

**FLITTON AND GREENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of the Planning Sub Committee held at the Church Hall, Flitton on Wednesday 16<sup>th</sup> August 2017

**Present:** Cllrs N Arthur (Chairman), M Gates, N Thompson, T King, P Woodland, R Stokes, G Ellis and M Lowe

CBC Cllr James Jamieson and D Lawson (Clerk) plus residents

**1. APOLOGIES AND SPECIFIC DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr J Fisher sent apologies.  
Cllr P Woodland declared an interest in the any discussion on Flitton Hill.  
Cllr Arthur welcomed residents to the meeting and agreed to start with an open session to discuss the Local Plan Consultation.

**OPEN DISCUSSION**

There was a discussion about the village hierarchy and Cllr Jamieson confirmed that Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges has been re-designated as a small village and a case can still be made to separate the villages into three separate settlements. The Parish Council will pursue this to try and ‘future proof’ the Parish position and the CBC hierarchy matrix has been re-calculated to show the effect of separation. This would be in line with the way that other Parishes have been treated in the matrix. In separating the settlements this also emphasises the importance of keeping the open spaces and gaps to avoid any coalescence

This means that the presumption in the next draft of the Local Plan will be that none of the settlements should have any large scale development and that 10 or less dwellings would be an appropriate size. In this case generally the Local Plan is not identifying sites in smaller villages; these are being left to make up any shortfall once the largest development areas have been designated. The sites in Flitton and Greenfield which had been identified to proceed to stage 2, will now be considered against the small village status and whether they may be suitable for small scale development or any housing needs which the Neighbourhood Plan may identify.

However, this presumption will still have to be agreed as part of the official approval of the Plan and responses outlining local views are still required, so as many people as possible do need to add comments.

The Chair commented that the Parish and Neighbourhood Plan Group accepted there would have to be some development but the recent housing survey very much emphasised that this should not be large scale. The emphasis based on responses was for affordable, elderly persons and local housing and this is what the Neighbourhood Plan would include without necessarily identifying any sites. It was confirmed that any recent planning decisions or those which may happen before the Local Plan is approved, will fall outside the totals required in the Plan and so will not count as a Parish contribution.

Cllr Jamieson suggested that as part of the response to the Local Plan, residents and the Parish Council should give an idea of what they envisage the Parish to be like in the future, encapsulating the points they like in and wish to keep, so setting a ‘tone’ for any future development. The Neighbourhood Plan could provide a steer for this so that when it is agreed there is an official ‘policy’ line for the planners to follow. Cllr Jamieson also confirmed that sites less than 10 dwellings did not have to provide any low cost housing or s106 provision and were also too small for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to take any real effect.

The Parish Council would discuss its response to the Local Plan later on the agenda and would publish this along with the minutes later in the week.

Residents were thanked for their continuing interest and urged to send in their own comments to CBC.

**2. MINUTES**

The previous minutes had been presented to the Council meeting in May

<b>3. CONSIDERATION OF CURRENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b>	
<b>44 Mill Lane, Greenfield, Bedford, MK45 5DF - Householder developments</b>	
<b>AGREED</b> Comment – No Objection but condition to ensure that the off road parking provision is made available from the build start to prevent lorries and deliveries parking in Mill Lane and obstructing the traffic flow. Also to ensure that any neighbours comments are taken into account about the size of the extension	DL
<b>22 School Lane, Greenfield, Bedford, MK45 5DE - Listed Building consents (alter/extend)</b>	
<b>AGREED</b> Comment – No Objection	DL
<b>Land rear of 1 - 15 Westoning Road, Greenfield Beds MK45 5BH - Minor Dwellings1-9 /area less than 0.5ha</b>	
<b>AGREED</b> Object as back fill and impact on neighbouring properties. Also outside the settlement envelope	DL
There was also an application to undertake works (felling) to a tree in the Conservation area at 41a High St Flitton	
<b>AGREED</b> Object to the removal of a healthy tree in the Conservation Area	DL
<b>4. PLANNING APPEALS and DECISIONS</b>	
It was noted that the Appeal at 30 Flitton Road (The Old Orchard site) Greenfield, Bedford, MK45 5DJ for the residential development of up 15 dwellings CB/16/05667/OUT had still not been received, even though it was showing on the CNC planning Portal	
<b>5. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN</b>	
Cllr Arthur said that Cllr Gates had kindly agreed to draft the first version of the Neighbourhood Plan and that it may still be ready for the end September deadline in readiness for local consultation to take place. It would not include any preferences for sites in the Parish, but would express broad policy statements specifying the types of sites and dwellings which would be most acceptable. This would be based on the results of the Housing Needs survey and previous experience of a local exception site.	
<b>6. LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION</b>	
The Clerk had circulated a draft response based on the Local Plan when it was first produced for consultation (when the Parish was classed as a large village) and these comments would still be submitted. A few amendments were made and words added about the village roads, along with an agreed comment about the site in Greenfield. The Clerk would also add in the information suggested by Cllr Jamieson and append the final version with the Minutes. Any Cllr(s) with any further comments on the draft should let the clerk know before the minutes are published. The Parish comments would then be submitted well in advance of the 29 August deadline	All/DL
<b>7. AOB</b>	
There was no other business	

