

Appendix D

No.	Respondent	Support / Object	Summarised Comments	Response
01	CBC Environmental Policy Team	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An urban extension on this scale warrants a town park type facility to serve the new community but that would also provide a link to the existing community Keen to see provision of GI to serve existing community Would be interested to see the level of formal/informal open space provided Unclear whether the rural green buffer, near the M1/A5 link, is under the control of the developers and intended to function as Green Infrastructure Houghton Regis Quarry, as a County Wildlife Site, must be safeguarded Concerns regarding screening. Some "east-west" screening would help to reduce the scale of the new housing and provide permeability through the development. Developers should work together to secure meaningful advance planting of the green corridors or screen planting 	No change: FP requires extensive Public Open Space to be provided and identifies key protected areas and new green corridors.
02	Cambridgeshire Police Authority	n/a	n/a – Admin request	n/a
03	English Heritage	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very concerned that the draft Framework Plan lacks reference to the historic environment and the heritage assets in the area The main Framework Plan diagram does not show Thorn Spring, a Scheduled Ancient Monument. (SAM) The supplementary written text provides no guidance regarding how the SAM will be treated. "Specific protection" is required for the old Houghton Regis chalk pit, and similar explicit protection should be stated for the SAM The design principles in Section 5 need explicit reference to preserving and enhancing the heritage assets within and surrounding the site 	<p>Change: references to historic environment added. Change: references added.</p> <p>No change: not appropriate for a high level FP. No change: FP identifies these as protected areas</p> <p>Change: design principle added.</p>
04	St Francis Group	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The West Bidwell Consortium have proposed a revised layout for their area of the Framework Plan, identifying and buffering the areas of historic significance. 	Change: FP diagram amended
05	The Theatres Trust	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 15 at para.6.3 a) – states new facilities will be required for secondary schools. We suggest that theatres in schools can be vital performance spaces which should be encouraged for new and existing schools Page 6 - states that new communities will have neighbourhoods including community and cultural facilities. It is unclear what community and cultural facilities would be provided. We suggest a performance space in a new or expanded school would cover this expectation 	No change: detailed matter for CBC to consider when commissioning school buildings. As above.

06	Sports England	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals for providing new formal sports pitches/courts and a new joint use leisure centre are particularly welcomed in principle The framework plan should therefore developed in continued consultation with the Council's leisure team to be consistent with the emerging Leisure Strategy When providing for outdoor sports facilities in major new developments Sport England and sports governing bodies (such as the FA and ECB) advocate that a small number of large multi-pitch sites are provided rather than a larger number of small sites. The number of pitches should be clarified. The principle of the development providing sports facilities for meeting the additional educational needs generated by the development is welcomed. However, attention will need to be given to the siting of, and access to, any new playing fields that will serve these sites. In the case of natural turf playing pitches, Sport England does not support new school playing fields being used to meet the community's playing pitch needs when the needs of new residential developments are considered. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: this level of detail will be provided in subsequent Master Plans.</p> <p>No change: detailed matter for CBC to consider when commissioning schools.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p>
07	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main road connections to the site are already heavily congested. The proposed Woodside Connection is to be welcomed, however it is unclear whether the benefit will be lost with the provision of 7,000 dwellings Concern regarding the benefits the A5-M1 Link and Guided Busway would bring 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: for consideration at policy level i.e. the Development Strategy.</p>
08	Buckingham and River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 'Flood risk management' should, in the very least, be apart of the critical or essential infrastructure, detailed in Chapter 6. 	<p>Change: appropriate text added.</p>
09	Natural England	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The framework plan incorporates Houghton Regis Marl Lakes SSSI. This area forms part of the wider Houghton Regis Chalk Pit CWS, an area of significant local biodiversity interest and believed to be of similar ecological value to the SSSI area. Any assessment of impacts and mitigation proposals must consider the interest of the pit in its entirety, rather than as separate SSSI and CWS elements. Any proposals to open up this site for public access and a visitor centre will require a full assessment of likely impacts on the special interest features of the Chalk Pit. We believe that such a proposal will require a detailed access strategy. We have concerns that the Framework Plan appears to indicate transport access (cycle/pedestrian and indicative main bus route) along the north western boundary of the SSSI/CWS area. In a residential development of this size, we would expect the inclusion of 40% GI (Natural England's aspirational target). Natural England strongly recommends the production of a GI strategy for the entire area. The development site is within 2km of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and adjacent to the Chiltern Way & Chelgrove Heritage Trail. To consider the 	<p>No change: this level of detailed assessment will be considered at planning application stage.</p> <p>As above.</p> <p>No change: links considered to be essential. Mitigation will be required at Master Plan and Planning Application stages. No change: FP <u>is</u> the overall GI strategy which will be supplemented by detailed local strategies at Master Plan level.</p>

