northern Bypass passes through AONB and thereby directly contradicts this policy objective. Summary - the consultee highlights concerns about the constraints to development to the East of Luton that the Environmental Sensitivity Study highlights as well as constraints in other locations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The route for the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
1657	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Are landscape, wildlife, woodland and geological conservation addressed?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Landscape, wildlife and geological conservation is addressed in section 12.</p>				
1658	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Are landscape, wildlife, woodland and geological conservation addressed?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Landscape, wildlife and geological conservation is addressed in section 12.</p>				
2797	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: We must preserve this area for future generations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
3756	Mr Ralph Ford	Cockernhoe	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: It was disturbing to note that the recommendations put forward by the environmental sensitivity consultants were disregarded and not referred to in the consultation Summary Document.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1054	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: We must protect and conserve as much of our lovely countryside for future generations to enjoy.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
429	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: Leighton Buzzard does not have a good record of conserving its heritage; the Narrow Gauge Railway, a significant piece of Leighton's history as an industrial town, remains under threat from the proposed Eastward development of the town. Measures must be taken to safeguard this and other key heritage features if the unsustainable Eastwards Extension of the town is allowed to proceed.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Masterplanning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
882	Mr Richard Halse	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: But in addition existing developments should be screened from new developments to preserve quality of views. Buffers of green space should be provided.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Key views into the countryside will be sought to be protected through master planning work of the preferred urban extensions.				
JC Reason for Response: Key views into the countryside will be sought to be protected through master planning work of the preferred urban extensions.				
2718	Harlington Parish Council	Harlington	Q. 17	No
Comment: Neither Greenbelt 'openness' or the uniqueness and attractiveness of the AONB can be kept if significantly large urban extensions are built in and around them.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.				
791	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	No
Comment: I think the proposals for development in the eastern area of Leighton Buzzard would have a detrimental effect on the countryside and wildlife, and I would rather the countryside was left as it is within the area of outstanding natural beauty.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.				
2856	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: The village has already suffered significant impacts for many years as a result of quarrying. It is essential that any restored quarries and those that will be restored in due time are not taken out of their Green Belt classification to become brown field sites with the potential for development. This would be a major threat to the rural character of the village as it is today.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The village of Heath and Reach has not been identified in CS6 as a village to meet the housing requirements. Green infrastructure is an important component in the provision of sustainable communities and thus opportunities to enhance green infrastructure will be sought thus there could be potential for these sites to be used for GI.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2123	Hertfordshire County Council	St. Ippolyts	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: In my capacity as County Councillor for Hitchin Rural (covering all the areas for your 'proposed' building of 5500 dwellings), I object in the strongest possible terms. Hertfordshire has enough problems fulfilling it's own quota of houses without other authorities adding to this. I support the arguments of both Lilley Parish Council and Kings Walden Parish Council. I can't state enough, that most of the area concerned is Grade 1, the highest level of natural beauty.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development.</p>				
2440	Hitchin & Harpenden Liberal Democrats	Welwyn Garden City	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: On the technical side our main objections boil down to these: · The impact on the landscape value seems to have been grossly under-represented in the documents relative to the conclusions of your consultants. It is quite clear that the impact of the 5500 to 7000 houses will be impossible to "mitigate" and will be a blight on present and future populations in the area. Development in this area will destroy Green Belt land much of which is classified as Landscape Grade 1. · There are very serious concerns regarding groundwater and aquifer recharge that may well be sufficient to prevent any development going ahead in this area. · There is a complete lack of environmental impact assessment in respect of the transport infrastructure proposals required for this development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				
1027	Mr Andrew Hull	Stevenage	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Were you blind when you viewed the countryside to the east and the surrounding vicinity. Did you even bother to get out of your vehicle and actually do a proper survey and conduct an impact statement. The heading at the start of this chapter states 'Preserving and Enhancing our Countryside and Heritage'. The only preserving of this countryside will be the destroying of a landscape that has stood the test of time to be obliterated from the face of the planet by an indefinite occupation of brick, concrete and steel. History can not be brought back. The greenbelt was meant to protect the countryside for all generation, to control and buffer the expansion of towns, but when will the cancerous growth of Luton across the Hertfordshire border stop. It wont it will just keep going. Then there will be no landscape to preserve.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2032	Melanie Jarra	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Luton has few areas of recreation which are accessible to all and allow recreation and relaxation in the countryside. One such area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)- Warden and Galley Hills (Chilterns) on the North East boundary of Luton which is also an SSI site. I object strongly to any transport or housing development in this area which should be preserved for the residents of Luton to enjoy. I object to the Spatial planning Strategy of building thousands of homes outside the current boundaries of Luton town. The suggested infrastructure planned will be of no benefit to current residents and will make traffic problems in the Luton area worse as the plans will take traffic form the A505, A5 and M1 and direct this through North East Luton. I strongly object to this proposal. I object to the South Beds authority claiming the moral high ground in respect of preserving the countryside while actively seeking to decimate the countryside on the outskirts of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
2039	Liam Jarra	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Luton has few areas of recreation which are accessible to all and allow recreation and relaxation in the countryside. One such area is designated as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)- Warden and Galley Hills (Chilterns) on the North East boundary of Luton which is also an SSI site. I object to the Spatial planning Strategy of building thousands of homes outside the current boundaries of Luton town. I object to the South Beds authority claiming the moral high ground in respect of preserving the countryside while actively seeking to decimate the countryside on the outskirts of Luton.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
313	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Some loss may be necessary in order to remove the side-effects of congestion</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The policies in the Core Strategy aim to ensure that development will enhance, preserve and maintain the countryside and landscape and linked with policies in section 11 aim to increase the amount of green infrastructure.</p>				
711	Mr David Kateley	Breachwood Green	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: I completely support. It is most important that the Core Strategy should contain policies to protect, conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape and the Chilterns AONB in particular.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1835	Keep East Of Luton Green	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: The "Environmental Sensitivity" and "Preserving and Enhancing the Countryside our Heritage" makes reference to paragraph 12.7 on page 89 of the Core Strategy contradicts the Evidence studies (stating that it is grade 1 which is inappropriate for development or grade 2 which can only allow for small scale development under mitigating circumstances). The 2 parts of the Environmental Sensitivity Assessments are not comparable as were produced by different consultants with different methodologies. They do not appear to be available as part of the consultation or take some development, the East of Luton Bypass or A505 Park and Ride Scheme into account.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment December 2008 comprises a supplementary report drafted by consultants who used the same methodology used by Bedfordshire County Council. The supplementary report did include an assessment of the areas that lie outside of Luton and southern Bedfordshire. These reports were available as part of the consultation.</p>				
