

ARLESEY APPENDICES

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.

ARLESEY APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Appendix one lists additional comments submitted using the consultation survey form. Some surveys were submitted by individuals on behalf of a company, agency or organisation. As a point of clarification we list below (where details are held) the names of consultees who submitted these surveys, the bodies they represent and the sites commented on.

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
P J Frampton	Framptons Chartered Town Planning Consultants	H293
Mr Tony Charles	Charles Planning Associates Limited	E12, H328

Ref Number: H020

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High street/Hitchin Rd). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which it is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land south of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and it's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'Greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Senior	Inappropriate access to site.
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site is virtually inaccessible and a new access road to serve the 30 dwelling capacity could not be provided to adoptable standards. Further the sight line achievable onto the High Street would be wholly sub-standard. The development would also be readily visible from open countryside to the east.
Pauline Brotherton	I am totally opposed to any land which is currently used for agricultural purposes being used for any form of development. However, that said, I have to reluctantly agree that the area is in close proximity to GP Surgery and Lower School.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H048

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	As it would appear that the land is currently not used and is in close proximity to the High Street, then - as much as I am against any major development in Arlesey, which will increase emissions when "our Government" want us to reduce emissions!! Then I reluctantly have to agree that this seems to be good use of the area. Ideally, the relief road would take a westerly route out (crossing the railway line if need be) from Arlesey to relieve congestion from the Church End area. The situation currently is not good, with people trying to access the railway station - schools, A507 and A1M - which is getting worse as the new developments in Stotfold are emerging and will get worse no doubt with the increases planned for Arlesey. It wont take too long before it becomes "situation gridlock".

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	Generally we support the comprehensive development of all of the land west of the High Street and east of the railway line which would serve to link the two parts of the village and create a cohesive settlement (i.e. sites H003/E27, H227/E35, H048, H165, H156 a and b, H293 (part)). The problem with this site, individually, is access to the High Street. There is currently no obvious access to the High Street. The site should only be developed in association with the larger more comprehensive option outlined above.

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all the existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been a subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which it is currently closely linked with at County Council level - once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on "land South of Stotfold" and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'Greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257), a more sustainable, and sensible, option could be for part o it, at least, to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes, which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community; with the proviso that such development should be of a sustainable, high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to its surroundings.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
C Dilley	When these sites are being considered I hope due consideration will be given to the horrendous traffic conditions in Hitchin Street and our already over-stressed water amines which are having to be repaired repeatedly, causing considerable inconvenience.
G P Page	This area is prone to having a high water table development could cause problems in other areas.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H063

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site is too remote and lies well outside the village envelope. Housing development here would result in an unjustified incursion into open countryside contrary to National planning policies for the countryside which seek to protect the countryside for its own sake. Further, because the site lies outside the village it has poor sustainability credentials. Development on this site would be visually intrusive and unrelated to the existing pattern of settlement. Development should not be permitted in this location.
G P Page	Well outside the general settlement envelope which is situated on only one through road.
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Churchlane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any specific level of development in the recent past, unlike it's neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some of 50% over a period of years and it's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such. Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'Greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. The Location of this submission site some distance outside the existing 'settlement envelope' (according to the map of Arlesey published as part of the consultation) should therefore count against it relative to the above criteria.
Pauline Brotherton	I am opposed to any major development in Arlesey, however, this site could provide up to 70 of the so call "required" housing - as the land is not currently "tended" or farmed and will not cause disruption as it is has no "near neighbours" as such - in saying that - it is only a short walk away from GP surgery, schools etc. The larger of the two options (6 or 70) should be considered in order to make best use of council services i.e. refuse collection etc and a larger development has a better chance of becoming a small "community" and due to its "remoteness" will help with making people feel more secure. Alternatively - consider this site for business use. I am opposed to mixing - business sites with houses i.e. the "mixed use".
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H064

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site is too remote and lies well outside the village envelope. Housing development here would result in an unjustified incursion into open countryside contrary to National planning policies for the countryside which seek to protect the countryside for its own sake. Further, because the site lies outside the village it has poor sustainability credentials. Development on this site would be visually intrusive and unrelated to the existing pattern of settlement. Development should not be permitted in this location.
G P Page	Site is really no different to Fairfield Farm identified site.
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been the subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at County Council level - once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on "Land South of Stotfold" and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years and its transport infrastructure, public services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, s that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'Greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. The location of this submission site some distance outside the existing 'settlement envelope' (according to the map of Arlesey published as part of this consultation) should therefore count against it relative to the above.
Pauline Brotherton	I am opposed to any major development in Arlesey. However, as this site is not farmed in any way - it could provide 30 houses - a small community. It is a short distance from GP, schools etc. Alternatively, consider using this site for business use. I am opposed to mixing business units with housing.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H143

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Churchlane/high Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which it is currently closely linked with at County council level-once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and it's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainability development must be fully considered, so that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'green field' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. This is a large 'green field' site, the development of which would have significant detrimental effect on the rural character of the surrounding area.
P L Edwards	The trains from Arlesey station into London during commuter hours are already crowded with many passengers not getting a seat. The development will encourage significant numbers of London commuters. What measures are you taking to increase the train capacity from Arlesey to London during peak commuter hours?

