

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



**TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

20 June 2017

Dear Councillor

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – WEDNESDAY, 21 JUNE 2017

Further to the agenda and papers for the above meeting, previously circulated, please find attached the Late Sheet.

17. Late Sheet

To receive and note, prior to considering the planning applications contained in the schedules above, any additional information detailed in the Late Sheet to be circulated on 20 June 2017.

Should you have any queries regarding the above please contact me.

Yours sincerely

Leslie Manning
Committee Services Officer

email: leslie.manning@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk
tel: 0300 300 5132

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 6 (Pages 15-40) – CB/16/02972/FULL – Former Dukeminster Estate, Church Street, Dunstable

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

Two further objections have been received from neighbouring residents of the Priory View development. They raise the following material considerations in addition to those set out in the Officers report:

- Traffic movements observed from 305 Priory View, Church Street, Dunstable.
Thursday 11th May 7.00—9.15am Westbound 1,327 vehicles
Eastbound 1,619 vehicles
4.00---6.15pm Westbound 1,272 vehicles Eastbound 1,222 vehicle
Thursday 18th May 7.00---9.15am Westbound 1,129 vehicles
Eastbound 1,384 vehicles
4.00---6.30pm Westbound 1,449 vehicles Eastbound 1,661 vehicles
- Priory View is purpose built luxury accommodation for 100+ residents between ages 55 and 95 and should not be described as an 'Extra Care Scheme'. It is CBC's award winning, first independent living scheme in the area but the best interests of residents are not being considered.

Responses to the above matters are in the 'Considerations' section of the Officers report.

Amended Plans

Following a meeting on the 13th June 2017 between the applicants and the residents of Priory View, an amended layout plan has been received which seeks to address residents concerns regarding Flat Block 2, located in the south-west corner of the site. The amended layout shows Flat Block 2 replaced with 8 two storey dwellings which would have rear gardens backing onto Priory View. Flat Block 3 directly to the north of this has been increased in size to mirror Flat Block 4. 5 dwelling houses in the north-east corner of the site would be replaced by a part 3, part 2 storey flatted building. The overall number of units would not be changed but the mix would be changed to 125 houses and 201 flats (120 houses and 196 flats previous).

Further amended plans are due to be received which will address floor plan/elevation treatment changes as a result of the above. In light of the significance of the proposed amendments and to allow opportunity for neighbours to fully understand the changes, there will be a further 21 day consultation period once all amended plans are received.

Amended Recommendation

In light of the above it is recommended that the application be **deferred** to the next available committee meeting following expiry of the 21 day consultation period.

This page is intentionally left blank

Item 7 (Pages 41-86) – CB/16/05127/OUT - Land at the former Fullers Earth Quarry, Ampthill Road, Clophill, Beds

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

- Parish Council Email and Planning Officer comments

Dear Lisa,

Further to the Parish Council's letter dated 28th May 2017 (setting out its position to CBC in response to the documentation provided by Paul Ellingham from Mott Macdonald, dated 17^h May 2017) and your subsequent conversation with Cllr Grant Walford on 6th June 2017, please find below a series of questions that relate specifically to the concerns/objections raised by the Parish Council regarding the proposed Enabling Argument and the Land Transfer.

The Parish Council considers these two elements pivotal to the application, and believe that while they remain unanswered they pose a significant risk to CBC and the residents of Clophill. Thus, the Parish Council's view is that absolute clarity is required with regard to what Gallagher's are putting forward and committing to, along with CBC's recommendation to the DMC on the 21st June 2017 to potentially agree and enforce a mutually beneficial outcome for all parties.

The Parish Council therefore kindly requests that CBC provide a response to the questions summarised below ahead of the DMC, and also includes these questions and answers in the DMC information pack for consideration by the Committee.

- a. Is it CBC's position to insist that all of the freehold land owned by Gallagher's will transfer to a suitably qualified Partner (to return it to Public or equal ownership) except one land parcel for the development of up to 50 dwellings, which is the position of the Parish Council?

The Parish Council is concerned that all of the land owned by Gallagher's is not included within the application boundary, and requires this to be corrected prior to DMC.