416	Mr Julian Keogh	Hitchin	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: I should think that would be blindingly obvious. Why on earth would anyone not want to protect, conserve and enhance the local countryside and heritage.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1896	Kirkby and Diamond	Central Milton Keynes	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: We support the objective to protect, conserve and enhance the quality and character of the countryside and landscape and are that areas of landscape value and areas which contain nationally designated should be protected from new development with development directed to other suitable locations. We are however concerned that the choice of the preferred route for the Northern Bypass which passes through the AONB directly contradicts this objective and policy on such nationally designated areas. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment reveals evidence about the sensitivity of the urban extensions (see attached) which suggests that the selection of the Urban Extensions is therefore open to question in terms of Protection that the proposed Urban Extension to the east of Luton is located in a landscape identified as having a strong and distinctive character and forming a rural context to the villages east of Luton with a strong wooded setting to the eastern edge of Luton and the setting of the Lilley Valley.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The ESA Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1. The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
1305	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: There is no specific mention of heritage other than the landscape itself.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS16 deals with the promotion, preservation and enhancement of the rich historic environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1996	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Such plans are vital to sustainability, but proposals in this strategy show a blatant disregard for countryside and heritage. A bypass is proposed across nationally protected AONB, skirting a SSSI and damaging woodlands; another road is an option through Houghton Regis Quarry CWS skirting the SSSI. There is much heritage value East of Luton where a monstrous degree of development is proposed. C15 is saying one thing (protect countryside and landscape), the preferred options would have a totally different effect.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
2093	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: RECOMMENDATION(S) 1. Executive is recommended to approve the proposed response to the consultation by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: Preferred Options as set out at Appendix A to this report. The Council recognises the importance of countryside and heritage to the quality of life for existing and future residents, and to provide attractive environments for business.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1936	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS. Provide more detail about how the aspirations will be achieved. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The details of implementing the aspiration in particular with this section will be covered in greater detail in master planning work for the preferred urban extensions.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is important that the policy objectives of the Core Strategy can be delivered to protect, enhance and conserve the countryside.</p>				
2208	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Welcome the content of paragraphs 12.1 and 12.2 which explains the national importance of the Chilterns AONB, however suggests that they should go further and explain s84 and s85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. It is right that no preferred sustainable urban extensions are proposed in the Chilterns AONB. However, concerned that no reference is made in this context to the preferred alignment for the proposed Luton Northern Bypass. Welcome the inclusion of references.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Chapters in the Core Strategy are being redrafted and omissions will be corrected.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: A report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported that the alignment of this route as subject to refinements on the evidence base.</p>				
1484	Mrs Janice Neal	Cockernhoe	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: It is so VERY important that the Core Strategy contains policies to protect, conserve and enhance the Chiltern AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS15 makes special reference to the protection, conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
503	Dr John Noble	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: This is the wrong question. The proposals do not in any way shape or form protect, conserve or enhance our countryside or heritage. To pretend that they do is disingenuous and wilfully misleading. There is no mitigation for urban expansion into the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1840	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: The quality of the environment east of Luton has not been given due weight in the assessment process. Its loss to development would be disastrous. Lilley Bottom is one of the most attractive stretches of countryside within Hertfordshire and is on a par with adjoining land north of the A505 which has been designated part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Selection of this site is contrary to the recommendation of the JC's own consultants, who state that "it is not considered appropriate for development to take place". Even the plateau area between Lilley Bottom and Luton is said to be "one where some small scale development may be appropriate provided sufficient mitigation is implemented." 5,500 new dwellings, an employment area and new bypasses are not small in scale. The methodology applied to the assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity is also faulty, in that it does not provide a true indication of the relative differences in quality between the various options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				
1907	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: The quality of the environment east of Luton has not been given due weight in the assessment process. Its loss to development would be disastrous. Lilley Bottom is one of the most attractive stretches of countryside within Hertfordshire and is easily on par with adjoining land to the north of the A505 which is part of the CAONB. Selection of this site is contrary to the recommendation of the consultants, who state that "it is not considered appropriate for development to take place" in Lilley Bottom. Even site L (the plateau area between Lilley Bottom and Luton) is said to be "one where some small scale development may be appropriate provided sufficient mitigation is implemented." 5,500 new dwellings, an employment area and new bypasses are by no stretch of the imagination small in scale. The methodology applied to the assessment of landscape sensitivity and capacity is also faulty, in that it does not provide a true indication of the relative differences in quality between the various options.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				
1989	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: There is no clear correlation between the units of assessment and the existing landscape character areas in either the Bedfordshire or the Chalk Arc LCA. The units in the ESA are generally larger and have questionable boundaries. No reference to the main national guidance, Topic Paper 6. The large units assessed hides internal differences in sensitivity. The grading of sites has been carried out on a scale of 1 to 4, although there are no grade 4s. No justification of how these conclusions have been reached, nor consideration of the sensitivity of each site to different scales of development. The methodology is simplistic. Inconsistencies between the conclusions in the ESA and the LCAs previously undertaken, and lack of transparency in how the conclusions in the ESA were reached. More work should be done on this aspect before the next stage of the Core Strategy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree      Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environment Sensitivity Assessment December was initially undertaken by Bedfordshire County Council and the supplementary report was undertaken by consultants who employed the same methodology for assessment. Ongoing studies and assessments will feed into the assessments of the sites in addition to the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3733	H Osborne	Great Offley	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Around Offley, we frequently see hares, deer, red kites and bats and many Stopsley and Luton residents make use of the Hertfordshire countryside for weekend leisure. The countryside itself is also prime agricultural land providing for our communities' well being. All of this will be lost or put at threat by any development east of Luton, which will be disproportionately expensive because of its need for additional roads.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in section 12 seek to ensure that the countryside and landscape in the Growth Area is enhanced, conserved and maintained by ensuring that development includes appropriate mitigation measures to reduce its impact in the countryside and to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