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This large site is visually very prominent from the east and would be visually intrusive in countryside views. It would further consolidate development at the southern extremity of the village. A preferable option would be to develop all of the land to the west of the High Street and east of the railway line, thereby linking both parts of the village in a cohesive manner (i.e. sites H003/E27, H227/E35, HO48, H156 a and b and H293/E12). This option would provide a cohesive settlement form plus the proposed link road associated with site H293/E12.
Claire Moon	The additional traffic through Arlesey will be travel along one existing road. Although there are plans to develop another road at the northern end of the village, this will only serve that end of the village and will lead to greater congestion, parking issues and potential danger to the residents of Arlesey and the many people who travel through our village to reach Ickleford and Hitchin.
J Knight	Greenfield site.
Neal Jillings	The core strategies suggested approach to the settlement hierarchy is flawed. Significant amounts of growth should not be directed towards Arlesey.

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotheton	I am totally opposed to any major development in Arlesey - especially when it comes to concreting and tarmac over arable farmland -but that is my opinion - and who cares what my opinions are - I doubt that anyone will take any notice. However as it seems that our locally elected representatives have given in to Governments wishes & want to help ruin the environment by covering it with yet more concrete & tarmac & increasing emissions by doing so - then I can see the "attractions" of using this site. It is also just a short WALK from the High St, doctors, schools etc. Maybe make it a car free zone - this would help the environment & result in healthier lifestyles.
Trina Davidson	Far too many houses being built on farm fields and green belt land; this will cause far too much extra strain on schools and doctor's surgery and roads.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.
David Russell Associates	400 homes and a country park would lead to a merging of Arlesey with Fairfield and urban land uses on the north-western edge of Letchworth.

Ref Number: H156a

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
David Russell Associates	This site is part of a larger area being promoted for mixed uses under reference H293 by Arlesey Town Council, and lies just north of a similar area being promoted under references H227 and E35. The land between the railway line and the High Street is the obvious first choice for the proposed growth of around 1000 new homes in Arlesey. The site could be critically important to the implementation of the proposed relief road being promoted under H293 and H227/E35. The site is within walking distance of a number of existing and proposed facilities being promoted under H293 and H227. A bus stop next to the eastern boundary, provides public transport services to Hitchin and Shefford. The site would have no impact on the countryside, and a sensitive development would do much to improve currently unused and unkempt land.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	Generally we support the comprehensive development of all of the land west of the High Street and east of the railway line which would serve to link the two parts of the village and create a cohesive settlement (i.e. sites H003/E27, H227/E35, HO48, H165, H156 a and b, H293/E12). The development of site H293/E12, in combinations with the sites west of the High Street would meet the strategic allocation for the village, create a cohesive pattern of settlement and provide a link road between Stotfold Road and the High street.

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood	<p>Arlesey is unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Churchlane/high Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which it is currently closely linked with at County council level-once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and it's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainability development must be fully considered, so that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'green field' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side on this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257), a more sustainable, and sensible, option could be for art to it, at least to be re-developed for B1 employment purposes, which could make it a much greater benefit to the wider local community, which provision that such development should be of a sustainable, high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to its surroundings.</p>

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	Here we go again - more needless housing - concrete and tarmac. I am against any major development in Arlesey. However - as this land is vacant - it is located in close proximity to the High Street and amenities - it might mean that the High Street might receive some attention and be rejuvenated to become the "hub" of the community which it should be.
Susan Hirst	The High Street in Arlesey is already congested throughout all times of the day and evening and any further developments would add to the traffic using this route. There would need to be another service road provided to cope with any additional traffic generated from this development. There are inadequate services/facilities in Arlesey to cope with a larger population - the schools are not big enough, one doctor is not adequate, there is no proper library, only a part-time chemist, etc. etc.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H156b

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	Am totally against any major development in Arlesey. Our emissions will increase when Government want to see them reduce.....As land is not farmed arable land - then reluctantly have to agree that this proposed site goes forward due to its proximity to the High Street and amenities. If it does go ahead, then maybe the existing High Street might receive some attention to help it become the "hub" of the town.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H165