In addition, the Parish Council requires that if a land parcel is reserved for the future expansion of St Mary's school, the Parish Council become the owner of the land parcel and it forms part of the Management Plan scope. Ownership of the land parcel would transfer only if and when a business case has been agreed and approved for the expansion of the school, otherwise the land parcel will remain part of the Community Parkland with the Parish Council as its custodian.

Response: The Land Transfer plan shows all the land to be transferred to a nominated party. The Land Transfer agreement sits outside of the S106 process but the S106 agreement will require the Land Transfer Agreement to be undertaken and in place prior to the commencement of any development.

b. What process (and sequence of approvals) will CBC set-out to guarantee that the entire freehold land owned by Gallagher's (except the single land parcel for residential development) will transfer to the Partner, plus the Community Parkland is created with an appropriate management model and plan in place, before any development takes place?

*The proposed indicative project programme and process submitted by Mott Macdonald (on the 17th May 2017) does not permit this. Thus, the Parish Council request that CBC and the DMC consider the **strawman process in appendix 1** (pages 3-5) as the basis for all parties to agree a process that ensures Gallagher's transfer the land and deliver the enabling argument prior to any development taking place.*

Response: As stated above the land transfer agreement will sit outside of the S106 process but clauses requiring the land transfer to take place will be included within the S106.

c. Following the transfer of the Gallagher owned land to a Partner, and the creation of the Community Parkland (on the premise of an 'Enabling Argument'), to whom will the Partner be responsible and accountable to on a day to day and strategic basis?

Specifically, if the Partner fails to meet its obligations (as defined in any agreed conditions and planning approvals) for any reason regarding the management, maintenance, and investment into the Community Parkland; and the Community Parkland consequently ceases to remain a safe, fit for purpose, compliant, and cost-effective community asset, who will ultimately be held accountable and enforce the Partner to fulfil its obligations?

The Parish Council requires clarity regarding CBC's view of the legal structure once the application has been delivered, plus CBC's proposed legislative measures to mitigate potential future risk.

Response: The owner of the land will be responsible and therefore the board of trustees for whichever trust would be responsible.

d. What measures have CBC taken to validate the key elements of Gallagher's business base that underpins the viability of the Enabling Argument?

The Parish Council request CBC confirm the measures it has taken to assure itself how Gallagher's will deliver the Community Parkland, and would reasonably expect Gallagher's to have provided documentation and information to CBC that sets out the 'what, how, and when' associated with the creation of the Community Parkland. Typically;

i. Definition (design statement) regarding what the Community Parkland will comprise of

ii. Demonstrate that its design, management, and maintenance model meets all statutory requirements, plus the requirements set out by specialist organisations such

as Ecologists, Historic England, the concerns reflected in the 724 objections, and those of the Partner

- iii. Demonstrate a robust process to qualify and appoint the proposed Partner, including its proposed resources
- iv. Confirm which Partner will be appointed, when, and on what basis
- v. Validate the capital investment (Capex) required by the Partner to create and mobilise the Community Parkland
- vi. Validate the operating costs (Opex) required by the Partner to deliver the perpetual management and maintenance of the Community Parkland
- vii. Guarantee that the Capex and Opex required by the Partner is ring fenced by Gallagher's
- viii. A developed mobilisation plan and programme
- ix. Develop and agree a Service Agreement that sets out the service level agreements and key performance indicators (SLAs and KPIs) that the Partner will perform to with regard to its management and maintenance activities
- x. Develop and agree a Service Contract that sets out the obligations of the Partner with regard to governance and reporting, plus includes standard contract clauses such as liabilities, insurances, indemnities, change control, escalation, audit, and step-in rights.

Response: The land transfer agreement would cover many of these aspects – the application sets out the description and work to be undertaken in terms of the community parkland and any variation to that set out in the application would require a new application.

e. Once the Community Parkland has been created, is it CBC's intention to include it as part of its Open Space and Greenspace strategy? And if so, on what basis?

Response: This decision has not been made and would be for the Green Infrastructure Officer to consider. When the Strategy is revised/ updated it may be that the land is included and any reasons for doing this would be set out at that time.

