



FLITWICK TOWN COUNCIL

MARKET TOWN REGENERATION PROJECT (MTRP) SECOND FACT SHEET

THIS DOCUMENT COVERS QUESTIONS RAISED AT AND AFTER THE PUBLIC MEETING HELD ON 3rd OCTOBER 2019

1. *Why not make the [new HQ] building wider and not as tall?*

Nicolas Tye architects of Maulden are instructed in relation to the design of the new Headquarters building.

The design of the Headquarters building is based on the outcome of consultation and discussions with representatives of the Flitwick Branches of the Scouts and the Royal British Legion. The proposed design of the Headquarters has subsequently been discussed with the representatives and their further comments fed back and incorporated in a revised design.

2. *The building should be taller with offices to be leased on a commercial basis to generate income.*

It is unlikely that Central Bedfordshire Council would accept a higher building is appropriate in this setting as it is largely a residential one comprising one or two storey buildings. A taller building would not be in keeping. Further, it is unlikely that a commercial use and community use accommodated in the same building would be compatible, not least due to safeguarding issues.

3. *Why and how were the Scouts and Royal British Legion selected to benefit from the scheme and selected as needing new buildings? Could other uniformed and/or community organisations benefit from the same building?*

This is not apparently clear from previous Flitwick Town Council minutes.

4. *If the Flitwick Branch of the Scouts, a charity that provides a public service, is forced to fund the provision of the new HQ that could impact upon the ability of other charities to raise finance e.g. the PTAs of local schools.*

This view is noted. The Council has a duty to balance the needs of different groups of people within the town when deciding what action should be taken and that individual councillors must be informed about and respond to the needs of the community and represent all electors in the town, not just those that voted for them.

5. *Why can't the Scouts and Royal British Legion use existing buildings within the town or a brownfield site be found for them?*

One of the options that is likely to be considered in the context of the review of the financial and amenity value of the Council's assets ordered at the recent Extraordinary Meeting on 5th September 2019 is the possibility of relocating the community organisations elsewhere.

6. *Why are the Girl Guides not benefitting from a new building?*

The MTRP is designed for Flitwick Town Centre. Hetley House, the Girl Guides HQ, is not in Flitwick Town Centre.

The Council has been informed that Hetley House is in need of refurbishment and this is an agenda item for discussion at the Town Council meeting on 29th October 2019.

7. *Can the Scouts afford to repair the new building going forward?*

The Scouts have been responsible for the maintenance of their building for many years. We understand that they are currently able to pay for maintenance, etc., from the subscriptions they levy on members, from the funds they receive from sub-letting and from specific fund raising activities.

8. *In the context of the now withdrawn application for outline planning permission, why were Central Bedfordshire Council asking for section 106 contributions towards Flitwick Cricket Club and Flitwick Leisure Centre, and not the community organisations concerned?*

The Council is not entirely sure why Central Bedfordshire were asking for section 106 contributions towards Flitwick Cricket Club and Flitwick Leisure Centre. The Council was certainly not anticipating this.

It is for the individual community groups to contact Central Bedfordshire to make a case that it is appropriate and reasonable for developers to be required to provide section 106 monies for the provision of a new building or towards maintenance of an old building. That is presumably what Flitwick Cricket Club and Flitwick Leisure Centre have successfully done.

By way of background, section 106 contributions are a type of Planning Obligation, which is a legal agreement between the local planning authority, the developer and other interested parties made under section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). These are evidenced by a Unilateral Undertaking or more commonly a section 106 agreement.

By law, planning obligations must be:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

They can involve restrictions or obligations on the developer, including to make contributions to the provision of offsite infrastructure, in order to secure planning permission.

Central Bedfordshire state on their website:

'We are developing a revised Planning Obligations Strategy for the whole of Central Bedfordshire that will sit alongside our Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

Until this is adopted, applicants should seek advice from their case officer on what planning obligations may be sought. These will be determined on a case by case basis and will be levied in accordance with the legal tests below set out in the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended).'

It is certainly foreseeable that the provision of a new community facility for use by community organisations could form the subject of section 106 contributions to be provided by those seeking to provide new residential development in Flitwick.

9. How much section 106 money has been allocated for Flitwick since 1st January 2000?

The report called S106 contributions secured shows all S106 agreements signed since 01.01.00 in the parish of Flitwick. The report can be found here <https://centralbedfordshire.app.box.com/s/446pmqtlzcnwda67o69keahkikr0hoyx?page=2>

10. How much has been spent?

The report called S106 Spent shows all funds spent from S106 agreements in the Parish of Flitwick. It has a brief description of how the funds have been spent.