			<p>direct and indirect effects of the proposal, we advise you contact the Chilterns Conservation Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England would wish to see details of local landscape character areas mapped at a scale appropriate to the development site as well as any relevant management plans or strategies pertaining to the area. • Consideration should also be given to the potential impacts on the adjacent/nearby Chiltern Way & Chalgrove Heritage Trail, and Ridgeway National Trail (if any). • Development proposals will need to consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites. • We strongly recommend that surveys for protected species should be carried out within the area affected by the development. • Development proposals should aim to avoid damage to existing biodiversity features, and to create opportunities for enhancing biodiversity through the delivery of Local Biodiversity Action Plan (LBAP) targets and the local GI Strategy. • Any environmental assessment should identify, describe and evaluate the effects that are likely to result from the project in combination with other projects and activities that are being, have been or will be carried out. • Early consideration should be given to the quality of soil resource on potential development sites and therefore the development strategy process provides a useful opportunity to consider soils and to ensure their protection during the plan making process. 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
10	Environment Agency	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have concerns regarding the lack of flood risk recognition and consideration that should have been carried forward from the June 2010 Framework Document. • We have a number of groundwater and contaminated land concerns. we recommend that the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs) are referenced as an important material consideration. • We recommend that the provision of wastewater infrastructure should be regarded as critical, and the 'drainage strategy' referred to should therefore be developed and agreed at the earliest opportunity - and at very least ahead of the submission of any planning applications for individual developments. • The council's Water Cycle Study has identified a number of potential foul drainage solutions for Houghton Regis North, but at this point in time none has been confirmed as the agreed option and none has been confirmed as deliverable without causing a breach of environmental legislation. • Previous documents on Houghton Regis have referred to a Waste Strategy to be developed for the constructional and operational phases of the development. It is important that waste management is addressed for this development • The framework document makes very limited reference to water supply and water 	<p>No change: FP identifies areas at risk. Change: reference added.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Change: additional references</p>

			resources regarding this new development.	added.
11	Bedfordshire Police (Colliers International)	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the Framework Plan, however some additional text should be inserted. • A Crime Impact Assessment should be undertaken to assess the baseline conditions and potential impacts that the proposed development would have on crime and community safety. • In terms of the large number of new homes to be provided, the imposed operational impact could not reasonably be met by the current level of Police facilities in the area. Therefore, as part of essential infrastructure, additional Police facilities will need to be provided 	<p>Noted. Change: reference added.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: for consideration at planning application stages.</p>
12	Resident	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support, but would raise the question of sufficient direct access routes so that additional traffic is not routed along already congested roads such as the High Street. • Will there be areas provided for individuals to purchase their own land and build houses to suit their particular needs and desires? • There does not seem to be sufficient provision for places of worship. 	<p>No change: all opportunities for direct access included in FP.</p> <p>No change: matter to be considered at Master Plan and planning application stages.</p> <p>No change: provision of faith facilities included in text.</p>
13	Bidwell Residents	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst we are supportive of the planned A5-M1 link road we have overall reservations about the Northern Houghton Regis Framework Plan • Bidwell Hamlet should be set into an area of green infrastructure to retain its distinctive rural identity taking into account the heritage asset nature of all of the dwellings in Bidwell. • "A development buffer or exclusion zone" should be defined around Bidwell with appropriate boundaries to be set by pre-existing significant features • The environment surrounding Bidwell Farm and Bidwell Spinney is home to a wide variety of fauna. It is likely that many of these species are located/nest in Bidwell Spinney and rely on the surrounding fields/open areas for feeding. This local rural biodiversity should be maintained and protected • Although the Bidwell Farm and Barns are not listed, they should be considered to be non-designated heritage assets, given the age of the original buildings in situ, and the fact that the dwellings establish historical links to Bedfordshire's rural and farming heritage. • The Barns have combined sewerage facilities as a septic tank, with discharge rights in to a tributary to the river Ouzel under the water resources act 1991 any development of the surrounding locales must either preserve this discharge right or incorporate the sewerage from our properties into the national system 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: FP identifies position of Bidwell within GI network.</p> <p>No change: FP identifies reasonable separation proposals.</p> <p>No change: to be considered at Master Plan and planning application stages.</p> <p>No change: reference to respecting character of area included in the text.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
14	Trenport Investments Ltd. and Cemex (David Lock)	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We consider that this proposed Strategic Allocation and Framework area should be limited to its eastern part, east of the A5120 • The Framework Plan itself does not take proper account of these constraints, especially Thorn Spring, the heritage assets at Bidwell, the areas of ecological interest and the 	<p>No change: not in accordance with emerging Development Strategy.</p> <p>No change: constraints referred to</p>

			visually sensitive and topographically constrained areas	in text.