2074	Preston Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Hertfordshire is already one of the most crowded/over-populated counties in the south east, especially in the Luton to Stevenage to Hitchin, Letchworth and Baldock conurbations, the remaining countryside is needed by existing residents. Precious Countryside and farming Land must not be lost through these plans. If the expansion of Luton is essential, there are other areas around Luton and Bedfordshire where expansion can occur at less cost to overall quality of lives.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Based on ongoing assessments and studies undertaken by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee, four preferred locations were identified to accommodate sustainable urban extensions in terms of impact on the landscape and environment, flooding and access to name a few.</p>				
61	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: What is there to disagree with, that is unless you are a developer.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
2203	Andrew	Lilley	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Proposed East of Luton development conflicts with Preferred Option CS15 Country and Landscape to conserve Chilterns AONB. Also against Government policy on development in AONB</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension to the east of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land and the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
2180	Derek Rogers	Harpenden	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: The proposed East of Luton development contradicts Preferred Option CS15 Country and Landscape</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extensions are not located in the Chilterns AONB although are located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3942	Ruth Ryden	Lilley	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: The landscape Sensitivity Assessment concluded that development east of Luton is not recommended and it is inappropriate for development to take place. Why are you planning to go against the recommendations of your own advisors? The Landscape Sensitivity Report also states that it forms the continuation of a dry valley contained within the CAONB. As the A505 is considered an arbitrary boundary, should this land not be treated in the same way as an AONB?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				
3326	Savills on behalf of Legal and General Assurance Society		Q. 17	
<p>Comment: L&amp;G challenged the Landscape Assessment undertaken by Allen Pike Associates in their representations to the consultation in relation to this document in June 2007. The L&amp;G land is within an area which is degraded by adjacent highways and electricity network infrastructure and visually well contained by surrounding topography and vegetation, where there is capacity to integrate appropriate development in accordance with local needs and the character guidelines. The core strategy should therefore recognise that the L&amp;G land south of junction 10/1A is appropriate for development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: In determining the preferred locations for growth, a number of assessments and studies were undertaken to seek the most sustainable location. The Landscape Assessment is one such type of assessment.</p>				
302	Mr Toby Shelley	Hitchin	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: The mitigation proposals are a fig leaf for wholesale destruction that will lead to greater and greater encroachment on the remaining countryside of the region.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.</p>				
1540	South Bedfordshire Friends of the Earth	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: The AONB should be protected and not have the Luton northern bypass built through it</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
2449	St Ippolyts Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: No. The Parish Council of St Ippolyts does not support your proposals. We do support the conservation and enhancement of our countryside and heritage but your proposals directly contradict these principals through the proposed Eastern extension of Luton into North Hertfordshire - destroying several villages in North Hertfordshire and the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although is located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies will aim to ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2447	St Ippolyts Parish Council	Hitchin	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Objects to the proposed east of Luton extension as not supported by the evidence provided; land is designated Green Belt and forms the natural eastern boundary of Luton; development would engulf hamlets/villages. Objects to proposed alignment of the Luton northern bypass as it passes through the AONB conflicting with Policy CS15; considers the consultation undertaken was flawed; queries cost and funding for this route.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment. The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
3771	St Paul's Walden Estate Company	Hitchin	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Development to the east of Luton is harmful to the attractive setting that we have sought to maintain for many years. The impression of open country will be lost and the distance between the Stevenage and Luton extensions will be only 4.5 miles. Many people come to this area to walk and enjoy the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although is located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies will aim to ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				
2118	Streatley Parish Council	Luton	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Despite public opposition, the Proposed route of the by-pass cuts through environmentally sensitive land and has antagonised various environmental groups. The Northern Bypass will Have detrimental effects on the Galley and Warden Hills SSSIs, despite any m</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required.</p>				
2132	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: East of Luton urban extension in this highly sensitive landscape area would be very damaging to the natural and historic environment and should not be considered further. Mitigation measures are not possible.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 advised that area L, a level 2 grade, where the east of Luton urban extension is proposed, was appropriate for development provided sufficient mitigation measures were implemented. Area L1, the area surrounding area L, was assessed to be inappropriate for development and graded as Level 1.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2068	Thorn Farm	Thorn	Q. 17	No
<p>Comment: Concerns about the ESA's conclusion on archaeological, landscape and historic landscape sensitivity to the north of Thorn Road. Detailed on-site assessment could redress this view switching the general sweeping classification of highly sensitive to more limited pockets requiring specific mitigation. As part of the masterplanning, proposals will seek to protect and preserve such features. Biodiversity: on site survey work will provide a detailed assessment of habitats and protected species present on the site and appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures. The delivery of the A5/M1 link road is expected to significantly reduce congestion benefiting this sites' ability to provide employment land through anew link with the major transport infrastructure network. The promotion of the Guided Busway would enhance its sustainability in transport terms.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment provided an assessment into the landscape, biodiversity and archaeology features of the preferred urban extensions. It is considered that the master planning work will provide more detail with regards to mitigation measures to implement the policies of the Core Strategy to protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p>				
1345	Mrs Gloria Twells	LUTON	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Our countryside is precious and should be protected from any form of road, house or business building development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
2021	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
814	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: But this can not be achieved by house building and road building.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.</p>				
785	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 17	Yes
<p>Comment: Which is why extending urban areas, especially east of Luton, is not a realistic option.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although is located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies in the Core Strategy will ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
786	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 17	No
Comment: The countryside can be protected by NOT BUILDING ON IT!!!				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.				
1022	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: We are but custodians of the countryside: we must preserve for forthcoming generations.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
3036	David Gibson Wheatley	Cokernhoe	Q. 17	Yes
Comment: Support. It is most important that the Core Strategy should contain policies to protect, conserve and enhance the countryside and landscape and Chilterns AONB in particular.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
102	Mr Steve White	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 17	No
Comment: I support the protection and conservation of our countryside, which is why I cannot support any more development in this part of England. Anyway, Mother Nature does not need, and has never needed man's help to "enhance it"				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.				
683	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 17	No
Comment: The proposals are correct in principle. The practice of what is being proposed is, however, entirely missing the need to protect even the Chilterns AONB				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: No urban extensions proposed are located in the Chilterns AONB and policies in the emerging Core Strategy seek to protect, conserve and enhance the Chilterns AONB.				