The Parish Council has worked collaboratively with Gallagher's for over 18 months, and has been completely open, transparent, and consistent with regard to the conditions that would need to be met in order for the Parish Council to support the application on the premise of an Enabling Argument. Furthermore, the residents of Clophill demand that there is no ambiguity in any agreement which will see Gallagher's provide 'Community Parkland' in return for up to 50 dwellings.

It remains the Parish Council's desire to agree a robust process with clear and appropriate conditions that will deliver the proposed Community Parkland in return for a residential development of up to 50 dwellings. This must of course be delivered in a risk-free manner to both CBC and the residents of Clophill, which the Parish Council believe will be resolved once CBC and

Gallagher's are able to demonstrate a clear and positive response to the above questions.

The Parish Council believe that if CBC and the DMC are unable to provide clear answers to the above questions, then the risk to CBC and the community of Clophill would far outweigh any benefit. Should this be the case (at the DMC hearing on the 21st June) the Parish Council would respectfully request that the decision-making process is deferred until Gallagher's is able to provide the necessary documentation and assurances.

Response: The recommendation to the DMC is to resolve to approve the application subject to a satisfactory S106 agreement the draft heads of terms has been set out in the report and the legal ties would be negotiated and covered in that process.

- Greensand Trust

We fully support the application made by Gallaghers, as being the long sought-after opportunity to finally resolve the issue of the Lakes. We or other suitable organisation would need to continue to work with Gallaghers post planning decision to further improve what may be an acceptable plan, into a sustainable one that takes in to consideration future growth. Actions that should be achievable through section 106 and additional applications by said organisation.

- Public Representation – Clova Cottage, 8 Mill Lane, Clophill

Planning Application No CB/16/01527/OUT Land at the former Fullers Earth Quarry site

I am writing this letter in response to the proposed planning application by Gallagher Estates to build 50 houses adjacent to the former Fullers Earth pits at Clophill, and to turn the site into a public Country Park, and object strongly to this proposal.

On Saturday 10th June 2017, a female otter and 2 cubs were sighted on the lakes, which demonstrates that this site is prime otter habitat, and that they will require further protection and as little disturbance as possible in the future. This site has very important ecological and biodiversity significance, and both otters and badgers need seclusion for their holts and setts for foraging, feeding and breeding.

The badgers and otters and other important wildlife present on and around this site should not be allowed to suffer from any human disturbance of any kind, and require full protection under the Wildlife and Countryside Act of 1981.

In view of this fact, further ecological surveys should be carried out over the next 2 years to record and ascertain what other significant species are actually present on this site, and in the future the site should be managed by the Greensand Trust for the benefit of wildlife and biodiversity.

The badger setts also located near to the proposed housing development will be seriously affected by any human disturbance and must have a buffer zone of at least 30 metres from the existing fence line and hedge.

Response: The Council's Ecologist is aware of the representation. Condition 3 will be amended to include a requirement for updated species surveys as necessary to inform the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.

- Public Representation – 95 High Street Clophill

Dear Councillor,

I wrote to Andrew Davie on 19 November 2016 in regard to the above about my concerns, particularly the letter I received from DCLG stating:

"The authority (local authority) is entitled to say no to development that would run counter to the Local Plan or not be in the interest or not be compatible with the sound planning of the area."

My reasons are justified and I call upon all members of the committee to reject this planning application on the grounds stated and ignore the summary recommendations copied in my other attachment. Most of your colleagues are in rural parts of Central Beds and you must please listen to the despair of your village residents who are finding great difficulty driving to work or driving socially along the only two roads that can be travelled along to their destination, namely the A507 and A6.

As I mentioned to Mr Davie, you will be encouraging an unprecedented amount of traffic on these two roads on top of what exists now, all accumulating at the "Flying Horse" roundabout, stretching back miles in all directions at all material times. The planning programme of housing development abutting nearly all our villages is now beyond a joke and you must listen to your conscience and reject this planning application.

Additional Comments

Land Transfer Agreement and S106 Heads of Terms

To clarify the Land Transfer Agreement will be entered into prior to any development commencing on site, however, the final transfer of land will not take place until after the capital works have taken place and a period of 12 months to ensure that the capital works have taken place satisfactorily.

