

**08.04.13**

**ASSESSMENT OF COMMENTS ON EAST OF LEIGHTON LINSLADE  
DRAFT FRAMEWORK PLAN (JANUARY 2013)**



**COMMENTS: LEIGHTON LINSLADE**

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
1	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build segregated cycleways.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide much needed link to roundabout on the ring road so that traffic from the Town Centre can exit south.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
2	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drainage system must not be overloaded and should deal with all surface and foul.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dealt with in Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure must be provided to meet needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already in Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
3	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlike elsewhere provision of Neighbourhood Centre should be in first phase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A505 needs to be expanded to two lanes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
4	Resident	Comment		
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sports facility should be more varied than just football pitches e.g. athletics possibly at Vandyke School.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
5	Friends of the Earth	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For good public transport links.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporated in scheme.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community facilities have to tie in with plans for Billington Park</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
6	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perspective change to the character of Leighton Buzzard as a market town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection to additional development at Leighton Buzzard: covered in Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate infrastructure facilities especially lack of Hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure for the development will be sufficient to cope with additional needs created by new residents. Hospital decisions made by NHS.</li> </ul>
7	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will destroy the character of the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection to the development covered in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling included in the TAs accompanying the planning application demonstrate improvements to traffic flows in the Town Centre and elsewhere.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional employment will render existing empty offices and workshops totally unmarketable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional employment required to accommodate new workers in the new dwellings to achieve a balance of development and provide more modern space.</li> </ul>
8	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for Green Corridor between existing development and proposed new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Very little housing in the new development is located adjacent to existing housing. Most outlooks are retained over open land. North of Hockliffe Road where residential abuts residential there is a proposed green corridor.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development should provide its own shops, school, surgeries relating to a complete community which is linked to Leighton Buzzard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New development provides sufficient physical and social infrastructure to deal with its own requirements.</li> </ul>
9	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Out commuting requires diversion of existing bus routes (150 and 70/69 into the new development)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New bus routes through the development designed to link with the Town Centre and Station to minimize car commuting.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support new public transport links to Town Centre plus walking and cycling links.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrict car parking, particularly that which encourages the school car run.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to encourage the use of solar panels/pv.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will be required to comply with Building Regulations and also District Council's own standards as set out in Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Innovative designs required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design issues will be dealt with at reserve matter application stage but will be covered by Design Briefs/Design Codes.</li> </ul>
10	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Linlade does not need to be expanded.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection dealt with in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>West Street and Heath Road still congested during peak hours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling suggests ELR will improve future congestion in the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Eastern Link Road will increase traffic on Heath Road to railway station and Tesco.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient infrastructure for older children e.g. cinemas etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional facilities for older children will be available as part of the Neighbourhood Centre/Secondary School improvements. The Council is also undertaking improvements in the Town Centre, where this infrastructure should be located.</li> </ul>
11	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2,500 houses unnecessary.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection covered by Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic on Heath Road will cause major problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16 hectares of employment does not guarantee jobs or reduction in commuting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guarantees as to who will occupy employment land (as with houses) but insufficient employment land within the Town making it less attractive to new investors, can be remedied.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will Doctors take up surgery facilities and what happens if they do not.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developers will be required to provide land for new surgery facilities through Section 106.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate facilities for teenagers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A matter to be addressed in Town Centre regeneration.</li> </ul>
12	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No information on phasing of the ELR through Chamberlains Barn.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter for S106 negotiations</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On land to the north of Chamberlains Barn development will be delayed by gravel extraction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The northern part of Chamberlains Barn will be subject to extraction to beyond 2031 according to current estimates. – see p15 of Framework Plan regarding phasing of said extraction</li> <li></li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework should include a Phasing Plan to show how each element fits together and how community facilities, especially schools will be phased.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Matter for Section 106 negotiations</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans should show density ranges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Housing densities are likely to vary throughout the scheme but higher densities will be focussed around the Neighbourhood Centre but away from existing housing.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only Heath Road connects directly to A5 and will be subject to increased congestion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See Line 7 above – planning application traffic modelling results.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No strategic need to connect Orbital Road to Heath Road except to provide new residents with a choice of routes. Consequently connections to Heath Road should be secondary to discourage people from using the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for the ELR to connect to Heath Road demonstrated in</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			connection as a rat run	traffic modelling.
13	Sport England	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To refer to expanded schools being used for community purposes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – already in Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leisure Facilities Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy being prepared by CBC and these should be taken into account.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerging Leisure Facilities Strategy and Playing Pitch Strategy will need to be subject to public consultation but should nonetheless be examined.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single large site accessible supported.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some sports prefer not to have additional pitches but to focus on existing facilities e.g. rugby.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ancillary facilities will be provided as part of Section 106 Obligations on individual planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential need for additional outdoor sports facilities e.g. MUGAs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MUGAs provided for within expanded secondary area and elsewhere within submitted planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of indoor sports facilities should be informed by the emerging Leisure Facilities Strategies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If multi purpose halls used then preference for 4 court hall. Possibly combine with improved facilities at school.</li> </ul>	Option for community use at the Secondary School is within Framework Plan
14	Resident	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Linslade loss of identity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection covered by Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed traffic modelling – see above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not enough employment locally.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan envisages more employment being made available locally.</li> </ul>
15	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR is inadequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR performs as outer orbital road removing congestion from central Leighton Buzzard.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eggington Parish Council must be involved in discussions because villages will be affected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delays for Eggington people getting to Leighton Buzzard for shops, doctors and traffic: 2,500 homes would generate more traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR improves congestion within the Town Centre – see comments above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for new bridge over canal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but not the only way to relieve congestion.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less building on Greenfield land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection covered in Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	
16.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle issued covered by the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Involve Eggington Parish Council in decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
17.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Belt land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection covered by Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over development at Leighton Buzzard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of infrastructure and congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure to be provided along with expansion of East of Leighton Linslade.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of job opportunities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land allocated for additional job growth to meet the needs of</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				the new residents.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of Green Corridor between Leighton Buzzard and Eggington and other villages.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Corridor maintained to keep Leighton Buzzard separate from Eggington and other villages.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of farm land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deficiency of brownfield land to meet housing requirements in CBC/Luton/Dunstable area: covered in Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to construct additional facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities East of Leighton Linslade to be provided in Neighbourhood Centre and secured through S106 associated with applications.</li> </ul>
18.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of information on cross town journeys.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling indicates congestion will be improved.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure such as the station and roads in the vicinity will be inadequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investment in other infrastructure e.g. public transport will ensure better conditions on the road.</li> </ul>
19.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the traffic proposals but only if further development cannot be avoided given already significant development around Leighton Buzzard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
20.	Highways Agency	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for reference to DFT Circular 0/207 for undertaking Transport Assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HA primarily concerned with safety of users of the road network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
21.	CBC Leisure Services Department	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC Leisure Services preparing strategies for indoor and outdoor formal sports facilities: amend to refer to emerging standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Single large site allows flexibility for various sizes of pitch. Precise mix will be informed by new Leisure Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> <li></li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy may identify new requirements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outdoor provision welcomed as it allows for good access from new and existing residential areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requirement for single changing room pavilion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – in Framework Plan</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Special needs of the rugby club.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for provision of 4 court sized community hall but further discussions needed re optimum size.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