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alan McManus	My main reservation concerning development of this site is regards access during development by construction traffic. I live in the adjoining St Johns Road and the past 15 months or so have at times been an absolute nightmare with the comings and goings of the traffic to and from the site which thankfully now is nearing completion. However, as far as I am aware there is still no prospect of a relief road going through to the High Street at the southern end as the current landowners clearly have no intention of selling. I would like to know how you intend to get round this problem as it appears to be a major obstacle to your proposed plans for development.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been the subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at County Council level - once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on "Land South of Stotfold" and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years and its transport infrastructure, public services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, s that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257), a more sustainable, and sensible, option could be part of it, at least, to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes, which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community; with the proviso that such development should be of a sustainable, high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to its surroundings.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Anita Wilden	This site will greatly impact on the vehicular access in Cricketers & St Johns Road. It is very close to the dedicated wildlife area just the other side of the railway line - this will all be disturbed with building works. Housing on this site will absolutely spoil our viewpoint and will most definitely overlook our residence. We purchased this property because it isn't overlooked & forms part of a small estate of diverse properties. The area of Arlesey has very few amenities - the local development should be concentrated on providing better leisure & social facilities - there are already lots of youths hanging around looking menacing - no swimming pool, tennis, badminton etc. The children's play areas are all very basic, the surgery only has 1.5 GPs, and the library facility could be much improved as could the schools within the area. If there is an influx of young families in the area there simply isn't enough for them and the youths to do in such an under-developed village.
Claire Moon	once again the addition of more homes will mean more traffic, whilst the north end of the village will be catered for with additional service road once past the old garage site and primrose lane, utter carnage will ensue as more traffic will be using the existing size road which at the moment is clogged up with parked cars and often require scars to pull over to give way. This development will mean more traffic despite what our local lead councillor says, as it will be impossible to prevent people from driving in whatever direction they want to through our village.
Pauline Brotherton	Am against any major development within Arlesey - emissions will increase & reduce the amount of agricultural land, meadows, grassland, greenbelt and natural scrub land. Once land has been covered in concrete or tarmac - it is lost forever - thus increasing likelihood of flooding - & a lot of the land in & around Arlesey, as people who actually LIVE here know, is prone to flooding or for being severely water-logged. However, that said - this area in question is close to the High Street & amenities & if the area is developed - then some attention may be given to the High Street to make it "hub" of the town. Difficult to pass comment when the only information available is "this site is promoted as part of a wider mixed use scheme".
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	Generally we support the comprehensive development of all of the land west of the High Street and east of the railway line which would serve to link the two parts of the village and create a cohesive settlement (i.e. sites H003/E27, H227/E35, H048, H165, H156 a and b, H293/E12).The development of site H293/E12, in combination with the sites west of the High Street would meet the strategic allocation for the village, create a cohesive pattern of settlement and provide a link road between Stotfold Road and the High Street. In site specific terms, access to this site is dependent on the two adjoining housing developments; the capacity of the local estate road network has yet to be shown to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional traffic that would be generated by a development of 128 dwellings. Whereas, as part of a larger, more comprehensive development more appropriate access opportunities may be possible.
Mr & Mrs White	We own part of this site that has been put forward, it has been included against our wishes and we are in the process of having it removed with our solicitors and the local government ombudsman. Our property has no deliverability.

Ref Number: H254

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Churchlane/high Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which it is currently closely linked with at County council level-once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfield will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and it's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainability development must be fully considered, so that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'green field' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	The access to this site takes the form of a narrow private drive between two recently built house plots. The access is unsuitable to be improved to an adoptable standard estate road which would be required to serve a scheme of 8 dwellings. A smaller scheme comprising a few houses might be possible, accessed from a private shared driveway, subject to other development control considerations. However, as currently proposed it should be rejected.
N. Wheelwright	Access as defined is across land I own. Nobody has approached me about this. My front garden is already very short - having a road across it would be inappropriate.
Pauline Brotherton	Opposed to any major development in Arlesey. Emissions will increase, another small chunk of land lost. However - as it is evident that our elected representatives are keen to obey the Government - and are not willing to resist this edict - then I reluctantly have to agree that this site, due to its proximity to the High Street and amenities could be used to provide 8 dwellings only - any more will encroach onto adjacent arable land.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H257

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that 'a barrier block will need to be constructed to screen the noise emanating from the railway'. It would be more sustainable, and sensible, option for this 'brownfield' site to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes, which could also be of greater benefit to the wider local community' with the provision that such development should be of a sustainable , high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to it's surroundings.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site forms part of a larger industrial estate. Access to the site is via the estate roads that serve the larger industrial estate. Housing development on this site would result in residential and heavy goods vehicle traffic movements coming into direct conflict. Further, given the location of the site relative to the rest of the industrial estate its development in isolation would result in a poor residential environment for the occupants of the dwellings. There may also be a highway objection in relation to excessive cul-de-sac length.
Michael Kirk	The issue of access and parking arrangements for existing residents of Hitchin Road needs to be addressed with great sensitivity before this development progresses any further. If existing access rights of way or informal parking arrangements are removed, there is the possibility for a great deal of chaos, and potentially a dangerous situation on an already busy road.

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	The area is currently an industrial site. It should be left as an industrial site. I am sure that someone somewhere is capable of over-ruling the planning permission granted "on appeal" for it to become a residential development. Once this has been achieved, make improvements to the site, modernise it, increase capacity etc. There would not then be a need to construct a "barrier block to screen the noise emanating from the railway" & those monies could be better spent improving the High Street. Questions need to be asked as to why/who granted planning permission for "brownfield" site to become a housing development. As we are now looking to ruin greenfield sites to become brownfield - absolutely ridiculous.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H277

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr. R. J. Patimore	With the proposed relief road from the centre of the village to Stotfold Road to the north, all sites between the railway and the high street are opened up to access without making the already very busy high street any worse. Good opportunity exists for recreational access to the west with perhaps a new footbridge over the railway and enhanced river walks. Many people are dissuaded in crossing a four track mainline railway on a flat crossing

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. The location of this submission site some distance outside the existing 'settlement envelope' (according to the map of Arlesey published as part of this consultation) might therefore count against it relative to the above criteria.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site is remote from the village and outside its boundaries. The land lies in the countryside and adjacent to the major development taking place at the Fairfield Park site. Development on this site would serve only to extend the Fairfield Park development into the open countryside where National planning policies seek to protect the countryside for its own sake. Development on this site would contribute nothing to the services and facilities of Arlesey. Development should not be allowed on this site.
G Rosa	Already enough houses built on Fairfield park without spilling onto the countryside.

