

APPENDIX TEN

General representations

Please Note: that the Consultation Report is a collection of all comments received during the consultation process. Comments included within this document are those of individuals and organisations and do not necessarily represent the views of the District Council.

GENERAL REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED BY E-MAIL

Name	Subject	Comment
Mary Goulder	General	<p>I have looked in detail at the proposed development sites, initially with dismay. However on hearing these were from owners/developers I was able to put things in perspective. When I look at any development in this area I take into account what else is going to happen. Like it or not we have Centre Parcs, likely Nirah, Wixams and potentially a waste recycling centre, to name but a few. The impact of these over time on the local infrastructure will be immense. The infrastructure doesn't cope at times now. I am against large developments in or near small villages and against any and all developments on greenbelt land, for whatever reason. I am against development on what is currently agricultural land. There is a wealth of evidence that the demand for grain and food worldwide is such that farmers, at last, will be able to make a good profit from their land. This should continue. I realise things have to change and move on. I, like many, disagree with Mr Prescott's view of concreting over the south of England and don't think we should just take things lying down. Housing and commercial development will happen in this area. I don't want this. I will be at least consoled if any and all developers are required to produce buildings that are environmentally friendly, that use water and energy resources according to the highest 'green' standards. As a consumer I am sick and tired of being forced to carry the can for change, it is about time councils and business were forced to take ownership for what they do. Pigs might fly!</p>
Alec Gallacher	General	<p>The 'need' for MBDC to build thousands of new houses on 50 to 70 sites across the area is a response to a central government target. The government have been forced to set such a target as a direct result of 12 years of disastrous immigration policy. The effect of this policy was pointed up a few weeks ago by the Office of National Statistics, which revealed that 85% of all new jobs created since 1997 have been filled by foreigners. This means that of the 14,000 new jobs that MBDC seek to create between 2001 and 2021, 11,900 will go to foreigners, who will inevitably occupy a similarly high proportion of the proposed new housing. In other words, you are seeking to further destroy the county's countryside for the benefit of foreigners, and to the detriment of the indigenous population, their environment and society. I moved to Bedfordshire two years ago. I did so because, after almost fifty years of living in my native London, I had had enough. For years I watched a previously pleasant corner of northwest London become a squalid, noisy, congested, smelly, overcrowded dump, in which I felt like a foreigner in my own country. With these proposals you are about to make exactly the same mistake. The correct response to central government is simple - NO, we will not implement your housing targets. WE HAVE HAD ENOUGH.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Duncan King	General	<p>Loved the news letter I received today, must have cost a packet to print, don't worry though, you can always hike the council tax again to pay for it.I can't wait to find out what my band F, 3-bed detached bungalow in Ampthill will cost me this year. I think the £2100 we paid last year is relatively small for what we get. When you think about it, a crusty, debt ridden, potholed, nil star performing county and council. Are we still the worst one in England? I hope so, it always gives me a chuckle to know that I live in the worst county in the land. Amazing really, when you think about it, one of the smallest counties and the worst run. Must be a hard time achieving that status, you must have to make a hell of a cock up to do it! Now on to the matter of land development, please can you arrange to concrete over as much of it as possible. This way no one needs to cut the grass and we get a save on our council tax, plus it will look like a motorway as people hastily pass through it going somewhere else. How about a chavvie council estate in the back garden of the Duke of Bedford, that'll work. I hope my note is of assistance. PS How about a leaflet in Albanian? The more languages the merrier, this is England after all. You can always fund the translation services against the council tax.</p> <p>Nothing personal in my comments to you, you are just doing your job. There are a lot of citizens of mid beds who are totally disenchanted with local politics and very cynical regarding what MBDC do with the money raised in sky high council tax. I am one of those people! I do not believe we get any real value in this county for the amount of money generated through local taxation. There are too many uses of money for non essential work and services. Frankly, these type of leaflets posted and roadshow consultations are a total waste of time, money and effort. Reason being is that the Govt. will do what it wants and when it wants, so if they have ear marked land for residential or commercial development. This will just happen. Therefore, why waste money on these type of PR exercises when all we really want is our refuse bins collected weekly instead of fortnightly. Until there is root and branch reform of local public services then we are doomed to endure sky high council tax, diminishing services and crumbling infrastructure. The sad part about it all is that there is no political will anywhere to tackle these issues head on. Local Govt. should only offer basis services to keep the council tax bill low - there should be no one employed in any type of marketing or PR function as this is non productive and just adds costs</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Gillian Kern	General	<p>I have responded to the survey for each site and I look forward to hearing the outcomes. I want to re-iterate my concerns about the impact on the environment left by builders and to reinforce my preference for:* Smaller/cheaper family homes including starter and key worker homes;* larger sites that accumulate 106 Gain to support the infra-structure development that will be needed particular for children and young people.</p>