22.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate consultation event.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nine weeks is longer than normal consultation period plus 2 exhibition days in Leighton Buzzard and 1 in Eggington.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for wider advertisement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were amendments considered and implemented as a result of public consultation to 3 outline applications on EoLL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some minor changes to the outline planning applications were made.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for hospital.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Depends upon decisions of Health Trust and not LPAs or developers.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern Link Road needs to connect to A505 bypass.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR will connect onto the existing Stanbridge Road which</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				connects onto the A505. A new roundabout is proposed on the A505.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic congestion in the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above comments</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New jobs need wider incentives as opposed to simply provision of site e.g. Apprentice Training Schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but provision of sites is one method of securing additional employment.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction will not occur if there is a need to travel to surrounding hospitals especially if buses are inadequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see above</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location of employment cannot be predicted, especially in a shrinking global market.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Locations of employees in relation to employment cannot be controlled; however, making jobs available locally can reduce commuting.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of rail link between Leighton Buzzard/Dunstable &amp; Luton a mistake affecting sustainability. Biking is not always practicable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but out of CBC/developer control.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim to provide facilities to train technically skilled staff.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but provision of employment sites comes first in the decision-making process.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excavated quarries are not suitable for residential development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but re-using excavated quarries can be acceptable provided adequate compacting and landscaping is undertaken when housing development occurs.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hourly bus services do not provide a satisfactory service into and out of Town; neither is there a satisfactory link to Aylesbury and Milton Keynes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but the new proposals envisage a direct link from the new development to the Town Centre including the railway station.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for a much wider corridor alongside the NGR and along the whole of Vandyke Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insert the words "and completed" in Paragraph 4.1 (10).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Show footpaths on plans to demonstrate linkages to Shenley Hill Country Park and other areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for dwellings for first time buyers to overcome existing housing shortage for local people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density on higher ground should be reduced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce more screen planting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme proposes the introduction of significant planting screens particularly on the eastern edge of the development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Streets should be wide enough to accommodate on-street parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parking need at allotment sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of tall 3 &amp; 4 storey building should be resisted especially close to the back edge of the footway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning application documentation does not anticipate 3 or 4 storey development. The Framework Plan envisages only the occasional use of 3 storey buildings and then in the appropriate location.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to survey empty commercial units not just in Leighton Buzzard but also in Milton Keynes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expectation of providing 2,400 jobs "unrealistic".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but when developed it is anticipated this number of jobs could be accommodated.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New Leisure Centre required as Tiddenfoot is inadequate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leisure facilities are proposed on site in Framework Plan</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No provision for tertiary education.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no tertiary educational facilities proposed at Leighton Linslade</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision for cricket?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cricket pitches will be made available on the pitch area.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of open areas?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These will be subject to Section 106 negotiations with the developers.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct all major new roads before any new houses are built and occupied.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be a programme for phasing the construction of the roads to minimize congestion in the Town Centre. This will be secured through S106 obligations association with applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the connections to the sewage treatment works.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewage Treatment to be dealt with by Anglian Water and EA as part of planning application process.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove acronyms and explain terms such as "character areas" and "Design Codes".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confusion will be addressed by explaining terms.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for clarification of northern part of Chamberlains Barn Quarry.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The northern part of Chamberlains Barn will be quarried until 2031 (see p15 of Framework Plan which addresses sand extraction).</li> </ul>
23.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding problems particularly around Hydrus Drive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted with all three planning applications demonstrating that the proposals will not generate more than greenfield run off thereby not adding to any flood risk within the Town. The situation will be marginally improved as a result of on-site storage proposed. See also p14 (point 6) and p21 (external infrastructure) in Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
24.	Heath & Reach Parish Council	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will satisfy the labour demands of Luton leading to unsustainable vehicular movements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development is intended to meet the needs of future CBC residents; this will include some residents who move from Luton but it will include movement into CBC from other areas as well. Dwelling calculations have been examined looking not only at new inward migrants but also new outward migrants from CBC.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing difficulties in driving across Leighton Buzzard (20 – 30 minutes).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic modelling associated with the planning application shows that the situation in the Town Centre will be improved by the construction of the ELR.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consequence stress on roads and residents of Heath &amp; Reach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous response.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of Green Infrastructure does not provide adequate mitigation for loss of countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EoLL scheme incorporates a substantial amount of open space representing 40% of the whole area. Most of this area will have public access whereas currently the site has very little</li> </ul>



No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				by way of public access.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will add CO<sub>2</sub> gases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will occur by a variety of methods including reducing journeys, making greater use of public transport/walking and cycling, but it is not feasible to simply ignore future dwelling needs as part of this equation.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Government commitment to no building on Green Belt land consequently development of Leighton Buzzard should be on brownfield land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is insufficient brownfield land to meet housing requirements. The Development Strategy removed land East of Leighton Linslade from the Green Belt,</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large scale building will put pressure on water supplies and drainage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All the Water Companies have accepted that there is sufficient water to serve the new development. The new Building Regulations will reduce water usage within individual properties.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building on Shenley Hill will deplete the ecology of the area not to mention the loss of farming land as well as the adverse impact on Heath &amp; Reach.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More important Nature Conservation Areas are to be retained (Clipstone Brook) and biodiversity improvements will be introduced on the remaining areas of open land (40% of the site). Shenley Hill to be retained as an informal Park.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework fails to take into account the views, opinions and concerns of people.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection should be addressed through the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The principle of development at East of Leighton Linslade has been the subject of considerable debate over a prolonged period during the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy with Luton (now abandoned) and more recently through the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework superficial and inadequately evidenced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Framework Plan is part of a series of Framework Plans on urban extensions proposed in the Development Strategy. This is the second Framework Plan after the North of Houghton Regis Framework Plan which was adopted last October.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly oppose urban extension as it bears no relationship to local needs and will add to congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of the urban extension has been determined by the Development Strategy. It partly meets local needs and also contributes to other needs within the Council area. The proposals have been examined carefully with respect of traffic volumes and the effect of the outer orbital road has been looked at in detail.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection to building being limited to the existing Chamberlains Barn quarrying area and land to the south of Billington Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No building is proposed on Shenley Hill which is retained as open space.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to connect Stanbridge Road to the A505 thus keeping traffic away from Heath Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted – a connection is proposed via a new roundabout replacing existing junction.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to examine Junction of Eastern Way and the A5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No proposals are made for the improvement of Eastern Way at the A5 Junction. The Highways Agency and the Council's</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				Highways Department are satisfied with this Junction.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heath &amp; Reach cannot accept any further increases through traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
25.	Economic Growth Schools & Regeneration (CBC)	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the addition of new employment land to the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome the development as it will assist in the regeneration of the Town Centre including Bridge Meadow and land south of the high Street.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for contributions from Section 106 towards regeneration in the Town Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomed the need for "service" land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal complements Council's aims to improve skills outcome locally, including apprenticeship, work placements and training.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is the employment allocation split?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment split into two parts to deal with different markets.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have there been discussions with the owner of the smaller employment allocation close to Vandyke Road? If it cannot be achieved then this undermines the ability to achieve 2,400 jobs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No need to involve owner of smaller employment site. Will respond to FP.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the market demand for the smaller 5 hectare site?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Class B1 (a) and non Class B uses major increase in job growth in Development Strategy. Site adjacent to Neighbourhood Centre responds to this.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the deliverability of a 5 hectare site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative location not examined at this stage.</li> </ul>
26.	Leighton Linslade Churches (Mrs. Tricia Humber)	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neutral as to the proposed new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan does not provide definitive guidance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan provides guidance for planning applications and planning obligations which will then be determined by CBC. This will ensure that the applications are brought together and meet the FP objectives.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure that planning applications are considered on a unified basis to provide critical and essential infrastructure (so as to avoid the situation that has occurred at Sandhill).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous point.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to secure fully integrated affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emerging Development Strategy sets out requirements for affordable housing at each of the major urban extensions.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High density on Chamberlains Barn is not dissimilar to Sandhills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Density levels at EoLL will be significantly lower than at Sandhills as stated in the FP.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for phasing controls to determine when infrastructure is brought forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be secured through Section 106 obligations</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan must recognize needs of proposed new and existing local residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for new community hub but with indoor sports provision separate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but joint provision specifically set out in the Sport England Design Guidance.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paper attached based on Sport England's Village &amp; Community Hall Design Guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous answer.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that community infrastructure levy not in place until April 2014.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