11. What was it spent on?

This is itemised on the report available via the link in Q9 above.

12. What plans are there for the remaining money?

All funds remaining show on the parish reports on the web, the S106 spending officers for each area is responsible for the proposing S106 funded projects.

13. How much section 106 money is likely to be received in the next 10 years?

New S106 money will be sought on individual planning applications received based on the 3 CIL tests to mitigate the impact on infrastructure of the development. The tests are:

- i. Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- ii. Directly related to the development; and
- iii. Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

14. What will the money received in the next 10 years be used for?

This will be dependent upon what it has been collected for.

15. The construction of the Headquarters building involves a loss of open space. What are Flitwick Town Council's plans to provide equivalent green space for the public space it intends to develop? We are concerned about the loss of green space.

This concern is noted. Our full position on this is, in summary, as follows:

- The land was until 7th November 2017 allotment land that benefitted from statutory protection under section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 ("the Act") against it being used for any other use without the consent of the relevant Secretary of State;
- Allotment land can be considered to be open space regardless of its statutory protection, on the basis that the definition of open space is wide enough to encompass use of land as an allotment;
- Central Bedfordshire Council was, and is, therefore able to designate the land as open space, but not as recreational land as this was and is not consistent with the statutory protection the land enjoyed as allotment land;
- Planning policy seeks to limit the circumstances in which open space can be built upon;
- One of the exceptions to this limitation is when an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space is surplus to requirements;
- The assessment the Secretary of State undertakes in deciding whether to grant consent under section 8 of the Act, to allow allotment land to be used for another purpose is an assessment to determine if open space is surplus to requirements;
- The Secretary of State decided on 7th November 2017 that the land was surplus to requirements for use as allotments and hence open space;

- As the open space is assessed as being surplus to requirements under paragraph 97 a) of the National Planning Policy Framework, Central Bedfordshire cannot in addition request that the loss of open space be compensated by equal or better provision or significant improvements to existing open space; the tests are stated to be in the alternative (“or”) and not cumulative (which would be “and”) – once one of the tests is satisfied there is no need to go on to consider the others;
- The Secretary of State’s decision to grant consent took into account local planning policy and decided that the proposed use of the land as a retirement living facility was an appropriate alternative use of the land, albeit it would need to be tested further in the planning application process;
- The Town Council has not designated the land for public use as public open space or recreational space in the interim, and clearly there has not been sufficient passage of time since the land lost its designation as allotment land to argue that a public right to use the land for informal recreation has arisen by prescription as that takes at least 20 years.

16. Does this proposal mean the loss of the play area for the children and the allotments?

No.

17. Has a usage survey of the grassed area at Station Road been undertaken? Has a survey of the use of the green space been completed? How many users use it?

No, there is no obligation on the Council to do so in the context of the planning applications. It would be hard to see how a survey would be beneficial in making decisions on this.

18. Can the Council comment on the proposal to block residents from applying for village green status on the land at Station Road; it seems like a show of bad faith.

This view is noted.

Residents will be aware that voting was tied (8 Councillors for/ 8 Councillors against) in relation to this issue at the Extraordinary Meeting held on 5 September, and that the resolution to proceed with this followed the use by the Chairman of his casting vote. The decision of the Council as a whole was therefore to make an application under section 15A of the Commons Act to prevent residents being able to claim the land is a village green. The decision was taken solely to protect the future development value of the land, if the Council later decided to dispose of the land following the asset review.

19. Have the Council considered the impact losing green space might have on the problems of antisocial behaviour and increased crime? Residents have suggested several alternative uses.

The Council has a duty to balance the needs of different groups of people within the town when deciding what action should be taken and individual councillors must be informed about and respond to the needs of the community and represent all electors in the town, not just those that voted for them. It has already considered this issue, and will consider it again together with the proposed alternative uses if the disposal of the land comes back into the frame.

20. What consultation did the Council undertake before applying to have the statutory allotment status removed?

The Council has sought to improve the take up of allotments by residents of Flitwick by advertising the availability of allotment plots in Flitwick Papers, and even from time to time offering discounted rates, over the past five years or so.

At the time the Council applied to have the statutory allotment status removed on the land at Station Road, it had a surplus of allotment plots, especially on the Steppingley Road site. This continues to be the case.

It also consulted with the National Allotment Society as required.

21. How do the Council's plans for use of the revenue comply with section 32 of the Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908?

The Council is not disposing of land under the Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908.