Roger Langworth	General	<p>I read with interest all the details on your website about development in Mid Beds. You mention that we need 400 new homes from 39 villages. That is an average of 10 per village. However I toted up the numbers that you have identified for Henlow (a linear village) and it comes to 1606 (resulting in a 50% increase in population). If you add in the numbers for Langford (another linear village with poor access links) and Clifton then the numbers exceed 3000. Almost ten times the number required from only 3 villages. If you then project these ratios to cover the whole of the 39 villages then the figure comes to 20,000 new homes. Are you trying to solve the housing shortage all by your selves?. I also note that there are another 1700 homes proposed in Stotfold. This is in addition to the 1200 homes already being built on the Fairfield site. This amounts to an increase in the population of Stotfold of 50%. There is also significant development planned for Arlesey. (2592 homes. A 50% increase in population again) . A again a place with very poor access links, being a linear village yet again, with only one road in and one road out. The access from the North is particularly poor being by a narrow road through a housing estate. The proposals are grossly excessive. Whilst I realise that a lot of the sites are only proposals, history reveals that what is proposed usually happens, and you only have to look as far as Stevenage to see that. I think that your proposals require a radical rethink. You say that the proposals are in addition to current planning, but you do not say how many planning applications are already authorised. Please can you tell me this. The proposals are also silent on what facilities are being proposed for Schools, hospitals, GP surgeries, playing fields and the like.. Together with access roads, certainly the A6001 will not be able to cope. Maybe what is really needed is less time being spent on core strategy and more on providing essential services. I hope that you will be able to re assure me that all these proposals won't happen but I doubt it. What you should be doing is telling government that all the new homes need to be built in the north of England not in the overpopulated south. Roger Langworth</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Michael Brooks	General	<p>I just wanted to raise the question of the 'District Council Initial Comments' appended to the description of each site included in the consultation. Questions of fact, such as 'This site is in the Green Belt' or 'Part of this site is in the Conservation Area', are helpful. But other comments such as 'The principle of development in this location is already firmly established' (if it is not a site already allocated in the previous Local Plan) or 'Smaller scale development would be considered here' or 'Development of this scale is unlikely to fit with the approach of the Core Strategy' are surely somewhat premature and should await analysis of the consultation and subsequent publication of the Preferred Options. In the light of this you may wish to consider adding a note on the home page or in the FAQs that the District Council's 'initial comments' are just that and do not prejudge the outcome of the consultation. Having said that, may I commend you on the website and the ease with which it presents the information to users. One thing that would enhance it even more would be for each site on the parish maps to have a link direct to the site description rather than having to memorise the site reference number and then look it up in the list. But the more we have, the more we want ... Well done, anyway. Michael Brooks Community and Regional Planning Services</p>
John & Wendy Chalmers	General	<p>We would like to make the following points with regard to the 400 sites which have been submitted to Mid Beds District Council for potential residential and commercial development as part of the consultation process currently underway: Firstly - the areas for proposed development are developer-led and obviously originate solely from a desire by land owners for profit. Surely areas suggested for growth should be put forward by communities themselves and reflect local needs whilst maintaining the integrity of communities. Secondly - the maps available show only development sites under consideration for future development. They do not show the numerous developments currently under construction or with planning applications already approved. Therefore an accurate picture of the scale of development once current building developments are added is not available and you are asking people to make judgements based on less than the complete picture.</p>