27.	Paul Newman New Homes	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection to the nature of the proposed urban extension at EoLL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection dealt with in Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan fails to provide robust and coherent high level guidance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was the format and methodology that was devised to deal with the North of Houghton Regis proposal. This does not make it immune from criticism but it is a standard form which has been prepared and used previously on other urban extensions.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document fails to acknowledge and respond to the principal concerns of the Examining Inspector at the Joint Core Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Examining Inspector at the JCS was primarily concerned about objections from Luton Borough Council to proposals on the edge of Luton within CBC area: he expressed no concerns about EoLL urban extension.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early approval of the Framework Plan in advance of Development Strategy is not "sound".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soundness of the Development Strategy will be tested by the Examining Inspector. Framework Plan does not have this test.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the Council simply facilitating the passage of the planning application or preparing a coherent strategy?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Development Strategy considered a number of development options as part of the Sustainability Assessment and selected those which it believed to deliver the required measure of development in a sustainable manner.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan fails to deal with issues of deliverability particularly as regards phasing of infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Development Strategy has considered the question of "critical" and "essential" infrastructure as well as the phasing therefore which will, in any event, partly depend on Section 106 negotiations associated with the planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to consider reasonable alternative Strategies in accordance with Paragraph 181 of NPPF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment of the Framework Plan contains within it an objective approach to the decision-making based on the Development Strategy. The Development Strategy incorporated a number of options within the Sustainability Appraisal and accords fully with the NPPF. There is no requirement for a Framework Plan to consider alternatives that have already been rejected through the Development Strategy process.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Premature in advance of the adoption of the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan being prepared in parallel with Development Strategy to demonstrate deliverability</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence to support the vision or the Master Plan proposals; poor quality of pedestrian/cycling links in inappropriate locations for POS leisure and recreation facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details of the integration of the new development with the rest of the community can be seen from the Framework Plan itself and also in more detail in the submitted planning applications.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of any defined targets for sustainable construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Targets for building efficiency are set out in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to acknowledge poor relationship between the development and Town Centre (including railway station).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site is well related to the heart of the Town and to the railway station to which it will be linked by improved public transport.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aims too broad based.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to include target for affordable housing (although acknowledged in Policy 32 of Draft Development Strategy).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan assumes Development Strategy policies will be implemented</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Owing to viability issues the Council will fail to achieve its affordable homes target.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous answer</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to protect the Green Belt and to meet NPPF requirements and to set out "exceptional circumstances".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council has undertaken a clear examination of all sites across its area. When selecting sites for development which are currently within the designated Green Belt, it has gone through the necessary process outlined in the NPPF of demonstrating "exceptional circumstances".</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to protect delivery of mineral extraction in the Chamberlains Barn area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mineral Extraction plans for the northern part of Chamberlains Barn have been taken into account in the preparation of the Framework Plan (see page 15 point 12).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failure to take account of the fact that a major proportion of the site lies within the Floodplain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The inclusion of Green Infrastructure within Zones 2 and 3 is acceptable under the terms of the NPPF and the Companion Guide to PPS25 (see pages 14 and 21 of Framework Plan).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not clear whether the Council is saying that the Concept Plan will shape the planning applications or vice versa.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reference is made to the question of planning gain in the Framework Plan particularly as regards education.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 106 issues are primarily a matter for planning applications. However, the Development Strategy outlines the expected requirements for "critical" and "essential" infrastructure which will be coming forward into the CIL DPD. Education contributions and the requirements of EoLL are set out within this document.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the phasing linkages for the Eastern Link Road and triggers – these should be clearly expressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Precise triggers regarding the Eastern Link Road are set out in the planning application documentation submitted in respect of EoLL.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no method of enforcing the stated aims and objectives of the Concept Plan which makes is debatable in terms of fitness for purpose.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If CBC is not satisfied with the package of measure then it will refuse planning permission.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 5 is inadequate because it fails to measure up planning gain against detail of Viability Assessments.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Viability Assessments have been undertaken as part of the Development Strategy including material commissioned from the Three Dragons.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assurances regarding integration with the existing community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical integration of the development with Leighton Linlade is shown in the Framework Plan and in more detail in the individual planning applications. Social integration will only occur after the development is commenced and will need to be</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				monitored.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of a compelling structure to the Framework Plan with the methodology being employed unsound making it not fit for purpose.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The structure of the document is precisely the same as that used for other urban extension Framework Plans. CBC believe that these work well although it will monitor and develop this methodology if and when circumstances suggest that changes should be made.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instead of resurrecting the abandoned Joint Core Strategy the Council has missed an opportunity to take a new informed look at the needs of the District.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC Development Strategy has undertaken a fundamental reappraisal of all of the proposals contained within the Joint Core Strategy as it applies to the CBC area. This was not an uncritical carry forward of the previous arrangement.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is critically important for the Authority and its residents that a scheme which is deliverable in the early part of the Plan period is properly evaluated and judged against the clearly structured set of definite objectives and standards which are transparent to all.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC take the view that the Framework Plans provide a clearly structured blue print for the Town against which the planning applications can be evaluated and judged.</li> </ul>
28.	Hockliffe Parish Council	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate assessment of traffic impact particularly in terms of additional traffic accessing the A5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling undertaken by the developers suggests that additional traffic at A5 crossroads will not materially harm the existing situation.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to examine the Eastern Way/A5 Junction in more detail bearing in mind 60mph speed limit on the road. Suggests introduction of 30mph limit by HA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but HA and Council's Highway Department satisfied with this junction.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need for additional works to Church End Road Junction and Hockliffe to allow safe entry to A4012 which is currently on a blind bend.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but further discussions on this matter will need to be undertaken with the Council's Highways Department.</li> </ul>
29.	Leighton Opposes Unsustainable Development (LOUD)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wide opposition to the urban extension which is simply a re-run of the Joint Core Strategy (now withdrawn).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of urban extension determined through Development Strategy process which took into account comments from all CBC residents, including those at Leighton Linlade.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some landowners have not been involved in the preparation of Framework Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The major landowners and their agents have been involved in the preparation of this document. The purpose of the consultation process is to draw in others and local residents to obtain their views.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although Framework Plan states that development should be brought forward in a timely manner it is not explained for whom.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under a plan-led system there is a requirement to ensure that allocations are brought forward at the appropriate time together with the necessary infrastructure; the Development Strategy envisages an early start at East of Leighton Linlade and the Council's Housing Trajectory includes it as part of the 5 Year Supply.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no "pressing need" for the release of land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Pressing" is derived from the need in the NPPF to increase housing production across the country as a whole. The question as to whether the Council has or is not a 5 Year supply of land will need to be examined further but both the Development Strategy and the Housing Trajectory assume an early start at East of Leighton Linlade to meet NPPF</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				requirements.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Big Plan could proceed with adequate funding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Features to the Big Plan have been incorporated in the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC's vision for East of Leighton Linlade is not accepted by LOUD or the existing population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC's vision takes into account the implementation of the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the evidence for new inward investment and jobs deriving from additional allocations especially when few new local jobs have been created and outward commuting increases.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Linlade needs new employment allocations in order to attract jobs. Current sites are not adequate for this purpose and there has been very little new employment allocations made available hence the increase in outward commuting.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional development will involve more commuting, probably by private car.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Planning Authority could or should stop commuting as this is a personal choice. However, it can influence the availability of local jobs and thereby seek to reduce outward commuting.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will create additional cross town traffic which will not be relieved by the ELR.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments above (Line 23)</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Misleading to claim that new employment sites will reduce the need to commute from the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no certainty that any allocations will simply automatically reduce commuting. However, there will be an opportunity for more jobs to be established locally and for local people to use these and hence not travel to work long distances.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contemporary designs will not fit with the character of the historic market town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contemporary designs would not necessarily impact on the character of the Town Centre and would be subject to consultation.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential increase in flood risk especially as long promised flood alleviation scheme is not now to proceed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments above</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the evidence of 2,400 additional jobs. Will they come before the houses and which companies have indicated that they intend to locate at EoLL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2,400 jobs is a calculation of the total number of jobs likely to be created on the employment areas and the Neighbourhood Centre when the development is completed. There is no indication as to when jobs will occur (in the same way as there is no indication as to occupants of the houses. Market research has been undertaken to find out whether there is a demand for additional employment land in the Town.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claim for ELR as an alternative orbital route is misleading. The road does not connect to the bypass or across Town to the station. Benefits overstated. Development will lead to increase use of Eastern Way/A5 Junction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The outer orbital route from Heath Road to Stanbridge Road is adequate to relieve congestion within the Town Centre. There is no need to connect to the bypass as this would actually increase the amount of traffic on arterial routes into the Town Centre. No bypass could ever change access to the station in the centre of Town. A5 Eastern Way point noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that arterial routes will suffer badly from more congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling shows radials will have less traffic generally.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All required infrastructure should be in place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure will be phased as required as it will inefficient and unviable to introduce all new infrastructure in advance of</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				residential development.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to verify transportation modelling.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Copies of the detailed transport modelling are attached to the Planning Applications</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ample employment land in the south of the Town already available.