Instead the Council has opted to pursue the disposal route provided for under section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 which enables land to be released from its allotment status provided the Secretary of State is satisfied that "adequate provision will be made for allotment holders displaced by the action of the local authority, or that such provision is unnecessary or not reasonably practicable". In this instance, the Secretary of State agreed that the statutory criteria provided for in section 8 had been satisfied as there were no existing plot holders.

Section 32 of the Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908 is not therefore relevant.

22. Why didn't the Town Council consult on the MTRP before the planning applications were submitted?

It is apparent that an opportunity to consult on the MTRP in full arose in Summer 2017, when the highways works were consulted on. However, the Council did not avail itself of the opportunity at that time. Going forward we want to ensure that the public are involved in consultations and are able to give feedback on projects as demonstrated by the Public Meeting held on 3rd October 2019.

23. How far have the Council got in looking into alternative sources of funding in light of the withdrawn C2 use planning application for the Station Road site? Are they only looking at sale of assets or are they also looking at other ways of raising funds (e.g. the Freemason grant to Bromham Scout Group).

The Council is only looking at the disposal of its own assets to fund the provision of the proposed HQ building. Following agreement at the Extraordinary Meeting held on 5th September 2019, a review of the Council's asset portfolio is being undertaken to ascertain the available options for raising the necessary finance.

Seven Council owned sites are being considered including Station Road and land adjoining the Steppingley Road allotment site (which has been allocated for housing development in the emerging local plan).

FTC will discuss the results of this review and make decisions on any other alternative funding at that stage

It is anticipated that the review will be completed in the next three to four months.

24. How does the Town Council plan to finance the provision of the Headquarters building if Station Road is not built on?

See answer to Q 23 above.

25. What other options for generating funds for MTRF have been, or will be explored as alternatives to selling the land at Station Road for development?

See answer to Q 23 above.

26. When does FTC expect the assessment of potential alternate funding to be complete?

It is anticipated that the review will be completed in the next three to four months.

27. How much is Central Bedfordshire Council contributing to the MTRP? What is the estimated cost of the proposed HQ building?

The Town Council is prevented from disclosing this for reasons of commercial confidentiality – firstly, as the Funding Agreement prevents the parties commenting in any detail on the provisions it contains, and, secondly, because disclosing this sum could compromise the ability of the Town Council to realise best value on any disposal of its assets in conjunction with the delivery of the MTRP.

The Town Council is not able to disclose any information regarding the potential development value of any of its assets prior to their disposal. This

information will be available in the Council's accounts in the financial year following disposal.

The Council can though confirm that the tender to construct the HQ building will be subject to a competitive bid process in line with applicable procurement rules.

28. Should the land at Station Road be sold for development, how much money does the town council anticipate generating from the sale, and will all of this go towards the Market Town Regeneration Fund?

See answer to Q 27 above.

29. What is the estimated cost of the proposed Scout Group and RBL development? Will the tender for this build be a competitive process?

See answer to Q 27 above.

30. It is not clear from the available documentation how the market town regeneration project will actually regenerate and improve our town centre. Are the plans just around improving roads and providing a car park? Are there any plans in place that would attract new businesses and shoppers to Flitwick?

This was the original agreed outline for the project:

- Major highways improvement works, including the delivery of a new public space with works expected to commence this November.
- These works are to be funded direct by CBC.
- The relocation of the Scouts and RBL to a new headquarters building on Station Road.
- Demolition of existing headquarters buildings and laying out for a short stay shoppers car park.
- Together, these deliver the bulk of the 50% match funding the Council are required to provide.
- The sale of the land at Station Road for the provision of an independent retirement living facility (**Update:** *The outline planning application for an independent living facility has been withdrawn*).
- This was judged by CBC to be an improvement to the town centre as it was, and still is, judged by CBC that there is insufficient housing stock to provide for older people in Central Bedfordshire.
- As well as providing a benefit, the sale of the land was envisaged to fund the Council's obligation to deliver the new headquarters building and the car park.
- An enhanced service at Flitwick Library. This has been implemented and is ongoing.

31. What does this development do for the people of Flitwick? The highways improvements appear to be calming measures that aren't needed; how does building on green space benefit the people of Flitwick; why do we need a country park?

The bid for funding was supported by a financial document that showed how the proposal would benefit Flitwick as a whole. Whilst the majority is understandably commercially sensitive, the following can be shared:

'The place we are seeking to support and revitalise is Flitwick town centre with a particular focus on rejuvenating the High Street and linking improvements to Central Bedfordshire Council's proposed Transport Interchange centred on Flitwick Rail Station.

