

## **Woodside Local Development Order**

### **Statement of Community Consultation**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 This Statement of Community Consultation has been produced to detail the process and results of the consultation which took place for the proposed Local Development Order (LDO) for the Woodside Industrial Estate and surrounding area in Dunstable in early 2014.
- 1.2 The proposed LDO seeks to enable businesses, landowners and occupiers in the designated area to undertake more works to their premises without the need for planning permission. This is intended to encourage employment in the area, save businesses time and money, enable businesses to respond more quickly to opportunities, to encourage ongoing regeneration of the area and to provide a source of competitive advantage over other, competing, locations along the M1 corridor.
- 1.3 The proposed LDO would allow a wide range of minor works to be undertaken without planning permission, including new or replacement windows, shutters and doors, mezzanine floors, solar / PV panels, fencing, lighting and single storey buildings for ancillary uses such as cycle storage, electric car charging, smoking shelters or uses associated with plant, maintenance or the utilities supply to the building.
- 1.4 The proposed LDO would also allow extensions to existing buildings of 1200sqm or 25% of the current floorspace (whichever is the greater) provided the building stayed within its current plot, and allow new build of up to 1200sqm.
- 1.5 The proposed LDO put forward conditions to ensure that local residents and others were appropriately protected. These included restrictions on building height, noise, lighting and parking.
- 1.6 A full list of the proposed measures and conditions can be found in Appendix 1 of the draft Local Development Order.

#### **2.0 Summary of Consultation Process**

- 2.1 Prior to undertaking the consultation, four distinct groups were identified as stakeholders whose views should be sought. These were businesses in the identified area, landowners of the industrial estates, local residents

and statutory consultees (for example Town Councils or the Environment Agency).

- 2.2 The first part of the consultation exercise took the form of a manned public exhibition which was held in a unit within the industrial estate on Thursday 30 January between 2.00pm and 8.00pm. The unit in question was accessible from the nearby residential area by means of a footpath connection, so it was accessible to both local businesses and nearby residents. Display boards were produced to explain what was proposed and how the proposals sat alongside the Council's other work to benefit Dunstable. Officers from Economic Growth and Planning – both Policy and Development Management - were in attendance to talk through the proposals and answer questions.
- 2.3 The exhibition was subsequently moved to Dunstable library for a period of just under four weeks. All of the exhibition material, full copies of the document and questionnaires were also available online, at the receptions of both Watling and Priory Houses and in Houghton Regis library.
- 2.4 In order to promote the consultation and encourage responses, the four groups identified in paragraph 2.1 were notified in specific ways:
- 2.5 Firstly, a letter was hand delivered to all businesses in the identified area. The letter informed them of the consultation, the dates and where the material could be viewed. The letter also asked that this information was shared with the landowner, if the business in question was a tenant in their premises.
- 2.6 Secondly, landowners were notified of the consultation. This was through direct contact with Canmoor, who own a significant proportion of the identified area, and indirectly through agents Lambert Smith Hampton who represent the vast majority of landowners in the identified area. Landowners were asked to share the information with their tenants if possible.
- 2.7 Thirdly, local residents were notified. This was done by a direct mailing to those immediately adjoining the identified area and in close proximity on other streets, a total of 590 letters. Part way through the consultation period, officers from Economic Growth and Development Management undertook a door to door exercise for approximately two hours to remind residents about the consultation and, where possible, to secure additional questionnaire responses.

- 2.8 Statutory consultees were informed of the consultation by a mailing, in line with normal practice in both Development Management and Planning Policy.
- 2.9 More generally, a press release was sent to the Dunstable Gazette and the article appeared in the 29 January 2014 edition as well as online. Planning site notices were put up around the industrial area and nearby residential areas. In all 23 such notices were posted. Some posters were put up in nearby locations such as the Woodside Estate site office, Dunstable and Houghton Regis libraries, and Dunstable and Houghton Regis Town Councils put posters up on their noticeboards around the two towns. Information about the consultation also appeared on Central Bedfordshire Council's Facebook page, Twitter feed and the Let's Talk Business news alert.