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment land to the south of the Town is not of a quality which is likely to attract new Class B1a and Class B1b development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of Clipstone Brook as a pedestrian/cycleway route will reduce the amenity of houses backing on to the Brook.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The use of Clipstone Brook as a means of connecting to the Town Centre by pedestrian and cycleway is deemed to be an appropriate measure.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims regarding community hub and flexibility are unclear.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of funds for indoor sports provision could be combined with such facilities on the secondary school site to allow for community usage. This option needs to be left open and will depend upon other decisions at a later point in time.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No clear indication of funding for infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All infrastructure will be funded from the value of the land which requires both residential, retail and employment sales to be made.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR does not track the edge of the new development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR does not track the edge of the development throughout its length and it is has never been suggested that it should be used as a perimeter road.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No concerns raised by LOUD dealt specifically by documents issues by CBC.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many of the comments made here are dealt with in the Environmental Statements associated with the individual planning applications. The current document represents the Council's considered position in respect of all the issues raised by consultee responses.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applications made in 2011 should be rejected because the Development Strategy has yet to be finalized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Framework Plan is being prepared to ensure proper co-ordination of the planning applications and the implementation of the Development Strategy which includes an urban extension East of Leighton Linlade.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the Development Strategy has yet to be approved why proceed with strategic allocation at EoLL. The current arrangements will lead to years of uncertainty which will impact on ability to sell dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The principle of the development at EoLL will be determined through the Development Strategy which the Council is proposing to submit to the Secretary of State very shortly. The Framework Plan is not intended to deal with matters of principle. Far from creating uncertainty the Plan will demonstrate a long term vision of development around the Town which will assist in Forward Planning.</li> </ul>
30.	CBC Environmental Health Officer	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opportunity for non-guided link with Luton/Dunstable bus way with a strategic located park and ride facility. Need to ensure that Class B2/B8 Uses avoid impacting on residential proposals. However Class B1 is deemed to be compatible. Maximizing outdoor sporting potential can include the provision of floodlights which can affect amenity of adjoining residential properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Important to ensure that residential and other sensitive uses are not affected by noise and fumes from major link roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and taken into account on Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning conditions can be applied in respect of noise, odour and ground conditions as suggested in earlier memos.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Care needs to be taken where new development abuts existing development so as not to sterilize the future plans of the existing development (?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and incorporated in Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for new development on existing arterial roads to be assessed for noise and air quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
31.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Opposed to the entire development as Leighton Linlade is overdeveloped</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Principle of development covered in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Linlade highly congested.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling suggests that the ELR will relieve Town Centre congestion.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing employment area is not full at present</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quality of employment area is poor and needs improving to attract new employers.</li> </ul>
32.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will ruin countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient land available on brownfield sites therefore the need for the release of Greenfield land (see Development Strategy).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No building on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exceptional circumstances exist hence the need to review Green Belt designation.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building houses on or near floodplain is ridiculous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land for development avoids all Flood Zone 3. See pages 15 and 21 of Framework Plan and response on Line 23 above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Buzzard and surrounding villages will be ruined.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection dealt with in the Development Strategy</li> </ul>
33.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority route should not come through the village of Eggington but should be shown down the A4012 to Junction of Nursery Lane/Mill Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority route not shown as going through village of Eggington.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No provision for bus routes from Eggington to any part of the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing bus routes will pass along Stanbridge Road and Hockliffe Road then through the development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel from Eggington to Tidy Tip at Shenley Hill be forced to go through Planets Estate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to tip will be along the new ELR.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for some infrastructure to benefit Eggington if scheme "goes ahead" including perhaps a gas supply to the village and high speed broadband.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
34.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Licence to build as many houses as possible for as little cost as possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will deliver a substantial package of infrastructure which is by no means cheap.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A cheap inadequate proposal which would destroy the identity of Leighton Buzzard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous answer.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment, nice idea but probably unrealistic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment is an important element of this mixed use scheme and is deliverable.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for effective and regeneration of existing Town Centre which is ignored by the Strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy incorporates provision for regeneration of the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development of proper vehicular access and infrastructure to Town Centre is ignored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vehicular strategy involves improvements to not only highways but also to public transport provision linking to the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eastern Link Road will effectively alienate the new community from the existing community and will choke</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Eastern Link Road is intended to provide an alternative</li> </ul>



No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			the Town Centre with traffic leading to more use of Milton Keynes.	route for those not wishing to use the Town Centre as a destination thereby relieving the radial routes. Do not agree with lack of integration point.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel to Milton Keynes will divert resources away from the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Money and trade from the new development will be retained in the Town.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed network of cycleways and pathways lead to "no-go" areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Footways and cycleways reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions if residents can be persuaded to utilize these facilities.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate policing and fire services.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All services are subject to reductions to meet with public sector cut backs. This does not absolve the Authority from making provision for new development, especially where this has the necessary new facilities e.g. education, community facilities etc.</li> <li></li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ignoring regeneration of Leighton Buzzard. It is essentially a strategy "approved by a cheapskate Council who associates itself with greedy landowners, greedy buildings and greedy developers with the aim of maximizing residential units for minimal outlay under the guise of satisfying a housing quota".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strategy is a forward looking (15 year) programmed to allow for the planned expansion of the largest settlement within CBC area. It is not a proposal which minimizes costs whilst maximizing housing numbers. The viability of the proposals will need to be tested in accordance with the Development Strategy arrangements to finalize details.</li> </ul>
35.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oppose East of Leighton Linslade because Town Centre roads already congested and further congestion will be the result.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection dealt with in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Green Belt protection on the other edge of the planned development so that there will be even more housing at a later stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy continues Green Belt protection outside the urban extension.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for allocated space for amenities to be in place before housing is completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land allocated for amenities will be retained and facilities put in place before the development is completed.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Floodplain will not prevent my house from being flooded and being unable to obtain insurance cover.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will some minor improvement on the existing flooding brought about by additional flood storage on the proposed new development – see response o Line 23 above.</li> </ul>
36.	Resident	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development cannot come soon enough as it is good for everyone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
37.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As preceding objection (see line 29 above).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See responses on line 29 above.</li> </ul>
38.	Resident (former LL & SB Councillor)	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time taken for Section 106 contributions to fund new infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Phasing of funding will be determined through the Section 106 obligation associated with planning applications and linked to specific timescales or delivery of specific numbers of houses.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for new hospital in the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but a decision for the NHS Trust.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of new houses primarily in Eggington Parish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The need to provide houses within the Parish of Eggington is part of the expansion of Leighton Buzzard and the desire to see these accommodated in the most sustainable way. Administrative boundaries are not necessarily the correct way</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				of determining sustainable locations.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No guarantee that land allocated from employment will be fully utilized thereby increasing commuting and cross town journeys along local rural roads. Eastern Link Road not adequate as it does not connect with the A505.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allocation of land for employment does not necessarily ensure it will be fully utilized but the lack of land is definitely preventing new inward investment and has done for the last 30 years. Local jobs should reduce outward commuting and pressure on local roads. The traffic modelling shows that there is no need for a new connection to the A505.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can the proposal create more open space with the construction of 2,500 houses (which are a poor substitute for open countryside).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal provides nearly 40% of the land area as open space. Most open countryside does not have public access available to it. Therefore the proposal substantially increases the amount of land to which the public have access.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How can Eggington retain its own character when most of the Parish land will be built on?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eggington village is separated from the new development by an area of open land and by Charity Hill.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acting in accordance with the proposals in the discredit Joint Core Strategy, CBC continue to disregard residents wishes. Without the Framework Plan and Development Strategy CBC should not allow planning applications to proceed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Framework Plan is being prepared in conjunction with the Development Strategy which is shortly to be submitted to the Secretary of State. This incorporates a complete review of the original Joint Core Strategy and identifies three urban extensions within the CBC area which are regarded as the most sustainable location. The Framework Plan would show how these areas are to be developed in a consistent and coherent manner. CBC have listened to wishes of residents and amended scale of scheme.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain "bringing forward in a timely manner".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of a Forward Planning process allocated land must be deliverable within the requisite timeframe hence reference to "a timely manner".</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should not be allowed to precede a Development Strategy which needs to be put into the public domain for consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Development Strategy has already been consulted on once and is being consulted on again shortly prior to submission to the Secretary of State.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JCS Inspector had concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning Inspector had no concerns regarding EoLL.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Big Plan features should not be funded from Section 106 contributions as these have been unreliable in the past.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 106 arrangements in respect of South Leighton Linslade inadequate as the scheme was considered on appeal. The current arrangements involving Section 106 negotiations would allow this matter to be retained under the control of CBC. It is appropriate that most of the infrastructure is funded through the new development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC's Vision for Leighton Linslade not accepted by most of the Town's population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy explains the CBC Vision for Leighton Linslade. The level of objections in principle to this have been limited.