The meeting ended at 21:40h

## Local Plan Parish Council Response - August 2017

### Local Plan document

In principle the Parish is supportive of the general proposals in the Plan in terms of the 4 main development areas and how the rural area D will have to contribute towards the remaining figure.

#### **Community Plans page 39**

- If Community Plans are 'continuing' to inform later stages of the LP, will they adopt NP's when they are ready or is this duplication based on a mis match of community areas - we don't really have many links with our Community Plan area, especially as we are part of the Flitwick Community Liaison Forum

#### **Developing the Strategy page 46**

- We would not wish to be part of the area marked 'Growth in Transport Corridors' – see map page 47 as the boundary of this area seems to include F&G?

#### **The Spatial Strategy Page 59**

- Some areas are recognised as having to take unplanned growth due to speculative development when there was not a five year land supply. Flitton is certainly one of these areas. The Plan states that 'continuing unrestrained growth in these areas is unsustainable' – yet if F&G is not classed as a small village, why are there are six sites being considered in the Sites Assessment document and another in Pulloxhill which is closer to Flitton than Pulloxhill
- Page 65 – paras 7.6.15 – 7.6.17 This is Flitton and Greenfield - the 'settlement pattern and constrained infrastructure' of Areas in D (Central) quote 'severely limits the options for growth in Area D, yet see point above and why are there potentially 6-7 new sites in the Flitton and Greenfield Site Assessment document?
- Para 7.8.2 small and medium sites have not been identified or given indicative capacity in this version of the Plan – why are there so many sites going forward to Stage 2 in Flitton and Greenfield in the Site Assessment Document?
- Para 7.10.2 What's the point of having so many windfall sites included in the Plan as these may end up being on top of any sites included in the Site assessment Document and could be a double penalty on small or large villages?

#### **Green Belt, Coalescence and Settlement**

- Importance of preserving gaps in the countryside and maintaining open nature of the countryside – agree strongly and this also needs to be applied to settlements such as our three areas. We do not want to see any coalescence of the settlements at a local level either

#### **Settlement Hierarchy page 121**

- We are unhappy in the Plan that F&G is classed as a large village and we have made the following suggestions which has resulted in re-designation as a small village.
  - Everyone in the Parish is deeply concerned at the idea of the villages being classed as a large village. Flitton and Greenfield has always been a small village and we are fiercely proud and protective of this as it helps to keep a low key rural community feel and protect us from much larger scale development.
  - We believe and I think you do too now that the three settlements should be treated

separately for the purposes of the hierarchy. Flitton and Greenfield are officially separate Parts of the Parish in terms of the Boundary and warrant their own Councillors and Election processes and Wardhedges has always been considered to be a hamlet. There are other examples in the hierarchy where Parishes have been separated into settlements eg Cranfield and Wharley End, Eversholt and Church end, Upper and Lower Sundon and Haynes. So there is already a precedent within your own methodology to do this.

- We have produced a revised matrix to this effect
- Residents in the Parish also associate themselves with the village that they live in, so locally there is already a definite delineation between Flitton and Greenfield. We have also used this separation as a reason to object to planning applications which seek to allow any coalescence. Indeed the Local Plan makes it clear that it is important to preserve gaps in the countryside and maintain its open nature.
- There are also some anomalies within the matrix which seem to contradict the various scores allocated to settlements and if corrected, between them they would also have the effect of returning the whole Parish to a small village categorisation. These have been sent to you and resulted in the re classification as a small village
- We have made the above case and it has been accepted to continue as a small village
- We do not wish to be seen as a large village as we lack amenities and facilities and could not sustain any large scale development as suggested by the sites which have been initially assessed

### **Housing**

- Para 12.5.4 – yes the NP should be able to make the decisions about affordable sites, exception sites as this is what the Parish Council is spending months working on at the moment

### **Retail and Town Centres**

- Table 15.1 Large Villages – provide a small number of local shops serving a small catchment – there are no such facilities in the Parish
- Para 14.3 – surely this is best left to the NP to set out as this will have been researched and tested at a Referendum. Farms are also important, yet Prior Consent to convert farm buildings into dwellings means that these are being lost rapidly to housing and will never be returned to agriculture. This is short sighted.