### **3.0 Summary of Questionnaire Responses**

- 3.1 A questionnaire was produced to capture the views of people from the consultation. A copy of the questionnaire is attached at Appendix 1.
- 3.2 The questionnaire was split into four sections. Firstly, an opinion was sought on the principle of the LDO, namely allowing businesses to undertake a greater range of work without the need for planning permission, provided measures were in place to safeguard local residents and others. Secondly, an opinion was sought on the principle and specific details of the proposals around allowing minor works. Thirdly, an opinion was sought on the principle and specific details of major works around extensions and new build. Finally, an opinion was sought on the principle and specific details of restrictions and conditions to safeguard residents and others. There was also the opportunity for respondents to submit additional comments on all four of these sections, and any other comments at the end of the questionnaire.
- 3.3 During the consultation, a total of 39 responses were received. This took the form of 32 returned questionnaires, 5 letters and two internal responses. One email was also received, though this related to the White Lion Retail Park rather than the industrial area. Full details of the questionnaire responses can be found at Appendix 2, but they are summarised here.
- 3.4 Of the questionnaire responses, 77.4% came from residents living close to the Woodside area. The remainder were from a mix of residents from elsewhere, landowners and local businesses.

- 3.5 When asked about the principle of the proposed LDO, opinions were reasonably split with 56.3% either agreeing or strongly agreeing, and 40.6% either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. Those who provided further comments were split between agreement and seeing economic benefits, and those concerned about the potential impact on residents.
- 3.6 When asked about the principle of allowing minor works, 59.4% agreed or strongly agreed, while 34.4% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Those who made further comments raised concerns about building height, overlooking residents and noise
- 3.7 When asked about the principle of the LDO allowing extensions to be built without the need for planning permission, again opinions were reasonably split with 40.6% either agreeing or strongly agreeing with the principle and 50% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. Those who made further comments expressed concerns about size, noise and proximity to nearby homes.
- 3.8 When asked about the principle of the LDO allowing new build up to 1200sqm, again opinions were divided with 37.5% agreeing or strongly agreeing and 53.1% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. Again, further comments were based around the potential impact on local residents, and three made comments around height restrictions.
- 3.9 When asked about the principle of the LDO seeking to protect nearby residents and others through restrictions and conditions, the vast majority were supportive with 83.3% agreeing or strongly agreeing, but only 6.7% (2 responses) disagreeing.
- 3.10 Similar figures came from a question asking about height restrictions, with 78.1% agreeing or strongly agreeing and 9.4% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing, and for a question about noise and lighting restrictions, with 78.1% agreeing or strongly agreeing and 12.5% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. Those who made further comments were concerned about the proximity of buildings and made specific comments on noise or light levels.
- 3.11 Finally, a question asking about proposed conditions regarding access and parking arrangements showed that 63.0% agreed or strongly agreed whereas 14.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed.
- 3.12 As can be seen, views about the proposed LDO captured through the questionnaire varied, with a split of opinion over the principle and the specifics of what was proposed through the consultation. Whilst a majority

agreed with the principle, there was stronger support for allowing minor works whilst the proposals around new build and extensions were opposed by a majority of respondents. The proposals to impose conditions or restrictions were strongly supported but points raised about some of the specific details.

#### **4.0 Summary of Written responses**

- 4.1 As well as the questionnaires received, 5 letters were also received during the consultation process. Of these, one was from a landowner and 4 were from statutory consultees. There were also two responses from internal consultees.
- 4.2 The one response sent on behalf of a landowner, Prologis, who own a sizeable part of the proposed LDO area, was strongly supportive of all proposed aspects and hoped that the LDO “will be a positive tool to attract occupiers, remove uncertainties surrounding the planning process and ultimately speed up development”. They further stated that they believed that the proposals around minor works would be “attractive to tenants”, and suggested that monitoring should take place and a review undertaken in advance of the expiry date to ensure that, if successful, the LDO could be extended without disruption or confusion.
- 4.3 The other written responses came from statutory consultees and two internal respondents. Those responses can be summarised as follows:
- 4.4 Natural England raised concerns that the proposals failed to recognise the close proximity of the site to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Blows Down Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and other Local Wildlife Sites. Concern was raised that the potential impacts upon these areas have not been explained and they suggested that a condition should be included requiring proposals to demonstrate that they will not have an adverse impact upon the environment.
- 4.5 English Heritage highlighted the proximity of Houghton Hall Park and the Houghton Regis Conservation area to the site, and whether any impact assessment on this area had been carried out. This issue was also raised by the CBC Conservation Officer, and by CBC Countryside Access and, who are undertaking significant work on the Houghton Hall site with the aim of making significant improvements to the park including the development of a visitor centre. The Conservation Officer highlighted potential issues which could be caused by development from building height, proximity of buildings to the site boundary, fencing types and

building finish / colour schemes, and requested that consideration be given to all of these issues and their potential impacts.