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC must provide for evidence regarding establishing new jobs particularly in the light of price differentials for houses between London and Leighton Linslade, which leads to commuting. This will worsen congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed use development aims to provide a similar number of jobs to the numbers of people seeking jobs from the new</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				houses thereby reducing the opportunities for long distance commuting. There is no certainty that local people will automatically take local jobs but without the opportunities additional commuting will occur, hence the need to attract new jobs.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain travel by non private vehicular means and estimate of usage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Aim is to increase use of public transport, walking and cycling, hence focus on this in the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel across town will continue to occur and the proposed ELR does not alleviate the one crossing point hence the possibility of additional traffic congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling suggests that ELR will take up much of the traffic which does not have a destination in the Town Centre thereby improving traffic in the Town Centre. This will occur notwithstanding the fact that some new development will continue to have destinations in the Town Centre e.g. shopping or station.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has already been loss of job opportunities in the Town and CBC must provide concrete evidence that new employment sites will provide local jobs. Focus initially should be on re-using existing premises otherwise there will be substantial outward commuting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing employment land and buildings inadequate for modern usage and the Town needs to improve its image by having a business park catering for new investments. Some new residents will travel to London and hence the proposal to improve the bus connection from the site to the station. Overall the aim is to ensure greater job retention within Leighton Linlade.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What are the conditions for the developer to accommodate a mix of contemporary and traditional designs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will be determined through the application of Design Codes and when reserved matter applications are submitted for detailed design.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for consultation on a range and design of new dwellings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All planning applications are subject to public consultation including reserved matter applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does new development assist in managing flood risk.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response on Line 23 above</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adverse effect on Narrow Gauge Railway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NGR protected in Green Corridor alongside Vandyke Road (see Framework Plan).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduction of dwelling numbers to 2,400 calls into question CBC housing land supply calculations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy re-assesses overall housing requirements for CBC area and allocates them to urban extensions. This process subject to full public consultation.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will 2,400 jobs be created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This assessment has been made based on the overall area of land for employment and the Neighbourhood Centre having regard to standard densities. At present the lack of employment land in Leighton Buzzard has led to job losses. This can only be reversed by allocating sufficient new land in an area where it can generate its own high quality environment. Some initial marketing has occurred to find out whether Leighton Linlade is an attractive location for employers.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the EA reviewing floodplains around the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The views of the EA are being taken into account in terms of the Framework Plan. The EA will also comment in detail on the Flodd Risk Assessments of each of the planning applications at East of Leighton Linlade.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Take note of CABE comments dated 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2009.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CABE have been advised of the Framework Plan and will respond if they deem it necessary. Previous CABE comments relate to an earlier proposal no longer relevant.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>When will additional educational facilities be provided.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In accordance with an agreed timetable with the Council's Education Department. These matters are already under discussion in respect of the planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure must precede housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure will be provided on a phased basis in accordance with the demands placed on it by the new residents and employees.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to Clipstone Brook walkway should be shelved following earlier objections from local residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal anticipates improvements to Clipstone Brook corridor for footway and cycleway linkages. This is in the wider interest of the community</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will CBC finance "critical" and "essential" infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is set out in the relevant documentation for the Development Strategy. Most of the EoLL "critical" and "essential" infrastructure will be provided by the promoters/developers through Section 106 contributions associated with planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will concerns put forward in previous consultations be responded to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This response document sets out the Borough Council's position.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public consultation on Development Strategy will be in 2013 not 2012.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public consultation already took place on the Development Strategy in Summer 2012. Further consultation is currently taking place and the document will be submitted to the Secretary of State later this year i.e. before Summer 2013.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning applications made in 2011 should be rejected and only resubmitted after Development Strategy has been issued for public consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy has already been issued for public consultation and the aim is for the Framework Plan to proceed in parallel with the Development Strategy which is due to be submitted to the Secretary of State in late Spring of 2013.</li> </ul>
39.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objector owns house on Cotefield Drive that backs on to a proposed area of open space adjacent to a small fast running waterway during periods of heavy rainfall. The proposal to introduce an area of public open space along the eastern bank of this watercourse is unacceptable because it will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduce a potential adventure playground into an area which is currently private land thereby causing noise and disturbance to occupants such as ourselves.</li> <li>Give rise to potential loss of protected and unprotected species of animal.</li> <li>Create health and safety problems in respect of the proximity of the watercourse to a playground.</li> <li>By planting additional trees in this general area give rise to more opportunities for leaves and twigs blocking the watercourse thereby flooding adjoining properties.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention is that the proposed area around Chamberlains Barn should be separated from the dwellings on Cotefield Drive by an open wedge of land. The likelihood is that this would be utilized for informal open space and would be controlled by either CBC or the Town Council who will be responsible for its maintenance (with commuted sum payments from the developers). Such areas will be ones where there are arrangements in place to improve informal usage but care will be taken to ensure that the amenities of existing local residents</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				are protected so far as possible. This would include ensuring that regular maintenance occurs to the watercourse. The position of any adventure playground is yet to be finally determined and its position both in relation to the watercourse and in relation to existing residents will be taken into account when details are submitted. Local residents will be consulted on this in due course.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional housing in the Town will put pressure on existing roads and cause additional congestion of traffic pollution.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle issue dealt with in the Development Strategy</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional population would put strain on existing amenities which are insufficient.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle issue dealt with in the Development Strategy</li> </ul>
40.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases in population from 2,500 homes will result in a poorer quality of town life for everyone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Linlade as the largest town in the Council area needs to contribute its fair share of new development for the next 20 years.</li> </ul>
41.	Resident	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development is exactly what the area needs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
42.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to ensure houses are built to Code for Sustainable Homes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction efficiency will be determined by reference to the Development Strategy and to Building Regulations applying at that time.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Direct bus essential to success of the scheme and help reduce congestion in the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal to introduce much improved public transport links to the Town Centre/station.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic calming measures essential along Hockliffe Street/Road (possibly a 20mph zone).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
43.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BC has ignored objections from many Leighton Linlade residents to "this obscene urban proposed development".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but urban extensions have been considered through the Development Strategy process and subject to public consultation.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LL residents do not accept CBC Vision for East of Leighton Linlade with inevitable cross town traffic and commuted journey increase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but CBC Vision for EoLL commensurate with the status of Leighton Linlade as the largest Town in the Council area. New residents with destinations in the centre of Town will be offset by traffic which no longer has to access its destinations via the Town Centre – see traffic modelling associated with planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC's record of securing infrastructure through Section 106 contributions is poor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not believe 2,400 jobs will be created.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2,400 jobs represents a conservative estimate of the job density across the allocated land plus numbers required in the Neighbour Centre. CBC approach suggests that more likely to be 3300 new jobs. Little modern employment land available within the Town and there is a need to provide for more jobs to make the town sustainable.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR just another opportunity to extend development in the area at some stage in the future.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No intention to use ELR as an opportunity to argue for more development.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning applications made in 2011 should be rejected until Development Strategy has gone to public examination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan being brought forward in conjunction with the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 15 year development window maximizes the enormous negative impact on the ELL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan-led strategy for 20 years generates certainty as regards the way in which the Town will develop.</li> </ul>
44.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development unpopular with residents of the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle development dealt with through the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objector using Green Belt agricultural land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response on Line 27</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will aggravate flooding issues within the Town by affecting the floodplain levels of Clipstone Brook.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response on Line 23</li> </ul>
45.	CPRE	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition of the need for expansion beyond existing urban boundaries and that brownfield quarry land may be required.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Quarry land is not necessarily brownfield land. In any event the land north of the Town is insufficient to meet overall housing needs as set out in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposals for 2,500 goes beyond any local need within the 2031 timeframe particularly having regard to the as yet incomplete development on the south side of Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The urban extension for 2,500 houses additional supporting uses represents a reasonable proportion of the CBC needs as at 2031 having regard to the fact that Leighton Linlade is the largest settlement within CBC area.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Together the two proposals generate unsustainable impacts on Leighton Linlade and the surrounding countryside; Will overwhelm its infrastructure and degrade the quality of life.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The aim of the Framework Plan is to ensure that the infrastructure is improved and the quality of life improved as a result of the new development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan disappointing as it mirrors the original AWE/WDH Masterplan proposals and the earlier planning applications.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Framework Plan reconsiders the proposals as set out in the Development Strategy. This in turn is based on the earlier Joint Core Strategy which was entirely reconsidered after the abandonment of this process. The Framework Plan is intended to set out details as to how the urban extension will be delivered.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPRE continue to object the EoLL concept as contained in the Development Strategy and will present evidence at the EiP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
46.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not agree with the development being built.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection dealt with under the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