### **Historic Landscapes**

- Para 19.3.1 – We support this because of the de Grey Mausoleum and need to take a holistic approach to any development which may impact on it
- Para 19.6 – as above for the Flitton Conservation Area – some pretty poor decisions already made on this and need to pay special attention to the ‘special overall quality of the area’

### **Transport page 188**

- The Parish in line with a lot of the rural area is served by unclassified country roads which were never expected or built to take the current volume of traffic.. This creates problems for rural villages in terms of speeding, being used as rat runs and sheer volume of traffic. Linking transport to development is critical as the roads do need to be considered when any new development takes place especially in the countryside.
- The Parish would support the creation and maintenance of cycle way networks to ensure safety and remove unnecessary traffic from the roads
- Agree that the main transport routes provide better areas to develop housing and employment
- Already HGV bans in the rural area are not adhered to and this causes local residents a problem, we need better/more enforcement and more consideration about alternative routes

which should be publicised

- Traffic problems already prompt voluntary schemes such as Lorry Watch or Speed Watch, which mean local people are giving up their time and this should be taken into account in future planning

### **Development in the Countryside**

- Surely this is what NP set out to test to ensure local communities thrive and grow through appropriate and sustainable sites

### Site Assessment - General View

The Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Flitton, Greenfield and Pulloxhill is nearing completion and a first draft will be available in early Autumn 2017. This Plan outlines the type of 'place' which residents and local councils want to see in the future. The draft vision statement for the NP is as follows *'To enhance the parishes as an area of rural tranquillity by maintaining the character of the separate villages, their conservation areas and areas of outstanding natural beauty whilst developing closer links with the nearby towns of Flitwick and Ampthill on whom the parishes are dependent for many amenities and to whose residents we have much to offer in terms of rural leisure activities.'*

The NP is evidenced based, following a Housing Needs Survey and a first stage consultation. It contains a chapter on Policies in terms of Development to Meet Local Need. We would hope that this will be encapsulated as part of the Local Plan once it has been adopted.

Analysis of the data considered in the Housing Needs survey identified a need for affordable housing within Flitton & Greenfield and Pulloxhill from households resident in (or with strong links to) the parish, that is unlikely to be met by normal market provision. Most of this need comes from young adults living with their parents who want to move out (or young people who will be in this position in the future). Also there is some need from families who are in need of more space and some older people looking for properties more suitable in retirement.

Based on data supplied by respondents, there are already households with a local connection who would be suitable for housing within a rural exception site development, whether for rent or shared ownership. In order to have reasonable confidence that any new housing provided through a rural exception site will be taken up by people with a local connection to Flitton, Greenfield and Pulloxhill, the NP is likely to recommend that approx 11 units are required to meet the need identified over the next 20 years, and these could be broken down as follows:

2 x 1 bed house / flat (Shared ownership)

4 x 2 bed house (1x Starter home initiative / 1 x Affordable rental / 2 x Shared ownership)

3 x 2 bed bungalow (1 x Shared ownership / 2 x Affordable rental)

2 x 3-bed house (1 x Shared ownership / 1 x Affordable rental)

On top of the NP, the PC has recently set out its views in detail about the type of area which it and local residents desire for the future. This has been as a result of a number of predatory planning applications and Appeals during the formulation of the CBC Local Plan and these arguments have been persuasive in terms of decisions against development, although we accept there was one site where the arguments failed: however this was mainly based on the CBC failure to identify a 5 year housing supply.