- 4.6 The Environment Agency agreed with the proposals and specifically the requirement to assess contamination and encourage renewable energy. They suggested an additional condition to require a foul and surface water drainage scheme to prevent impacts on the underlying aquifer.
- 4.7 Luton Borough Council responded to express concern over possible additional traffic generation. Whilst they raised no concerns over the majority of minor works, their concerns focussed on those aspects which would allow an increase in floorspace as additional floorspace could lead to an increase in HGV traffic. In particular, they raised concerns over the potential impact upon traffic generation modelled for the Woodside Connection road, and the potential impact of this and the consequent noise upon the residents of Wheatfield Road, to the north of Poynters Road.
- 4.8 Houghton Regis Town Council responded to say that the proposals had been considered by their Planning and Licencing Committee and that they felt it would encourage businesses into, or to remain in, the area and combined with the safeguards to protect residents, "Members were happy to support the proposed LDO".

## **5.0 Response to Points Made**

- 5.1 The table below highlights the comments or suggestions made, and the proposed response to them. Comments have been grouped together where possible rather than addressed individually:

Comment	Response
Potential impact on Houghton Hall Park and the Houghton Regis Conservation Area	The LDO Boundary has been amended slightly to follow the line of the existing buildings where it faces the Conservation area or the Park. Small amendment to the policy on fencing to restrict height to 2m where it faces the Conservation area or the Park. No amendment to height restrictions as existing buildings are beyond the proposed height limit.
Concern over building finish and impact on Conservation area from inappropriate colour schemes.	Currently, the painting of buildings is not classed as development so does not need to go through the planning process and cannot be controlled. Whilst the colour of cladding can be controlled, and this is one of the areas proposed would no longer need planning permission under the LDO, it seems unlikely that an inappropriate colour would be used. Whilst this is a risk, it seems small and would be mitigated by the planted screening around the boundary of the Conservation area.
Concern over site enclosure and impact on Conservation area from inappropriate fencing types.	As noted above, it is suggested that the boundary of the proposed LDO be amended slightly so it follows the current building line in this area. In this case, the fencing along the current boundary line of the Conservation Area would fall outside of the LDO area, and thus require planning permission. In addition, the condition on fencing will be amended to limit the height to 2m where it adjoins the Conservation area.
Potential impact on Blows Down SSSI and Chilterns AONB	Within the context of the existing industrial / commercial area, we do not believe that LDO developments as proposed would have an adverse impact from this proximity to the SSSI and AONB. However, a Screening Opinion for an EIA has been undertaken and this will be appended to the final LDO document

	for reference. Paragraph 7 of the document will be amended to specifically acknowledge the proximity of these two sites.
Request for further condition to ensure that a foul and surface water drainage system is provided	Additional condition included
Impact on local residents	This is a general concern, and the specific issues raised are considered below.
Any new building should need to go through the planning application process	The LDO seeks to encourage employment and ongoing regeneration in the area by enabling landowners and businesses to be able to undertake certain works as quickly and easily as possible. It is considered that extensions and new builds are an important element of this. The threshold proposed for new builds, 1200sqm, is not especially large in the context of existing buildings in the area. Whilst the threshold for extensions is larger (1200sqm or 25% of current floor space, whichever is lower), the requirement to develop within the site curtilage and the requirement to adhere to parking standards will act as a constraint in most locations. In addition, it is considered that the conditions restricting height will provide protection for residents living nearby
Noise, dust and flooding concerns	A noise restriction condition is already included. Any flooding or dust concerns are existing and will not be worsened by the proposals in the LDO
Various comments detailing a need for height restrictions / proposed restrictions are not strong enough	A height restriction policy is already included in the draft LDO. It is considered that this will provide appropriate protection for residents adjoining the site. A further condition will be added so that any windows facing residential properties are opaque and non-opening in order to protect the privacy of residents.
Concern about noise and lighting levels	Conditions restricting both light and noise are present in the draft LDO. It is considered that these conditions present appropriate protection for residents nearby.
Vehicle noise, as well as operational noise, should be monitored	There is a proposed noise restriction condition within the LDO. In response to any complaint of non compliance, investigation /