47.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC ignores earlier petition and is preparing the way for planning applications to proceed without the Development Strategy being approved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection considered through the Development Strategy. The Council has not ignored objections but is looking for Leighton Linlade to make a proportionate response to the needs of the area in line with its size as a settlement.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent experience suggests that additional development will increase cross town traffic and outward commuting.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments on traffic above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC's record in securing necessary infrastructure to support housing development is poor.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 106 negotiations relating to contributions from the development will take place when the planning applications are considered.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Claims of 2,400 new jobs is unsubstantiated especially as there is still existing employment land available within the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR would not produce cross town traffic but would simply enable bottlenecks to build up more quickly.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR would not provide an outward edge and would not form a new boundary for the Green Belt.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning applications in 2011 should be rejected as the Development Strategy has not been finalized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planning applications were submitted to coincide with the previous Joint Core Strategy. The Framework Plan has been prepared in parallel with the Development Strategy to ensure that the urban extensions are implementable.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 15 year development window maximizes the negative impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 15 year development window has been introduced so as to ensure a proper plan-led approach with certainty as to how development will proceed.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letters submitted with responses to Willis Dawson application on Clipstone Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
48.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As preceding comment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As preceding response.</li> </ul>
49.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC preparing to grant planning permission before Development Strategy approved despite previous petition. Why have voices been ignored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection considered through the Development Strategy. CBC has modified substantially the scale of development proposed at Leighton Linlade compared to that which people previously objected to.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will increase cross town congestion and existing infrastructure deficits will not be addressed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cross town congestion issues addressed above. Framework Plan sets out a clear strategy for securing infrastructure improvements in a phased manner.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No massive of increase in job creation and there is still empty employment land to the south.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Employment land required to attract new development to the Town. Land to the south poor quality.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR will not form a boundary to development to stop further release of green land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR not intended to act as barrier for development throughout. Green Belt will be realigned along clear boundaries. The urban extension will not set a precedent for any further releases.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will exacerbate flood risk along Clipstone Brook.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response on Line 23 above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not consider building near floodplain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response on Line 23 above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application should be rejected now until Development Strategy finalized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy in the process of being finalized and Framework Plan is intended to show how delivery can occur.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fifteen year development window maximizes negative impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See note on Line 47 above.</li> </ul>
50.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with the need for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection covered by Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considerable thought given to the appearance of the development but no indication of how this will be enforced.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but will be followed by Design Codes prior to submission of reserved matter applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient thought given to mitigating impacts on the rest of the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mitigating impact on remainder of the Town is an important matter particularly so far as provision of social infrastructure is concerned. So too is the construction of the Eastern Link</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				Road which will relieve traffic congestion in the Town Centre to a considerable degree. Mitigation will be secured through Section 106 obligations associated with planning applications.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Problem with development overwhelming the Town still struggling to accommodate development from the last 10 years.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development Strategy aims at spreading development across CBC area focussing on sustainable locations. Leighton Linlade is the largest settlement in the area and will therefore have to take its share of development.</li> </ul>
51.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultations will have little effect and will not stop the Town being swamped. The Council will ignore any submission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of the development is an issue covered in the Development Strategy. The Framework Plan process is intended to see how best to distribute the development within the allocated area. Constructive contributions will be incorporated.</li> </ul>
52.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of development destroys semi-rural environment for those living north east of the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of development determined through Development Strategy. The Town is one of three urban extension locations and the overall scale of development has been reduced compared to that which was originally proposed some years ago.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will involve floodplain land generating a "disaster waiting to happen".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments on Line 23 above.</li> </ul>
53.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suspect that consultation is a waste of time particularly as Leighton Linlade residents signed a petition opposing expansion on this scale.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of the development has been reduced substantially from the time of the previous petition.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notwithstanding this, welcomes the emphasis on keeping the outer edges of the framework area green and recreational.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest that Green Belt boundary is not adjusted to follow Shenley Hill Road and Clipstone Lane but is brought to the inner edge of the Country Park and playing fields to provide long term protection.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but the open land will probably be handed over to the Council or Town Council for maintenance (and probably the freehold as well).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for greater clarity regarding "defensible" Green Belt boundaries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See preceding response.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the Country Parks, sports ground etc be donated to the Council or retained in the ownership of the developer and who is going to pay and manage them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note also that developers will pay commuted sums for the cost of management of these areas when handed over to the Council/Town Council.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed residential area to the north of Vandyke Road adjacent to Shenley Hill Road is a projection out into open countryside. This should be omitted making a marginal difference of only 200 homes. It will preserve the character of the countryside and the views of and from Shenley Hill.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but development avoids the high ground along the crest of Shenley Hill. Moreover, it still permits a green corridor to be protected alongside the Narrow Gauge railway.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Content with houses and employment at Chamberlains Barn quarry area close to the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional traffic on local roads will be problematic particularly along Heath Road and Woburn Road and Miletree Road and Eastern Way (with both the latter having dangerous junctions).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See earlier comments on traffic.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not like dog leg where the link road crosses Vandyke Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; amended layout being examined for this Junction as</li> </ul>



No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				part of planning application.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not allow estate road access onto Shenley Hill Road to the south of the tip as this would increase fast traffic on these unsuitable country roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New link onto Shenley Hill Road through to the Eastern Link Road will allow the existing Junction between Shenley Hill Road and Vandyke Road to be closed to through traffic thereby reducing potential for accidents in this location.</li> </ul>
54.	Countryside Access Service of CBC	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As this constitutes development in the Green Belt recreational aspects of the application should be exemplary. Shenley Hill Country Park will need to meet Green Flag Standard as well as those from natural England. Currently inadequate information to assess this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formal car parking facility welcomed but current location on Shenley Hill Road inappropriate because it is remove and will lead to vandalism and illegal activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest car parking provision be relocated closer to the ELR or where it can be policed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design and delivery of access routes and informal open space should be accorded high priority and approved along with the reserved matters for the houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preparation of open space areas will be considered as part of the Section 106 and will form part of reserved matter applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for proposals to be considered by Countryside Access Service and referred to in Section 106 negotiations. All routes should be provided to adoptable standards and to CBC specification.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All open space and access routes should be handed over to the Council for ownership and management (following a 5 year after care period with appropriate commuted sum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for full strategic Green Infrastructure contributions as well to reflect pressure that will be placed on Rushmere/Stockgrove.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
55.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disgraceful amount of housing being permitted in Leighton Buzzard.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Buzzard needs to accommodate a proportionate number of new houses needed in CBC. These have been calculated through the Development Strategy over the course of the next 20 years.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greenfield development is a disgrace when it only benefits landowner and not existing residents who are opposed to further development because of traffic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional housing is needed over the next 20 years and therefore development benefits all those who come to live in these houses including those within affordable housing. Additional traffic has been modelled. This shows that with the Eastern Link Road future traffic congestion will be reduced in the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flooding caused by too much development with flash flooding.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that flooding has been caused by high levels of hardstanding and inadequate drainage facilities. However, the current scheme is based on ensuring that run off from the site is equivalent to a Greenfield situation. This involves balancing ponds outside the floodplain area. These are of sufficient size to bring some marginal improvements to downstream residential properties which are currently affected by flooding. See also comments on Line 23.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vote from residents of Leighton Buzzard as to whether development only needed to meet Government targets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultation process on both the Development Strategy and on the Framework Plan allow local people to express their views.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Houses only provided for commuters to Luton and Milton Keynes. Both these sites have many brownfield sites which could be built on.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention is that with the provision of additional employment opportunities locally there will be opportunities to</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				reduce commuting. Brownfield sites in Luton are already scheduled for redevelopment. Brownfield opportunities in Milton Keynes are not widespread (because it is a new Town). Some development will need to take place on Greenfield land.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This compares with Leighton Buzzard which was a small pleasant market town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too many examples of small flimsy houses on narrow overcrowded roads especially near Pages Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intention of CBC is to produce Design Codes to ensure that quality of development is improved substantially compared to recent schemes.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow more time for public consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation process on Development Strategy and the Framework Plan allows locals residents to have their say and is similar to the North Houghton Regis Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
