

BROGBOROUGH 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.

BROGBOROUGH 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
Miss Ellie Smith	Dlp Planning Ltd	H196

Ref Number: H196

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

Submitted by	Comments
C McCarthy	More houses here would increase potential for improved community facilities. Increased numbers would benefit small rural schools. At the moment Brogborough has a lay-by frequented by lorries from landfill site. More houses here would benefit the look and feel of Bedfordshire as you get off at J13.
Marc Kitchen	As noted in the application development at a significantly lower density level would be appropriate for this site. It is right that Brogborough is identified as a small village; however its small size is currently its downfall, with many local facilities closing. Without some development the community will not last. A reasonably small development, at a reduced density level would therefore significantly benefit the existing village, and enable the maintenance of existing services and support new services.
Miss Carly Brown & Mr Lee Brueton	I hope that by having a new housing area this will increase the need for more facilities to Brogborough including better transport links, shops etc.
Mrs Barnett	Brogborough needs to move on from only family housing, smaller accommodation for single and retired people is what is needed now, with a bus service where you can get from A 2 B without using a car.
Mrs Jeannette Newbery	Housing is a much better option in this area than industrial, we have more than enough in the area at the moment for a small village, the "blight of the tip" has been removed therefore we do not want industrial units to replace it, housing would be preferable as it would be on greenbelt land and hopefully ensure that the village does not die.
Steph Last	Brogborough is a small village with virtually no local facilities but a strong sense of community. Further sensitive, sustainable and locality appropriate housing would enhance the community and provide the opportunity for development of community facilities. Although we strongly disagree with the use of green field sites for development we would rather have a larger "community" than an expanse of "sheds" that will not benefit the local population in any way.

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
Bryan Willim	There are NO! public transport links except school bus. Using the train would involve crossing A421 and walking along A421 and A507 without footpath. Only 1 shop (sandwiches) and 1 Chinese takeaway. No other facilities.
Lorraine Slade	Inadequate road structure and public transport.
Mr P Alexander	I believe this is the wrong site for additional housing in Brogborough, it further fragments the village and will create considerable danger while the A421 runs on its current course. Another site could benefit the village & result in further amenities being provided. Surrounding this proposed site completely with industrial units would be extremely detrimental to the village as a whole.

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 in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Adam Easter	These new houses would not be part of this village because they are cut off from us by the A421. This would not be beneficial to us because we would not gain any facilities for the village, for example shops, post office and a pub. We would need a means of connecting to the villages, for example a crossing, a bridge or some traffic lights.
Bryan Willim	There are NO! public transport links except school bus. Using the train would involve crossing A421 and walking along A421 and A507 without footpath. Only 1 shop (sandwiches) and 1 Chinese takeaway. No other facilities.
Clint Ledger	1. Add another blot on landscape. 2. Add traffic to an already congested A421. 3. There are not sufficient services for Brogborough at the moment, let alone more housing. 4. Area likely to flood at times of heavy rain.
Davis	Any amenities that Brogborough may have for new residents are mainly on opposite side of A421. (shops, bus stop, playground, mobile library, village hall and access to station. It seems silly to have two small isolated housing communities separated by the A421. Would it not improve the area to have a more substantial community, i.e. possibly site E15 would be more suitable and sensible to develop for housing? Seems ridiculous to have two isolated housing communities separated by A421. Is housing is to be considered, better to use site E15 to enlarge community.
Ellie Smith	Access to the site would be taken from the A421, with the proposed re-aligned carriageway traversing the western boundary. As the site promoter has not specified where the access would be taken from, it is assumed there could be 2 accesses. The first taken from the existing single track driveway to the north of the cluster of semi-detached properties and bungalow and second may involve access being taken from the lay-by fronting the main carriageway situated between the properties fronting Salford Road and the cluster of semi-detached units fronting Bedford Road. It is considered that neither access proposals would be considered acceptable due to inadequate visibility and the 50mph speed limit. The suggested density indicates that the land was not being used in an efficient manner and suggests that the development proposed would be for large dwellings creating incongruous development.
Martin Bjeletic	I strongly oppose this plan. t will ruin our peaceful village. This is greenbelt land, not brown belt. It will increase congestion on already crowded roads.
Miss Lucy Easter	Why do we have to have new houses and Cranfield get the new health facilities? If you build houses here it will not become part of the village, due to A421 as a barrier. With new houses where are the new transport and business as in a post office, local shop etc. We have nothing.
Mr Ben Meech	The land proposed is green belt land. Putting houses here will have a dramatic impact on countryside and wildlife. We are happy being a village, if what is put forward is built this area will be ruined.
Mr S + Mrs C Cronin	My home gets flooded every year. Any more building will make the situation worse. You are building on soak away sites.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs S.I. Easter	We have no local services so there is nothing for extra houses to support. Building houses over the other side of the A421 would be a completely separate community to Brogborough Village with little or no contact with local people. It would mean a huge increase in traffic in an already congested area. If shops were to be built as well as houses then it could improve the present village and give back to our very isolated community.
Patricia Rezon	This application should be rejected out of hand. It's a speculative planning application of the worst type. The area is just about to benefit from new road infrastructure to elevate the congestion that has existed for years - yet as soon as this to be brought to fruition - planning applications such as this seeks to unravel the gain and start congestion in the area again. There is no need for houses of this type or density in the area. The current public transport, retail and school structure will not change - i.e. They don't exist so this is commuter housing! Proposing housing within an area where distribution sites like this being planned is ludicrous and would demean and destroy the countryside.
Pete Brown	Too close to motorway noise and pollution/motorway junction traffic/future warehousing. Suggest swap with northern segment of E74.