	monitoring would be undertaken on a site by site basis in line with normal planning enforcement practices.
Roads need to be ready for HGV's	There are no proposals within the LDO on roads. However, when the proposed Woodside Connection link road is constructed, it will take significant traffic away from the town centre and other areas by providing a much improved connection between the Estate and the M1.
Parking is a concern	There is a condition in the draft LDO that any development must accord with CBC Parking Standards, so there will be no negative impact on parking in the area.
Impact upon traffic volumes and noise impacting upon Wheatfield Road	Traffic modelling work undertaken to inform the development and Public Examination for the Woodside Link demonstrates that any increase in traffic can be accommodated by the road network in that area. Any development under the LDO must adhere to CBC Parking Standards and there is an advisory note regarding Travel Plans to further ensure good practice in development.
Wheel cleaning facilities are a must	A condition around wheel cleaning facilities is already included in the proposed LDO
Would neighbouring residents be made directly aware of any proposed changes?	Proposed development would not need to go through the planning application process as it currently does, so no consultation letter would be sent to residents. However, landowners or occupiers wishing to undertake development under the LDO would need to provide a prior notification of this before commencing development and as such any proposals will appear on the weekly list of planning applications which can be viewed on the CBC website.
It is important that businesses do not extend beyond the boundaries of the LDO, or things could escalate or open doors and result in larger development without permission	The parameters for development under the LDO are made very clear in the document and a prior notification process will be put in place, so it should not be possible for businesses to undertake work beyond that which is proposed without planning permission.

Concern on hours of operation	A condition on this is not considered appropriate as the majority of existing premises not subject to such control under planning
-------------------------------	---

## **5.0 Conclusion**

**5.1** As can be seen, the public consultation process for the proposed Woodside Local Development Order was undertaken comprehensively and that businesses, landowners, residents and statutory consultees all had a good opportunity to access information and take part in the consultation.

**5.2** Many of the comments received concerned the potential impact on nearby residents. It is considered that the conditions and restrictions included within the LDO provide an appropriate level of protection for nearby residents whilst enabling businesses to benefit from the improved flexibility the LDO offers.

**5.3** As a result of the consultation, it is proposed that some minor amendments are made to the draft document. In particular, it is proposed to make a small amendment to the boundary of the LDO area where it adjoins the Houghton Hall Conservation Area. It is also proposed to include an additional condition related to foul and surface water drainage, and another concerning windows facing residential properties. These proposed changes are detailed in Appendix 3.

## **Appendix 1 – Copy of Questionnaire**



# Woodside Local Development Order



**This consultation sets out proposals to implement a Local Development Order (LDO) for the Woodside Industrial Estate and surrounding industrial area in Dunstable. This would enable businesses and landowners to undertake certain types of improvement to their buildings or certain forms of development without the need to secure planning permission. As a part of this, we are proposing certain restrictions and conditions to ensure protection for local residents and others.**

**We would like to hear your views on the plans and proposals contained within the Draft Local Development Order. Please review the draft document and then provide your feedback, completing this questionnaire by Friday 28th February 2014.**

**1. Are you responding as:**

- ☐ Local Business
  - ☐ An owner of land in Central Bedfordshire
  - ☐ A resident living close to Woodside
  - ☐ A resident living elsewhere in Central Bedfordshire
  - ☐ Community/ Voluntary Organisation
  - ☐ Town or Parish Council
  - ☐ Developer/ Agent
  - ☐ Other (please write in below)
- 

**2. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the principle of the Local Development Order, namely to allow businesses and landowners to undertake certain types of development without the need to seek planning permission, provided there are measures in place to protect local residents and others?**

- ☐ Strongly agree    ☐ Agree    ☐ Neither agree or disagree    ☐ Disagree    ☐ Strongly disagree

**3. If you have any specific comments on the principle of a Local Development Order for the area, please provide them here.**

### Minor Works

We are proposing to allow businesses or landowners to undertake certain types of minor works without planning permission, such as changing the use of buildings, installing mezzanine floors, installing solar or PV panels. The proposals are detailed in full in section 4.3 of the consultation document and on the display boards.

4. It is proposed that the Local Development Order permits a number of minor works to be undertaken without planning permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?

☐

Strongly agree

☐

Agree

☐

Neither agree or disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Strongly disagree

5. Are there any types of minor works listed which you feel should not be allowed without planning permission, or are there some types of works which you feel should be permitted but which have not been included?

6. Please use the box below to make any comments on the proposal to allow certain types of minor works without planning permission.

### Major Works

We are proposing to allow businesses or landowners to extend existing buildings up to 25% of their current size or by 1200sqm (whichever is the greater). We are also proposing to allow the construction of new buildings up to 1200sqm in size. For full details of this, please refer to section 4.5 of the consultation document or the display boards.

7. The Local Development Order proposals seek to allow businesses and landowners to extend existing buildings up to a certain size without planning permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this?

☐

Strongly agree

☐

Agree

☐

Neither agree or disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Strongly disagree

8. Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to allow businesses and landowners to extend existing buildings to a certain size without planning permission?