Submitted by	Comments
K Irving & N Hall	Ludicrous!
Pauline Brotherton	<p>Opposed to major redevelopment in Arlesey which will result in loss of green field - agricultural land - pastures - meadows and the like and result in increased emissions - more cars on already overburdened roads.</p> <p>However - the land is vacant and not used for crops - and is within reasonable distance of the High Street and amenities.</p>
S J Barber	Vehicle access not easy. Strongly affects green space between Stotfold (Fairfield) and Arlesey. Very poor public transport.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H282

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site lies within the built up area of the village and is currently a Business Centre. The site has a good frontage to the Hitchin Road and access would not be an issue. The redevelopment of this Previously Developed Site (PDL) could take place without it needing to be specifically allocated for development in the Site Allocations DPD.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been the subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at County Council level - once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on "Land South of Stotfold" and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years and its transport infrastructure, public services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing Mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, s that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. As noted in the "additional information supplied", it might be more sustainable, and more benefit to the local wider community, if this site were to be redeveloped for employment purposes, especially as any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257. B1 employment usage should be preferred, with the proviso that the development should be of sustainable, high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to its surroundings.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	This is an industrial site. It should be left as such - and improved to increase capacity and modernised. I totally disagree with converting existing brownfield sites to housing - as a replacement industrial site will need to be found and in doing so no doubt this will mean using perfectly good arable land or greenfield / greenbelt land to convert to brownfield sites. Absolutely crazy. This site lies next to a railway - so if houses are built - some sort of barrier block or screening would be required. Not needed if left as industrial. Am not in favour of "mixed use" sites (industrial or business units amidst houses developments).
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: H293

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Howard	The scale of development proposed looks to create the financial resources required to provide Arlesey with much-needed facilities - new houses; a relief road (this is vital); a local supermarket (currently residents have to travel to Stotfold of Morrison's for their groceries); a new school...
Charles Planning Associates Limited	Generally we support the comprehensive development of all of the land to the west of the High Street and east of the railway line which would serve to link the two parts of the village and create a cohesive settlement (i.e. sites HO03/E27, H227/E35, HO48, H165, H156 a and b, H293/E12) and provide a new road link from Stotfold Road to the High Street. However, this representation (H293) omits to include site HO03/E27 which forms an integral part of the consideration of the land west of the High Street and east of the railway lying immediately south of and butting Chase Hill Road. With this addition, it is considered that site H293 represents the best option to meet the strategic housing requirement allocated to Arlesey in such a way as to deliver significant benefits to the village. Further, the opportunity could be taken to provide a centre community focus within the development such as a new Health Centre, new School site etc.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood	<p>Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. While this is a huge 'green field site'- the development of which would have a significant detrimental effect of the rural character of the surrounding area- it's location adjacent to the A507 and neat to Arlesey railway station make it of considerable interest relative to enabling Mid Bedfordshire to meet it's government - imposed targets in terms of residential and employment development; the bypass could ensure that extra traffic from outside the local area would not need to pass through central Arlesey and the rail link could ignorantly reduce the number of private motorised vehicles (especially those owned by employees) accessing the site, in accordance with the directives of PPG13. Perhaps therefore, it is important to determine that a significant part of the site- an even greater than that identified with submission E12- should be developed for B1 employment purposes, which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community, including residents of Stotfold, with the provision that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon 'neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to it's surroundings. Certainly, the fact that this site is within easy walking distance Arlesey railway station is a compelling material reason for such a use.</p>
Mr Peter Scammell	<p>We have said that we neither agree nor disagree as to whether the site could be developed without creating traffic congestion problems in the vicinity as the proposed relief road would mean that traffic leaving the development would have to turn right to join the Stotfold Road to then join the A507. As we are sure this could be quite busy at certain times it would probably mean that traffic would leave the development by the village centre and come along the Stotfold Road which would not ease the current traffic issues in the village centre. We would suggest that it might be feasible to have another exit on the roundabout (of the A507/Stotfold Road) to allow access directly to the development. We have disagreed about the impact of the development on the countryside or local environment as obviously it is currently green space which will be built on. We would also like to suggest that it might be better to place the two proposed industrial sections together.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
P L Edwards	The trains from Arlesey station into London during commuter hours are already crowded with many passengers not getting a seat. The development will encourage significant numbers of London commuters. What measures are you taking to increase the train capacity from Arlesey to London during peak commuter hours?