15	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Houghton Regis North Framework plan comes across as a deliberately vague document which hints at all sorts of “good things” but with enough caveats and generalisations to make it meaningless The document fails to recognise the adverse impacts, such as crime, on the surrounding areas, for example the village of Chalton which although likely to be one of the worst affected. Central Bedfordshire is already one of the most densely populated council areas The document fails to give any indication of how many jobs will be supported. The surrounding existing industrial areas (e.g. Camford way, Woodside) already have a high proportion of unoccupied factory /office units, some of which have never been fully occupied The plan implies that the A5 M1 link road is a critical component of infrastructure for this development. I fail to see how that can be the case as the link road is primarily designed to move traffic between the A5 and M1 and while that may have some positive effects on Dunstable traffic it provides little support for the infrastructure requirements of the proposed development. Woodside link would undoubtedly ease the HGV traffic in Dunstable and Luton Oppose the Guided Busway 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Change: reference to crime assessment requirements added.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>No change. Employment provision included in text referring to proposed Development Strategy.</p> <p>Noted. The FP could not be constructed without the A5 M1 link.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
16	Greensand Trust	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision must include reference to the creation and enhancement of GI networks, linking existing assets, buffering and expanding them, creating multi-functional networks for the benefit of people and wildlife We support the linking of Houghton Hall Park to the network to the north-west, highlighted by a proposed footpath /cycling link. The quality and design of this link is important in encouraging its use. We welcome the creation of a ‘Nature Centre’ as a visitor hub at the Houghton Regis Chalk Pit. Links to the wider countryside are shown and are very important, but it is not clear from the Framework Plan diagram what the paler green shading represents. Design should take surface water management, carbon reduction, pollution and noise reduction into account 	<p>No change. Vision refers to GI networks appropriately.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Refers to existing open areas.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
17	Jeremy Peters Associates	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are broadly supportive of the HRNFP, its visions and objectives. However we are concerned over certain designations that are shown attributed to our clients land such as Flooding areas and Green Infrastructure and Open space areas which may not be appropriate when considered in detail as they stymie much of the land for development. 	<p>No change: appropriate assessments will be required at master Plan and Planning Application stages.</p>
18	Markyate Parish Council	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for more schools is highlighted. Markyate is looking more and more to Dunstable for secondary education. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There seems to be a commitment to good leisure provision for the future, which does not reflect in the current much publicized closure of same. There should be far more effort put into making full use of the facility 	
19	St Albans Diocesan Board of Finance (Old Road Securities)	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports the vision of its development as set out in the Framework Plan. Concerned to note that critical infrastructure is required prior to the commencement of significant development Paragraphs 3.1 and 5 would benefit from clarification 	<p>Noted. No change: reflects the requirements of the emerging Development Strategy. No change: text appropriate for the level of a FP.</p>
20	WM Morrison Supermarkets PLC (Peacock and Smith)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are several inconsistencies with the Draft Development Strategy and the Framework Plan Object to Chapter 4. In particular the retail should complement and not compete. There is no indication of scale. 	<p>Noted. Noted.</p>
