

Appendix A - Table of Comments Received and Changes Proposed to Consultation Draft

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
Councillor, Central Bedfordshire Council	<p>11.5.2 Affordable Housing - does not specify what "qualifying sites" is, what is this?</p> <p>11.5.7 Extra-care and Enhanced Sheltered Housing in table 17 specifies that all site 500+ dwellings, where the objective is for 6-7% How many developments has the Planning Authority approved (or previously Mid Beds) which were in excess of 500 dwellings? say over the last three years ? I am trying to assess the fairness of the development sizes in the context of actually delivering extra-care units.</p> <p>11.5.7 This should be indicated a shortfall, not indicated an shortfall.</p>	None	<p>The threshold for qualifying sites has been amended in light of the Affordable Housing Technical Study. Affordable housing contributions shall now be applicable to sites of over 4 dwellings. This is stated in the Core Strategy DPD. It should be noted that affordable housing contributions are not collected through the Planning Obligations Strategy.</p> <p>The comments relates to an issue that has not been updated or amended in this current review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>Thresholds for extra-care and enhanced sheltered housing can be considered at that stage.</p> <p>Noted, the text will be updated.</p>
Councillor, Central Bedfordshire Council	<p>Public Art - this could arguably be part of the community/leisure facilities area and I feel would be more acceptable if added to this list instead of being a stand alone cost.</p> <p>Policing/emergency services - I have always questioned this especially given that they stand alone in terms of precepting to council tax.</p> <p>Waste and recycling- all part of the ongoing council</p>	None	<p>The comments relates to issues that have not been updated or amended in this current review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>The principle of contributions and thresholds can be considered at that stage.</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
	tax, should we really be adding to the cost of a "bin" which is how some would view this.		
Peter Sayer Associates	My experience of your Planning Obligation system to date is that the speed you expect it to be completed, i.e. before the 8 weeks has expired for your decision to be made is unreasonable. Where a property is mortgaged the owner must get an agreement from his provider and usually pay them a fee. Whilst I believe that no fee is paid to you if planning permission is not granted, there are real and significant costs to the applicant.	It would be much fairer if your requirement for a planning obligation could be a condition within a planning approval as this would save a lot of wasted time and cost to the applicant.	The comments relate to an issue that has not been updated or amended in this current review. There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.
David Lock Associates	Updated guidance was published by CLG in July 2009, ("Detailed proposals and draft regulations for the induction of the Community Infrastructure Levy consultation") and we expected this to have been referred to. Paragraph 5.19 of the updated guidance is relevant because it states "The Government considers that Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 is no longer a suitable basis for standard charged in light of the introduction of CIL". As regulations implementing CIL could come into force as early as April 2010 it is frustrating the Council does not set out its approach explaining how it might apply the CIL, if it chooses to adopt this process. To make future consultation documents easier to		The guidance published by the DCLG in relation to CIL is a consultation document. Whilst the authority acknowledges that CIL could come into force as early as April 2010, this review of the Planning Obligations Strategy was necessary as the existing SPD was prepared and adopted in the context of the Mid Bedfordshire Adopted Local Plan (2005). This Local Plan will be largely superseded by the Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document and therefore any SPD based on the Local Plan will also be superseded. It was considered prudent to update this document and therefore adopt it again, to avoid a policy vacuum. The Council will respond accordingly to the CIL regulations when they are implemented. Noted.