56.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Joint Core Strategy was withdrawn and Leighton Linlade residents have petitioned against the urban extension. Why are these voices being ignored.</li> <li>Not all landowners involved in the planning applications.</li> <li>Why is it important for development to be brought forward in a "timely manner". Explain for whom.</li> <li>Why is development considered "pressing".</li> <li>Why has CBC decided to press ahead with development without the benefit of an agreed Core Strategy.</li> <li>Why cannot the Big Plan proceed?</li> <li>CBC's Vision for EoLL not accepted by the majority of residents.</li> <li>Where is the supporting evidence for new inward investment and job creation especially as the Town has been losing jobs recently. Commuters increasing (including the objector!).</li> <li>Creation of a new bus service will not prevent private vehicular movements which will still be significant. There is a need to be straightforward about this.</li> <li>Travel across the Town will increase significantly because there are a number of destinations in this location. The ELR does nothing to alleviate the one crossing point problem.</li> <li>Misleading to state that two new employment sites will reduce the need for commuting out of the Town especially as new residents will inevitably have jobs in Milton Keynes, Hemel Hempstead, Watford and London.</li> <li>How will contemporary designs fit with the overall character of the market town.</li> <li>How does new infrastructure assist in managing flood risk.</li> <li>Need to provide financial guarantees that cover existing residents against the cost of flood damage.</li> <li>How will 2,400 jobs be created will these jobs come before the houses do. What companies have indicated that they intend to relocated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>Improved bus service should also reduce the amount of private traffic utilizing the Town Centre especially with good links to the station. The traffic modelling has regard to improvements in bus travel but is not over optimistic about this, however it is important to recognise the number of internal trips accessing services such as schools and employment within the development.</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> <li>See response to Line 23</li> <li>Improved upstream balancing arrangements will reduce flood risk for downstream occupants. See also Line 23.</li> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ELR is not an alternative orbital route as it only joins Heath Road to Stanbridge Road (and not to the bypass or to the station).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR could be used to form a real barrier to Green Belt on the edge of the proposed urban extension.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Miletree Road/Eastern Way/A5 will be the main route out to Milton Keynes and the Junction with the A5 is very dangerous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted; details of the A5 Eastern Way junction have been considered in the traffic modelling and by the responses from CBC Highways and the Highways Agency to the planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify Paragraph 4.5.15 regarding right of way given to arterial roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why is there only a general commitment to secure the ELR. Compare with Aylesbury and Bicester where new roads and station have been provided before any houses are completed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a firm commitment from the Council to ensure that all the necessary infrastructure is provided at the requisite time. At this stage the precise timing is not known but it will be a matter of negotiation with the developers/landowners as part of consideration of the Section 106 Agreements for any planning approvals which might be granted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some employment land to the south of the Town already available for development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycle and pedestrian highway along Clipstone Brook will adversely impact existing residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify arrangements with regard to community hub and the need for flexibility.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How will "critical" and "essential" infrastructure be financed and secured. Providing funds from the selling of housing is a risky strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No evidence that concerns, comments or suggestions every responded to.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan consultation is intended to demonstrate that points have either been considered or will be considered in the future.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application submitted in 2011 should be rejected until the Development Strategy has been finalized. What is the rush?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intention is to progress the Framework Plan in parallel with the Development Strategy to demonstrate deliverability of the scheme. The East of Leighton Linlade is one of the three urban extensions which can be brought forward early in order to increase housing numbers within CBC area (a general objective of central Government as there is wide acceptance that housing completions are currently far too low).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fifteen year development programme maximizes the impact on existing residents and will generate years of uncertainty.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 29</li> </ul>
57.	Plymouth Brethren Christian Church	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes the plan to provide sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Faith organizations are an integral part of creating an attractive community.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make specific reference to Places of Worship (perhaps in Paragraph 2.2) to ensure adequate provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and will incorporate.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Plymouth Brethren look forward to working with the Council on the scheme.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomed.</li> </ul>
58.	Landowner	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposals have been around for a very long time and the Council should grant consent so that the project can get underway and the Council see the benefits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
59.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Priority for provision of Lower School so that new residents children can attend straight away and avoid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and CBC intention to provide Lower School at an early</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			changing schools.	stage but to be discussed as part of Section 106 obligations associated with planning applications.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for a dual carriageway along the ELR right the way through to the A505.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CBC Highways do not see need for a dual carriageway. Traffic volumes can easily be accommodated on a single (by wide) carriageway road with appropriate junctions with the radial route.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10% of this figure (250 dwellings) should be a maximum as Town Centre and railway line cannot cope.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>250 dwellings inadequate numbers in terms of providing for overall housing needs and infrastructure improvements to the Town.</li> </ul>
60.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with the scale of development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EoLL urban extension needed – see Development Strategy and housing requirements.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objector is a NIMBY living on Mercury Way which backs on to open fields.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to possible footpath running behind objector's property as this will create a nuisance. Do not build this footpath but access footpaths should be on the new estate roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for new development to make provision for footpaths/cycleways to follow design lines within the proposed new development and to link into existing fabric of the Town.</li> <li>Both sets of footpaths probably needed to secure linkages to existing Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR will not relieve congestion in Town Centre especially taking into account current problems.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ELR will <u>reduce</u> future congestion in the Town Centre by diverting existing and new traffic from using the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please do not ignore these points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All complaints will be examined carefully.</li> </ul>
61.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Buzzard at capacity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Buzzard is a thriving centre which makes it a sustainable location for development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Centre is a nightmare to drive through.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of the ELR will relieve congestion in the Town Centre whilst allowing new residents to access the Town Centre as well.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neither schools nor surgeries can cope.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional facilities (including schools and surgeries) will be provided on site.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bad idea to build more houses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New houses needed to meet future needs over the next 20 years – see Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
62.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consultation a farce.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but disagree.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Questions about detail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Details are important to determine whether the scheme is appropriate.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Main question should the Town continue to expand beyond its ability to cope.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle issues determined through the Development</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				Strategy and consultation process.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town is big enough – no further expansion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Town is one of the larger settlements in CBC area and must contribute as a sustainable location for future growth over the next 20 years proportionately to its size.</li> </ul>
63.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Buzzard too big for existing infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional infrastructure will be built to meet the needs of new residents (and existing residents) as part of implementation of the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No guarantee that schools and businesses will be built out of Sandhills Estate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools and businesses will be provided in a “timely manner” to match the demand.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sports facilities at Billington Park have taken years to sort out and Police Station only part time.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location and timing of sports facilities will be determined through Section 106 agreements associated with planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urgent need for medical facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional surgery facilities provided within the new Neighbourhood Centre together with a Close Care Home for elderly people.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where will affordable housing be built especially as the Sandhills has a reputation as a drug haven with private housing close by being attractive to burglars.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but affordable housing is a requirement for all CBC developments above a certain threshold size.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton will grow to become a satellite of Milton Keynes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leighton Linslade is programmed to take a proportionate share of growth which will take place over the next 20 years based on its overall size within the District and opportunities for development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve existing facilities for existing residents.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What will happen to the rubbish?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but will be addressed by the Council.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will increase in Council tax contributions cause overall Council tax rates to decrease?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council tax rates are determined on a year by year basis depending upon the need for and cost of services.</li> </ul>
64.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of development unacceptable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of development determined through the Development Strategy consultation exercise.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will changed the character of the existing market town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional development can be added on without necessarily adversely affecting the character of the market town.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion for Luton should be elsewhere.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expansion is not solely for Luton but is needed for local needs and some inward migrants from elsewhere.</li> </ul>
65.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the development include a running track to encourage athletics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but the specific uses within the formal open space areas will be determined through the planning applications and will take into account the Council’s Leisure Strategy.</li> </ul>
66.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council ignore comments and consultation is a sham.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan consultation exercise is an opportunity for</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				constructive suggestions to be made; the Council will try to incorporate these within an amended version of the Framework Plan.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Difficulty if small high density housing built with no parking, no services and no road links.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To prevent poor quality housing the Council will be promoting the idea of Design Codes.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why no link to the A5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic modelling shows most movements eastwards along the A505.</li> </ul>
67.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to provide for sports other than football e.g. athletics, hockey and more diverse facilities as well as a decent indoor sports facility (Tiddenfoot is inadequate for a Town the size of Leighton Linlade).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
68.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with all the questions as the plans are ludicrous.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Framework Plan is based on Development Strategy which has considered housing needs very carefully and identified sustainable locations for development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objector feels like a NIMBY as his house backs onto open fields and he will lose the view.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of view is not a relevant planning objection. However, the layout has been arranged so as to try and avoid any direct overlooking from existing residential properties to adjoining residential properties.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it possible to move the footpath to the rear of his property as this could cause a nuisance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and will examine the possibility of realigning footpath.</li> </ul>
69.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for introduction of athletics facilities in the Town: despite Council promises to provide facility at Billington Park and improve the old RAF Stanbridge running track this has not materialized.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capitalize on success from the Olympics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
70.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide athletics track.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
71.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for firm provision of both indoor and outdoor sports facilities specifically for athletics.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indoor sports facilities proposed. On athletics facilities See response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Following loss of track at Astral Park need for new facilities especially to take into account part of Olympic legacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted especially offer of help with fund raising.</li> </ul>