9. The Local Development Order proposals seek to allow businesses and landowners to build new buildings up to a certain size (1200sqm) without planning permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this?

☐

Strongly agree

☐

Agree

☐

Neither agree or disagree

☐

Disagree

☐

Strongly disagree

10. Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to allow businesses and landowners to build new buildings up to a certain size (1200sqm) without planning permission?

11. If you have any other comments to make on the proposals regarding Major Works, or if you feel that different limits should apply to either proposal, please provide them below.

### Restrictions and Conditions

To answer the following questions please refer to Part C of Appendix 1 of the consultation document or the display boards, which explains the restrictions and conditions that will apply to development under a Local Development Order.

12. The Local Development Order proposals seek to protect residents and others nearby from unwanted impacts by placing restrictions and conditions on what can be developed without Planning Permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the principle of this?

☐ Strongly agree    ☐ Agree    ☐ Neither agree or disagree    ☐ Disagree    ☐ Strongly disagree

13. To what extent do you agree or disagree that there should be a restriction to prevent a building of more than 5m in height being located less than 10m away from a residential property?

☐ Strongly agree    ☐ Agree    ☐ Neither agree or disagree    ☐ Disagree    ☐ Strongly disagree

14. Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to restrict buildings of more than 5m in height being located less than 10m away from a residential property?

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed conditions detailed in Part C (Section 3) of Appendix 1 which restrict noise and lighting close to residential areas?

☐ Strongly agree    ☐ Agree    ☐ Neither agree or disagree    ☐ Disagree    ☐ Strongly disagree

16. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed conditions restricting noise and lighting close to residential properties?

17. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed conditions detailed in Part C (Section 5) of Appendix 1 which concern parking and access arrangements for the site?

☐ Strongly agree      ☐ Agree      ☐ Neither agree or disagree      ☐ Disagree      ☐ Strongly disagree

18. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed conditions around access and parking arrangements for the site?

19. Are there any conditions detailed in Part C of Appendix 1 which you feel are inappropriate or unnecessary, or are there any additional conditions or restrictions which have not been proposed which you think should be put in place?

20. If you have any other comments to make regarding the conditions detailed in Part C of Appendix 1, please provide them below.

21. Please use the box below to make any other comments about the proposed Local Development Order (LDO).

### About You

The following information will help us when considering your opinions and to make sure that we're getting the views of all members of the community. The answers will not be used to identify any individual.

22. Your postcode:

\_\_\_\_\_



23. Are you: ☐ Male ☐ Female

24. What is your age?

☐ Under 16 yrs ☐ 16-19 yrs ☐ 20-29 yrs ☐ 30-44 yrs ☐ 45-59 yrs  
☐ 60-64 yrs ☐ 65-74 yrs ☐ 75+

25. Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

Under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 a person is considered to have a disability if he/she has a physical or mental impairment which has a sustained and long-term adverse effect on his/her ability to carry out normal day to day activities

☐ Yes ☐ No

26. To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

☐ Asian or Asian British  
☐ Black or Black British  
☐ Chinese  
☐ Mixed  
☐ White British  
☐ Other Ethnic group (please write in below):

---

**Thank you for your views.**

**Please send your completed questionnaire by 28th February 2014 to:**

**FREEPOST RSJS GBB2 SRZT (you do not need a stamp)  
Woodside LDO Consultation  
Central Bedfordshire Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands  
Shefford  
SG17 5TQ**

**Data Protection Act 1998**

Please note that your personal details supplied on this form will be held and/or computerised by Central Bedfordshire Council for the purpose of the Woodside LDO consultation. The information collected may be disclosed to officers and Members of the Council and its' partners or consultants involved in this consultation. Summarised information from the forms may be published, but no individual details will be disclosed under these circumstances. Your personal details will be safeguarded and will not be divulged to any other individuals or organisations for any other purposes.