Biodiversity

The report and condition 19 currently refer to a badger mitigation corridor. Following further discussions and concerns over anti-social behaviour and potential for unwelcomed interest in the badgers, it is considered that this may no longer be the best approach. Therefore, a variation to condition 19 is proposed to allow for the submission of a badger mitigation scheme this will

allow a broader scope in terms of badger mitigation and will still ensure proper consideration of the badger sett during construction and within the reserved matters submission.

Additional/Amended Conditions

Condition 3

No development shall commence until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan to be informed by updated species surveys as required, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall then be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Details are required prior to commencement to ensure an acceptable management of the landscape and to enable proper consideration of the impact of the development on the contribution of nature conservation and ecology in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 7 & 11 of the NPPF.

Condition 19

No development shall commence until a badger mitigation scheme, including a method statement in relation to construction, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details of the scheme shall be taken into account in the submission of any reserved matters application and the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: Details are required prior to commencement to ensure an acceptable management of the landscape and to enable proper consideration of the impact of the development on the contribution of nature conservation and ecology in accordance with Policy DM14 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 7 & 11 of the NPPF.

Item 8 (Pages 87 - 102) – CB/17/01619/FULL – Land to the rear of Silver Birch Avenue, Aspen Gardens and Alder Green, Stotfold

Further Consultation Responses

Town Council

This conflicts with Nation Planning Policy Framework policy guidance on 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment' (Section 1.1). Paragraphs 109 (page 25) and 112 (page 26) are of relevance to this assessment of agricultural land quality and soil and state that:

'109 ...The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ... protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils'... and

'112...Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poor quality land in preference to that of a higher quality ...

There is a planning history for the area going back several years, all of those outside the Settlement Envelope have been refused for reasons such as 'the proposed development would form an unwanted intrusion into an area of open and undeveloped land and would be detrimental to its appearance and rural character' and 'it would form an intrusion into open countryside outside the Settlement Boundary and be contrary to the policy NE3'

Consultation responses

20 further responses have been received, including a detailed report by Parker Planning Services, instructed by some residents, which raise concerns on the following topics (a number of which relate to the planning application for housing rather than this application):

- The principle of the development
- The agricultural use of the land
- Site layout and character
- Green Infrastructure
- The sustainability of the development
- Ecology and trees
- Flood risk and drainage
- Highways and traffic generation
- Consultation by the applicant
- Relevant appeal decisions
- No need for recreation space in this location
- Tax payers will need to upkeep it
- Only submitted to allow housing application
- The Council can meet its housing need
- Concerns relating to the previous application have not been overcome

- Noise and disturbance
- Proximity to the A1 could cause ill health
- No community benefits
- Consultation inadequate

Item 9 (Pages 103 - 150) – CB/17/01642/FULL – Land to the rear of Silver Birch Avenue, Aspen Gardens and Alder Green, Stotfold

23 further responses have been received, including a detailed report by Parker Planning Services, instructed by some residents, which raise concerns on the following topics:

- The principle of the development
- The agricultural use of the land
- Site layout and character
- Green Infrastructure
- The sustainability of the development
- Ecology and trees
- Flood risk and drainage
- Highways and traffic generation
- Consultation by the applicant
- Relevant appeal decisions
- No need for recreation space in this location
- Tax payers will need to upkeep it
- The Council can meet its housing need
- Concerns relating to the previous application have not been overcome
- Noise and disturbance
- Proximity to the A1 could cause ill health
- No community benefits
- Consultation inadequate
- Existing infrastructure poor
- Poor relationship with the settlement

Conditions

The following additional condition should be added:

Any application for the approval of reserved matters shall not show built development (other than garages or sheds) outside of the area marked on plan number T.0298_02 rev Q as the 'Built Form Extent'.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of the development, its relationship with neighbours and the contribution made towards local green infrastructure would be acceptable in accordance with Policy DM3 of the Central Bedfordshire Core Strategy and Development Management Policies (2009).

S106

Contributions towards education provision should be:

EY	£65,675.40
Lower	£218,918.00

Middle	£220,284.48
Upper	£270,127.10
Total	£775,004.98

***Item 10 (Pages 151 - 198) – CB/16/05887/OUT – Land opposite
The Lane & Lombard Street, East of Marston Road, Lidlington***

The applicant has made a submission in support of the application, which is appended to the Late Sheet.