Flitwick has an important role as a transport hub and broader gateway for the Central Bedfordshire area. However, the Town is faced with a number of ongoing challenges in terms of the quality of offer (i.e. the diversity of services and facilities) it provides and accessibility to services and facilities.

Many of these challenges are based on how the layout of Flitwick has developed over time. The town centre is in effect divided in two due to the presence of the Thameslink rail line. The traditional High Street is on one side of the rail line whilst the more modern expansion of the town is on the other which is dominated by a large Tesco store and car park.

The centre does benefit from the presence of the mainline train station linking Central Bedfordshire to London St Pancras and beyond. It acts as an important commuter hub and generates over 1.6 million passenger journeys per year. Flitwick also provides the home station for Center Parcs Woburn and as a consequence its profile is now significantly higher with considerable promotion of transport links to Center Parcs via Flitwick in locations such as Waterloo and Kings Cross. Flitwick Station also links and provides an important facility to the Millbrook Testing Facility and Technology Park which has developed major proposals for growth that are supported by the South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership and other major employers including Lockheed Martin.

These benefits are however outweighed by the negative division of the town centre and if improvements are not made to the public realm and broader accessibility it will not be possible to provide a high quality modern market town offer to residents, businesses and visitors. Flitwick will always be constrained by negative perceptions and a poor quality retail offer beyond the Tesco store.

Flitwick does generate considerable footfall for a location of its size however due to the issues outlined above it is not capturing significant spend and investment. We consider that improving the overall experience of visiting Flitwick will generate significant returns in employment, growth and overall satisfaction levels for the benefit of all."

The town centre is, as already stated, divided and cannot provide a better service and sense of place for those that use it without mitigating these issues by creating new spaces and environments focused in the High Street area that will link to and integrate with CBC proposals in Flitwick

Station area.'

With regards to the country park, there is limited public open space in the North East of Flitwick and the proposed provision of a country park will help to readdress this.

32. The extra car park is not needed, no one is going to walk to the shops from there/ 42% of users had a negative view of the parking situation/. Does that mean that 58% had a neutral or positive outlook?

The view about the car park location is noted. Various consultations of shoppers and businesses over a number of years have all indicated the need for more off street car parking for shoppers.

Improving car parking was a key theme to emerge when Town Centre Users were questioned on how Flitwick could be improved. In terms of the Business Confidence Surveys undertaken, 71% stated car parking to be a negative aspect of Flitwick Town Centre.

33. What makes the council think a shoppers' car park on Station Road will be useful given it is not significantly nearer to the town centre than Tesco car park, which already offers 3 hours free parking?

Successive surveys of businesses and shoppers have identified the need for more short stay car parking in the town centre – the latest from August 2019 found 42% of users rating car parking as a negative aspect, with improving car parking a key theme to emerge from town centre users.

34. Parking and traffic is very difficult and there are no cycle routes.

It is hoped the short stay shoppers' car park will help to alleviate parking issues. It is noted that there are no designated cycle routes.

35. Will electric charging points for electric cars be provided in the proposed car park?

As this is for a short stay, shoppers' car park, this is not likely to be appropriate but is not discounted at this stage.

36. Has a survey been done to count how much traffic uses the road each day?

This is a question for Central Bedfordshire Council.

37. What timescale has FTC agreed with CBC to complete their part of the MTRP agreement?

It is clear that there has been significant delay on the part of both parties in delivering the Project – it should have been completed by Q3 2017/18.

38. The report at the Extraordinary meeting noted that FTC access to future grants/match funding opportunities would be at risk if it were to pull out

of the MTRP, what other grants/match funding have FTC applied for, plan to apply for in the near future, or would be eligible to apply for?

In the context of MTRP, there are none.

39. *What physical changes are happening to Kings Road and Station Square? Anything that is provided needs to be carefully thought out so as to avoid the risk of vandalism.*

Works to the area will include: new natural stone paving footway works, new road lining, raised table for traffic calming in Kings Road, enhanced surfacing to the area in front of Barclays and installation of street furniture. A letter from Central Bedfordshire Council Highways detailing all works will be issued shortly and posted on social media.

40. *We are concerned about the removal of the trees planned as part of the highways improvement works.*

This concern is noted. Central Bedfordshire consulted on the highways proposals envisaged by the MTRP in Summer 2017. They have also undertaken the necessary statutory consultation on the scheme. CBC has agreement with the landowner to remove the trees to open up the public space.

