

The two hour workshop was attended by environmental experts and other volunteers, and involved delegates working in groups to identify green spaces, both public and private, that are worthy of protection. The general concern from the workshop was that LUC had not consulted enough towns, parishes and people with expertise and knowledge of the local area, and a number of maps presented were inadequate and out of date and not accurate.

A summary report of the event has now been produced, and does identify some of the failings and faults of LUC in the Plan process. There are some references to Stotfold and the immediate area.

Members were advised to keep an eye on what is happening in North Hertfordshire as well as Bedfordshire.

256. TO CONSIDER A RESPONSE TO THE MID BEDS DISTRICT COUNCIL CORE STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES: DRAFT SUBMISSION CONSULTATION

Relevant extracts from the document were previously circulated to Members. The document is also available on the District Council's website or can be viewed in the Council Offices, and main libraries across the District. The deadline for comments is 24th November 2008.

Members gave due consideration to each page relevant to Stotfold and it was:

Recommended that the following comments be made:

- Page 22 – there is concern that Fairfield Park is shown as a separate entity – as a village settlement – and that it is part of Stotfold and we are working to try to integrate the development more with the rest of the town.
- Page 22 – question why Stotfold is shown as a Minor Service Centre when it is projected to be the second largest settlement in the Mid Bedfordshire area in the next 10 years. It should therefore be shown as a Major Service Centre.
- Wherever the words 'Arlesey/Stotfold/Fairfield Park' are shown in the document as a title or text, they should be replaced with '*Arlesey/Stotfold (which includes Fairfield Park and Astwick)*'.
- Page 22 – Arlesey/Stotfold/Fairfield Park – remove the words 'these three settlements' and replace with '*that Arlesey and Stotfold*'
- Page 22 – query the reference to the new supermarket and town square. We want to emphasise our wish to strengthen the existing town centre and not create a new one.
- Advise that we will be sending the District Council the results of the Town Plan Questionnaire, in particular regarding the town centre. These results should be made available for the Inspector when approving the Core Strategy document.
- Page 32 (3.13.5.) – suggest providing increased parking provision at Arlesey railway station.

- Page 33 (3.13.10.) – it is suggested that the local education authority look to putting a new upper school in the Stotfold and Arlesey area, as the population for both areas is increasing significantly.
- Page 38 (3.16.5.) – should read ‘The *two* settlements will ...’.
- Page 38 (3.16.6.) – with regard to the wording ‘appropriate to a town centre’, this provision should stand alone and not include other smaller shops, it should also not be termed a town centre.
- Page 38 (3.16.8.) – any employment area off the A1(M) or A507 should have access directly off those roads by way of a roundabout.
- Page 38 (3.16.11.) – with regard to the wording ‘this will need to be supported by an improved quality bus service’, point out that the bus service for Stotfold has been reduced to one an hour and no service during the evenings.
- Page 38 (3.16.11) – query the term ‘vital’ when referring to the increase in links between the settlements. How is it so vital?
- Page 41 (3.18.6.) – we agree with the sentence ‘The provision of additional shops and services will be pursued in association with the existing permission for Land South of Stotfold, adding to the cluster of services that already exist in the vicinity of High Street.’.
- Page 42 (3.18.10.) – there is no reference to provision of a centre for elderly people in the sentence beginning ‘Investment will also take place to improve library, community, youth,’.
- Page 42 (3.18.10.) – with regard to the sentence ‘the centre (leisure) will be an important strategic leisure asset for the district.’, the leisure centre will need far more facilities than currently permitted if it is to fulfil the requirements of the document. The follow-on will be the need for extra infrastructure to support this increase in facility.
- Page 69 – again, Stotfold should be moved to the Major Service Centre allocation and not Minor Service Centre.

257. TO CONSIDER THE ESTIMATES FOR THE YEAR 2009/2010

Members were previously provided with a copy of the figures for the first six months of the current financial year and undertook an appraisal before the estimates of the general running costs for the Committee were considered.

Recommended that any remaining sums in the Town Enhancement Projects revenue budget for this Committee at the end of the current financial year be transferred to the reserves fund for Town Enhancement Projects. This will assist in the publication costs for the Town Plan.

Members then considered the estimates for the financial year 2009/2010.

Estimated running costs:	£5,000
Less estimated income:	<u>£ 0</u>
	£5,000

258. TO CONFIRM THE UPDATED TERMS OF REFERENCE SHEET, AS PER SEPTEMBER'S MEETING OF THIS COMMITTEE

Members were previously circulated the updated Terms of Reference sheet for approval. Minor amendments regarding repetition were suggested and it was:

Recommended that the amended final Terms of Reference Sheet, for this Committee be forwarded to the Establishment Committee for approval.

259. OTHER ITEMS FOR INFORMATION PURPOSES ONLY

There were no items for information purposes only.

There being no further relevant business the meeting was declared closed at 9.07pm

CHAIRMAN

DATED