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Chalkley	This number of households of Arlesey high will only cause traffic chaos at church end Arlesey and at Arlesey service garage roundabout only provision of a complete new road between the Stotfold end of Arlesey and the Hitchin end of Arlesey would allow sensible development in this area.
J Knight	Will destroy the very nature of the village and cause traffic mayhem. Will ruin the entire area!
Mr P Mythen	Housing maybe, commercial no!!! The roads, rail and schools can't cope with demand now. Improve these and you're onto a winner. But that means widening the A1M (not just using the hard shoulder), the a507 needs to be a dual carriageway, the rail bottleneck at Welwyn needs to be sorted and more (or longer) trains put on at key times.
Neal Jillings	The Core Strategies suggested approach to the settlement hierarchy is flawed. Significant amounts of growth should not be directed towards Arlesey. We will be making representations to the Core Strategy to this effect.
P.J Frampton	There is no justification for this scale of growth being allocated to a small settlement such as Arlesey. The proposed relief road is simply self serving in order to provide access for this massive development in the context of Arlesey. The so called relief road is not justified to revolve serious congestion within Arlesey. The proposal represents poor spatial planning and is not sustainable.
Pauline Brotherton	West of Arlesey already included under H227 & the like? Agree West of Arlesey be enhanced & improved with relief road West of the town alleviating congestion to the East. Am against development of East site. This is farmed agricultural land, a buffer between Fairfield & Stotfold. Development here will create mayhem; gridlock in an already busy access area, increase flood risk, deprive peoples livelihoods & displace wildlife, increase pollution, noise & be detrimental to Arlesey. Do not believe in "mixed use" sites. Do not approve of football pitches. Use the opportunity to update/improve the High St & vicinity. Leave businesses where they are & update/improve these sites. We moved here for the "rural" style lifestyle-we have now put our plans on hold awaiting the outcome of this exercise before deciding to move or stay. Our elected reps should simply say NO to expansion which will bring with it increased emissions & pollution with countryside lost forever.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Trina Davidson	Have seen plans for this site and relief road from Stotfold road to high street, cannot believe yet more fields are being ruined for absolutely no good reason, we do not need a relief road here and we certainly do not need any more commercial units as the ones we have now many of which are empty create areas for vandalism. I have lived in Arlesey for 25 years and have seen many changes but this is going too far, it is ruining the village or town infrastructure, soon we will be joined to Stotfold Letchworth and Hitchin! And have no separate identity.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	West of Arlesey already included under H227 & the like? Agree West of Arlesey be enhanced & improved with relief road West of the town alleviating congestion to the East. i am against development of east site. This is farmed agricultural land, a buffer between Fairfield & Stotfold. Development here will create mayhem; gridlock in an already busy access area, increase flood risk, deprive peoples livelihoods & displace wildlife, increase pollution, noise & be detrimental to Arlesey. Do not believe in "mixed use" sites. Do not approve of football pitches. Use the opportunity to update/improve the High St & vicinity. Leave businesses where they are & update/improve these sites. We moved here for the "rural" style lifestyle-we have now put our plans on hold awaiting the outcome of this exercise before deciding to move or stay. Our elected reps should simply say NO to expansion which will bring with it increased emissions & pollution with countryside lost forever.

Ref Number: H307

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site is currently an industrial area immediately adjoining the railway line and accessed via a sub-standard road. The shape of the site, its access and noise considerations relating to its proximity to the railway line make this a poor contender to accommodate residential development. There are better, less constrained sites available within the village - e.g. HO03/E27 and other land west and east of the High Street.
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway as submission H257, it would be a more sustainable, and sensible, option for this 'brownfield' site to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community ; with the provision that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to it's surroundings. Certainly, its position within walking distance of Arlesey railway station makes it considerable value of such a use.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.
Valerie Letowska	If part of this plan is to improve infra-structure and increase job opportunities, why displace/remove existing industrial units?

Ref Number: H328

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood	<p>Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, with which it is currently closely linked at County Council level – once the 1, 300 houses agreed for construction on “Land South of Stotfold” and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is significantly more able than Stotfold to meet the outstanding quota of housing that Mid Bedfordshire must provide in the period up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that ‘brownfield’ sites are preferred to ‘greenfield’ sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257 from the ‘first phase of this Site Allocations consultation), a more sustainable, and sensible, option could be for part of it, at least, to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes, which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community; with the proviso that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, ‘carbon-neutral’ design that is sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of scale and appearance. The location of this submission site some distance outside the existing ‘settlement envelope’ (according to the map of Arlesey published as part of this consultation), and some distance away from Arlesey railway station, could count against it, however, relative to the above criteria. Furthermore, a development of some 300 dwellings in this location seems excessive and not sustainable. NB – given that the unexpected ‘second phase’ of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date), it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so ‘latecomer’ submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Tony Charles	This site is too remote and lies well outside the village envelope. Housing development here would result in an unjustified incursion into open countryside contrary to National planning policies for the countryside which seek to protect the countryside for its own sake. Further, because the site lies outside the village it has poor sustainability credentials. Development on this site would be visually intrusive and unrelated to the existing pattern of settlement. Development should not be permitted in this location.

Ref Number: E01

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site may be appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arleseey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been the subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at County Council level. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, s that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'Greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains - the map of Arleseey published as part of this consultation suggests that the western section of this site might lie within the floodplain of the River Hiz - and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Part of this submission site, certainly its western section, appears to be 'Greenfield' land outside the existing 'settlement envelope' (according to the map) and, as such, might not be considered a sustainable option relative to the above criteria. However, the eastern section of the proposed site, which appears to be 'brownfield' land (again according to the map) could be of considerable value in terms of its redevelopment for employment provision; with the proviso that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to its surroundings.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site is not appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with all the cars? No schools, no jobs. Trains are full. What bus service? How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Ref Number: E12