Ref Number: E10

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

Submitted by	Comments
C McCarthy	Is it necessary to turn all of junction 13 into storage and distribution, Bedfordshire will no longer have the kudos or rural, it will be London's dumping ground and lorry chaos and huge warehouses with a halo of artificial light. In Brogborough I currently do not see darkness due to Prologis warehouse
Kevin Burke.	This would have a serious effect on the surrounding properties. If these plans are to be seriously considered, then significant landscaping/bunding would be needed to screen the development from the surrounding properties, and countryside. There are no real local facilities, e.g. shops etc.
Marc Kitchen	This site maybe suitable for development but not in the manner suggested. There are good transport links, (once the proposed upgrades to the M1 and A421 are completed). It is worth noting that the area is primarily on greenbelt land. The proposed site use of distribution and storage is not welcome. There are already a significant number of distribution warehouses along the Beds/Northants/Bucks stretch of the M1. The development of further industrial units (storage/distribution) has the potential to create traffic problems, cause significant light pollution and depress nearby property values. Not to mention the unsightly blot on the landscape that they will cause. New jobs created would be unskilled work. If the site is to be developed the creation of skilled and professional jobs should be a priority to bring prosperity to the Marston Vale area. Development of offices with some supporting retail, if indeed the site is developed at all, would better support objectives.
Marianne Spicer	Should this site be part bordered by the new A421 and be sufficiently landscaped to conceal it from the greenfield/leisure walks of the forest and is responsible for little noise and nuisance. However, too much traffic on the A421, any other real nuisance possibility should be held in check. There is housing nearby and adjacent -it would be sad to lose housing to offices, because nobody can live there. So very low key, with not too much disturbance and some reparation made to make up for loss of green field site to people and wildlife. Haulage is a little undesirable at this location as we see it today, but somewhere in this or the logistic zones, there should be a place for lorry drivers to eat or stop to buy food to take away. The A421 is busy - at the little chef, there is no place for large haulage. At present, they pull into lay-by's for snacks.
Mr P Alexander	Although further from Brogborough this site would still cause pollution, light, noise air etc. which is a serious concern. The burden on the existing road system would cause more traffic holdups, and strain on the road network, increasing dangers. If approved Brogborough would be swallowed up by industrial property and reduce house prices and most importantly, make it less desirable to live in the village for prospective residents. Air pollution was too high last year and would become worse with such a development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Pete Brown	This site is far too big and should be considered only if its northern portion (beyond the track, wood and field line to Highfield Farm) is entirely removed. I see the applicant here has already turned permission for a farm shop in the corner of a field into a helicopter port and hanger.
Wilson Sharp	The site is fairly landlocked at present, but if the alterations to the A421 provide a more suitable access, and road infrastructure, this could be a suitable site... Main concern is current access road has. Is on a bend in a dip...on a busy road (which is am main feeder to the existing A421 at Brogborough). All heavy traffic should be required to use The M1 junction 13 route, as there is a weight restriction on the road through the village of Salford out to Junction 14, to the west of the site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Tabner	With 2000 new homes currently under construction at the MK end of Broughton Rd and the planning application to turn Wavendon Golf Club into 800 homes the area of Salford, which already suffers from excessive traffic during the rush hours , is set to get worse. The roads are windy and narrow, despite recent resurfacing they are cracking up under the weight of speeding traffic. The villages of Salford and Hulcote could already do with a by-pass. Its use as a cut through to Bedford/Cranfield and industrial areas by Junction 13 already make it noisy and unsafe when walking on roads without pavement. There are already existing industrial areas on the other side of the A421 which to build on, do we really have to build on every space of green.
Alistair Gram	Site shown on a twisty rural lane - not suitable as access for large vehicles. Would be ok if new A421.
Bryan Willim	Brogborough is a very small village with only a small sandwich shop and a Chinese takeaway we are already dwarfed by Marston Gate. There are no public transport links to this site. Using the train would involve crossing the 421 at the busy A507 junction and no footpaths.
Clint Ledger	1. Spoil countryside. 2. Increase congestion on already congested A421. 3. Increase danger on Salford Road.
D J Patterson	We have more than enough storage and distribution depots in this location.
Davis	Further transport problems for Brogborough. Light and noise pollution.
Elaine Tabner	The villages of Salford and Hulcote are too small to cope with any more traffic, which this proposal will in site, if the development were to go ahead. Broughton Road is already congested with traffic and is unable to cope with any extra. It is not very well maintained and is very bendy and too narrow to cope with much more. This road really needs a by pass not any more heavy traffic. At present there are too many cars and lorries speeding through this village (which the expansion of Milton Keynes I'm sure has added to this problem),but as a result the road itself is in a bad state of repair, it has been patched recently but this has just added to the problem making an uneven surface. Any development in this area can only compound the problems. We need a BY PASS for SALFORD AND HULCOTE.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Lorraine Slade	Inadequate road structure. No local employment-all bussed in from other areas. All this will bring to the area is more traffic congestion and light pollution.