Our vision for the future of the Parish includes

- Small scale development (less than 10 dwellings)
- Not allowing coalescence of the gaps between the three settlements
- Protecting, maintaining and enhancing the Flitton Conservation area
- Maintaining the setting of Listed and historic buildings
- Maintaining open space to keep a rural feel
- Maintaining agriculture to keep a rural feel

- Maintaining wildlife (trees and hedgerows) to enhance and protect the bio diversity of the Parish
- Ensuring any developments do not make land drainage or localised flooding problems any worse
- Not making the traffic problems (speeding and volume) any worse in the Parish which has original country (unclassified ) roads which were never expected to take the level of traffic which is experienced now as a result of development and the village being used as a rat run between the A6 and M1
- Providing local residents with the quality of life they expect and enjoy by living in a countryside village, even if this does mean there is a lack of local services or transport links, for example
  - Seeing wild birds and animals
  - Being surrounded by fields, woods and copses
  - A feeling of open space because housing densities remain low and there is plenty of space for gardens, park and amenity land
  - Being able to walk safely on quiet rural footpaths and roads to the local pubs, Church and School
  - Beautiful country views from vantage points and allowing local residents to maintain their views and light
  - Ensuring school places are available for local children
  - Having a local church, hearing the bells ringing and a focus for the community
  - Local events being held in the community managed halls, the Moor and playing field
  - Benefitting from Flitton Moor, Centenary Wood, River Flit footpath and Information Centre and a plethora of public footpaths, cycle ways and bridleways to enjoy simple rural activities such as walking and cycling
  - Feeling safe to walk out alone at night in the Parish
  - Avoiding lots of unnecessary street lights
  - Being able to access local roads without the feeling that traffic is oppressive
  - Having local village pubs
  - Unpolluted local air
  - A sense of wellbeing living in a quiet and peaceful environment

On top of this, the Parish Council does not believe that the settlement needs six - seven potential development sites. We would want to see the historic settlement pattern maintained through a largely linear style avoiding back land and finger development. We would not want to spoil the approaches to the villages with any large scale monotonous housing developments which did not set the right tone or feel for the area and want people to realise that they are entering a rural community. We do not want to lose Grade 2 agricultural land which is part of the Parish history in terms of market gardening and farming, so any development would have to ensure a balance to preserve this heritage. We want to maintain the quirky interesting feel of the Lanes and Closes in the Parish and not introduce further traffic or noise or allow access to new development.

We are horrified to see that the Site assessment document shows that 6 sites within the Parish could deliver 234 (taken as maximum), houses against a current 640 tax base which would be an increase of 36%+ and cannot see that this would be justified when we had believed that a small village such as ours may need to find an addition 25 – 30 houses as part of the Local Plan. In the Parish there are already a significant number of dwellings approved which could mean an additional 37 houses which we understand will be seen as historic in terms of the Local Plan.

We are also very unhappy about the site identified in Pulloxhill which is much closer to Flitton and the resultant strain on facilities within this Parish as local residents will find it more convenient to use facilities on their doorstep rather than travel to Pulloxhill.

We strongly support the decisions made on the sites which have not progressed to Stage 2 and would not want to see any of these decisions changed without further consultation

Site Assessment Forms Specific

**ALP240 Land at Flitton Hill – Do not wish to see this site progress for reasons set out below**

**Density and Settlement**

Would not wish to see 15 or 11 dwellings on this site as density would be far too high in outlying part of village.

Will create built up first impression on entering Flitton and development would change the nature of the historic settlement pattern and also unnecessarily extend the village eastwards

Site currently used for agriculture and would not want to lose Grade 2 agricultural land in this outlying part of the village

**Landscape**

The site is an open and elevated site which is exposed, and this could cause impacts in terms of wide reaching rural views and it would dominate over the west side of Flitton Hill

**Traffic**

Very busy minor (unclassified) country road with high volume traffic and high usage from HGV's and articulated lorries. Traffic calming measures already imposed to try to reduce speed.

Poor visibility on the Hill where the additional access/egress will be and make already difficult vision, unsafe and likely to cause accident and injury

There is no footpath on Flitton Hill meaning there is no safe access to the rest of the village

**Wildlife & Environment**

There are a significant number of bats and owls in the area which are protected species. Any development as proposed is likely to impact on the local colony. The countryside should be preserved as it is within the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area.

**Infrastructure**

Local lower school is already at capacity and neither Flitwick middle school or Redborne upper school are in our catchment area. Children from F&G go to Arnold (Barton) then Harlington upper and the distance to get to these 2 schools is far greater than Flitwick and Ampthill. Also there is currently a threat to withdraw school coaches certainly to Arnold which would totally exacerbate the problem

The centre of Flitwick is well over 2 miles away in terms of supermarket and nearest health care services

**NLP 203 Land at Flitton Hill – Do not wish to see this site progress for reasons set out below**

**Density and Settlement**

Would not wish to see 20 -40 dwellings on this site as density would be far too high in outlying part of village.

