

CLOPHILL 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.

CLOPHILL APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Ref Number: H032

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
Geogina Martin	It is possible consideration, however I do not think that a roundabout on the A6 would be safe, a small number of houses possibly business would be able to use the current road without too many difficulties.
J. Collins	A much better use could be made of existing, derelict quarry site. The potential to offer residential/employment provision exists at a site nearest of any to local shop/pubs/public transport. There would be minimal on the countryside. Access via Back Street would reduce traffic impact on rest of village.
Jem Giles	This site would provide all facilities, without adding further congestion to an already overcrowded village. It has a very narrow high street with narrow pavements. There is too much congestion with cars parked in the road and the traffic goes through far too fast. It has become a dangerous place in which to live.
K. Collins	The existing derelict quarry site could be put to much better use. There would be potential to offer residential and employment provision at a site nearest to local shop, pubs and public transport. Access via Back street would reduce traffic impact to rest of village. Minimal impact on the countryside environment.
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	There are errors in the submission regarding schools. Clophill does not have a middle school, pupils are bussed to Shefford. Senior pupils are bussed to Harlington Upper, not the Shefford Upper School. This would be one of the best sites for development; it is near the P.O./store, social centres, and good public transport. The addition of many more cars would have little effect on the village.
Mr P. J. Patmore	Housing could be built on this site secluded from the A6 and public footpaths that run alongside this site. Access is difficult via narrow Back Lane with its difficult exit onto the A6. The Greensands ridge path adjoins this site. There would be wide opposition to any development that seriously affected the recreational use of these rights of way.
Tina Keech	This site would be ideal to provide most of the housing required all in one place. It could be combined with traffic calming on the A6 leading onto Bedford Road.
Turner	This appears a suitable derelict area for housing development on a small scale, twenty or less. I do not support its use for employment because access to the site at the junction of Back Street and the A6 is potentially dangerous.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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
Brent Benjamin	I feel this site could not support any employment development. It abuts the Greensand Ridge plus safe access would not be possible. It is also a picturesque site and the character needs to be maintained.
Elizabeth Hentlan	Housing for max 8-10 say modest properties school could accommodate extra pupils, small scale only safe alternative due to traffic problems on to back street.
Michael Brooks	Despite the site boundary shown on the map provided with this consultation, any development on this sensitive site should be restricted to the flat quarry bottom only, with no development on (or cut into) the quarry sides or at the higher level. There is wildlife interest here and there should be no negative impact on it. Footpath FP2 crosses the site (see Definitive Map) and this route through the quarry should be retained, even though the path has been temporarily diverted round the edge of the site (this forms part of the Greensand Ridge Path). Additional footpaths should be provided within the site, linking to the wider footpath network. Road access to this site is going to be tricky, however. Access should be from Back Street with an improved junction between Back Street and the A6 (but not a roundabout or mini-roundabout). Development should be contingent upon a 40mph or 50mph speed limit being imposed on the A6 through the Back Street junction.
Mrs C Mathieson	Would only support 20 dwellings so as not to significantly spoil the area or put undue pressure on for vehicular access
Mrs S Ratcliffe	The site should only provide no more than 20 properties and should be aimed at small families and starter homes which are lacking in Clophill. The countryside should be maintained as much as possible and should not be destroyed unnecessarily. I would prefer that no further new homes should be built locally but this is a preferred site if I had to choose. Most definitely access should be on the A6 with the speed limit reduced and not onto Back St where the lanes are narrow and in some places only adequate for one car width.
Roger Trudgill	I do not feel that the proposal for employment on the site is either necessary or likely to be viable despite the current move to sustainable communities. Similar proposals for the Westbury Homes Development on the south side of Wilstead resulted in the development of 3 storey B1 space which have remained vacant since construction.