Rafe Bateson	General	<p>Chris, The whole region has a part to play in providing homes for all levels of income but in this strategy what has happened to the ROADS, many of the people will travel on the A1M and along the A507, where are the plans to widen the A1M it needs 3 Lanes now, I travel down a number of local roads where 10 years ago there were hardly any cars now there are ¾ PER HOUSE !!! What are the proposals regarding the future of our Roads.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Bill Shaw	General	<p>I have just been to the presentation at Stondon Village Hall and I am concerned at the lack of information regarding the bigger picture. I do understand the need for more housing and employment facilities but I am frustrated at the lack or perceived lack of information regarding roads, hospitals, schools etc. I spoke to a nice young lady who was very informative about the proposed developments but when asked about roads, she suggested contacting the highways Agency, and the PCT regarding hospitals. I feel this information needs to be in one place, I don't want to go chasing around trying to find it. There are huge developments proposed for the east of Stevenage and the west of Luton, which will have a great impact on our area. The expansion to Stondon is small in comparison but none the less will have an effect. For instance the A600 into Hitchin is often clogged up and will become worse when Hitchin is at a standstill due to traffic from Luton and Stevenage. The A1 (M) cannot cope at the moment. One little accident and Henlow, Langford and Shefford become blocked. There is much talk of hospital closures and relocations, i.e. Lister, QE2 and Bedford. Luton and Dunstable is a nightmare for parking and the cost to park is constantly going up. The elderly have enough difficulties getting to them with having to travel further afield. Could someone co-ordinate all this information into one so we can see the whole picture.</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
Ms Sarah Moxey	General	<p>It's good to be paper free as we need to think about all resources and what we are going to leave for the next generation. Eventually a majority will be able to use this means of communication. In general I think we need to address far more basic issues than where to put houses. Jobs - that are sustainable - need to come first then services and then housing. Looking at things at the moment I think we should be looking at people getting back to the land and growing food as a priority - for local consumption. with all the future predictions looking bleak we need to consider self sufficiency much more seriously. Any secondary or tertiary industries are all very well but need the basics to be in place sensibly. We must cut ridiculous transport costs - e.g.: apples which we can grow here - are in the supermarket from New Zealand, South Africa and Chile. Jobs need to be within cycling distance of current housing. When we eliminate or reduce so much road use we are creating a better air quality for all and are putting sensible time into the work place rather than spending hours each week just stuck in slow moving traffic. We have several electricity cuts a year here and I wonder about the strain on the "invisible" services underground which need to be updated and maintained before any more strain is put on them. I dread to think about our drains and their maintenance. In short we need to provide a solid workable basis before we entertain any ideas of more housing to overload a creaking land. While I'm giving my thoughts - please, please do all you can to clean up this filthy countryside - I know it's a bad attitude from the public who just keep littering but we have to sort it - it's so embarrassing when foreign visitors look at our roadsides and just can't understand why. I often litter pick on walks and so much that I collect is recyclable that it is unbelievable!</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
<p>Rose Freeman "</p> <p>The Theatres Trust</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of 14 February consulting The Theatres Trust on the issues and options stage of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document. The Theatres Trust is The National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. The Town & Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995, Article 10, Para (v) requires the Trust to be consulted on planning applications which include 'development involving any land on which there is a theatre.' It was established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres'. This applies to all theatre buildings, old and new, in current use, in other uses, or disused. It also includes buildings or structures that have been converted to theatre, circus buildings and performing art centres. Our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use, but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies. It is not part of The Theatres Trust's remit to comment on site specific allocations except to provide guidance on assessing the best locations for theatre provision in a town or city which will support and protect sustainable theatre use. The Council should be satisfied that there is adequate provision for cultural facilities and that these are in easily accessible locations by public transport and road with adequate parking. We look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents.</p>
<p>Steve Mortimer</p> <p>East West Rail Consortium</p>	<p>General</p>	<p>Thank you for your letter of 14-02-08, offering the opportunity to comment on the above document. The main comment of the East West Rail Consortium is that the sites selected for development should have good public transport access, preferably being adjacent or close to a railway station, like those on the Marston Vale (Bedford-Bletchley) railway which forms part of the proposed East West Rail route connecting Oxford, Aylesbury, Milton Keynes and Bedford. In line with the above, the East West Rail Consortium is discussing how there might be a common policy between all local authorities along the route to ensure a degree of Section 106 funding from them all towards the realisation of East West Rail. A workshop was held recently on this, at which Mid-Bedfordshire District Council was represented.</p>