Will create built up first impression on entering Flitton and development would change the nature of the historic settlement pattern and also unnecessarily extend the village eastwards

Site currently used for agriculture and would not want to lose Grade 2 agricultural land in this outlying part of the village

**Landscape**

The site is an open and elevated site which is exposed, and this could cause impacts in terms of wide reaching rural views and it would dominate over the west side of Flitton Hill

**Traffic**

Very busy minor (unclassified) country road with high volume traffic and high usage from HGV's and articulated lorries. Traffic calming measures already imposed to try to reduce speed.

Poor visibility on the Hill where the additional access/egress will be and make already difficult vision, unsafe and likely to cause accident and injury

There is no footpath on Flitton Hill meaning there is no safe access to the rest of the village

**Wildlife & Environment**

There are a significant number of bats and owls in the area which are protected species. Any development as proposed is likely to impact on the local colony. The countryside should be preserved as it is within the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area.

### **Infrastructure**

Local lower school is already at capacity and neither Flitwick middle school or Redborne upper school are in our catchment area. Children from F&G go to Arnold (Barton) then Harlington upper and the distance to get to these 2 schools is far greater than Flitwick and Ampthill. Also there is currently a threat to withdraw school coaches certainly to Arnold which would totally exacerbate the problem

The centre of Flitwick is well over 2 miles away in terms of supermarket and nearest health care services

**NLP 172 Land off Sand Road Flitton – Do not wish to see this site progress for reasons set out below.**

**Error in the statement as this site is 100% in Flitton. Recently refused planning consent for 18 dwellings on Appeal**

### **Density and Settlement**

Would not wish to see up to 90 dwellings on this site as density would be far too high in this central part of the village.

Will create built up first impression on entering Flitton from Pulloxhill and open countryside and development would change the nature of the historic settlement pattern.

Site currently used for agriculture and would not want to lose Grade 2 agricultural land in this outlying part of the village

### **Landscape**

The site is in open countryside which is exposed, and will impact in terms of the wide reaching rural views from Sand Road and High Street Flitton as well as Silsoe Road and Wardhedges.

### **Traffic**

Very busy road with high volume traffic and traffic calming measures being considered by the Parish Council to try to reduce speed.

### **Wildlife & Environment**

There are a significant number of farmland birds, reptiles and brown hares and is a site of ecological importance The countryside should be preserved as it is within the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area.

### **Infrastructure**

Local lower school is already at capacity and neither Flitwick middle school or Redborne upper school are in our catchment area. Children from F&G go to Arnold (Barton) then Harlington upper and the distance to get to these 2 schools is far greater than Flitwick and Ampthill. Also there is currently a threat to withdraw school coaches certainly to Arnold which would totally exacerbate the problem

The centre of Flitwick is well over 2 miles away in terms of supermarket and nearest health care services

**NLP 272 Moat Farm Close Greenfield - Comment on site progress for the reason set out below**

Would not wish to see up to 24 dwellings on this site which is currently Grade 2 agricultural land in an outlying part of the village

**NLP 449 Land to rear of 96 Greenfield Road Flitton – Do not wish to see this site progress**



**for reasons set out below.**

**Density and Settlement**

Would not wish to see up to 25 dwellings on this site

Site currently used for equestrian business but in Grade 2 agricultural land which should not be lost

**Landscape**

The site is in open countryside, visible from all neighbouring properties in Sand Road and High Street and would be back-land development in a mainly linear setting.

**Traffic**

Very busy road and high volume traffic with traffic calming measures already in place to try to reduce speed

Close to junction with Sand Road and another access to the Hedgerows and this will mean a third access in very close proximity with inherent highway safety issues, made worse by development opposite granted on Appeal

**Wildlife & Environment**

**Infrastructure**

Local lower school is already at capacity and neither Flitwick middle school or Redborne upper school are in our catchment area. Children from F&G go to Arnold (Barton) then Harlington upper and the distance to get to these 2 schools is far greater than Flitwick and Ampthill. Also there is currently a threat to withdraw school coaches certainly to Arnold which would totally exacerbate the problem

The centre of Flitwick is well over 2 miles away in terms of supermarket and nearest health care services

**NLP 127 Land to rear of 58 High St Flitton – Do not wish to see this site progress for reasons set out below.**

**Density and Settlement**

Would not wish to see up to 40 dwellings on this site

Site currently used for farming business and is primarily Grade 2 agricultural land which should not be lost to the Parish. There are quite often cows and sheep on this land which is preferable to more housing

Settlement is mainly linear in the High Street and this would change the pattern, despite smaller side roads nearby.