Security classification: Protected when complete

## **Appendix 2 – Questionnaire responses**

**Woodside LDO results**  
**32 respondents**

**Q1 - Are you responding as:**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	A resident living close to Woodside	24	75.0	77.4
	A resident living elsewhere in Central Bedfordshire	2	6.3	6.5
	An owner of land in Central Bedfordshire	1	3.1	3.2
	Local Business	2	6.3	6.5
	Other (please write in below)	2	6.3	6.5
	Total	31	96.9	100.0
Missing		1	3.1	
Total		32	100.0	




**Q1.a - Other**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Planning agent on behalf of a landowner	1	3.1	50.0
	Professional transport planner [NB not stated whether the response is on behalf of a client or in a personal capacity]	1	3.1	50.0
	Total	2	6.3	100.0
Missing		30	93.8	
Total		32	100.0	

**Q2 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the principle of the Local Development Order, namely to allow businesses and landowners to undertake certain types of development without the need to seek planning permission.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid	Strongly agree	7	21.9	21.9	56.3
	Agree	11	34.4	34.4	
	Neither agree or disagree	1	3.1	3.1	40.6
	Disagree	2	6.3	6.3	
	Strongly disagree	11	34.4	34.4	
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	



**Q3 - If you have any specific comments on the principle of a Local Development Order for the area, please provide them here.**

Topic	Frequency
Valid	
Agree with the principle	2
Good economically	3
Noise, dust & flooding concerns	4
Protecting residents	2

**Q4 - It is proposed that the Local Development Order permits a number of minor works to be undertaken without planning permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this proposal?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid	Strongly agree	7	21.9	21.9	59.4
	Agree	12	37.5	37.5	
	Neither agree or disagree	2	6.3	6.3	34.4
	Disagree	3	9.4	9.4	
	Strongly disagree	8	25.0	25.0	
	Total	32	100.0	100.0	

**Q5 - Are there any types of minor works listed which you feel should not be allowed without planning permission, or are there some types of works which you feel should be permitted but which have not been included?**


Topic	Frequency
Valid Change of use	2
Height restrictions needed	3
Internal/minor works ok	4
Concerns about changes overlooking residents	3
Concerns about noise	3

**Q6 - Please use the box below to make any comments on the proposal to allow certain types of minor works without planning permission.**

Topic	Frequency
Valid Positive step forward	2
Minor work only	2
Concerns about impact on residents	4

**Q7 - The Local Development Order proposals seek to allow businesses and landowners to extend existing buildings up to a certain size without planning permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid Strongly agree	4	12.5	12.5	40.6
Agree	9	28.1	28.1	
Neither agree or disagree	3	9.4	9.4	50.0
Disagree	6	18.8	18.8	
Strongly disagree	10	31.3	31.3	
Total	32	100.0	100.0	




**Q8 - Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to allow businesses and landowners to extend existing buildings to a certain size without planning permission?**

Topic	Frequency
Valid Concern about sizes/proximity compared to homes	3
Noise	4
Change of use concerns	2

**Q9 - The Local Development Order proposals seek to allow businesses and landowners to build new buildings up to a certain size (1200sqm) without planning permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this?**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid Strongly agree	4	12.5	12.5	37.5
Agree	8	25.0	25.0	
Neither agree or disagree	3	9.4	9.4	53.1
Disagree	7	21.9	21.9	
Strongly disagree	10	31.3	31.3	
Total	32	100.0	100.0	



**Q10 - Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to allow businesses and landowners to build new buildings up to a certain size (1200sqm) without planning permission?**


Topic	Frequency
Valid Concern about local residents	5

**Q11 - If you have any other comments to make on the proposals regarding Major Works, or if you feel that different limits should apply to either proposal, please provide them below.**

Topic	Frequency
Valid Height restrictions	3


**Q12 - The Local Development Order proposals seek to protect residents and others nearby from unwanted impacts by placing restrictions and conditions on what can be developed without Planning Permission. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the principle of this?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid	Strongly agree	12	37.5	40.0	83.3
	Agree	13	40.6	43.3	
	Neither agree or disagree	3	9.4	10.0	Disagree & Strongly disagree valid %
	Disagree	2	6.3	6.7	
Total		30	93.8	100.0	6.7
Missing		2	6.3		
Total		32	100.0		



**Q13 - To what extent do you agree or disagree that there should be a restriction to prevent a building of more than 5m in height being located less than 10m away from a residential property?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid	Strongly agree	13	40.6	40.6	78.1
	Agree	12	37.5	37.5	
	Neither agree or disagree	4	12.5	12.5	Disagree & Strongly disagree valid %
	Disagree	1	3.1	3.1	
Total		32	100.0	100.0	9.4
Missing		0	0.0	0.0	
Total		32	100.0		




**Q14 - Do you have any comments regarding the proposal to restrict buildings of more than 5m in height being located less than 10m away from a residential property?**

Topic	Frequency
Valid Too close	8
Height restrictions are important too	2

**Q15 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed conditions detailed in Part C (Section 3) of Appendix 1 which restrict noise and lighting close to residential areas?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid	Strongly agree	9	28.1	28.1	78.1
	Agree	16	50.0	50.0	
	Neither agree or disagree	3	9.4	9.4	Disagree & Strongly disagree valid %
	Disagree	2	6.3	6.3	
Total		32	100.0	100.0	12.5
Missing		0	0.0	0.0	
Total		32	100.0		