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Ltd	This site is also being promoted as a Mixed Use site under reference H 293, along with the land to the west and east of the High Street. Although the site boundary of this site (E12) is slightly different to that of H293 (being promoted by the Town Council and another) the principles are similar.; It is argued in our representations in relation to H293 that we generally support the development of all of the land to the west of the High Street and east of the railway line for development as this would result in linking the two parts of the village and creating a cohesive settlement. Further, linking this development to the development of the land the subject of H293 (part) and E12 east of the High Street and up to...(not complete)
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been the subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike it's near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at County Council level Therefore, while this submission site is part of a huge 'greenfield' site - the development of which would have a significant detrimental effect on the rural character of the surrounding area - its location adjacent to the A507 and near to the Arlesey railway station make it of particular interest relative to enabling Mid Bedfordshire to meet its government-imposed targets in terms of employment development; the bypass could ensure that extra traffic from outside the local area would not need to pass through central Arlesey and the rail link could significantly reduce the number of private motorised vehicles (especially those owned by employees) accessing the site in accordance with the directives of PPG13. The proposal should thus be deemed of greater merit than related submission H293, so that an even greater part of whole site should be identified for employment development, which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community, including residents of Stotfold; with the proviso that such development should be of sustainable, high quality, 'carbon neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to its surroundings. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, s that 'brownfield' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. However, the fact that the submission E12 site is within easy walking distance of Arlesey railway station is a compelling material reason for it to be considered seriously as a viable location for employment development.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr P Mythen	Still being built: 1000 new homes in Fairfield, 1000 new homes in Stotfold and a proposed 1000 new homes in Arlesey. The road, rail, schools and doctors can't cope with demand now. I understand that houses need to be built but please make sure the infrastructure can cope. It took me 4 mins to travel 1 mile on the a507 this morning! The primary and middle schools are already over subscribed. Do you really have to build the commercial units adjacent to the prime residential road in Arlesey? Why can these not be put next to the a507 on the other side of the relief road? You know you will be building there eventually. Have you thought of how you will compensate residents for the loss in value if their homes?
Pauline Brotherton	Agricultural land should not be used. Developed site here with access via Stotfold Road causes gridlock and a possible extra 1500 vehicles trying to enter exit site to access 507, schools, railway stn., & A1M via 507. Increased noise, pollution & congestion. Roads/rail cannot cope. Has consideration been given of impact of extra vehicles from new Stotfold sites once inhabited? Hopefully common sense & your conscience will not permit you to select existing agricultural farmland but select sites in vicinity of the High St which needs much improving and needs to become the "hub" of the town. Definitely do not want to see football pitches mixed housing/business or relief rd here. We will lose vital produce, deprive peoples livelihood & displace more wildlife whether they are skylarks, bats, frogs, pheasants, herons etc.
Trina Davidson	I think the council are going crazy !!! Why do we need more football pitches and clubhouse??? Is one large one not enough on the town? And we certainly do not need more light industrial units why would anyone want to start up a business in Arlesey?? When in this economy many businesses are folding. People will still use the high street and not the so called relief road; this will be a total waste of money and not to mention yet again ruining our countryside.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with all the cars? No schools, no jobs. Trains are full. What bus service? How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Submitted by	Comments
Warick Brotherton	<p>Building football pitches and Club house will be a magnet for trouble and vandalism. (Why do we always want to have football pitches when football is the breeding ground for A.S.B.Os, unruly behaviour and disregard for Authority). Building football pitches is using ground (that is ours - the tax payers) that should be available to all and should not be more important than destroying countryside. This development would be hypocritical of the Government Policy of reducing CO2 and not to build on green space. This is currently Agricultural Land which supports wild life (foxes, frogs, Herons and many other types of birds. We need Agricultural Land to feed our ever increasing population. Less Agricultural land means an increase in our Import Trade. The area adjacent to Stotfold Road gets water logged (i.e. super-saturated) when it rains. Adding houses to this area would increase flooding. The area is adjacent to the river where ducks, swans and herons frequent. Building houses will devastate this wild life. The area adjacent to the river is situated in a flood plain. Stotfold road is used for a link from Stotfold to Arlesey Railway Station and vice versa. With more houses being built and to be built in Stotfold the traffic will increase, If a road was built to connect to Stotfold road then 1) Trees/hedgerow would have to be decimated. 2) Traffic congestion would occur and cause a bottleneck due to the increase in traffic. 3) Will create an accident black spot.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E12a

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Livermore	If this site is developed is MUST include a complete road link between stotfold road and arleseey high street, allowing taffic to bypass the already congested house lane/church end
Mr Alan Chalkley	this site would be a good place for developing arleseey as long as it was in conjunction with a new relief road running east of the high street from the bypass roundabout avoiding church end of Arleseey and joining the hitchin road to prevent the traffic problems that occur on the high street this site would benefit from a supermarket and petrol station and industrial units for employment

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment n Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood	Arleseey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (Church Lane/High Street/Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, with which it is currently closely linked at County Council level – once the 1, 300 houses agreed for construction on “Land South of Stotfold” and Fairfield Park have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arleseey is significantly more able than Stotfold to meet the outstanding quota of housing that Mid Bedfordshire must provide in the period up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that ‘brownfield’ sites are preferred to ‘greenfield’ sites and development is directed away from floodplains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. But while the location of this submission site, adjacent to the A507 and near to Arleseey railway station, makes it of particular interest relative to enabling Mid Bedfordshire to meet its government-imposed targets on terms of employment development – the bypass could ensure that extra traffic from outside the local area would not need to pass through central Arleseey and the rail link could significantly reduce the number of private motorised vehicles (especially those owned by employees) accessing the site in accordance with the directives of PPG13 – the scale of this proposal would undoubtedly have a detrimental effect on the rural character of the surrounding area, involving as it does, a huge tract of ‘greenfield’ land, much of which lies far outside Arleseey’s existing ‘settlement envelope’.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood (continued)	<p>Furthermore, its eastern and south-eastern boundaries extend a considerable distance towards Stotfold along the A507 and could well increase the likelihood of future 'infill' development that could result in these distinct settlements becoming conjoined. The leap, in terms of scale, from submissions E12 and H293 (of the 'first phase' of this Site Allocations consultation) is dramatic, excessive perhaps. If this proposal – or, preferably, one for a smaller 'footprint' than suggested here – is to be taken forward, then the greater part of the site should be utilised for employment development (as per submission E12), which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community, including residents of Stotfold; with the proviso that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon-neutral' design, sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of scale and appearance. The fact that the northern part of the site (that part identified within submission E12) is within easy walking distance of Arlesey railway station is a compelling material reason for it to be considered as a sustainable location for large-scale employment development. NB – given that the unexpected 'second phase' of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date), it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so 'latecomer' submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.</p>
Mr Tony Charles	<p>Whilst we can see some merit in the enlarged site area, we do not agree that the opportunity to create a new access to the village direct from the A507 is a good solution. This would create a competing access to the existing village gateway at the roundabout with the A507 and Stotfold Road. It seems to us preferable that the new link road should take the form of a spur off Stotfold Road to the west of the A507 roundabout, as originally proposed. In addition, the extended site would enclose too much land, if a new access direct from the A507 was created, this would lead to pressure for either more than 1,00 dwellings (as proposed for the village) or the exclusion of the development of the land to the west of the High Street. The latter forms an essential part for the future development of the village is a cohesive settlement pattern is to be achieved. Care therefore needs to be taken to ensure the needs of the village are looked at holistically and all of the available land to the west of the High Street should be included in the proposals to accommodate an additional 1,000 dwellings at Arlesey.</p>
Ms Joanne Sams	<p>This site is situated nearer to public transport but is to be built on greenfield land. The scale of the site is large and could cause Arlesey and Stotfold to join in to one long town with new development filling in the gaps.</p>