21	Aylesbury Vale District Council	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments to make. 	Noted.
22	Bidwell West Consortium	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst supportive of this principle, the Consortium is concerned that the conceptual style of the Framework Plan could lead to misunderstanding from consultees and members of the public and does not reflect the more detailed assessment of constraints and opportunities that has informed the Masterplan prepared by the Consortium's Project Team, which has been submitted to the Council The Framework Plan does not accurately reflect the Consortium's Masterplan as submitted The Consortium Members are pleased to see in paragraph 1.3 acknowledgment that the Council is supportive of the principle of early planning applications for the strategic allocation North of Houghton Regis and that these will not have to wait for the adoption of the Development Strategy Paragraph 4.3 should be amended to reflect that many of the existing constraints within Site 2, such as the Ouzel Brook and the topography can be turned into opportunities and help to give the site a more interesting character In Paragraph 6.3 g) reference should be made to viability considerations informing any decision on the scale of affordable housing given the high level of infrastructure that is to be delivered The Consortium would expect to see the Local Planning Authority ensure that it fully assesses the implications of any future Charging Schedule on the delivery of this site before it is adopted 	<p>No change: the FP is intended to be a high level document that will inform individual Master Plans and Planning Applications.</p> <p>Noted. Noted.</p> <p>No change: such opportunities are best explored at Master Plan and Planning Application levels. No change: a matter for detailed negotiation at Planning Application level. Noted.</p>
23	Highways Agency	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Paragraph 1.3 it is unclear when development would be expected to commence. There are potential contradictions between the Framework Plan and the Development Strategy. Greater clarity needs to be provided regarding bus links 	<p>Change: additional text added on timing.</p> <p>No change: FP identifies strategic</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Guided Busway is not listed as a part of the essential infrastructure in Paragraph 6.3 The location for retail/non-B use employment developments is not considered appropriate 	<p>links. The Guided Busway is not a proposal of the FP. No change: the urban extension requires such facilities and it is appropriate to locate these at strategic transport nodes.</p>
24	London Luton Airport Operations Limited (Terence O'Rourke)	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LLAOL supports the approach, which has been taken by the council in preparing the Framework Plan to inform any development proposals. LLAOL has previously supported the planned growth to the north of Houghton Regis and continues to do so. It is suggested that a policy should be incorporated to deal with noise insulation associated with proposals for residential and other forms of development, which are particularly sensitive to aircraft noise 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: a matter for the Master Plan and Planning Application stages.</p>
25	Optimis Consulting	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of consideration and detail within the Framework Plan in relation to the settlement of Bidwell and how the development surrounding it will integrate with the existing built form of the settlement. Specific policies relating to Bidwell should come forward through a masterplanning exercise and development brief for the specific area which will encourage the organic growth of the settlement. Developments should build upon the individuality of the settlement which will help to create an area which will form the cultural heart of the development defined by its own unique character. Green links and transport routes throughout Site 2 need careful consideration due to topographical constraints. The transport route through Bidwell needs addressing to allow the settlement to become a community hub for the whole of the development. The Framework Plan needs to direct the housing growth of Site 2 to the areas in and around Bidwell in the first instance to help create a critical mass of development where the main infrastructure is currently available. The importance of the role of Bidwell as an individual character area needs adding to the document. The direction of growth and the masterplanning exercise for Bidwell will help the existing character area to integrate with the development surrounding it. Without this the provision of homes and employment may be delivered in a piecemeal and incoherent manner. Bidwell also has the opportunity of being an area where land can come forward in the early phases of the delivery of the site as it can be delivered without major infrastructure being delivered. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: Bidwell is identified broadly for separation from significant development and not as a focus for development.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p> <p>No change: existing text in section 4 makes appropriate reference to Bidwell. No change: as above.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p>
26	Optimis Consulting	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lack of consideration and detail within the Framework Plan in relation to the settlement of Bidwell and how the development surrounding it will integrate with the existing built form of the settlement. Specific policies relating to Bidwell should come forward through a masterplanning 	<p>As above.</p>

			<p>exercise and development brief for the specific area which will encourage the organic growth of the settlement. Developments should build upon the individuality of the settlement which will help to create an area which will form the cultural heart of the development defined by its own unique character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green links and transport routes throughout Site 2 need careful consideration due to topographical constraints. The transport route through Bidwell needs addressing to allow the settlement to become a community hub for the whole of the development. • The Framework Plan needs to direct the housing growth of Site 2 to the areas in and around Bidwell in the first instance to help create a critical mass of development where the main infrastructure is currently available. • The importance of the role of Bidwell as an individual character area needs adding to the document. • The direction of growth and the masterplanning exercise for Bidwell will help the existing character area to integrate with the development surrounding it. Without this the provision of homes and employment may be delivered in a piecemeal and incoherent manner. • Bidwell also has the opportunity of being an area where land can come forward in the early phases of the delivery of the site as it can be delivered without major infrastructure being delivered. 	