M G Ladell	Detrimental visual impact on the local environment.
Martha Mackinnon and Ben MKeech	Ugly eyesore to beautiful countryside, creating more traffic, fumes from lorries and trucks. We had a tip here for many years and thankfully this has no closed. Now we are hit with more large impacts to our countryside village.
Martin Bjeletic	I strongly oppose this greenbelt destruction. DO NOT RUIN OUR VILLAGE.
Miss Lucy Easter	Stop and look at what you're proposing, Brogborough will become an island surrounded by warehouses. We will not get an improved infrastructure and we only just got rid of the tip, now we have this instead. Brogborough is starting to feel like a sh*t magnet!
Mr S + Mrs C Cronin	My home gets flooded every year any more building will make the situation worse, you are building on soak-away sites.
Mr Sacha Balachandran	The infrastructure in and around Salford suffers to cope with the existing requirements let alone any new developments. Despite recent repairs the roads are still too narrow to cope with larger vehicles (which frequent them). The proposed new developments will only add to the volume to traffic, already increased by through traffic travelling between JCN13 of the M1 and Milton Keynes and the recent development in Broughton which add to this. All of this will only add pressure on the ill equipped network AND DESTROY the small village feel/life and endanger local pedestrians and cyclists. In the absence of a well constructed bypass around the village I would strongly recommend against this development.
Mrs A C Moss	The land in question is green belt not Brown site. Please leave it as such. There will be no benefit to the local people or area at all.
Mrs S.I. Easter	GREENFIELD SITE - build on brownfield site, not here. Huge amount if traffic not all using the M1 will cause problems. The proposed new road will be up to capacity by the time it is built, with the amount of development you are proposing the village of Brogborough will be surrounded by warehouses and heavy traffic. Our property will be de-valued, will we be compensated?
Mrs Sue Clark	This is a very attractive area of countryside, and would be ruined with this large scale development. Green field site.
Nicola King	This will make an already intolerable traffic problem even worse. Also jobs won't be for local people and will add incredibly to the high traffic congestion.
Patricia Rezon	An absolute disgrace! This application should be rejected. The new road project being finalised between Bedford and Junction 13 on the M1 is designed to elevate congestion and return some semblance of calm to this area. Putting distribution infrastructure into this area will undo all of the good that the road system is designed to achieve. There is no need for more developments of this type. There are already other significant developments on either side of the existing M1 motorway in Beds & Bucks - this plan should also be viewed alongside others E14, E15 plus other housing applications to see the devastating affect it & they would have on the area.
S Cook	Eating into countryside there will soon be no open space between junction 13 and Milton Keynes. The whole area will become a massive distribution centre.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Steph Last	1. This is a greenfield site. Govt. policy states that development should primarily be on brownfield sites before taking any greenfield. 2. The existing Prologis development does not provide local employment - it provides employment for the coach loads of agency staff that are bussed in daily from London, Leicester, Birmingham etc - is this sustainable development??? 3. A development this size would totally swamp the small village of Brogborough preventing further housing development, suffocating the local community and possibly blighting the housing values. 4. The village already suffers from extensive noise and light pollution from the existing Prologis site we do not need more.
Stephanie Beckham	I feel that with distribution buildings already at Brogborough & new ones gone up alongside the A421 near Kingston, any more in this vicinity would reduce the existing countryside to a huge industrial estate, with the potential for more & more large units being built in the future. At the moment, this area is an oasis of rural life which needs protecting from being swamped & spoiled for ever by encroaching city & business. Whatever the excuses given - ie jobs; needed housing etc - behind it all is the making of money & profits, not the lives & concerns of local people.
T Greenlees	Any development as large as this in such a small historically important settlement would not preserve or enhance the character of the site. The historic patterns and landscape of the area would be eroded if this plan went ahead. The areas of Hulcote and Salford form an area of beauty which should be protected as a conservation area for the benefit of all. Mid Beds council has invested well in footpaths in this area for the benefit for all especially as it connects the area to Marston Vale and the forest centre. The views of ancient hedgerows and trees, and wild life, form an important part of Mid Beds which should be looked after for the benefit of everyone. Thank you.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Cox	This is just too much industry/industrial area in essentially a rural environment. This size of industrial development should be confined to urban areas.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E15