The highways contractor is now appointed and work is due to commence imminently so unfortunately there is no opportunity at this stage to change the scheme.

41. *Do we know what the major highway improvement works around Barclays are? Are plans available?*

These are all available from the Planning Portal. They are also on display in The Rufus Centre foyer.

42. *Why not use the area that was used for the old skate park as a meeting point?*

Millennium Park is not part of the MTRP. However, we are keen to hear residents' suggestions on how the old skate park area can be used going forward. It is currently used by some members of the public for young children learning to ride bikes, scooters and use roller skates and for remote control cars. It is also used as the Food Court area at Flitwick Carnival.

43. *Flitwick has a failing market. Why use the area outside Barclays Bank in Station Square?*

It is not the intention to relocate the current Flitwick Market to Station Square. The French Market proposal highlighted at the presentation at the Public Meeting on 3rd October 2019 was a one off event to launch the new public space. It has not yet been decided if this is a viable option; the Council is at an initial exploratory stage.

44. What events would FTC plan to hold in the new public space for town events being created by CBC? Do they anticipate other events run there by others?

Nothing has been decided as yet, but FTC welcome ideas and suggestions.

45. How many floors will the independent living facility have? How many car parking spaces?

The application for outline planning permission for this use has now been withdrawn by the Council. These questions are not therefore relevant at this time.

46. Affordable housing would be a better use of Station Road rather than an age restricted residential use.

The application for outline planning permission for age restricted residential use has now been withdrawn by the Council. The view on affordable housing has been noted.

47. I would like to know what research has been carried out and what evidence there is for the need for 60+ flats for an independent retirement living facility on the land at Station Road MK45 1AZ as included in the planning application submitted to Central Bedfordshire Council.

The application for outline planning permission for age restricted residential use has now been withdrawn by the Council. However, this was judged by CBC to be an improvement to the town centre as it was, and still is, judged by CBC that there is insufficient housing stock to provide for older people in Central Bedfordshire.

48. We are concerned about the amount of retirement accommodation already in and planned for Flitwick.

This view is noted. The PowerPoint presentation at the Public Meeting touched on the national government's and Central Bedfordshire Council's views on this. Please visit

https://www.flitwick.gov.uk/images/MTRP_public_meeting_ppt.pdf

49. How will Flitwick Surgery be able to cope with the additional capacity generated by serving a residential development comprising over 55s?

The application for outline planning permission for age restricted residential use has now been withdrawn by the Council.

The Council is aware of the pressures currently placed on Flitwick Surgery, long wait times for appointments and the lack of GPs and acknowledge the pressure any development will put on the doctor's surgery. The planning and

commissioning of health care services is the responsibility of the NHS Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

50. Why do we need any more housing in Flitwick?

This is a question for Central Bedfordshire Council. Whilst Flitwick Town Council are consultees on planning issues in Flitwick, it is the Unitary Authority that dictates the overall policy.

51. Disabled people are not catered for.

It is hoped that the new highways works will assist in making the town centre more accessible for disabled people. Disabled car parking will be provided in the short stay shoppers' car park and in the HQ building car park and disabled access will be provided to the HQ building. This will be a vast improvement on the current access arrangements to the existing Scouts and Royal British Legion buildings.

52. Why is the MTRP being looked at in isolation? You cannot drive from one end of Flitwick to the other; there are pockets of problems with traffic. Central Bedfordshire Council needs to look at Flitwick as a whole.

This view is noted. As is clear from the answer to Q 31 above, the MTRP is not being looked at in isolation.

53. I believe the cemetery is already planned for land near The Rufus Centre and the funding is already coming from another direction. Crematoria – maybe incorporate this into the proposed cemetery site in Maulden Road to provide an inclusive facility. What is the estimated cost of the burial ground?

Planning permission had already been obtained for the current site on Maulden Road but this was not implemented before it lapsed.

Central Bedfordshire Council are currently pursuing a planning application for a crematorium on land in the parish of Steppingley, which is close to The Rufus Centre. This is nothing to do with Flitwick Town Council who have already objected to, and continue to object to, this proposal. The Council does though agree that if it can be demonstrated that there is a need for a crematorium in this part of Central Bedfordshire, which at this time we are not convinced there is, then it would make more sense for the two facilities to be combined.

[The estimated cost of providing the first phase of the proposed burial ground, including consultants and other costs, is approximately £500,000. The only way for the council to fund it is through either the disposal of existing assets or by way of a capital loan. The Council is not though in a position of being able to raise a capital loan of this amount.]