27	Houghton Regis Development Consortium (Barton Willmore)	Support/ Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We strongly support the creation of a CBC's Framework Plan both plan and written text to guide the development at Houghton Regis North. • Section 3.0 Aims – bullet 5 – change the wording of District Centre to 'Town Centre of Houghton Regis' for consistency with the rest of the written text in the Framework Plan and to reflect the settlement hierarchy as set out in Policy 4 of the Draft Development Strategy, which identifies both Houghton Regis and Dunstable as Major Service Centres. • There should be explicit mention of a foodstore being included in the Mixed Use Area to avoid any ambiguity. It may be helpful in this context to confirm either on the Plan or in the text that it is anticipated that there will be three local centres and one Mixed Use Area (i.e. with the foodstore). • The Framework Plan or text should recognise that there maybe a requirement for the Secondary School to serve Site 1 to be provided on the development site rather than CBC land, notwithstanding the close working relationship between council as landowner and the developer on this matter and in relation to linkages. • Paragraph 6.5 Line 4 – We welcome the Council's acknowledgement that viability should be a factor in determining the mitigation package. • Paragraph 6.5 Line 2 – We suggest wording is amended as follows: '....all mitigation, including financial contributions, associated with 'for completeness. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Change: appropriate amendment.</p> <p>No change: specific proposals will be a matter for later assessment at the Master Plan and Planning Application stages. No change: the FP reflects CBCs preferred approach.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Change: clearer text.</p>
28	Willis Dawson Holdings Ltd	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although one of the provisos refers to the need for "critical infrastructure" to be provided such as the A5/M1 link road and the Woodside Connection, the precise details and 	Change: additional clarity added.

	(Pegasus Planning Group)		<p>timing are questionable and appear inconsistent with the Development Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the land supply position there is a good case for seeking to advance this delivery date on both (HRN and LB) sites as there appear to be "very special circumstances" justifying an early release from the Green Belt 	Noted: a matter for the emerging Development Strategy.
29	Landhold Capital (Phillips Planning Services)	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients land holding at Osbourne House and Windy Willows Nursery is not currently considered by the Framework Plan which simply leaves it without annotation other than some green dots running through it which we understand to reference a pedestrian or cycle route It is requested that our clients land is identified on future drafts of the Framework Plan as a housing area with the same yellow shading as utilised elsewhere We ask that the public footpath / cycle way annotation is removed / re-routed around the site which is presently private land comprising a mixture of storage and commercial uses As our clients land is not included within the allocation area for the North Houghton Regis site, its development should not to be constrained by the infrastructure delivery requirements related to it The site could deliver at an early stage and aid land supply in the early years of the plan. 	<p>Noted: at the scale of the FP, individual land holdings are not identified.</p> <p>No change: however CBC would welcome further discussions. No change: as above.</p> <p>Noted. However any proposals will be required to contribute to infrastructure requirements arising from any development and any supporting infrastructure required to facilitate such development. Noted: As above.</p>
30	Paul Newman New Homes	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not believe that the level of detail showing land use distributions accurately reflects the impacts of constraints on the master plan and appropriate levels of mitigation Concerned that the site provides for dwellings for development post 2031, but does not show any differentiation between allocations under this Development Strategy and reserve sites for future development Concerned that the Council has not evaluated the financial viability of the proposed development site to be reasonably assured of its delivery in an appropriate manner, having regard to the Vision and Objectives of the draft development Strategy. PNNH do not therefore believe that this proposed allocation has been justified 	No change: there is the potential for mitigation at Master Plan and Planning Application stages.