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

Submitted by	Comments
Marc Kitchen	This site maybe suitable for development but not in the manner suggested. There are good transport links, (once the proposed upgrades to the M1 and A421 are completed). It is worth noting that the area is primarily on greenbelt land. The proposed site use of distribution and storage is not welcome. There are already a significant number of distribution warehouses along the Beds/Northants/Bucks stretch of the M1. The development of further industrial units (storage/distribution) has the potential to create traffic problems, cause significant light pollution and depress nearby property values. Not to mention the unsightly blot on the landscape that they will cause. New jobs created would be unskilled work. If the site is to be developed the creation of skilled and professional jobs should be a priority to bring prosperity to the Marston Vale area. Development of offices with some supporting retail, if indeed the site is developed at all, would better support objectives.
Matt Harris	In light of A421 HA changes in the future lorry access should be considered to avoid the use of old A421.
Mr A H Wilkins	As a footpath official for the ramblers association I am concerned about the rights of way in the countryside, in the parish of Cranfield primarily, but also in Brogborough.
Peter Brown	This site is too big. Its northern corner should be bermed off along the east-west gridline and its southern corner should be removed for landscape improvement, flood control, like its neighbour. One unit only and strict height control.
S G Cook	Sites E10-E74-E15 This site most suitable keeping all warehouses together - lorries etc turn left roundabout only, or use Ridgemont bypass - widening of A421 to ease traffic - junction 13 always hazardous and now you plan to put further strain on junction with more development.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Adam Easter	This field floods very badly and if there were warehouses built on that area it would flood the A421 ten times quicker than average. I do not want to wake up and look out of my window and see a warehouse at the end of my garden, these warehouses are very undesirable. Are there any newts in the field?
Bryan Willim	The site is a flood plane I have submitted recent photos and a map at the presentation in Aspley Guse Village Hall. I have copies if required. Only 1 sandwich shop and 1 Chinese takeaway, no other facilities.
C McCarthy	Marston Gate distribution park is as big as it should get. Further storage/ distribution would mean greater traffic congestion on the Bedford rd/ A421 NO benefit to the community.
Clint Ledger	1. Area liable to flooding on Leavy Raisis 2. Increase congestion on an already congested A421 3. Increased noise pollution.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
D J Patterson	We have more than enough storage and distribution depots in this location.
Davis	Brogborough has endured enough transport problems. This development will cause further light and noise pollution.this site may be better as a housing development. Further transport problems for Brogborough. Light and noise pollution. Maybe serve Brogborough better as housing development to increase community in Brogborough.
Lorraine Slade	Road structure not sufficient, no local employment-all bussed in from other areas. All this will bring in is traffic congestion and light pollution.
Martin Bjeletic	I strongly oppose this green belt destruction. DO NOT RUIN OUR VILLAGE!
Miss Carly Brown & Mr Lee Brueton	Due to the fact that Brogborough already has an existing huge industrial area behind, I feel that the development of this land will impact hugely on countryside, view from houses and house prices!!