This page is intentionally left blank



Appendix A

Millbrook, Bedford, MK45 2JQ, UK

www.millbrook.co.uk

STATEMENT OF ECONOMIC BENEFITS

May 2017

Outline Planning Application: CB/05887/OUT

Land Opposite The Lane & Lombard Street, East of Marston Road, Lidlington



Introduction

1. This Statement has been prepared by the applicant, Millbrook Proving Ground Limited ("Millbrook", or "the Company") to provide additional detail to that included in previous correspondence submitted to the Council (letter from Millbrook President Alex Burns dated 15th December 2016; and letter from Simon James, DLP Planning dated 7th February 2017).
2. The purpose of this Statement is to explain the likely benefits that would accrue from the development of the land, contingent upon planning permission being granted on the terms sought in the application and accompanying draft S106 Obligation, in terms of both future investment and potential job creation, at Millbrook Proving Ground itself, and also the local economy more widely.

Spectris Plc Acquisition of Millbrook Proving Ground Ltd

3. In September 2016 Millbrook was acquired by Spectris plc from the previous owners, Rutland Partners. Spectris is a UK-based listed company and a leading supplier of productivity-enhancing instrumentation and controls to the international market. It has four key business segments; Test & Measurement (into which Millbrook falls); Materials Analysis; In-Line Instrumentation; and Industrial Controls.
4. Millbrook continues to maintain its own identity as a limited company, with its base in Central Bedfordshire, and has its own ambitious growth plans.
5. Spectris acquired Millbrook because it provides a strong UK-based platform on which it can grow a substantial test services business. Spectris is currently evaluating a number of growth opportunities at Millbrook and has committed to invest £20million in the facilities in 2017, with further investments to follow in subsequent years.

Site Valuation

6. The application site, whilst outside of the Company's defined operational zone, is nonetheless part of the Key Employment Area, as defined in planning policy. As part of the review of the landholding leading up to the submissions of the application for development of the Technology Park (Ref CB/14/02490/OUT), it was decided, on balance, that the land was more suited to residential development, this notwithstanding its policy reference as a Key Employment Site. Moreover, and again notwithstanding its policy allocation, the Company sees the site as contributing to the investment package being put into place at Millbrook to support its continued growth and expansion in what is a competitive global market.



7. As the site is without formal use, and indeed elements have become derelict (the scout hut), the Company wish to make beneficial use of the land in a manner that both responds to the local environmental context, will provide community benefits and also will provide to the Company welcomed capital to support further investment and additional job creation.

8. Initial valuation of the development site, assuming a grant of outline planning permission on the terms sought, suggests the **sale of the land would generate in the region of £3-4 million**. This is a net figure taking into account contributions being made to other community focused benefits and requirements, inter alia:
 - Provision of 35% on-site affordable housing;
 - Early Years, Lower, Middle and Upper School Education contributions;
 - Contribution to enable a Junction Assessment of the Lidlington A507 (Woburn Road) and Bury Ware Road junction;
 - Leisure Centre Contribution;
 - Railway Improvement Works contribution;
 - Contribution towards improvements to the existing recreation ground in Lidlington;
 - A contribution towards the maintenance as the Scout Hut Land as open space; and
 - Contribution towards the improvements to the existing sports pavilion in Lidlington;

9. At this stage this is an initial valuation based on current general values and costs but without the benefit of detailed inputs (e.g. ground conditions etc) that would serve to refine it either up or down. Irrespective of this however the Company is committed to investing 100% of the capital receipt into its *Capital Investment Programme*.

Capital Investment Programme

10. Millbrook's *Capital Investment Programme* includes a number of projects and improvements over the next 5 years intended to maintain and enhance the Company's competitive advantage as one of the world's leading vehicle test and development centres. These comprise a series of both stand-alone and integrated projects, some of which are commercially highly sensitive.