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr P Brown	Arlesey and Stotfold would almost become one town. There is no justification for such a large scale development.
Mrs P Brotherton	Cannot seriously believe that this parcel of land has been put forward once -let alone twice. Arlesey needs development in & around its high street - to create a "hub". This proposal would simply create a community on the outskirts with no integration or benefit to existing inhabitants. Have to ask why is there a need for more football pitches? Does life revolve around football? This parcel of land SHOULD be retained and used for farming/ producing crops & act as a "buffer" between Stotfold & Arlesey. The infrastructure will have difficulty coping once the new developments in Stotfold are complete & any development on this proposed site would make matters considerably worse. Some of this land is within flood plain area, is home to much wildlife, including Skylarks, which are a protected species - mainly because their habitat - agricultural land - is being engulfed in concrete and tarmac. No, we need land to produce food - leave it be and continue to farm it - concentrate on improving the area in and around the High Street.

Ref Number: H227/E35

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	Generally we support the comprehensive development of all of the land to the west of the High Street and east of the railway line which would serve to link the two parts of the village and create a cohesive settlement (i.e. sites HO03/E27, H227/E35, HO48, H165, H156 a and b and H293/E27 (part)). In addition, when linked to the land being promoted under H293 and E12, this would, in combination, deliver the strategic housing allocation for the village (i.e. 1,000 houses) plus providing employment and a link road from Stotfold Road to the High Street. However, this site (H227/E35) omits site HO03/E27 which forms an integral part of the land between the two parts of the village and immediately abuts Chase Hill Road in the northern part of the larger site. Site HO03/E27 should be included in the consideration of the larger development.
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257), a more sustainable, and sensible, option would be for a greater proportion of it to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes , which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community ; with the provision that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to it's surroundings. Certainly, it's position within walking distance of Arlesey railway station makes it considerable value of such a use. However, the intention to provide accommodation for the elderly within this proposal is also of merit.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A. Weller	Hardly any of the roads in this area can carry the volume of traffic let alone the parking problems throughout the entire village. Have you seen the chaotic state of parking around the station area, developments are going full tilt without any consideration of the consequences.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs White.	We own part of this site that has been put forward, it has been included against our wishes and we are in the process of having it removed with our solicitors and the local government ombudsman. our property has no deliverability.

Ref Number: H003/E27

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site lies to the west of the High Street and east of the railway line and abuts existing residential development at Chase Hill Road. The site is well suited to accommodate a housing and/or mixed use (housing and employment) development, either individually or as part of a larger more comprehensive development of all of the land to the west of the High Street and east of the railway line thereby linking the two parts of the village.(I.e. sites H003/E27, H227/E35, HO48, H165, H156 a and b, H293 (part).Taken together with the land being promoted east of the High Street (i.e. H293/E12) the combined sites could deliver the strategic housing allocation for the village (i.e. 1,000 dwellings) plus employment and a new road link from Stotfold Road to the High Street. The result would be a compact cohesive village form with good road access and local facilities etc.

This additional comment was made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains- nothing that the district councils initial comments on submission H003/E27 indicate that part of this site does lie within a floodplain- and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. Given that any residential development on the western side of this site might require some work to screen the noise emanating from the railway (as per submission H257), a more sustainable, and sensible, option would be for a greater proportion of it to be redeveloped for B1 employment purposes , which could make it of much greater benefit to the wider local community ; with the provision that such development should be of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to it's surroundings. Certainly, its position within walking distance of Arlesey railway station makes it considerable value of such a use.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
G P Page	This would encroach onto an area that is prone to water logging. If built on it would then possibly create flooding elsewhere.
Mr R T Chamberlain	1. Taking valuable farm land 2. Having just had ten years of quarry, and still have another ten years to go. I think it's time to give us a bit of a break 2. We have hardly any public transport come through the village - only 4/5 buses a day 4. The road in and around broom are not suitable for this major plan.
Mrs M R Chamberlain	1/ Taking valuable farm land 2/ We have just had ten years of quarrying and still have 10 more years of it 3/ There are only four single decked buses that go through the village a day, five days a week 4/ The roads in and around village are not suitable for any more traffic.