1831	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Para. 12.10	Yes
Comment: Board welcomes JC's commitment, on behalf of the constituent local authorities, to the continued funding and support of the Conservation Board.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2664	Mr Bartels	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The narrow gauge railway, which is the only attraction that brings visitors to the town, appears to be of no relevance in your document; and it should be adequately protected with prevention of any house construction that is likely to obscure the remaining 30% of the line that offers open views across the countryside.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
2609	Mr Christopher Bartlett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: I understand that there are plans to develop all along Van Dyke Road, which will affect the light railway, which in the summer months brings visitors to the town. The loss of that is again a loss of local history, it played a big part in the town for many years and its loss would be a tragedy.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
3635	Mr Barry Brownell	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
3594	M J Carr	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The historic character of Leighton Buzzard has not been taken into account - in particular the effect development will have on the historic narrow gauge railway.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
1832	Chilterns AONB	Chinnor	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: Board objects to lack of core strategy policy concerned with design and use of materials. With such high levels of development expected, much of which would be close proximity to the Chilterns AONB and other high quality landscapes, there should be a policy that provides clear and string guidance on the design and appearance of new development. Such policy should address general sustainability materials as well and there should be reference to key, locally made, building materials. The policy should then be supplemented by appropriate design guides such as those produced for the Chilterns AONB.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Central Bedfordshire Council are currently drafting a Design Supplementary Planning Document which will deal with design and use of materials.</p>				
2583	Mrs Joan Costello	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: How would this development effect the narrow gauge railway? It is part of the town's valuable history.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2536	Martin Davey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The addition of so many houses will totally destroy the character of the town.				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policies in the Core Strategy seek to ensure that the historic environment of Luton and southern Bedfordshire is promoted, preserved and enhanced. The market character of the town centre is identified in section 8 and sought to be enhanced.				
2498	Mr Paul Dickens	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The proximity of the proposed eastern development of LB to the Hockliffe Conservation Area and the Scheduled Ancient Monument there has not been properly considered				
JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policies in the Core Strategy seek to ensure that the historic environment of Luton and southern Bedfordshire is promoted, preserved and enhanced.				
746	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 12.12	Yes
Comment: We welcome the discussion of heritage and townscape issues within this chapter, although paragraphs 12.12 to 12.21 give the impression that the historic environment is regarded as something purely related to designated assets and the built environment. It includes buried archaeology, formal and rural landscapes and undesignated features, and this needs better recognition within this section. The historic environment also forms an important part of the Countryside and Landscape Preferred Option CS15 and the supporting paragraphs 12.1 to 12.11.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Reference to the area's historic environment including archaeological sites will be strengthened in the Core Strategy.				
JC Reason for Response: The Preferred Options Policies do seek to protect and conserve Luton and southern Bedfordshire's historic environment.				
747	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: We disagree with the statement in paragraph 12.12 that the "preferred sustainable urban extensions are not likely to impact adversely and directly on much of the historic environment", as this regards the historic environment as designated features only. Whilst there are relatively few designated historic assets affected by the preferred urban extensions, there is a wealth of undesignated features as identified by the Environmental Sensitivity Assessment and other documents. There are some notable designated features affecting by the preferred urban extensions, including Dray's Ditches Scheduled Monument and Putteridge Bury Historic Park and Garden.				
JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: Reference to the area's historic environment including archaeological sites will be strengthened in the Core Strategy.				
JC Reason for Response: The Preferred Options Policies do seek to protect and conserve Luton and southern Bedfordshire's historic environment.				
3636	Mr Keith Fish	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2220	Mr Christopher Gravett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The preserved narrow gauge railway is likely to be ruined by the proposed development as other aspects of the town's heritage have been in the past				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2199	Ms Jayne Green	Eggington	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The historic character of Leighton Buzzard has not been taken into account - in particular the effect development will have on the historic narrow gauge railway.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
3540	Jon Green	Eggington	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The historic character of Leighton Buzzard has not been taken into account - in particular the effect development will have on the historic narrow gauge railway.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2390	Mr Sean Harvey	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: If houses are built along Vandyke Road, the setting of the narrow gauge railway will be ruined. The railway is an important piece of local and national heritage and attracts visitors to the area.				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
3640	Linda Holbrook	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2348	Mrs Jean Holmes	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	Yes
Comment: Leighton Buzzard is a pleasant market town and its heritage should be preserved including the narrow gauge railway				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
3633	Leighton-Linslade Opposes Unsustainable Development	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views				
JC Response: Agree				
Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2564	Mrs G Lopez	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: What will happen to the light railway? This is a major draw to the area. Are you really intending to destroy part of the history of this town?				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2611	Mr Robert McAlister	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: This town has built up a significant tourist industry around our national heritage narrow gauge railway. The proposal from developers will ruin this by removing what little is left of the view of beautiful Bedfordshire countryside.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2632	Andrea	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: One of the main tourist attractions in LB will be lost if the proposals go ahead; this attraction brings thousands of visitors to the town and adds greatly to its character; and it is the town's heritage and should not be treated as just another dispensable asset.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2775	Mr Robert Minor	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The very character of the town is likely to change. Leighton Buzzard is a market town, with a nice town centre and attractive surrounding villages. The proposals threaten to engulf the town into a suburban sprawl.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policies in the Core Strategy seek to ensure that the historic environment of Luton and southern Bedfordshire is promoted, preserved and enhanced. The market character of the town centre is identified in section 8 and sought to be enhanced.				
2732	Mr Nigel Mould	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The star attraction for welcoming visitors to our town - The Narrow Gauge Railway - needs more countryside not less, how many people would want to travel through an estate of houses. Please do not destroy Leighton Buzzard and the rich history and character of the town.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				
2533	Brian	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
Comment: The National Heritage Railway could be ruined.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.				
JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2530	Brian	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The narrow gauge railway is the only tourist attraction in the area but has been ignored by developers and even if it was worked into the plan, its attractiveness would be severely compromised</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
3738	Lorraine Rowe	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The narrow gauge railway is the only tourist attraction in the area but has been ignored by developers and even if it was worked into the plan, its attractiveness would be severely compromised</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
3632	Mr C Shane	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
2319	Cindy Sharp	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The proposed site would detrimentally affect Leighton Buzzard's main tourist and heritage attraction by removing what is left of open views and scenery</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
2754	Stephen Sheppard	Eggington	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The location of the proposed Eastern Development will directly affect the route of the railway and will remove open landscapes views. The Narrow Gauge Railway is a very important and successful tourist attraction for the town, which attracts over 10,000 visitors each year.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
2286	Mrs Christine Simmonds	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: New housing development will destroy the character of the narrow gauge railway which is a popular tourist attraction in Leighton Buzzard</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree</p> <p>Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3434	Anthony	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: Leighton Buzzard's main tourist attraction will cease to run through the countryside as its whole route will now run alongside residential developments, with the exception of the small part of the line beyond Shenley Hill Road. This can only detract from its unique status and discourage visitors to the railway. The developers appear to have made a token effort to placate any objectors by setting housing back from the track but the overall appeal of the line will be lost forever.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
3643	Mr David Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
2755	Sue Stone	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee consider that it is important that the historic environment is not adversely impact upon.</p>				
3641	Edward Syrett	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The CS makes no mention of the narrow gauge railway which is the town's most important tourist attraction. The location of the proposed development will directly affect the route of the railway and remove remaining open landscape views</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				
2435	Andy	Leighton Buzzard	Para. 12.12	No
<p>Comment: The proposed development is likely to damage LB's only tourist attraction, the narrow gauge railway. The railway brings economic benefit to the area; it has already has over half of its route surrounded by new housing development and being further encased by housing will make travelling on it less attractive to prospective tourists; and further development will make the town a multi-centre conurbation and thus it will lose its unique market town character</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Reference to the Narrow Gauge Railway will be made in this section.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Narrow Gauge Railway is an important feature relating to the historic environment of Leighton Linslade and contributes to tourism in the area. Master planning for the east of Leighton Linslade urban extension would need to ensure the safeguarding of this feature.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2344	Hertfordshire County Council	Hertford	Para. 12.13	No
<p>Comment: The proposed route will have an impact upon significant known archaeological remains and also passes close to several other known archaeological sites in Hertfordshire. Route has high archaeological potential by virtue of its proximity to the Icknield Way. It is therefore highly likely that additional archaeological remains exist along the route. The route passes through a number of known archaeological sites which are noted by the Historic Environment Record (HER).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The alignment of the proposed Luton northern bypass was subject to consultation in January and February 2009 and the report to Joint Committee in March 2009 reported the findings of the consultation. This report also indicated that further work on refining the evidence base was required. The heritage considerations will form part of the detailed assessment on the northern bypass.</p>				
1994	North Hertfordshire District Council	Letchworth Garden City	Para. 12.13	No
<p>Comment: Additionally, the archaeology and historic landscape for Sites L and L1 does not appear to have been assessed as part of the overall environmental sensitivity. Thus it appears that the sites could be undervalued compared to sites in Bedfordshire. This is particularly important given that there are indications that Site L may contain archaeology of national importance which would be a material constraint to development.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report, December 2008, did undertake an assessment of the archaeology and historic landscape for Sites L and L1,</p>				
3510	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Para. 12.16	No
<p>Comment: The paragraph states that development would have limited impact on the historic environment and would not encompass any existing villages. What about Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green?</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Paragraph 12.16 to be amended to reflect that Cockernhoe and Mangrove Green will be affected by development.</p>				
685	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 12.17	No
<p>Comment: Totally negated by the proposals - villages like Mangrove Green and Cockernhoe will be fully engulfed and other villages irreparably blighted</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The policies in the Core Strategy seek to ensure that the historic environment of the area is promoted, preserved and enhanced, this includes the impact on villages.</p>				
695	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: Although TBH I struggle to see what Luton's rich historic environment actually amounts to. Considerably less than the NHDC villages which will be swamped.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Given the lost heritage of Luton, it will be vital to learn from the mistakes made in the past and ensure that the remaining heritage of Luton and southern Bedfordshire is protected and preserved.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
3730	Mr J J Barber	Cockernhoe	Q. 18	No
<p>Comment: What would happen to the archaeology that can be found in the local areas?</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The preservation, protection and conservation of the historic environment is important to the Joint Committee.</p>				
1711	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1958	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
269	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment:</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
3298	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: PNIH support this policy.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1660	East Of England Regional Assembly	Bury St. Edmunds	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: Are woodlands protected by a policy?</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Woodlands would be covered by Preferred Option CS17.</p>				
2798	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: The impact of the development to Leighton-Linslade must not have a detrimental effect on the old Salt route (Theedway) which runs past Leighton, through Eggington and off towards Norfolk/Suffolk.</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in the Core Strategy seek to protect, enhance and conserve the historic environment, including that of historic routes and features.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
745	English Heritage	Cambridge	Q. 18	No
<p>Comment: Recommends that a specific policy on heritage, townscape and design is included within the Core Strategy that seeks to define, protect and enhance local character and distinctiveness throughout the Growth Area. This will require a robust evidence base to support such a policy. There is no document for townscape and the built environment within the Growth Area, and it is not clear how decisions will be supported in terms of a thorough evidence base. There is a need for an urban and historic characterisation study of the main towns that builds on the Extensive Urban Surveys and Conservation Area Character Appraisals that exist for some parts of the built environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Greater reference will be made to the built environment in the Core Strategy to ensure that it is protected, enhanced and conserved.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment December 2008 did undertake an assessment of the historic landscape within the Growth Area and Town Centre Master plans provide an assessment and plans for the historic environment in these centres. Work is underway to prepare Conservation Area Appraisals across southern Bedfordshire which will inform the protection and enhancement of the built environment.</p>				
1057	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: We want our historic town to remain as such for future generations, but want all new build projects to 'blend in' with the existing conurbation.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It will be important for the historic environment of Luton and southern Bedfordshire to be enhanced and protected yet ensure that the new developments are created with an identity of their own. Detail of design is addressed in the emerging Design Guide for Central Bedfordshire Council and master plans of the developments.</p>				
314	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
1310	Leighton Buzzard Railway	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: We support this policy, as long as it is employed actively as a material consideration in future planning decisions.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The preservation, protection and conservation of the historic environment is important to the Joint Committee.</p>				
1995	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: With Reservations. CS16 looks like a minimalist policy. As Luton has lost most of its buildings of heritage value through bad planning or "accidental fires", rarely goes out of its way to protect mature trees and much of the town centre currently looks like a bombsite, there is little to give confidence in policies to protect remaining heritage and townscape.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Given the heritage of Luton, it will be vital to learn from the mistakes made in the past and ensure that the remaining heritage of Luton and southern Bedfordshire is protected and preserved.</p>				
2094	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: RECOMMENDATION(S) 1. Executive is recommended to approve the proposed response to the consultation by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: Preferred Options as set out at Appendix A to this report. The draft strategy supports the protection of important heritage and townscape features, which is a necessary function of the development plan process.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2460	Luton Conservative Association	Luton	Q. 18	No