Submitted by	Comments
Miss J. E. Green	<p>Re: Potential industrial development site E15 to accompany blue response form. (many of these points also pertain to E10 and E74 – see blue response form) Dear Mr Andrews, I have already responded on-line to the four proposed sites for Brogborough in my capacity as Chairwoman of Brogborough Parish Council, when at our meeting on 2nd April, we strongly opposed the three employment sites, but gave positive response to proposed housing development. I am writing here in my personal capacity at some length because the on-line space of 999 characters was insufficient.. Along with most other residents of Brogborough I was astounded and appalled at the proposed above site put forward to Mid Beds for possible storage and distribution use. I would like to strongly oppose such a site on the following grounds – some of which are not due planning matters, but are relevant and may even be interesting!</p> <p>1. On environmental/landscape grounds – the buildings would swamp the village of Brogborough far more than present Marston Gate Distribution Depot does, as it would be visually imposing on the southbound. These buildings would become a ‘blot on the landscape’. If distribution depots were to be allowed also on the west side of the present A421, this would totally hem in the village and the village would become even more insignificant. We did notice that your maps of the larger area at the Cranfield meeting did not even show the village of Brogborough as a ‘dot on the landscape’ – imagine what it would become if the total area of distribution buildings were to be four times the size of the village.</p> <p>2. On the grounds that this is Greenbelt land. Marston Gate Distribution Depot was built mostly (though not completely) on the footprint of the old brickworks and was on brownfield land. Recent planning applications for individual one-off dwellings in the village have been turned down on the grounds that the land around Brogborough is Greenbelt land. So why allow massive imposing industrial units?</p> <p>3. Non-existent job creation for Mid-Beds. This site will not provide local jobs. Although I appreciate the burning ambition to meet government employment targets, and allowing development of potentially 500 plus jobs on E15 appears to be godsend to wipe off a huge % of total required jobs (and even more so if you take 500 plus for site E10), the authority would be deluded in thinking that these jobs are creating employment for residents of Mid Beds. The distribution facilities on the present Prologis site at Marston Gate show that they are enormous employment magnet for a very wide sphere of influence – a very large majority being bussed/coaches/mini-bussed in from surrounding out-of-county cities such as Leicester, Coventry, Northampton, Luton, London (I could go on), presenting enormous traffic pressure between 5.45-6.15 in the morning and the same at night at shift change time at Amazon. Very few approaching cars and other vehicles come from local roads – the majority from the M1.</p> <p>4. The Majority of the jobs will be low skilled minimum wage jobs. Job creation in Mid Beds should be of the calibre and pay level likely to provide sustainable communities with a high reputation for skilled workers. How best to drive potential high value employers away than to become known as a district where the preponderance of the jobs are low skilled. Pay levels will be insufficient to support people buying into local housing, thus increasing the commuting problem and traffic congestion.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss J. E. Green [continued]	<p>5. Traffic Congestion. The local train station does not provide a viable public transport facility. Trains run hourly (and even less so in the afternoon) and are subject to frequent cuts in the school holidays. The number of local people commuting by train to the present Marston Gate distribution depot is minimal because of the timetable problems and unreliability. Thus car congestion will increase. The widening of the M1 and thus improvement of M1 Junction 13 may not happen – so the traffic congestion in the area will increase. 6. The two accompanying statements from Mid Beds on employment and housing land are not compatible with the Core Strategy. In the accompanying documents on E10, E15 and E74, the Mid Beds initial comments were: ‘Brogborough is well located to the M1 and is in the Marston Vale Growth Area’. The comment that accompanied H196 was: ‘Brogborough is identified in the emerging Core Strategy as a Small Village. Allocations will be only considered here if there is an exceptional need for development. A development of this scale (less than 85 housing units) is unlikely to fit with the approach of the Core Strategy’. If the latter is the case then I would argue that buildings of a massive industrial nature are even less likely to fit with the approach of the Core Strategy. This is particularly the case when a statement has been made that only small-scale rural employment sites will be considered in Small Villages (photocopy leaflet sent out with map of the 4 sites). 