**Landscape**

The site is in open countryside, visible from all neighbouring properties in Sand Road and High Street and would be back-land development in a mainly linear setting. The site is part of a hill and the elevation would mean overlooking and blocking of views for existing residents

Development of site is not acceptable in landscape terms as it forms part of the rural landscape setting to Wardhedges and abuts the Flitton Conservation Area with Church and Mausoleum

**Traffic**

Busy road and high volume traffic with traffic calming measures already in place on junction opposite to try to reduce speed.

Access near junction with Flitton Hill where there is a fast traffic flow. There is absolutely no option to gain access to site through Cobbett Lane which is too narrow and within the Conservation area with houses of interest along the lane.

**Wildlife & Environment**

Existing hedgerows / trees would need to be retained and enhanced,

**Infrastructure**

In terms of point 33 Drainage and flooding on the Site Assessment forms, the mark is a G meaning no assessment is required. However the stream to rear of existing properties on High Street already floods at times with runoff from site. This would be much worse if the field was developed. Local lower school is already at capacity and neither Flitwick middle school or Redborne upper school are in our catchment area. Children from F&G go to Arnold (Barton) then Harlington upper and the distance to get to these 2 schools is far greater than Flitwick and Ampthill. Also there is currently a threat to withdraw school coaches certainly to Arnold which would totally exacerbate the problem

The centre of Flitwick is well over 2 miles away in terms of supermarket and nearest health care services

**NLP353 – Hand-Post Field – Sand Road Pulloxhill – Do not wish to see this site progress for reasons set out below.**

### **Density and Settlement**

Would not wish to see anywhere near 69 to 105 dwellings on this site as density would be far too high in this peripheral part of the village, which is closer to Flitton and Greenfield than it is to Pulloxhill. It is removed from the rest of the Pulloxhill settlement completely and will not have any impact on that village. The site should therefore only be seen as part of Flitton as it would have a huge impact on the village particularly due to its size and potential for further development Will create built up first impression on entering Flitton from Pulloxhill and open countryside and development would change the nature of the historic settlement pattern. Development of site not acceptable in landscape terms as it forms part of existing landscape buffer to village, containing development edge

Site currently used for agriculture and would not want to lose Grade 2 agricultural land in this outlying part of the village

### **Landscape**

The site is in open countryside which is exposed, and will impact in terms of the wide reaching rural views from Sand Road and High Street Flitton as well as Silsoe Road and Wardhedges. Direct impact on Greenfield Road Recreation Ground and Centenary Wood.

### **Traffic**

Very busy road and high volume traffic with traffic calming measures being considered by the Parish Council to try to reduce speed in Sand Road.

Access to the site is opposite the junction of Silsoe Road and Sand Road where a number of accidents have been recorded in the past. The junction is already well used particularly at the beginning and end of each working day. Flitton Road is a long straight road linking Pulloxhill and Flitton. Vehicles reach great speeds from Pulloxhill towards Flitton and additional traffic would have to pass the entrance to the site for access to amenities in neighbouring towns and villages

### **Wildlife & Environment**

There are a significant number of farmland birds, reptiles and brown hares and is a site of ecological importance The countryside should be preserved as it is within the Greensand Ridge Nature Improvement Area.

### **Infrastructure**

Local lower school is already at capacity and neither Flitwick middle school or Redborne upper school are in our catchment area. Children from F&G go to Arnold (Barton) then Harlington upper and the distance to get to these 2 schools is far greater than Flitwick and Ampthill. Also there is currently a threat to withdraw school coaches certainly to Arnold which would totally exacerbate the problem

The centre of Flitwick is well over 2 miles away in terms of supermarket and nearest health care services

Potential cumulative impact from this development as Pulloxhill sport and play facilities are restricted to a single site where expansion is not possible and this would put pressure on existing facilities in Greenfield without the benefit of any contribution. If this site is delivered a combined delivery of new land and facilities for sport, play and informal OS is essential preferably in

Greenfield because it is closest.