

Minutes



Title of meeting:	Marston Vale Stakeholder Meeting
Date:	27 th January 2020, 7.00pm
Attendees:	Cllr Sue Clark (Chair), Laura Webster (Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC)), Thomas Mead (CBC), Caroline Danby (CBC), Sian Farrier (CBC), Peter Hinson (Brogborough PC), Lyn Lyman (Parish Clerk for Brogborough Ridgmont, Hulcote and Salford), Roger Baker (Cranfield PC), Daryl Saint (Cranfield PC), Jean Peall (Lidlington PC), Shawn Haddaway (Lidlington PC), Rob Booth (Lidlington Action Group), Chris Martin (Marston Moreteyne PC), Stewart Long (Marston Moreteyne Action Group), Jennie Thomas (Millbrook Parish Council)
Venue:	Forest End Lower School, Marston Moreteyne
Contact:	Laura Webster

No.	Item	Please tick box below if there is an attachment ↓	Lead Person	Time
1.	<u>Introductions</u>		Cllr Sue Clark	7.00pm
	<p>Cllr Sue Clark asked everyone to introduce themselves and then ran through the previous minutes.</p> <p>Attendance at future meetings by additional groups and Parish areas was discussed. It was agreed that instead of increasing membership of the group, additional attendance would be arranged upon request for specific topic-based meetings of most relevance to those groups.</p> <p>Discussed an Officer from Bedford Borough attending a future meeting to provide an update on developments in their area. ACTION: Laura Webster to contact Bedford Borough.</p> <p>Feedback from the O&H Hamptons trip was discussed. All felt it was a useful exercise. Overall residents seem positive about living in the</p>			

	<p>development and the resident committee and Parish Council set up is interesting. Open spaces and construction of new schools positive. However, there was general consensus that O&H have not properly addressed how Marston Vale would be different given the existing village context as opposed to an urban expansion. It was felt that higher density development is provided to achieve the open space at Hamptons and question what the density proposed at Marston Vale would look like in reality.</p> <p>ACTION: Laura Webster to include future agenda item with an exercise demonstrating how the densities proposed could translate at Marston Vale.</p>		
2.	Application Update		<p>Laura Webster</p> <p>7.20pm</p>
	<p>Laura Webster provided an update on how the application has been progressing since the last meeting.</p> <p>Period of limited progress during Local Plan whilst gaining an understanding of the Local Plan timetable.</p> <p>Officers have been working with AECOM who are providing additional technical support and critique of the transport modelling. This is an extensive piece of ongoing work. Highways England currently maintain a holding objection for the application until 20/02/2020 to allow further time to review the Transport Assessment. Once these matters have progressed, transport will be further discussed with the Stakeholder Group at a dedicated meeting.</p> <p>Officers and Members have been reviewing the revised Development Brief with the applicant which has evolved significantly since the original submission. Feedback has been provided to the applicant to ensure the Brief meets the Councils expectations and guidance document.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group asked for confirmation that the Network Rail objection still stood. Laura Webster confirmed this objection had not been removed to date.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group emphasised the importance of transport matters and proposed mitigation, especially through the existing villages. Questions were raised over the M1 Junction 13 work (also see Local Plan update below) and consideration of cumulative impacts from other developments within CBC and beyond. Laura Webster confirmed transport will be discussed further at future meeting(s).</p>		
3.	Local Plan Update		<p>Caroline Danby</p> <p>7.40pm</p>
	<p>Inspectors letter received on 30/09/2019 raised some specific issues, including with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The Council is working</p>		