Online Questionnaire Representations				
29	Community/ Voluntary organisation (Wildlife Trust)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plan shows a secondary road and cycle network running through, and potentially seriously damaging, the Houghton Regis Chalk pit Site of Special Scientific Interest and County Wildlife Site. The Wildlife Trust objects to this. The concept of the 'nature centre' may be good, but it does not consider the management of the site, storage of equipment and income generation to carry the site forward. 	<p>No change: text includes requirements for mitigation.</p> <p>No change: this will be a matter for later Master Plan and Planning Applications.</p>
30	Chalgrave Parish Council	n/a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The online questionnaire is hard to find and does not constitute a proper consultation 	Noted.
31	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the alignment of the new road running alongside M1 to Porz Avenue industrial estate. 	Noted.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the level of housing in the area. 	Noted.
32	Voluntary and Community Action	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Framework Plan page 6 Help Form New Communities to read ".... local employment opportunities; high quality social and community infrastructure, including shops, schools, community centres, cultural facilities and places of worship;and acces to a range of quality open spaces" Amend Framework Plan page 8 Aim 6 to read: 6. to contribute to the provision of new social and community infrastructure to meet the needs of the new development and in a way that also benefits existing communities. Add to Framework Plan Page 16 new paragraph (e) (and renumber accordingly): Interim Community Facilities - developers will be required to provide interim community facilities and cover their maintenance and running costs until permanent community facilities are available. They will also be required to meet the costs of providing adequate social infrastructure, including the cost of community development workers. We believe there is a need for three interim community facilities: one to the west of Site 1, one to the east of Site 1 and one on Site 2 and for the associated social infrastructure (including maintenance, running costs and community development staff). They should be provided from prior to the first occupation (in each phase) until six months after the last occupation. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: existing wording suffices.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p> <p>No change: resources should address permanent facilities.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p>
33	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to any development on Green Belt 	Noted.
34	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing should be closer to the airport No details of access improvements for the busway. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Guided Busway not a FP proposal.</p>
35	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The public are being misled as there is no mention that the site is currently Green Belt. The Framework Plan talks of secondary and primary schools, however this are has a three tier school system 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Provision in the area will be changing.</p>
36	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is not wanted and is located on Green Belt land 	Noted.
37	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Framework Plan consultation is not a proper consultation. The new homes will not be affordable to the nearby population The plan does not take account of the Localism Bill and Social Welfare Reform. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
38	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the development and building on Green Belt land 	Noted.
39	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is not wanted 	Noted.
40	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Luton/Dunstable/Houghton Regis area is too big already and there should not be further development 	Noted.
41	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land is Green Belt and not suitable for development 	Noted.
42	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer the Woodside Connection to not go through the new development due to the noise and pollution it will create Do not believe the A5-M1 link road will provide any benefits Concerned that there has been no consultation on the preferred route of the Woodside 	<p>No change: the position of the road previously established.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

			Connection	
43	Resident	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with the development as long as it is south of the A5-M1 link road 	Noted.
44	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not agree that the scale of development is required Disagree with development on steep hills near Dunstable sewage works, which will be highly visible. There will be added visitor pressure on the Houghton Regis Chalk Pit SSSI. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>No change: there is the potential for visual impact which will require further analysis and mitigation at Master Plan and Planning Application stages.</p> <p>No change: text identifies visitor centre as a positive management tool for the area.</p>
45	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Infrastructure should be encouraged where possible. The renovation, improvement and reallocation of existing buildings would be preferred 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
46	Bedfordshire Fire and Rescue Service Fire Safety Department	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New development schemes such as that highlighted in your document would undoubtedly place additional demand on Fire and Rescue Service resources, both in terms of the need for additional capital investment in new facilities and funding for additional fire-fighters, officers and support staff. It is, therefore, reasonable for Fire and Rescue Service needs to be taken into account by local authorities when determining planning applications relating to the provision of new developments. There should be no assumption that Fire and Rescue Service infrastructure could be provided by funding generated outside of the planning framework. BF&RS have no automatic access to sources of capital funding that could contribute towards new infrastructure arising from growth, although it will continue to seek to identify potential funding sources through other mechanisms in support of the delivery of its strategy. The inclusion of BF&RS in this developing CIL process is clearly essential in order to ensure that the Service is not materially disadvantaged in any future planning developments over the next 15 – 20 year period as highlighted within your consultation document and, with this in mind, we would strongly recommend that BF&RS is considered a full partner in this developing process. 	<p>No change: matter to be considered at Master Plan and Planning Application stages.</p> <p>No change: as above.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
47	Town/Parish Council	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads should be developed prior to residential. 	Noted.