7. I contest any exceptional need for development of an industrial nature on this site. Many industrial units developed by Prologis up along the M1 (Junction 16A) and M6 (Junction 1) corridor are not being taken up on lease – so there is probably over-capacity for distribution units in the area. This is particularly as the Fen Farm and Hayfield Farm areas have been designated by the MK expansion plans as areas of considerable storage and distribution units. 8. Light pollution in the area will increase. At present the Marston Gate Distribution Depot sheds an enormous light pollution on the horizon of Marston Vale as one travels westwards along the A421 in the hours of darkness. This is because the Local Authority did not insist on low level lighting when it was developed (despite Parish Council opposition to most of the lightning demands). I cannot see any distribution depot not adding to this pollution. 9. The monopoly of distribution depots by one company puts considerable pressure onto Local Authorities who do not have sufficient clout to demand environmentally friendly buildings. 10. I feel than in the present economic and environmental climate, yet more developments encouraging road transport is short-sighted. The coming economic recession is well documented (though hopefully not one of enduring length) – so the present need for such employment and distribution facilities is doubtful. The transport business is one of the most cut-throat, even in times of economic boom, so the transient nature of many distribution companies would provide a fragile employment basis. The local authority (and in future the Central beds Unitary Authority) should be setting a ‘Green example’ by championing a greener mode of distribution – cutting down packaging would lessen the number of HGVs on the road and thus lessen the need for as many distribution depots.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Lucy Easter	This site is on a floodplain! If you build on this site it will cause extensive flooding of new buildings, new houses, the existing A421, possibly causing problems for J13 as well. The current industrial estate is situated at the bottom of my garden and calls itself Marston Gate near Ridgmont. Why don't you move it there as it doesn't want to be associated with us even though its in our parish. Why don't you try living here before lumbering us with more industrial building and misery! The site is owned by Prologis so it's a for-gone conclusion.
Mr Ben Meech/Martha MacKinnon	Too near to kids playground and housing in the village. The light and noise level will be higher. Un noticeable employment change for the village as all workers would be brought in. Would create an eyesore to village. Would you want this built 200 yards from your home?
Mr P Alexander	I believe this site is too close to the current houses and will create noise, pollution and additional traffic congestion. Of all the sites (E10, 74 + H196) part of this site would be preferable for housing. Traffic management would require considerable input and work to improve safety along the dangerous stretch of road.
Mr P Sim	Proposed site is a flood plain. Every year during outbursts of rain our garden, driveway and rear garden are flooded. This can also be said of the field to the rear of our house, site E15.
Mr S + Mrs C Cronin	My home gets flooded every year. Any more building will make the situation worse. You are building on soak away sites.
Mrs A C Moss	The land in question is green belt not Brown site. Please leave it as such. There will be no benefit to the local people or area at all.
Mrs J Barrett	Strongly disagree with more units so close to our houses as for more jobs how many local people work at the units already there, I should think only about 8.
Mrs S.I. Easter	I don't want to live in a small village surrounded by warehouses but that is what is going to happen, as the land is owned by Prologis more warehouses are inevitable. Your PC wording of PROPOSED is rubbish, DESIGNATED is more like it. Brogborough needs more amenities NOT warehouses and lorries and don't forget the extra lights which disrupt birds so they sing at night. Reversing sensors are left on and alarms ring unattended as it is. This development will only make things worse. And don't forget THIS FIELD FLOODS BADLY although you choose to ignore this fact more concrete will make it worse.
Nicola King	this site regularly floods-where will the water go when developed? Also the a421 cannot take anymore traffic even with proposed bypass. And finally this will not provide local jobs as current warehouses haven't.
Patricia Rezon	This as speculative planning applications at its worst. One that is set, if passed to continue a circle of frustration and congestion in this area. For years the A421 from Bedford to the M1 and beyond have been a nightmare. The new road being built cures this and will speed everything up. Journey and time wise - cutting pollution down and noise. Allowing development of this type will relog the area, regenerating frustration. Will not guarantee jobs for Bedfordshire people and will destroy the greenfield barrier that protects Beds from Bucks and Milton Keynes.