<p>Comment: Your Consultants assessment notes on the Historic importance of site L (East of Luton) include Iron Age and Roman sites, likely to be of national importance, these are a material constraint to development proposals. -</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 did undertake an assessment of the archaeology and historic environment for areas L and L1. Development will be subject to archaeology assessments before development can commence.</p>				
1937	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
62	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: Nothing to disagree with</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
2133	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 18	No
<p>Comment: The proposed urban extension East of Luton sits within an area of considerable archaeological sensitivity and a registered Historic Park and Garden. The development would destroy the historic landscape.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Areas rich in archaeology and historic buildings will be protected through national and local planning policy (emerging Luton and South Bedfordshire Core Strategy and North Hertfordshire Core Strategy)</p>				
3723	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 18	No
<p>Comment: The EoL proposals do not make any reference to LUC's report on sites of archaeological importance or their likely impact on the construction of the bypass, which may be halted if significant archaeological finds are made during construction.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 did undertake an assessment of the archaeology and historic environment for areas L and L1. Development will be subject to archaeology assessments before development can commence.</p>				
2022	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: This addresses all the key issues of the SCS.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
815	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment:</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1023	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: The impact of the development to Leighton-Linslade must not have a detrimental effect on the old Saltway (which runs from Leighton through Eggington and off towards Norfolk/Suffolk) where the proposed road crosses that route.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in the Core Strategy seek to protect, enhance and conserve the historic environment, including that of historic routes and features.</p>				
686	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 18	Yes
<p>Comment: The proposals for heritage And townscape are correct, but the question brushes aside the totally absurd impact on North Herts villages.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Not agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment Supplementary Report December 2008 undertook an assessment using the methodology undertaken to assess the potential urban extensions within South Bedfordshire.</p>				
748	English Heritage	Cambridge	Para. 12.20	Yes
<p>Comment: In paragraph 12.20, we would be grateful if English Heritage could be added to the list of key stakeholders in the second bullet point, given our role as the government's statutory advisor on the historic environment.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: English Heritage will be included in the list of key stakeholders.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: English Heritage is an important stakeholder for the historic environment.</p>				
1879	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 12.23	No
<p>Comment: 'Significantly reduce' should be removed and current levels should be maintained and enhanced. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Paragraph 12.23 to be rephrased.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee consider that it is important that biodiversity is not lost.</p>				
1190	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 12.23	No
<p>Comment: The Wildlife Trust suggests that the wording in this paragraph is changed to reflect the need to enhance and add to biodiversity in line with the principles of PPS9. We would suggest that the last sentence should read as follows: It is important that the growth planned for the area does not harm or significantly reduce the level of biodiversity or geological resource in this area but enhances it for the enjoyment of existing and future generations.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: Paragraph 12.23 to be rephrased.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee consider that it is important that biodiversity is not lost.</p>				
687	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 12.23	No
<p>Comment: Inconsistent with the plans to build houses to the east of Luton and with plans for building bypasses</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Preferred Option CS17 aims to protect, conserve and enhance biodiversity resources.</p>				
1880	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 12.24	No
<p>Comment: SSSIs are of 'special', not 'strategic' scientific interest. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The reference to SSSI's will be corrected.</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1291	The Greensand Trust	Bedford	Para. 12.24	Yes
Comment: Should also reference RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Sites).				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References to RIGS will be made where practical.				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
688	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Para. 12.24	No
Comment: This refers only to Luton and South Beds. Given the proposals to build in North Herts the same consideration need to be given to that area				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policies in the emerging Core Strategy for North Hertfordshire will cover the conservation and enhancement of the countryside and landscape, similar to the preferred option policies in section 12 of the Core Strategy: Preferred Option for Luton and southern Bedfordshire.				
3715	Jackie Davies	Kings Walden	Para. 12.26	No
Comment: If extensive environmental studies have been completed, it is hard to see why development to the east of Luton was the best option! The area is classed as the start of the CAONB according to the Chilterns Conservation Board, where people can enjoy the countryside. This is a particularly rural area with a wide variety of wildlife including deer, buzzards and red kites (re-introduced 3-4 years ago) that will move-on or disappear if the countryside between Luton and Hitchin becomes much smaller. Mixed woodland will be developed on, destroying essential wildlife habitats.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although is located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies will aim to ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.				
3710	Keith Ewington	Kings Walden	Para. 12.26	No
Comment: If extensive environmental studies have been completed, it is hard to see why development to the east of Luton was the best option! The area is classed as the start of the CAONB according to the Chilterns Conservation Board, where people can enjoy the countryside. This is a particularly rural area with a wide variety of wildlife including deer, buzzards and red kites (re-introduced 3-4 years ago) that will move-on or disappear if the countryside between Luton and Hitchin becomes much smaller. Mixed woodland will be developed on, destroying essential wildlife habitats.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The proposed urban extension in the East of Luton is not located in the Chilterns AONB although is located in greenbelt land. The Environmental Sensitivity Assessment undertaken for the Core Strategy identified the most suitable areas of land with regards to sustainability and the least impact on the environment. Policies will aim to ensure the protection, enhancement and maintenance of the environment.				
1881	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Para. 12.27	Yes
Comment: Early design of developments needs to account for protected and other notable species and habitats. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It is essential that these issues are identified during the master planning of developments to ensure that protected and other notable species and habitats are taken into account.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1121	Miss Sally Gray	Houghton Regis	Para. 12.29	No
<p>Comment: I would like to ask how the proposed Woodside Connection Option 1, plus high density new house build on the fields between Parkside and the M1, plus Industrial Development at Jct 11A will not cut the present wildlife corridor which runs from Houghton Park, through the existing green spaces between housing, across the bus link, through the fields and out to the countryside. The creation of a large road in this small and precious green space will inevitably fragment habitats, and affect the 'right to roam' of the wildlife currently in the area: barking deer, foxes, hedgehogs amongst them, which are likely to get killed crossing the Woodside Connection. Green spaces between housing is easier to protect than where a major road is concerned. This area may not be an SSSI but it is full of wildlife which are a pleasure to see and treasure.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: The protection of wildlife habitat and environment is important and thus new development should not fragment habitats but seek to link them through the creation of green infrastructure and links which would encourage wildlife corridors in the area.</p>				
1452	Stockwood Park Property Holdings Ltd	Northampton	Para. 12.30	Yes
<p>Comment: Paragraph/Policy: Preferred Option CS17 Support/Object/Comment: The importance of biodiversity is recognised, and in bringing forward development of our client's land adjoining J10A, consideration will be given to ecological enhancement, in particular of the western boundary corridor linking in to the woodland to the north. It is considered that the design of development can ensure opportunities for ecological enhancement and connectivity to other green infrastructure is maximised.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				
696	Mr Matthew Andrews	Lilley	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: Does the question specifically and intentionally ignore NHDC where development was not recommended? I assume from the wording, yes.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in the emerging Core Strategy for North Hertfordshire will cover the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity resources, similar to the preferred option policies in section 12 of the Core Strategy: Preferred Option for Luton and southern Bedfordshire.</p>				
3729	Mr J J Barber	Cockernhoe	Q. 19	No
<p>Comment: Has anyone considered the effect of the development on the many types of wildlife? St. Peter's church and a private home in Lilley have bats, which are protected in England. Has the JTU commissioned a survey to see what roosts might be affected? Bloor Homes has allegedly commissioned a bat survey, though no-one has ever seen it.</p>				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree		Proposed Action: No action required		
<p>JC Reason for Response: It will be important that such features of sites of maintained and protected. Master planning work on the individual urban extensions will identify such features of the site.</p>				
1152	Barton-le-Clay Parish Council	Barton-le-Clay	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: This is strongly supported. However, there should be an explicit reference to National Nature Reserves, either in CS17 or in the supporting text.</p>				
JC Response: Agree		Proposed Action: References to National Nature Reserves will be made where practical.		