54. Is a burial ground on Maulden Road a necessary proposal? Is there not still a plan to have a burial ground / remembrance garden at the proposed crematorium on Steppingley Road?

The Council are not obligated under law to provide a new burial ground. The combined planning and needs assessment accompanying the Maulden Road application for the country park and burial ground indicates that based on the annual average number of burials (20 per annum), pre-purchasing of graves and remaining 47 burial spaces (as at May 2019), the existing cemetery is anticipated to be at capacity in 2 years and 4 months (around September 2021).

55. Why put money into a new country park when the town already has Flitwick Manor Park? More facilities could be provided there. Manor Park is starved of investment to clear the lake and improve the facility. Abandon the proposed country park and concentrate on Millennium Park.

Whilst this view is noted, it has long been an aspiration of the Council to develop a country park. As indicated, the funding for the initial laying of the country park is coming from section 106 monies already secured by Central Bedfordshire from developers, and successfully awarded to Flitwick Town Council following a bid for them.

Furthermore, there is limited public open space in the North East of Flitwick and the provision of the proposed country park will help to readdress this as paths from Ampthill Road and the housing developments in this area are expected to connect into it.

With regards to improving facilities in Manor Park this could be an issue because of restrictions from Natural England with regards to management of the land and also the planning restrictions. This is being investigated.

56. Do the Councillors agree they have a moral duty to consider the impact of future developments on the wider community?

Whilst this fact sheet cannot speak for individual Councillors' views, it is certainly true that the Council as a whole has a duty to balance the needs of different groups of people within the town when deciding what action should be taken and that individual councillors must be informed about and respond to the needs of the community and represent all electors in the town, not just those that voted for them.

57. What are the council doing to ensure a holistic view is taken of proposed developments, ensuring any developments improve the lives of residents rather than just further stretching resources and local infrastructure?

FTC actively lobbies Central Beds Council, and other organisations and bodies who have an influence on resources and infrastructure. However, planning decisions remain with Central Bedfordshire Council.

58. Please would the Council confirm what undertakings and covenants its predecessor entered into at the time of purchase?

This was dealt with in the first MTRP Fact Sheet, and again in the presentation which you can view at https://www.flitwick.gov.uk/images/MTRP_public_meeting_ppt.pdf

59. What is being done to deliver the last Flitwick Town Plan?

The last Flitwick Town Plan is no longer relevant. The MTRP and the proposals for the Interchange project around the Railway Station, which includes a new bus station, along with the development of the proposed burial ground and country park on Maulden Road are the Council's key development priorities for the town.

60. The village hall should be the central area for Flitwick – the five roads on the east side of the railway bridge experience too much activity for that role.

This view is noted.

61. The mini roundabout at the top of the High Street/ The Avenue/ Kings Road and Station Road is inadequate, on street parking causes vehicles to straddle the central line, speed limit is constantly exceeded. Access/ egress has deteriorated in the 43 years we have lived here and increased traffic cannot be supported safely by our struggling infrastructure.

We will relay this concern to Central Bedfordshire Council, the relevant highways authority for Flitwick, as we do all concerns about highways related matters.

62. Is there any scope to include the campaign for Step Free Access at Flitwick Railway Station in the MTRP?

Unfortunately not, neither Central Bedfordshire Council nor Flitwick Town Council own the land that is affected by the proposal.

63. Would the Council consider championing a cause in a unique way? For example, "incredible edibles", community gardens and "bee kind" initiatives.

This is not currently in scope on the MTRP. However, The Council has agreed to set up a working party to progress further

64. Flitwick needs a bypass, or at least a second bridge across the railway. Are there any plans to look at this?

Whilst this view is noted, the Council is not aware that the Highways Authority is looking at this issue.

65. A Traffic lights crossing is needed near the war memorial.

This view is noted. The need for and provision of a traffic lights crossing is a matter for Central Bedfordshire Council as Highways Authority.

66. The traffic calming measures on Steppingley Road and Froghall Road are dangerous.

Whilst this view is noted, it is not relevant to the MTRP. It has though been logged with Central Bedfordshire Council's highways department.

67. Why are residents willing to support the development of the Aldi store on Ampthill Road and not support the development of Station Road?

The Council does not consider this relevant to a consideration of the MTRP.

NOTE

To view a copy of the MTRP presentation from the Public Meeting held on 3rd October 2019 please visit Flitwick Town Council's website: https://www.flitwick.gov.uk/images/MTRP_public_meeting_ppt.pdf

4th November 2019.