Submitted by	Comments
Steph Last	1.This is a greenfield site. Govt. policy states that development should primarily be on brownfield sites before taking any greenfield. 2. The existing prologis development does not provide local employment - it provides employment for the coach loads of agency staff that are bussed in daily from London, Leicester, Birmingham etc - is this sustainable development??? 3. A development this size would totally swamp the small village of Brogborough preventing further housing development, suffocating the local community and possibly blighting the housing values. 4. The village already suffers from extensive noise and light pollution from the existing Prologis site we do not need more.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E74

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

Submitted by	Comments
Marc Kitchen	This site maybe suitable for development but not in the manner suggested. There are good transport links, (once the proposed upgrades to the M1 and A421 are completed). It is worth noting that the area is primarily on greenbelt land. The proposed site use of distribution and storage is not welcome. There are already a significant number of distribution warehouses along the Beds/Northants/Bucks stretch of the M1. The development of further industrial units (storage/distribution) has the potential to create traffic problems, cause significant light pollution and depress nearby property values. Not to mention the unsightly blot on the landscape that they will cause. New jobs created would be unskilled work. If the site is to be developed the creation of skilled and professional jobs should be a priority to bring prosperity to the Marston Vale area. Development of offices with some supporting retail, if indeed the site is developed at all, would better support objectives.
Pete Brown	Too big - remove northern third. Replace with H196 housing or to rear of Brogborough Club (disused), field patchwork/smallholding north of Hlghfield Farm, to improve quality of village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Bryan Willim	Brogborough is a small village only having 1 sandwich shop and 1 Chinese takeaway and is already dwarfed by Marston gate. There are no public transport links using the train would involve walking along A507 without footpath, crossing A425 at busy junction and walking up Salford Road all without footpaths.
Clint Ledger	1. Spoil countryside. 2. Increase congestion on already congested A421 and Salford Road.
D J Patterson	We have more than enough storage and distribution depots in this location.
Davis	Any more industrial buildings would suffocate Brogborough homes. They would cause more light and noise pollution. Brogborough has suffered enough transport problems over the years. We hoped the bypass would have relieved such traffic. Further industrial buildings would suffocate Brogborough housing and cause noise and light pollution.
Lorraine Slade	Road structure not adequate, no local employment bussed in from other areas. Will bring more traffic congestion and light pollution.
M G Ladell	Detrimental visual impact on the local environment.
Martha Mackinnon and Ben Meech	Eyesore for village residents. Ruining the countryside and wildlife. All these warehouses look ugly and have a huge impact to the look of the village. We are supposed to be a small village in the countryside.
Martin Bjeletic	I strongly oppose this greenbelt destruction. DO NOT RUIN OUR VILLAGE!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mc Carthy	Business services - other kinds of work opportunities rather than storage and distribution OR shared development between J14 and junction 13 rather than all at 13.
Miss J.E Green	1) Environmental/landscape - This is greenbelt not a brownfield site. 2) Hugh storage facility/distillation depot so close to A421 road, and Salford roads and M1. Far too visible as it rises up the hill. 3) New proposed A421 cuts through site anyway. 4) For job creation see main accompanying letter.
Miss Lucy Easter	Why do we more warehouses? Give us some amenities! The road has not got the capacity to deal with the extra heavy traffic.