72.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town needs more infrastructure, healthcare and sports facilities e.g. a new swimming pool but not housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New infrastructure will be provided including sports facilities and healthcare. This will be funded in part by the new housing although this is unlikely to extend to a new pool unless this is provided in conjunction with the school.</li> </ul>
73.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make provision for athletics track.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of track at Billington Park adjacent to RAF Stanbridge a problem for the town especially as £1M set aside by the Council.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As preceding.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to make provision for Olympic legacy especially as Vandyke is a "Sports Specialist College".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will examine the possibility of combining facilities with Vandyke Secondary School.</li> </ul>
74.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of athletics track and facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
75.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for alternative facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already enough football pitches.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Athletics track would replace loss of Billington Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More indoor sports facilities including swimming and squash.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some provision for indoor facilities will either be included within the community centre or a financial contributions will be sought for off-site improvements..</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide family homes at lower densities rather than high density "rabbit hutches".</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Likely that family housing at lower density will be constructed, hence the Framework Plan anticipates lower densities overall than, for example, Sandhills.</li> </ul>
76.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve overall recreational provision for the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large areas of the site devoted to informal and formal recreation (over a third of the site).</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include decent athletics provision.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notedbut see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
77.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to cater for Olympic legacy other than football.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted abut see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two good athletic/running clubs in Leighton and desperate need for athletics track.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ideally located in conjunction with the school site for combined use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option is allowed for in the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
78.	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for provision of athletics track to make up for one lost previously.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Athletics is a year round provision and is not seasonal.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enables the open space to be used by more diverse range of users including the disabled and minority groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree the need for a range of sports facilities.</li> </ul>
79.	Leighton Buzzard Athletics Club	Support/ Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impressed with the proposals overall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to provide for athletics as well as other sporting activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted but see response to Line 65.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of running track at RAF Stanbridge a hindrance to expansion of athletics in the Town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be associated with Vandyke Upper School which is a Specialist Sports College.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and has already been taken into account in the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
80	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for new sports hall.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indoor sports facilities have not kept pace with the growth of the Town and the growth in the numbers of older active adults.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing indoor facilities are very well used and CBC are looking at ways to provide more capacity.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tiddenfoot cannot cope with the existing demand and Vandyke does not provide an alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possibility of providing additional facilities in conjunction with an expanded Vandyke Secondary School is being considered and has been allowed for in the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
81	Leighton Linslade Town Council	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Education facilities should be flexible to accommodate any future changes to the three tiers school system.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Council supports provision of the Eastern Link Road but would want it to go to the A505 rather than Stanbridge Road.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As noted above extension of Eastern Link Road to A505 <u>increases</u> congestion in the Town Centre according to traffic modelling. The link attracts more traffic into the Town Centre than it relieves.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town Council supports a wide buffer to the Narrow Gauge Railway.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>

No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would like to see improvements to the Junctions with the A5 as well as the provision of new transport and travel infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBC Highways and Highways Agency satisfied with A5 Junctions.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If designated employment land cannot be delivered then this should be provided for elsewhere within the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of non delivery and employment sufficient to meet the necessary job numbers</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cemetery to be made available as quickly as possible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for Parish boundary to be amended.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
82	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FP has not properly considered impact of journeys eastwards across the Town, especially in peak hours.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modelling shows ELR removes more traffic from the Town Centre than enters it as a destination.</li> </ul>
83	Resident	Comment/ Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverse effect of development on already congested roads including car parks and railway; these needs to be addressed before development is approved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELR and road improvements reduce congestion in the Town Centre. The proposals involve a package of infrastructure improvements including some in the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
84	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not need another Billington Park.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional homes required for the extended Development Strategy period to 2031.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The houses are not in keeping with Village life in Eggington.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development separate from Eggington.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic in Eggington.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic flows in Eggington unlikely to increase because of the effect of Eastern Link Road.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No more new homes!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In principle objection dealt with in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
85.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion will add to chronic congestion in the Town Centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic modelling for planning applications indicates that ELR will reduce congestion within the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for roundabouts at ELR/Stanbridge Road and Stanbridge Road/A505 Junctions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted and included within the planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing congestion will hinder provision of good bus services for the Eastern Expansion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved bus services can be introduced with priority measures especially as the ELR will improve congestion within the Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best hope for Leighton Linlade is improved use of rail with road and the need for a link to the southern bypass (which now appears to have been abandoned).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
86.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Object because more houses means more vehicles leading to more congestion especially with existing development at Billington Park/Sandhills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of Eastern Link Road will assist in relieving congestion in the Town Centre including an allowance from the Billington Park/Sandhills development.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leighton Buzzard is dying partly because of traffic congestion and partly because people shop elsewhere; the plan would worsen this situation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See previous answer; more people locally will improve the local retail offer.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No building should be on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to consider limited Green Belt releases because "very special circumstances" exist – see Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to conserve the countryside especially as suburban parks do not constitute countryside.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for the release of some Greenfield land to meet housing needs in CBC area because insufficient brownfield sites in sustainable locations.</li> </ul>
87	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All new buildings should be zero carbon.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Houses will be built to Building Regulations standards applying at that time.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New road needs to extend to Stoke Road otherwise limited effect on Town Centre.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELR to Stanbridge Road relieves the Town Centre of congestion according to traffic modelling.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle paths should be directed towards the Town Centre and continue to the station.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cycle paths will be introduced through the Clipstone Brook Corridor into the Town Centre as shown in the Framework Plan.</li> </ul>
88	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to construction dwellings to high energy and insulation standards including PVs and wind turbines.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted; buildings will be constructed to Building Regulations standard prevalent at the time of construction. Construction using renewable opportunities will be in accordance with Development Strategy policies.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public transport provision and walking and cycling to be given priority over road building.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of allotments and woodland/green spaces to be given priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Laying out of open space will form part of all Section 106 Agreements.</li> </ul>
89	Resident	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for a new running track following failure of CBC to include this in new RAF Stanbridge redevelopment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted.</li> </ul>
90	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction of ELR between Stanbridge Road and Heath Road will increase traffic on the latter.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noted but overall ELR will reduce traffic within the Town Centre as shown in the traffic modelling work associated with the planning applications.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection to building in Green Belt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Very special circumstances" requiring limited Green Belt</li> </ul>



No	Respondent	Support/ Object	Summarised Comments	Response
				release is necessary to meet housing numbers – see Development Strategy.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Town unable to cope with another 5,000 residents because of lack of shopping facilities especially clothes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilities within the Town likely to increase with growth in population – see CBC proposals for regeneration of Town Centre.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic on already congested roads.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Congestion on roads eased by construction of ELR.</li> </ul>
91	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly object to additional housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In principle objection to housing which is dealt with by the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vandyke Road will not be able to cope with additional traffic from new development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vandyke Road will be able to cope with traffic from the development because of the relief provided by the ELR – see traffic modelling.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cars will use Vandyke Road to access the Town Centre</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See previous response.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During construction Vandyke Road will become a short cut for heavy lorries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to construction sites will be controlled by route management.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could Vandyke Road be used as a one way only route?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and will examine.</li> </ul>
92.	Resident	Comment/ Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why not refurbish empty properties before constructing development on Greenfield land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empty residential properties inadequate to meet the demand for new housing in the area over the next 20 years – see Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporates land which is subject to flooding by the Clipstone Brook.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No development proposed on land within the floodplain (see FRA attached to planning applications). See also response on Line 23.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed scheme not well thought out, sensible, and complete madness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted.</li> </ul>
93.	Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disappointed with the proposed use of Green Belt land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Very special circumstances” exist for the limited use of former Green land as set out in the Development Strategy.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor management of Sandhills/Billington Park with lack of infrastructure is not encouraging.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 106 Obligations will ensure provision of infrastructure in a timely manner.</li> </ul>
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Villages such as Eggington will be swallowed up by urban sprawl and lose their unique identity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Protected gap will exist between EoLL and Eggington.</li> </ul>