GENERAL REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED BY LETTER

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
<p>Warmingtons, Chartered Valuation Surveyors Land & Estate Agents</p>	<p>General,</p>	<p>I have your letter of the 1st July in response to our representations submitted on behalf of clients. We understand that you require any comments by today, 19th August, upon the 70 additional site proposals to enable you to identify your preferred sites. We have already proposed sites at Chapel End, Wilstead, Hawhills Farm, Houghton Conquest, Wootton Green Farm, Wootton, Beancroft Farm, Marston Moretaine, Maltings Farm, Blunham, Lower East End, Marston Moretaine and Red House Farm, Blunham. It seems quite clear that your Council wishes to make large settlements larger and the smaller settlements are to stay small. There is a limit to both these ideas; the large settlements cannot expand indefinitely before they burst and the smaller ones need housing and employment to keep them surviving. We and our clients object to the former (large settlements) and support limited expansion of the smaller ones. 'The Spatial Vision' is a vision to shape policies which will provide the means of implementation for the spatial aspects of the community plan. Spatial Strategy seeks to seek out sustainable levels, locations and forms of development in accordance with certain objectives and policies of regional studies. More dwellings within the proposed areas we have submitted would assist in procuring interest in more local amenities to maintain the viability of smaller communities. Some more housing and employment in the smaller settlements would help sustain the level of local services and facilities and diversification on some farm areas adjacent to settlements would assist both the farming businesses and the local rural economy without any significant adverse effects in terms of noise, landscape impact or traffic generation. We look forward to receiving your ' preferred sites' list.</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
Indigo Planning Ltd	General	<p>We write on behalf of our client, Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd, in respect of the recently released Site Allocations further Issues and Options consultation. In the district of Mid-Bedfordshire, Sainsbury's is interested in pursuing future opportunities (in addition to their existing store in Biggleswade) to meet the need for future floor space requirements in the District. The provision of additional floor space is necessary within Mid-Bedfordshire's centres to ensure the existing convenience provision is maintained and enhanced to meet the needs of an increasing population. Indigo has previously submitted representations to the Issues and Options stage of the Council's preparation of this document. We wish to reiterate our previous representations in supporting the general housing allocations coming forward but highlighting that the Council should allow for improvements to the existing retail provision. In particular, Mid-Bedfordshire District Council should promote allocations for additional retail convenience floor space in locations where significant housing growth is planned. This additional convenience provision will be required to complement the planned housing and employment growth outlined in the Core Strategy Preferred Options document. It will also ensure that the Local Development Framework process is coherent and sound. The Core Strategy has identified that Sandy and Ampthill, as major service centres, and Shefford as a minor service centre will accommodate additional housing and employment. In line with the above and our previous representations, we consider that the Site Allocations document should therefore identify and promote sites for convenience retail provision in Shefford, Sandy and Ampthill. We again repeat Sainsbury's eagerness to work alongside the Council to improve Mid-Bedfordshire's convenience retailing offer and we would appreciate the opportunity of discussing Sainsbury's aspirations in the District.</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
Timothy Sills D.L.	General,	<p>I am sorry to trouble you, but I understand that a further consultation stage has been reached in connection with the Local Development Framework. I hope you will not mind me writing to you personally as a member of Mid Beds District Council. I understand that as part of the Council's Strategy most future development will be directed towards the main towns in the District and some of the larger villages whilst restricting development in the other villages. I hope that the villages will not be completely ignored. It seems that the present government is not much of a supporter of villages, presumably because they get most of their votes from the larger urban areas! Despite this our villages are to a large extent the heart and soul of the District. It is vital that they should continue to be thriving communities and not be allowed to wither on the vine. If this is not to happen, they need facilities such as a post office, a village store, other shops (if possible) and at least one pub, and in larger villages doctor's surgeries. In order to support and retain those facilities there has to be a reasonable and active number of residents in the villages. Villages need a certain amount of development within them (including Affordable Housing) if they are not to stagnate. This is becoming increasingly important as fuel prices rise and we are encouraged to be environmentally conscious and unnecessary travel is to be discouraged. Village facilities will be vitally important. I am sure you are well aware of these points, but I felt that I should at least commit them to paper because of the consultations which are taking place. I should declare an interest as I am a trustee in connection with a site (H197 Blunham) which has been put forward for possible future development.</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
<p>Sarah Burgess</p> <p>Senior Planning Advisor CABE</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Design is now well established in planning policy at national and regional levels, and LDFs offer an opportunity to secure high-quality development, of the right type, in the right place, at the right time. 2. Robust design policies should be included within all LDF documents and the Community Strategy, embedding design as a priority from strategic frameworks to site-specific scales. 3. To take aspiration to implementation, local planning authorities' officers and members should champion good design. 4. Treat design as a cross-cutting issue – consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm. 5. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations. 6. You should include adequate wording or 'hooks' within your policies that enable you to develop and use other design tools and mechanisms, such as design guides, site briefs, and design codes. <p>You might also find the following CABE Guidance helpful.</p> <p><i>"Making design policy work: How to deliver good design through your local development framework"</i></p> <p><i>"Protecting Design Quality in Planning"</i></p> <p><i>"Design at a glance: A quick reference wall chart guide to national design policy",</i></p> <p>These, and other publications, are available from our website www.cabe.org.uk</p>