11. Millbrook can confirm that 100% of the sum raised from the sale of the residential land is to be added directly to Millbrook's *Capital Investment Budget*, and then used for the development of new projects within the proving ground as set out in the Capital Investment Programme¹. Confirmation of this has already been made in a letter from the Millbrook President, Mr Alex Burns, submitted as part of this application (dated 15th December 2016) in which he confirms the intention to use the proceeds from the sale of the land to advance planned developments on the main operational site. The benefits of this, in terms of job creation, are elaborated on below.

¹ For reasons of commercial sensitivity it is not possible to publically disclose the company's Capital Investment Programme.



Direct Job Creation

12. The projects set out within the *Capital Investment Programme* will increase the number of direct jobs on the Millbrook site. It is possible to broadly calculate the number of jobs likely to be created by £3-4m of additional capital investment by looking at past trends in terms of the relationship between Capital Expenditure and job creation.

Millbrook Occupied Facilities

13. To calculate the average number of jobs created by capital expenditure projects, we have looked specifically a number of Powertrain facility projects that are planned for the next 12-18 months. These will create new facilities for testing engines, complete powertrains and whole vehicles. The investment will be £18m and the projects will create 27 new direct jobs, giving 1.5 direct jobs per £1m investment.
14. It should be noted that the above simply relates to new direct jobs created, it does not consider those existing jobs safeguarded by the investment projects listed.

Third Party Occupied Facilities

15. Millbrook's *Capital Investment Programme* also includes projects that are built within the Proving Ground, but leased by other third party companies who operate in the same industry (or similar) and benefit from being located within the Proving Ground. An example of this is the buildings rented out on short term leases to automotive/transport companies such as UK-based premium vehicle manufacturers and SMEs working on driverless vehicles (expected to be a growing sector at Millbrook).
16. Historically, the leasing of site facilities within the Proving Ground has produced substantially higher levels of employment than those run directly by Millbrook. This is a result of the fact that leaseholders bring new highly skilled and specialised workforces to the site, whereas facilities run by MPG may transfer and retain existing employees across the site. These engineers, also, often relocate to the Central Bedfordshire area, or use local accommodation and facilities whilst working at MPG.
17. In this model, a workshop/office complex, with conferencing rooms, passenger car workshops and large vehicle workshops would cost circa £3million to build.
18. In terms of jobs created, the rental tenants would bring a different number of engineers to site depending on where the vehicle is in the development cycle, however, it is reasonable to average this at 3 engineers per vehicle, with a standard workshop having a capacity to accommodate 10 vehicles.



19. On that basis each facility could reasonably be expected to host 30 staff, equivalent to 10 staff per £1m capital expenditure. With occupancy at any one point in time typically 70%, this would equate to **7 jobs per £1m of investment coming into the area.**

High Skilled Jobs

20. It is important to emphasise that the vast majority of jobs created by capital investment in the Millbrook site will be **highly skilled and well paid jobs**. Typically, most engineers employed in the new facilities created will be **qualified to degree standard and earn in the region of £45-75k per annum.**

Indirect and Induced Jobs

21. In addition to direct jobs created by the capital investment programme, new building projects are known to create a number of indirect and induced jobs.
22. **Indirect jobs** are jobs that are an output of additional activities made possible by the project, but not as a direct output of the project itself. A common example of this would be construction jobs.
23. **Induced jobs** are additional jobs flowing from the wider beneficial effects of the project that fall outside the direct and indirect jobs. For instance jobs that are created or supported within local shops as a result of increased expenditure by those employed directly within the facility.
24. As a broad indication of the likely rate of indirect and induced job creation produced by the *Capital Expenditure Programme*, we can draw on the Standard Economic Appraisal that was prepared to support the planning application for the approved Millbrook Technology Park (CB/14/02490/OUT).
25. The Technology Park application had an estimated construction cost of £61 million and was predicted in 2014 to lead to 279 indirect construction-related jobs. **This can be translated to 4.6 construction jobs per £1m capital investment.**