	<p>through the actions identified and a review of the SA is being carried out. The additional work will be submitted to the Inspectors. Inspectors requested a detailed timetable and work programme, and this was sent 09/01/2020 outlining the following indicative timetable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Jan. Submit outstanding notes and modifications arising from hearings to the Inspectors. • End April. Submit to the Inspectors any new evidence and modifications to resolve issues raised in 30/09/2019 letter. • Hearings to be held to give participants the opportunity to make representations on new evidence. Expected June/July 2020. • Formal consultation on final list of modifications recommended by Inspectors. September 2020. • Adoption end of 2020 <p>The Inspectors responded quickly and appear comfortable with the work programme, although the Council are awaiting confirmation of the timetable – particularly the hearings and therefore this may be subject to change.</p> <p>M1 Junction 13 – At the time of examination, high level modelling demonstrated mitigation could make the plan sound. Highways England undertook to carry out additional modelling to identify if there was a mitigation scheme that was more appropriate. Inspectors wanted more confidence and to await this work. The Council recently met with Highways England, and the parties are working together. Work should be completed within 6-8 weeks and Highways England are confident there will be appropriate mitigation. Caroline confirmed the Council will produce a technical paper on transport to outline how issues have been addressed.</p>			
4.	Introduction to Development Briefs	x	Sian Farrier	8.00pm
	<p>The Council has produced Development Brief and Design Code Guidance, and this is due to be endorsed at Executive Committee on 04/02/2020.</p> <p>[Post meeting note: The Guidance was endorsed at Executive Committee on 04/02/2020]</p> <p>Sian outlined that a Development Brief bridges the gap between the policy requirements of the Local Plan and a planning application. It must be consistent with local and national planning policies and other guidance such as the Central Bedfordshire Design Guide. It provides additional guidance and sets out how a site should be developed by setting out the parameters and key principles for an application to follow. Once endorsed by Development Management Committee (DMC), a Development Brief becomes a material consideration in the determination of any subsequent planning applications. Endorsement of the Development Brief would not predetermine the acceptability of a scheme.</p>			

	The Stakeholder Group questioned securing the success of Development Briefs and noted their importance in securing delivery of high-quality development on the ground avoiding amendments to schemes undermining original principles. The need to secure infrastructure and mitigation schemes at the appropriate time was also raised with examples being given in relation to a scheme where advanced planting only went in once development was largely complete, and also the delivery of a community centre was delayed – how do we avoid this at Marston Vale?			
5.	Development Brief Presentation	x	Laura Webster / Sian Farrier	8.15pm
	<p>A copy of the revised Draft Development Brief was circulated, and an initial overview provided on the structure and content. Laura Webster noted that feedback had been provided to the applicant regarding further clarification around the exemplar elements of the scheme and seeking greater emphasis on the Forest of Marston Vale as a key theme, referencing existing communities, and a stronger emphasis on sustainable design principles, climate change and futureproofing. The structure is considered improved from the initial submission and the 10 development tests within the document would provide a development management tool going forward to assess future applications, including design codes, and secure the detail of the development and ensure quality. The document needs to maintain some flexibility to adapt to changes in policy and local needs over time, and the right level of balance in terms of providing high level principles with the relevant hooks to link back to aspirations and policy requirements and secure detail at a later date.</p> <p>Laura Webster noted that section 6.0 sets out the proposed permission structure which allows further details to be secured at the appropriate time, should outline permission be granted.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Group raised concerns around ensuring design coding is sympathetic to existing villages and housing, how phasing and construction impacts would be dealt with, and transport impacts including access to the site. Laura Webster noted that given the outline nature of the application the full extent of some of these details will be secured by condition and S.106 obligations. However, as consideration of the application progresses such matters will be discussed further with the Stakeholder Group with further explanation around structure of the permission and conditions and S.106 obligations.</p>			
6.	Process for Feedback and Next Steps		Cllr Sue Clark	8.30pm
	The Stakeholder Group is invited to take the brief away for a period of 4 weeks for consultation with their group and Parish members as appropriate. Feedback will be provided at the next meeting.			

	<p>Representatives are also invited to provide a written submission of their comments to the Case Officer, Laura Webster.</p> <p>ACTION: A representative to feedback at the next meeting comments from consultation with their group or Parish. A written response to also be provided for the Councils record.</p>		
7.	AOB		<p>CLlr Sue Clark</p> <p>8.45pm</p>
	<p>Next meeting to be scheduled for Monday 24th February.</p> <p>Peter Hinson, Chair of Brogborough Parish Council raised concern that the red line encroaches on land owned by the Parish Council.</p> <p>ACTION: Officers to investigate this further and raise with the applicant as necessary.</p> <p>Meeting closed 9:10pm.</p>		