Mr P Alexander	The pollution, light, noise air etc. Would be detrimental. The burden on the existing road system would cause more traffic holdups, and strain on the road network. The proposed site would swamp the village and reduce house prices and most importantly, make it less desirable to live in the village. Air pollution was too high last year and would become worse with such a development.
Mr S & Mrs C Cronin	My home gets flooded every year, any more building will make the situation worse. You are building on soak-away sites.
Mrs A C Moss	The land in question is green belt not Brown site. Please leave it as such. There will be no benefit to the local people or area at all.
Mrs S.I. Easter	E74 seems to overlap the area you are suggesting for houses. There are plenty of brown field sites for building warehouses, this is GREENFIELD. Building the huge amount of warehouses you have DESIGNATED for the area will de-value the houses in Brogborough, will we be compensated? Although the M1 is handy this development will swamp surrounding areas with traffic not all of it will be using the M1, our road structure will suffer. We need more amenities not warehouses.
Nicola King	Traffic on current roads is unbearable now-even with bypass this proposed development will mean it shall be intolerable.
Patricia Rezon	A plan that should be rejected. The development of the old brick...(?) to provide one development centre and the new roadway to unblock the congestion between Bedford and the M1 J13 have been good things. But any new additions such as this application, which should also be reviewed in connection with E10 and E15, will show the devastating effect it and they would have, and restart a circle of pollution, congestion and frustration that is about to disappear. No new services or retail infrastructure would be supported. The green field areas between Beds/Bucks and a sprawling MK to the west be lost and jobs for Beds people would not necessarily be created.
Steph Last	1. This is a greenfield site. Govt. policy states that development should primarily be on brownfield sites before taking any greenfield. 2. The existing Prologis development does not provide local employment - it provides employment for the coach loads of agency staff that are bussed in daily from London, Leicester, Birmingham etc - is this sustainable development??? 3. A development this size would totally swamp the small village of Brogborough preventing further housing development, suffocating the local community and possibly blighting the housing values. 4. The village already suffers from extensive noise and light pollution from the existing Prologis site we do not need more.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Page numbers 793 to 795 are no longer shown in the report due to formatting changes resulting from the removal of comments from Brogborough Parish Council which had been replicated in Appendix one and under each site in the main section of the Parish Report.

To view the Parish Council's comments, please see the relevant 'Views of Town/Parish council and Civic Organisations' table shown under each individual site report in the main section of the Brogborough Parish Report.

BROGBOROUGH APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Mrs. A Moss	Brogborough	I am writing to express my concerns at the proposed plans E10 E15, and E74 around Brogborough. I have lived in the village for many years and have watched and listened to various plans for our area. Most have been 'Bad News' for our village. However, lately we have been told that the 'Tip' will close and the A421 will be moved away from us. Great news at last. After years of flies and traffic congestion. The above plans have horrified me. Should they be granted, we would be surrounded by industrial units and disappear inside this development. It is suggested that they would give employment for locals. I doubt this as the current units employ very few locals; most are bussed in from distant towns. Please do not allow these developments in our village. GIVE US A BREAK!