**Q16 - Do you have any comments regarding the proposed conditions restricting noise and lighting close to residential properties?**

Topic	Frequency
Valid Concern about noise levels	6
Concern about lighting levels	3

**Q17 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed conditions detailed in Part C (Section 5) of Appendix 1 which concern parking and access arrangements for the site?**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Strongly agree & agree valid %
Valid	Strongly agree	5	15.6	18.5	63.0
	Agree	12	37.5	44.4	
	Neither agree or disagree	6	18.8	22.2	Disagree & Strongly disagree valid %
	Disagree	3	9.4	11.1	
Total		27	84.4	100.0	14.8
Missing		5	15.6		
Total		32	100.0		



**Q18 - Do you have any comments regarding the proposed conditions around access and parking arrangements for the site?**

Topic	Frequency
Valid	
Roads need to be ready for HGVs	3
Parking is a concern	3

**Q19 - Are there any conditions detailed in Part C of Appendix 1 which you feel are inappropriate or unnecessary, or are there any additional conditions or restrictions which have not been proposed which you think should be put in place?**

Topic	Frequency
Valid	
Effect on residents of buildings & their height	2

**Q20 - If you have any other comments to make regarding the conditions detailed in Part C of Appendix 1, please provide them below.**

	Frequency
Valid	
As 6	1
Existing light pollution not controlled.	1
All problems with LDO will cause more problems.	
No	2
Not read Part C of Appendix 1	1
See covering letter	1
Total	6
Missing	26
Total	32

**Q21 - Please use the box below to make any other comments about the proposed Local Development Order (LDO).**


	Frequency
Valid	
Encouraging and a positive benefit to the people of Dunstable that should be implemented ASAP. It is a greatown to live in but has been in steady decline up until recently. This will reverse this decline and enable Dunstable to thrive.	1
I do not believe the restrictions with regard to height of buildings near residential properties are strong enough.	1
Please see answer no.3 which extends below the box provided.	1
Proposed LDO is a very bad thing for residents	1
See covering letter	1
This is a large industrial area in the centre of residential properties.	1
This project should not be taking place.	1
We have no wish to hinder the development of the Woodside estate, or to provide employment and successful companies to prosper, but we do want to protect our way of life.	1
Wheel cleaning facilities - are a must	1
Would neighbouring residents be made directly aware of any potential changes? i.e. not rely on public notices. Would we receive direct communication like this questionnaire regarding neighbouring sites?	1
Total	10
Missing	22
Total	32

Q22 - Your postcode:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	LU5	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4GB	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4PL	3	9.4	11.5
	LU5 4QL	3	9.4	11.5
	LU5 4QN	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4QW	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4RJ	1	3.1	3.8
	Lu5 4RS	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4RS	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4RT	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 4SY	2	6.3	7.7
	LU5 4TA	4	12.5	15.4
	LU5 5	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 5SE	1	3.1	3.8
	LU5 5SR	1	3.1	3.8
	lu54qn	1	3.1	3.8
	LU6 1LT	1	3.1	3.8
	LU6 3RL	1	3.1	3.8
	Total	26	81.3	100.0
Missing		6	18.8	
Total		32	100.0	


Q23- Are you:

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Female	9	28.1	39.1
	Male	14	43.8	60.9
	Total	23	71.9	100.0
Missing		9	28.1	
Total		32	100.0	




Q24 - What is your age?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	16-19 yrs	1	3.1	4.0
	30-44 yrs	4	12.5	16.0
	45-59 yrs	8	25.0	32.0
	60-64 yrs	3	9.4	12.0
	65-74 yrs	4	12.5	16.0
	75+	5	15.6	20.0
	Total	25	78.1	100.0
Missing		7	21.9	
Total		32	100.0	




Q25 - Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	No	20	62.5	80.0
	Yes	5	15.6	20.0
	Total	25	78.1	100.0
Missing		7	21.9	
Total		32	100.0	



Q26 - To which of these groups do you consider you belong?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Other Ethnic group (please write in below):	2	6.3	7.7
	White British	24	75.0	92.3
	Total	26	81.3	100.0
Missing		6	18.8	
Total		32	100.0	



Q26.a - Other

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid	Mixed British	1	3.1	100.0
Missing		31	96.9	
Total		32	100.0	