Summary of Economic Benefits

- Assuming outline planning permission for up to 40 dwellings, the Land Opposite the Lane & Lombard Street, East of Marston Road, Lidlington, is estimated to be worth in the region of £3-4 million.
- This sum will be invested directly into Millbrook's Capital Investment Budget.
- The company's Capital Investment Programme, to be approved by Spectris Plc, includes a number of projects that will help maintain and improve MPG's competitive advantage as one of the world's leading vehicle test and development centres.
- A typical project for use by MPG can be expected to generate 1.66 additional direct jobs per £1m invested. A capital investment of £4m could therefore be expected to generate 6.64 additional direct jobs for MPG.
- A typical project for lease can be expected to generate 7 additional direct jobs per £1m invested. A capital investment of £4m could therefore be expected to generate 28 additional direct jobs in non-MPG employment within the MPG site.
- A typical project can also be expected to generate a further 4-5 indirect construction related jobs per £1m invested. A capital investment of £4m could therefore be expected to generate up to 20 additional indirect construction jobs.
- Most direct jobs created are likely to be highly skilled and highly paid and will result in additional induced jobs in the local economy.
- A capital investment of £3-4m will help safeguard existing highly skilled jobs at Millbrook Proving Ground.
- It will also continue to help to attract some of the world's leading companies to do business in Central Bedfordshire.

Signed:

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Alex Burns.

Alex Burns
President

Item 13 (Pages 243 - 262) – CB/17/01089/FULL – Oak Bank School, Sandy Lane, Leighton Buzzard, Beds

Additional Consultation/Publicity Responses

The Public Protection Officer has reviewed the application and has recommended the following condition:

1. Prior to the use hereby permitted first being brought into use the applicant shall submit for approval in writing details of the work done to mitigate risks from land contamination.

Reason: To ensure that any potential landfill gas and ground instability problems are investigated before the building is first brought in to use (Policy BE8, SBLPR & Section 11 NPPF)

Additionally, the applicant has sent further information in respect of drainage and as such, the SUDS team have agreed for conditions 4 & 5 to be removed and the following informatives added:

1. The final detailed design including proposed standards of operation, construction, structural integrity and ongoing maintenance must be compliant with the 'Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems' (March 2015, Ref: PB14308), 'Central Bedfordshire Sustainable Drainage Guidance' (Adopted April 2014, Updated May 2015), and recognised best practise including the Ciria SuDS Manual (2016, C753).
2. Construction and maintenance should be carried out in line with the drainage strategy (July 2016), revised drainage calculations and plans provided. Any changes to these plans should be resubmitted for approval by the LPA.
3. We will expect that any components that require replacement and/or maintenance will be designed to be accessible without undue impact on the drainage system and adjacent structures or infrastructure

Additional Comments

The following typo amendments to para 4.1:

There are no changes ~~are~~ proposed to the existing means of access to the highway and as the previously proposed community use is now not planned, the proposals would **not** impact upon the level of the available car parking on the site.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Item 14 (Pages 263 - 274) – CB/16/04384/REG3 – Lancotbury Close
Amenity Land, Totternhoe**

Additional Information

There will be no representative to speak in support of the application, instead, the following supporting information has been provided:

1. There is no visible evidence that any of the existing garages are being used to garage cars overnight. Their width is 2.1m, which is too narrow for most modern vehicles. Nor are the frontages being used either – the row adjacent to number 4 have insufficient curtilage anyway, at 3.5m. If a vehicle did park here it would obstruct the entirety of the footway.
2. There are 35 properties in total around the green. Of these only 5 currently (14%) have off-street parking (nos. 5a, 5, 24, 28 and 29). For most of the properties there is no realistic way of providing off-street parking because of the topography of the land, specifically nos. 7 through to 22.
3. If you applied CBCs parking standards then you would expect there to be a minimum provision of 78 spaces on the assumption that every property is 2 bed and excluding any provision for visitors. When measuring the available kerb space there room for only 23 cars in addition to the 10 that can be parked off-street. This is woefully short of our own standards and it is little wonder that people are parking all over the green. The application will help alleviate some but not all of the pressures and it is unfair to judge it on the basis of objections from residents who have parking within the curtilage of their properties.
4. Whilst on site I spoke to one of the residents at the eastern end. Of the six properties here that front the green, none have 'formal' off-road parking (though most do so illegally). The resident has four cars and in total her adjacent 5 neighbours have a further 10. That is 14 cars vying for the available 4 spaces on road in the section that fronts their properties. She would like us to be more ambitious and to provide further parking on the green area that fronts nos. 30-36.

This page is intentionally left blank