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
	<p>navigate through and make changes more easily identifiable, we suggest revisions could use either bold or Italic font.</p>		
<p>Peacock and Smith on behalf of Morrison's Supermarkets</p>	<p>It is considered in principle that the SPD should be superseded by the Community Infrastructure Levy in due course. Therefore, it is not necessary to update the document at this time as it should be superseded shortly.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, my client objects to the blanket approach. All applications should be assessed on a site by site basis, with an allowance for flexibility to take account of site specific issues and abnormal development costs It should not be the purpose of this document to prevent otherwise acceptable development by adding additional unnecessary burden in the form of a development land tax. Therefore, this is not relevant to the form of development and fails to comply with the provisions</p>	<p>Reference should be removed from paragraph 10.5 of retail development being sought to provide contributions in terms of local community facilities such as libraries, childcare, open space and sports provision. Furthermore, Para 11.6.1 should also reflect these changes accordingly.</p>	<p>The guidance published by the DCLG in relation to CIL is a consultation document. Whilst the authority acknowledges that CIL could come into force as early as April 2010, this review of the Planning Obligations Strategy was necessary as the existing SPD was prepared and adopted in the context of the Mid Bedfordshire Adopted Local Plan (2005). This Local Plan will be largely superseded by the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan Document and therefore any SPD based on the Local Plan will also be superseded. It was considered prudent to update this document and therefore adopt it again, to avoid a policy vacuum. The Council will respond accordingly to the CIL regulations when they are implemented.</p> <p>This matter relates to the principle of the SPD, and not any updates made as part of this review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>The objector can raise these comments at that time.</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
	of Circular 05/05. Therefore. the document is unsound.		
J &J Design	<p>Paragraph 2.2 We assume the Council mean until (last line).</p> <p>The SPD should make it clear that there will be a fundamental review prior to 2021 for the period to 2026.</p> <p>Para 4.1 A further consultation on the detail draft CL Regulations currently expires on 23 Oct 2009 The SPD omits any LPA conclusion on CIL for Central Bedfordshire. In the interests of transparency an additional paragraph to inform the reader is required here.</p> <p>Section 11.3 We welcome the deletion of VAT from Health Care Contributions.</p> <p>Section 11.5 We object to the lack of decisiveness in</p>		<p>Noted, the text will be updated.</p> <p>This SPD will be reviewed biennially.</p> <p>The guidance published by the DCLG in relation to CIL is a consultation document. Whilst the authority acknowledges that CIL could come into force as early as April 2010, this review of the Planning Obligations Strategy was necessary as the existing SPD was prepared and adopted in the context of the Mid Bedfordshire Adopted Local Plan (2005). This Local Plan will be largely superseded by the Core Strategy and Development Management Development Plan Document and therefore any SPD based on the Local Plan will also be superseded. It was considered prudent to update this document and therefore adopt it again, to avoid a policy vacuum. The Council will respond accordingly to the CIL regulations when they are implemented.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>These matters relate to the principle of the SPD, and not any updates made as part of</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
	<p>the use of "may be used". This is unhelpful to developers and contrary to the objectives of "transparency and certainty" set out at introduction para 1.2.</p> <p>Section 11.6.1 Clarification is required. It is our understanding that the 2008 report covered the former MBDC. Elsewhere this is clearly stated. Omission here could imply a wider application which we believe is incorrect.</p> <p>Section 11.7.18 It is noted that this Para is not being altered. The Council and potential faith building providers may find it helpful to refer to "Churches and Faith Buildings: Realising the Potential, DCMS, March 2009. This could usefully form a footnote, for guidance to potential funding sources.</p>		<p>this review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>The objector can raise these comments at that stage.</p>
Halcrow Group Ltd	<p>Central Bedfordshire's SPD fails to comprehensively identify and set out the main infrastructure requirements of all new development, as it does not examine the implications of the Milton Keynes South East Strategic Development Area. Indeed it fails to mention SESDA and indicate the infrastructure requirements arising from the part of SESDA in Central Beds.</p> <p>The SPD fails to accord with comments made by the Inspector in his report on the Mid Beds Core Strategy.</p>	None	<p>These matters do not relate to any updates made as part of this review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>The objector can raise these comments at that stage.</p>
Harlington Parish Council	<p>Table 19 on Playspaces is not strong enough to secure the quality of play spaces.</p> <p>Table 20 may not be enough to secure adequate green infrastructure where linkage and continuity through green "islands" needs to be implemented.</p>	Reword and amend tables to secure greater contributions and/or scheme quality where appropriate.	<p>These matters do not relate to any of the updates made as part of this review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
	<p>Rather than negotiate on a case by case basis only for 1000m², suggest that this should be the de facto arrangement with the charges being indicative.</p> <p>The potential application of Table 22 seems limited and takes no account of extensions to existing communities below the threshold.</p> <p>Table 25 seems of little value unless Central Beds is proposing centralised burial grounds. Harlington's experience is that the amount of money raised would not compensate CBC for the grant level to a Parish Council necessary to implement a new cemetery.</p> <p>Welcome Information Packs could be very useful - Harlington operates such a scheme itself at much lower cost but it isn't clear how CBC will utilise the sums yielded. £19 for the WIP seems large in comparison to the burial charge of only e.g. £5.</p>		<p>review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p> <p>The objector can raise these detailed comments at that stage.</p>
Cranfield Parish Council	<p>The document does not outline how each PC will receive the money, or how it will be determined how the money will be allocated. This needs clarifying.</p>	None	<p>The expenditure of money secured and collected is determined by an internal procedure, which sets out how Spending Officers from Central Bedfordshire or other partnering organisations will allocate funds, working with Parish Councils. The Officer responsible for the Planning Obligations Strategy SPD can clarify this with Cranfield Parish Council directly.</p>
Community and Regional Planning Services	<p>It is implicit in Para 9.2 to 9.4 that, for each particular 'specific matter' (listed in Table 1), that a development will <i>either</i> attract a standard charge <i>or</i> the obligation will be negotiated separately, unless the development is exempt. But it is not 'crystal clear'.</p>	None	<p>These matters do not relate to any of the updates made as part of this review.</p> <p>There will be an opportunity to comment more fully on the SPD in the new year, when a full review of the Strategy will be undertaken.</p>