### Appendix 3 – Schedule of changes (from draft to final document).

Paragraph	Proposed change	Reason
1.1	The phrase "...proposing to make..." to be replaced with "...has adopted..."	To reflect that this is a final rather than proposed draft version of the document.
1.5	The phrase "A draft of the LDO..." to be replaced with "The final LDO document..."	To reflect that this is a final rather than proposed draft version of the document.
1.7	The phrase "The proposed LDO is intended..." to be replaced with "The adopted LDO will..."	To reflect that this is a final rather than proposed draft version of the document.
2.4	Reference to the Development Strategy amended to "the emerging Development Strategy" and specific reference to proposed employment levels removed.	Work is underway on the Development Strategy and the document is yet to go to public examination. As the LDO will last for five years, this will ensure that the LDO document is "future proofed" and does not become out of date as work on the Development Strategy progresses.
4.3	The phrase "with no restriction" to be removed from points 3 – 6 and 9	Clarity. It could imply that conditions etc. do not apply to these instances.
4.3	Restriction in fencing height to 2m when adjacent to the Houghton Regis Conservation Area to be added to point 8.	To ensure appropriate protection for Houghton Hall Park and the Houghton Regis Conservation area.
4.5	The words "should be permitted" to be removed from points 10 and 11. Also "...will be..." in point 10 to be replaced with "...is..."	To reflect that this is a final rather than proposed draft version of the document.
4.7	Various references to "the proposed", or "it is proposed that..." to be replaced.	To reflect that this is a final rather than proposed draft version of the document.
5.1	Self Certification form to be appended to the document	Clarity and comprehensiveness
5.3	Comment to be added that the landlords consent must be sought if necessary	Clarity
6.1	Sentence pointing out that informatives can be found in Part D if Appendix 1 of the document.	Clarity
7.1	Paragraph to be amended to acknowledge the proximity of	Clarity



	sensitive receptors such as Blows Down SSSI and Chilterns AONB.	
10.1	Paragraph updated and a paragraph 10.2 added, to reflect that the LDO was the subject of a public consultation and that the final version takes account of comments received.	Clarity and updating document
Appendix 1 – Part A, no 3	We need to state the day of adoption, and expiry, once we know it.	The final document will state the date of adoption on the front cover. Updating document
Appendix 1 – Part A, no 3	Numbering to be amended as there are two no.3's	Clarity
Part B, no.10	Wording amended on the Apex Business Centre to “which is shown as cross hatched on the accompanying map”	Clarity
Part B	Explanatory note highlighting the basis that new floorspace should be measured on added after point 11.	Clarity
Part C, no. 1	Height restriction conditions rewritten slightly to make them clearer and to make them more in line with existing wording for Permitted Development.	Clarity.
Part C, no. 1	Condition added to clarify that development must remain within the curtilage of the existing plot / site.	Clarity. Was previously stated in the introductory text but not in the policy wording.
Part C, no.1	Point (ii) under fencing to be amended to “2 metres in height if erected or constructed adjacent to any residential property, Houghton Hall Park or the Houghton Regis Conservation Area”. Web link to the Houghton Regis Conservation Area Appraisal added.	To ensure appropriate protection for Houghton Hall Park and the Houghton Regis Conservation area.
Part C, no.2	Requirement to provide Noise Impact Assessment prior to development removed.	To reduce pre-development requirements for those wishing to develop. The actual condition on noise levels has not changed and breaches of conditions on noise restrictions can still be subject to enforcement action.
Part C, no.2	Condition that any upper floor	To protect the privacy of

	windows facing a residential property and within 21m of the property should be obscure glazed and non-opening.	residents.
Part C, no.5	Updated reference to the new version of the Design Guide.	Updating document
Part C, no.6	A new paragraph 6 added to include a condition on foul and surface water drainage. Previous paragraph 6 renumbered to 7.	To ensure that new development ensures the proper treatment of foul and surface water drainage to ensure appropriate protection for the underlying aquifer.
Part D, no.4	Design Guide reference to be updated to new version	Updating document
Part D, no.5	Informative amended to add surface water drainage as well as flood risk. Guidance amended to reflect consultation response from Environment Agency	Updating document.
Map	Slight boundary amendment around Nimbus Park as original line incorrect. Also revised line around Houghton Hall to move the boundary away from the conservation area. Also, slightly revised line around Humphrys Road, so that the road is the boundary and to move the boundary away from residential properties slightly.	To ensure appropriate protection for Houghton Hall Park and the Conservation area, and to ensure that strip of land adjoining residential properties is excluded from LDO area. Also, small error in original document.