<p>JC Reason for Response: NA</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1712	Bedfordshire Police Authority	London	Q. 19	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
2317	David Bowles	Breachwood Green	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: Fully support this option				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
1959	Central Bedfordshire Local Strategic Partnership	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: Incorporate the SCS ambition for the farming of wood fuel as an important renewable fuel combined with enhanced biodiversity and amenity. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee have recently commissioned a Renewable Energy Study which will look at the viability of a range of renewable energy methods that are appropriate for this area.				
230	Mrs Sarah Cooper	Breachwood Green	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: But this question yet again should include Hertfordshire. It really is ridiculous to say that you are planning to protect the countryside and heritage only when it suits you. If you were really interested in doing so, you would be building on the flat and uninteresting areas of Bedfordshire and not even thinking of building on Hertfordshire land. Therefore, although of course I agree with this point, it yet again highlights the skewed way in which this document has been put together and the way in which you want to take the moral high ground only when it suits you to do so.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policies in the emerging Core Strategy for North Hertfordshire will cover the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity resources, similar to the preferred option policies in section 12 of the Core Strategy: Preferred Option for Luton and southern Bedfordshire.				
270	Cottrell	Luton	Q. 19	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
3299	DPDS Consulting	Swindon	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: PNNH support working in partnership with the key stakeholders to protect the existing areas of biodiversity and secure benefits such as GI, to improve wildlife habitats from new developments. PNNH have demonstrated their support to protect and enhance biodiversity and geology by carrying out a full environmental statement through analysis of issues of environmental significance and the production of a rigorous Green Infrastructure Statement at their site West of Linslade. There is little evidence of this degree of work carried out on the Preferred Option Sites contained in the Core Strategy Evidence Base.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee commissioned an Environmental Sensitivity Assessment to undertake an assessment in terms of landscape, biodiversity and archaeology for all the sites.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2799	Eggington Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: The Parish of Eggington is based on agriculture. The farmers need the land to support their families and provide their livelihood. We have to protect the biodiversity, or else it will become a monoculture! But we have to provide an environment for this to flourish - it won't develop on concrete, bricks and tarmac!</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: It will be important that the biodiversity resources are protected, conserved and enhanced for both new developments and in existing areas of green space.</p>				
1882	Environment Agency	Hatfield	Q. 19	No
<p>Comment: Include large-scale habitat creation aspirations. 3rd bullet should include provision of wildlife habitats as well as corridors. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)</p> <p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: References to wildlife habitats and corridors will be made.</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: The increase of levels of biodiversity is important in the Growth Area.</p>				
1074	Mrs Patricia Ann Gates	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: Badgers come from the land east of Leighton Buzzard to my garden each night to eat peanuts I leave out for them. Their habitat will be lost/fragmented if development occurs in the fields they have inhabited for many generations. Every time mass development occurs, we lose yet more of our wildlife. Developers plan to build a huge dual carriageway through the middle of this new development, cutting in half any green corridors that should be in place to support wildlife, and for future generations to enjoy; unless they are stopped!!</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: It is important that the growth planned for the area does not harm the levels of biodiversity and fragment habitats. Through the master planning of new developments, such as the linkages of green infrastructure and wildlife corridors, ways to improve the biodiversity will be sought.</p>				
496	Mr Chris Grimes	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: I support the policies, but find them to be in conflict with the preferred eastern urban extension of Leighton Buzzard. The statement (CS17) made by the Joint Committee is worthy, but I find it hard to believe its aims can be achieved by building on arable farmland &amp; grazing, a landscape which features extensive established hedgerows.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: It is important that the growth planned for the area does not harm the levels of biodiversity and fragment habitats. Through the master planning of new developments, such as the linkages of green infrastructure and wildlife corridors, ways to improve the biodiversity will be sought.</p>				
3507	Jim Hearnshaw	Luton	Q. 19	No
<p>Comment: This section conveniently omits any reference to the proposed East of Luton development, presumably on the basis that this development does not conform to the grand statements made in this section.</p> <p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p> <p>JC Reason for Response: Policies in the emerging Core Strategy for North Hertfordshire will cover the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity resources, similar to the preferred option policies in section 12 of the Core Strategy: Preferred Option for Luton and southern Bedfordshire.</p>				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2858	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: Additional housing development, particularly to the east of Leighton Linlade, will damage the parish's green environment and local bio-diversity without delivering any benefits or compensation to the village as it will be nearby / adjacent rather than in the parish itself.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: It is important that the growth planned for the area does not harm the levels of biodiversity and fragment habitats. Through the master planning of new developments, such as the linkages of green infrastructure and wildlife corridors, ways to improve the biodiversity will be sought.</p>				
315	Mr Clive Johnson	Luton	Q. 19	No
<p>Comment: Because they refer to the so-called urban extensions which are unnecessary</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: To accommodate the required growth for this area, a certain amount of development needs to be planned for in what is currently green belt land. The policies in section 12 aim to ensure that this development has the least impact on the countryside as possible and where there is impact that this is mitigated.</p>				
1997	Luton Assembly	n/a	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: CS17 does not go far enough. Biodiversity was not chosen as one of our national indicators despite much lobbying by those who understand its importance. Our countryside supports herds of deer, badgers, bats, red kites, and several plant species found rarely elsewhere, and our small green urban spaces also have wildlife which is important to residents. There is a need to be more proactive to protect biodiversity in planning applications. Biodiversity policies are vital as we are experiencing mass extinctions of species, but frequently ignored.</p>				
<p>JC Response: Partially agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Biodiversity is considered an important component of the natural environment and as such Policy CS17 seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the biodiversity resources within the Growth Area.</p>				
2095	Luton Borough Council	Luton	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: RECOMMENDATION(S) 1. Executive is recommended to approve the proposed response to the consultation by the Luton and South Bedfordshire Joint Committee of the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: Preferred Options as set out at Appendix A to this report. The Council supports the policies as they recognise the importance of bio- and geo-diversity and the duty placed on public bodies by the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. (N.B. There are now 25 County Wildlife Sites in Luton, not the 19 referred to in paragraph 12.24 of the Preferred Options).</p>				
<p>JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: Na</p>				
1938	Luton Forum	Luton	Q. 19	Yes
<p>Comment: Incorporate the SCS ambition for the farming of wood fuel as an important renewable fuel combined with enhanced biodiversity and amenity. (Submitted late with prior approval of the JTU)</p>				
<p>JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required</p>				
<p>JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee have recently commissioned a Renewable Energy Study which will look at the viability of a range of renewable energy methods that are appropriate for this area.</p>				



ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
2215	Natural England	Peterborough	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: Support for CS17 however suggest that this section also includes additional advice on "designing for biodiversity".				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Central Bedfordshire Council are currently drafting a Design Supplementary Planning Document which will deal with design and use of materials. During the master planning process of the urban extension details of design relating to specific issues will be addressed.				