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
Dr Steve Langhorn	This is adjacent to the Greensands Ridge walk and is an environmentally important area, we should be looking much more closely at brown field sites.
I Porter	Whilst I have no objections to residential development I do not think this site is suitable for commercial use.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jayne Hunt	I believe this site is not suitable for development because it is too close to the A6 and this will cause access problems. Also I don't believe that this site is safe for development without a large amount of money spent on it to make it safe, given that it is a former sand quarry.
Jonathan Farr	This site has been proposed for development in the past. The only suitable access would be from the A6 at a location where there is already a junction. This is close to the end of the dual carriageway and the road leading from the A6 is narrow and on a steep hill. Additional vehicle movements from this location would be dangerous.
Marilyn Hill	Concerned about the impact on the rural and woodland locality i.e. the proposed building site is opposite Forestry Commission natural woodland
Mr & Mrs M Everitt	Unable to comment due to insufficient details and information. i.e. Number of houses and what "employment use" is proposed.
Mr D Martin	It's access from Back Street is not conducive to a development of this site as Back Street is a very narrow road and this would cause a lot of congestion.
Mr Sutton	A huge site. This seems quite ridiculous. A6 would not cope with a mini roundabout it is always busy and at peak times could not cope.
Mrs K Bray	I am concerned regarding the scale of the development and access on to the A6 would cause further congestion on an already overloaded road through the village.
Mrs P Maughan	The site is unsuitable for development particularly in relation to access on the A6 which would increase congestion and be a hazard.
Roger and Diana Diggins	A site built here would only add to existing congestion on the A6 since traffic is queued up here and beyond most mornings from before 8am.
S W Barratt	I do not consider this site to be good location for development. And please, no more roundabouts off main roads!!!!!!!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H039

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
Geogina Martin	It is already a brown field site. It would be easy to build access straight to the main road to Shefford without causing further impact on Clophill's already cramped roads. The 200 bus is every 2 hours.
K Breed	RE: "...potential, without creating traffic congestion problems.."-yes, so long as a roundabout is NOT built on the A507 outside Beadlow Golf Club. A roundabout here would undoubtedly cause problems for traffic (often long lorries) wanting to get from Clophill to Shefford in reasonable time. The whole point of bypassing Clophill with the A507 was to let traffic flow freely & without junctions at which the priorities would cause queues to back up at peak times. The current T-junction (priority to A507 as opposed to Shefford Road, an extension of Clophill High Street) WORKS FINE. I believe the idea of having a roundabout here has already been rejected by the Clophill Parish Plan for these reasons. This junction could cope with a limited increase in traffic coming from the proposed site, perhaps by addition of a "slip-road" along the Eastbound carriageway enabling lorries turning left out of Shefford Road to build up speed before merging with A507 traffic.
M D Martin	This is already a Brownfield site and would have easy access to the A506 without causing further congestion within the village.
Tina Keech	This site is suitable to provide all the required housing all in one place rather than spread out in various locations around the village.

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
Bradshaw	Outside village which could cause separation from community, not easy to access bus, public transport or services.
Gillian Wolfenden	It may help to pull in that end of the village, to create a whole.
J. Collins	With existing business use consent any residential development does have the possibility of providing local employment which is extremely limited in the village area.
Jayne Hunt	The site has a major drawback in that it is so far out of the village which will mean that all residents will have to use their cars all the time to get anywhere. This is not good for the environment. Perhaps this is a better site for only a couple of houses and development could be made for commercial reasons.
K. Collins	With existing business use, consent any residential development would have the possibility of providing local employment which is very limited in the village area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr P. J. Patmore	In the consultation documents it is recorded that most facilities are not available to public transport. There is now a 6 return weekday bus route 200 past this site serving Ampthill, Flitwick, Clophill Green, Shefford and Biggleswade with easy access to shops, stations, schools and connecting buses to hospitals. This site is on the edge of the village but would not congest it. It would benefit from the soon to be developed park land and footpath to the east of the site.
Mrs K Bray	The proposed development is significantly outside the main village and is unlikely to provide support for local facilities. I would consider a smaller development may be more appropriate.
Mrs P Maughan	The proposed development is outside the main village. A smaller development may be more appropriate but consideration should be given to whether or not Shefford Road could sustain increased traffic
Turner	I would support smaller scale development on this brown field site.

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
Dr Leon A. Terry	The proposed site is totally isolated and remote. It is significantly disjointed from Clophill. There is no pedestrian access, mains sewage or local amenities.
Elizabeth Hentian	Possible use for very modest quiet industrial use - already used as transport area. Too far away from village for large housing estate. A retrograde step in the context.
Michael Brooks	The site already has employment use and additional small-scale employment uses suitable to a rural area would be welcome, provided that these were not such as to be likely to import labour from the major urban areas. Replacement of the HGV transport depot would be welcome as this represents an intrusive feature in an open countryside location. However, this site would NOT be suitable for housing. It is remote from village services - approx 1.7km from the Lower School and 2.5km from shop and pubs, nearly 1km of which is along a road without a footway. The local bus service passing the site runs only 6 times a day with no service on Sundays. The information given with the site details says that there are no current Local Plan or other constraints. This is not true. The adopted local Plan contains a policy explicitly discouraging development in open countryside away from established settlements.
Mr & Mrs Litchfield	Beadlow consists of 3 houses adjacent to this site. This site is not suitable for any more houses as there are no support services.
Mr & Mrs M Everitt	As this appears to be an unknown quantity as to what exactly this development will comprise, we would support the Councils view as to the sustainability etc. for this proposal.
Mrs A Christopher	The proposed development is too big and too far out from the village boundaries.
Mrs Joanne Terry	The proposed site is totally isolated and remote. It is significantly disjointed from Clophill. There is no pedestrian access, mains sewage or local amenities.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H041