Submitted by	Comments
Susan Hirst	There is no mention of a relief road in conjunction with this proposed development and the High Street in Arlesey could not possibly cope with the additional traffic such a proposal would generate. In addition, this area is often flooded and is totally unsuitable for development. It is also a wildlife area and any B1 usage would be bound to have an impact. This site is so small it is not worth considering as part of the Mid Beds plans to create 4400 additional dwellings plus employment opportunities. There are other more appropriate sites in the District.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.
Valerie Letowska	Floodplain area and wildlife impact - so, no thanks! All these smaller proposed developments say there is no impact in terms of lower school capacity, but viewed together, they have an enormous impact! This particular one seems totally inappropriate to me.

ARLESEY APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Sue Hurst	Arlesey	<p>Re. your consultation document, under your FAQs you state that 30% of the 4400 additional dwellings will be divided between Arlesey and various other villages in the Mid Beds district. The document then goes on to say that 1000 new dwellings are proposed for Arlesey alone - which must make mean that about 23% of the 4400 additional dwellings will be built in Arlesey! Why it is that Arlesey is always lumbered by Mid Beds Council when the Government decrees that various developments have to take place? We have been earmarked for 2 gypsy sites and now we are earmarked for nearly a quarter of the new dwellings that the district is expected to provide by 2026. Why doesn't Mid Beds give Arlesey a break and put more of these new developments and gypsy sites in some of the other villages to spread the "treats". It is grossly unfair on Arlesey - we do not have the amenities/facilities to support these proposals and it is ridiculous to pretend that an arterial road will be provided to alleviate traffic congestion caused by such developments. The provision of a new road will not occur and it would be a nightmare trying to travel from one end of the village to the other. In conclusion I am asking that Mid Beds look to other villages which also have spare land to absorb some of this proposed new development. This would alleviate the burden proposed for Arlesey - 1000 new dwellings in one village with lack of infrastructure is ill-advised and grossly unfair on the residents already living there. Please take these comments on board when considering the consultation results. Sue Hirst.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Georgina Rudman and Sam Emery	Arlesey / Stotfold	<p>Please can you accept this e-mail and forward to the relevant department regarding our comments in relation to the proposed housing developments within the Arlesey area as part of the Mid Beds LDF framework proposals and reviews. We understand that this is not the normal procedure but we would appreciate your assistance on this occasion. We understand and recognise that any proposed development would be constructed to support and sustain local economic growth, and that you have identified what new services would need to be provided to support new development as there would undoubtedly otherwise be a strain on existing resources. However we do have some concerns about the proportion of development proposed in what is meant to be a minor service centre. Looking at the council's need to identify 4400 new homes across the whole of Mid Beds by 2026, you have suggested that 1000 homes, effectively one quarter of them, are to be allocated to Arlesey Ward. This seems a disproportionate amount of development to what is meant to be a minor service centre. We would suggest the 1000 homes, and with the average population per household of 2.36 in England and Wales (figure from the last census) this will increase the population in Arlesey by 2360. With the existing population recorded as approximately 5440 residents this would see a population increase of 43%. There is little evidence of a either an assessment of how the increased growth will effect traffic movements within Arlesey along the existing High Street, as the emphasis of this proposal concentrates on the infrastructure in and around Church End. It does not take into account how this new development will impact and may in fact change the social community of existing residents who have made lifestyle choices to reside in Arlesey. Secondly if you combine the Stotfold and Arlesey wards – separated only by the 507 bypass then the proposed sites you have suggested would potentially accommodate all the housing and business needs for the whole of Mid Bedfordshire. Although I understand that these wards are treated separately in terms of local Government – geographically they are not. What does not make sense is that you have identified many larger sites for development within Stotfold, but just residential capacity for only a further 250 houses, yet a larger number of smaller sites within Arlesey, for a far greater amount of housing. Finally we feel that the LDF plan for new houses, and the land identified for development within the LDF, in this region does not take into account or reflect the new houses already allocated and being constructed along the A507 corridor at Norton entrance to Stotfold along with others in the Stotfold region. As they are under construction they are not currently highlighted on any on the maps on your website – and therefore this is not offering people the full</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Georgina Rudman and Sam Emery [continued]	Arlesey / Stotfold	<p>picture to assess your proposals. I would suggest you review your strategy to dissipate the amount of development across all your services centres, major and minor, to effectively share the load, so that you reduce the impact on existing communities and residents who have made a choice to live in smaller areas (or minor service centres) most often for lifestyle reasons. Although I understand that developers will be required to address basic residential facilities there seems to be little evidence to suggest the impact of existing communities has been addressed or how it will affect and impact on the day-to-day lives of existing residents. We would like to express that we are opposed to the proposed development within these two wards as it disproportionate to the existing correlation of geographical and population spread to Mid Beds as a whole, and other than suggested sites by landowners there seems to be no evidence of an assessments of how your proposed plans will actually effect the social structures within the existing communities. You seem to be concentrating purely on communicating positive messages about the proposed development by purely concentrating and highlighting the opportunities of economic growth. We understand that today is the last date to register comments as the extension has been granted to the original time frame. Please accept these comments on behalf of Sam Emery and Georgina Rudman - both residents of the above property. I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this e-mail so that I know our thoughts have been acknowledged.</p>
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	E12a Land at Chase Farm Arlesey	<p>FP1 touches the southern boundary of the site. Tree screening along the southern boundary of any factory or similar buildings would help reduce visual impact to footpath users.</p>