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
	<p>their community activities, including public worship.</p> <p>Any emphasis on providing co-located multi purpose community/faith facilities seems to me to run contrary to statements found in the CLG's (ODPM) Diversity and Equality in Planning, good practice guide and PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development.</p> <p>It would be useful to include more specific clauses within the SPD makes allowance for faith development on sites that would otherwise be protected for other development. For example that identifies, in principle, that former community/public buildings and former commercial/industrial premises located outside residential areas as most appropriate locations for places of worship and associated community activities. But perhaps these are issues I can take up as part of future consultations.</p>		
The Theatres Trust	Grateful that the word 'cultural' has been retained at Paragraph 11.7.6 on page 37 although it only relates to community halls.	None	Noted.
Forest of Marston Vale	Supports the changes, as the document clearly sets out a positive strategy for the delivery of green infrastructure and particularly the delivery of the Forest of Marston Vale which is to be commended as it is heartening to see policy that helps the Trust to achieve its goals of increasing public access to open space and restoring the former industrial landscape of the vale to an area that Bedfordshire can be proud of.	n/a	n/a

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
Milton Keynes Council	<p>As far as the Milton Keynes Council is concerned, the joint working Memorandum of Understanding between Milton Keynes and Central Bedfordshire, our respective Core Strategies and the draft Consultant Brief for the Development Framework for the MK SE SDA set out the need for a joint cross-boundary infrastructure schedule and developer contribution regime for the whole of the MK SE SDA. It is too far into the future for the current Central Bedfordshire Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning document to include any reference in relation to the MK SE SDA.</p> <p>In View of the above, I can advise that the Milton Keynes Council has no comments to make in regard the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	None	n/a
Stotfold Town Council	No Objection	n/a	n/a
English Heritage	No Objection	n/a	n/a
Anglian Water	No Comments	n/a	n/a
Bedfordshire Coal Authority	No Comments	n/a	n/a
Civil Aviation Authority	No Comments	n/a	n/a
HSE	No Comments	n/a	n/a
Natural England	No Comments	n/a	n/a
South East England Partnership	No Comments	n/a	n/a

Respondent	Summary of Comments	Suggested Change	Council Response
Board			
East of England Development Agency	No Comments	n/a	n/a
Highways Agency	No Comments	n/a	n/a