63	Mr Alan Robertson	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: Nothing to disagree with				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
2134	The Hitchin Society	Hitchin	Q. 19	No
Comment: Large scale development East of Luton would be highly damaging to the biodiversity beyond the immediate area and would impact on other parts of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire through a loss of wildlife links.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It is important that the growth planned for the area does not harm the levels of biodiversity and fragment habitats. Through the master planning of new developments, such as the linkages of green infrastructure and wildlife corridors, ways to improve the biodiversity will be sought.				
1191	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: The Wildlife Trust supports the inclusion of this policy within the Core Strategy. It should provide a good framework for protecting, conserving and enhancing biodiversity and geological resources. We are pleased that the importance of local sites and species has been recognised in agreement with PPS9 and also the need to maintain and enhance wildlife corridors is included. In order to achieve the objectives within this policy biodiversity will need to be considered in new developments at the earliest planning stage. Once important wildlife features or opportunities have been identified the design of the development should fit around them. The aim should always be to not harm biodiversity or geological resources instead of mitigating for adverse effects.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It is important that the growth planned for the area does not harm the levels of biodiversity and fragment habitats. Through the master planning of new developments, such as the linkages of green infrastructure and wildlife corridors, ways to improve the biodiversity will be sought.				
3724	Marie Tyler	Letchworth	Q. 19	No
Comment: Bats and their roosts are protected in England and are present at St. Peter's Church and a private house in Lilley. Has the JTU commissioned a bat survey to see what roosts might be affected?				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It will be important that such features of sites of maintained and protected. Master planning work on the individual urban extensions will identify such features of the site.				
2023	Voluntary and Community Action South Bedfordshire	Leighton Buzzard	Q. 19	No
Comment: Incorporate the SCS ambition for the farming of wood fuel as an important renewable fuel combined with enhanced biodiversity and amenity.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Joint Committee have recently commissioned a Renewable Energy Study which will look at the viability of a range of renewable energy methods that are appropriate for this area.				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
816	Walter	Hitchin	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: Essential, and also need to undo some of the damage that has already been done.				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
787	Mr John Wells	Luton	Q. 19	Yes
Comment:				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
207	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: We have to protect the biodiversity, or else it will become a monoculture! But we have to provide an environment for this to flourish - it won't develop on new concrete, bricks and tarmac!!				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: It will be important that the biodiversity resources are protected, conserved and enhanced for both new developments and in existing areas of green space.				
1024	Mr John Westbury	Eggington	Q. 19	Yes
Comment: We (residents) live in the country and try to maintain it. It's city folks as want to come out here to live - yet seem to want to turn the countryside into the town!				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: NA				
690	Mr David Wynn	LUTON	Q. 19	No
Comment: The plans may be correct for Luton & South Beds but the document totally omits any consideration of equivalent matters for the North Herts area that is being considered.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: Policies in the emerging Core Strategy for North Hertfordshire will cover the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity resources, similar to the preferred option policies in section 12 of the Core Strategy: Preferred Option for Luton and southern Bedfordshire.				
1214	The Wildlife Trust BCNP	Bedford	Para. 12.31	No
Comment: Pleased that CS recognises importance of working closely with stakeholders. But list of stakeholders in 12.31 is confusing. Bedslife is a partnership of organisations guided by the Local Biodiversity Action Plan. The Wildlife Forum is a subset of Bedslife and not separate to it. Suggest the Wildlife Trust and Beds & Luton Biodiversity & Monitoring Centre be mentioned as key stakeholders. BMRC is vital to aims of policy, providing local knowledge to inform development'. ODPM says LAs should contribute to set up, maintenance of Local Record Centres as most effective way to facilitate access to information. Reliable, up-to-date information is necessary to protect, conserve, enhance biodiversity in new developments and existing areas. Disappointed there's no commitment to funding & supporting external groups working at achieving goals in CS17. Note that other policies, e.g. CS15 do have commitment to external groups. Should be an additional point on funding and supporting the Wildlife Trust, BRMC and Bedslife				
JC Response: Agree Proposed Action: The list of key stakeholders will be updated				
JC Reason for Response: NA				

ID	Name/ Organisation	Post Town	Paragraph/Question	Support?
1843	Environment Agency		Glossary	No
Comment: Include Water Cycle Strategy. (Accepted late with prior permission from JTU)				
JC Response: Agreed Proposed Action: No action required				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is supported by the findings of a Water Cycle evidence study.				
1346	Mrs Gloria Twells		Paragraph 14.1	No
Comment: This is not an easy document to wade through and I feel that it will be very offputting for many people.				
JC Response: Statement with which neither agree nor disagree Proposed Action: Ensure the contents of the Core Strategy remain accessible to all.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is a complex document and every effort is always made to make it accessible to all.				
334	Mr Paul Constantinidi		Paragraph 14.2	No
Comment: No other languages needed				
JC Response: Not agreed Proposed Action: Ensure the contents of the Core Strategy remain accessible to all.				
JC Reason for Response: The Core Strategy is a complex document and every effort is always made to make it accessible to all.				

This page is intentionally left blank