48	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Object to the development and the impact on nearby dwellings 	Noted.
49	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will add to flash floods and global warming 	Noted.
50	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unclear what impact the development will have on bus frequency in Parkside 	No change: matter will require addressing at the Master Plan and Planning Application stages.
51	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New infrastructure/development must be developed sensitively to integrate with existing communities 	Noted.
52	Resident	n/a	n/a – Regards naming of Site 1 Masterplan area	n/a

53	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic concerns 	Noted.
54	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disagree with the level of development 	Noted.
55	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will only make the area more congested Do not agree with the new road 	Noted. Noted.
56	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The employment needs to be provided before the residential. 	No change: any need for phasing arrangements will be considered at Master Plan and Planning Application stages.
57	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern regarding the level of development for the area 	Noted.
58	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area already suffers from considerable congestion. The area does not have any doctors, dentists and jobs, which will be exacerbated by this development 	Noted. No change: text refers to requirement for a Health Impact Assessment when Planning Applications submitted.
59	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The plans need to be clearer Do not feel the town can support the level of development The area will develop valuable countryside 	Noted. Noted. Noted.
60	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development may encourage new business and regenerate Dunstable 	Noted.
61	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development is too large There is no obvious access to get to a rail station Uncertainty regarding the location and development of the A5-M1 link road 	Noted. No change: text and diagram refers to road linkages and cycle links. No change: location of A5 M1 link road is clear on the diagram.
62	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not wanted by residents of Houghton Regis The town is at its capacity 	Noted. Noted.
63	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of development is too great for the area The utilities and infrastructure need to be planned early in the process 	Noted. Noted. This is the purpose of the FP.
64	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There needs to be sufficient police involvement/resources for the development 	Noted. Police comment above.
65	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houghton Regis is too large Disagree with the development 	Noted. Noted.
66	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An area of flooding, north of Kestrel Way, is identified for residential and mixed use development 	No change: FP identifies this area for specific attention and mitigation.
67	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The new area must be integrated with the existing community. It is expected that simply "a replacement sports centre at Kingsland Campus" is insufficient for the increased population of the Houghton Regis area 	Noted. No change: facilities are as advised by CBC specialist

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A railway connection should be provided for Houghton Regis • There should not be a road connection from Sundon Road to the new A5-M1 link road • It is unclear how either the A5-M1 link road or Woodside Connection will benefit the residents of Houghton Regis. S106 money should be used to benefit Houghton Regis, not Dunstable • The development provides the opportunity to provide green burial sites 	<p>officers. No change: no direct rail link available. No change: road link required for accessibility reasons. Noted. No change: text refers to cemeteries.</p>
68	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will destroy the character of the area • Will negatively affect social infrastructure • The scale of development is too large. 	<p>Noted. Noted. Noted.</p>
69	CBC Corporate Management	Support	<p>Minutes of CMT meeting dated 22/08/12: AGREED</p> <p>to note and endorse the approach being undertaken, subject to the Council's priority of promoting health and wellbeing being positively addressed in the Framework Plan;</p> <p>to note that further reports on the progress of the scheme would be brought to CMT:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when a planning application had been submitted • prior to determination of a planning application; <p>that in view of the need to encompass health and wellbeing considerations in the Framework Plan, a public health representative would be nominated to work on this by MS.</p>	<p>Change: references added</p> <p>Noted.</p>