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
Jayne Hunt	I think that the number of houses here should be restricted to less than those which are proposed as 15-20 would be far too many for a small lane like Jacques lane. Housing should be provided which is affordable. I think that Clophill has potential to provide a maximum of 20 homes (which is probably a fair share) and there are a few sites which could be used to provide this rather than concentrating all the new homes in one big area. This would have less impact environmentally and socially.

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
Elizabeth Hentian	A few possible linear modest properties on Eastern (left hand side going from Shefford Road High Street end) odd numbers only. No in depth as too much traffic for lane.
Michael Brooks	Jacques Lane is very narrow and could not support this size of development without widening and the provision of a footway, which would spoil its rural character. A small number of dwellings fronting Jacques Lane would be acceptable provided that development did not take place deeper into the site. It is somewhat distant (about 1.5km) from local services (shop/P.O., pubs and principal bus services); the nearest bus service to the site (about 240m) runs a mere 6 times a day (no service Sundays). Please note that there is an error in the supporting information provided for this site: it says that "There is currently no health provision in Silsoe ..." This should, of course, mean Clophill.
Turner	I do not support the scale of this proposed development outside the village area.
W. Toony	Will cause significant congestion cannot be supported by current 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
Barbara Haughton	Access via Jacques Lane would create congestion in a narrow lane.
Brian Adams	The High Street is the main artery of the village and is already severely congested. The development would be some 30 mins round trip walk from the shop/post office and therefore increased car use would create further parking problems around the Green.
Brian and Eileen Martin	Poor access via narrow lane with a sharp bend (Jacques Lane). Traffic already destroying verges and ditches, the latter magnifying drainage problems. (NB Council will not maintain ditches) Good agricultural land which should be retained to make good future food strategies.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales	<p>I have a number of objections to the proposed planning application for this site, which fall into a number of categories.</p> <p>1. Access The only means of access to the proposed plot would be along High Street and down Jaques Lane. High Street already suffers from traffic congestion daily, as a result of two factors: the volume of traffic and roadside parking. I believe that both of these will be aggravated by the building of a housing development on the proposed plot. Due to previous development through the middle of Clophill the volume of traffic along High Street is already much greater than the street was originally designed to accommodate. High Street is a relatively narrow two-lane road, bounded by houses on both sides, in many cases so close to the road itself that there are no pedestrian pavements. If the proposed plot were to be granted permission the volume of traffic will inevitable rise. Whilst there are bus services through the village, the nearest rail link (which will inevitably be used by a high proportion of those looking for housing in High Street) is in Flitwick, which realistically is only accessible by road. The proposed plot lies towards the eastern end of the village, and there is road access running out east along Shefford Road and joining the A507 opposite the Beadlow Manor. However it is unrealistic to suggest that the occupants of these new houses will use this route, when the more convenient route is directly along High Street and onto the A6. In any event it would be impossible to enforce such a route on the occupants of the new houses. In the absence of off-road parking, many people who live along or off High Street park on the road. This restricts the effective width of the road, making it passable to only one car at a time across several stretches. The effect of this is to create queues of traffic in both directions waiting to take their turn to manoeuvre around these obstructions. The result, in my view, will inevitably be that the volume of traffic along High Street will increase, leading to ever greater congestion along an already busy road. Further, any access will be along Jaques Lane. This is the single carriageway road with housing on both sides. Again widening this road would not be feasible. Increasing the density of the housing along this road will create greater traffic problems along a road already ill-equipped to manage the amount of traffic which uses it.</p> <p>2. Sewerage The provision for sewerage for the proposed plot would have to be derived from the main sewer line running along High Street. Our sewerage line in connected to this line also, and as our property lies in a similar area to the proposed plot I would suggest that it would be a good point of comparison. Our sewerage needs are very limited, encompassing a small 2 bedroom bungalow and one lavatory provided for the use of our staff during their working hours. The sewerage provision is inadequate even for such low level of usage. We are forced to employ a sewerage pump (as our land lies downhill from the main sewer line, as will the houses to be built on the proposed plot) but this is prone to breakdowns and in any even still results in our sewer lines blocking or backing up. If permission is granted to the proposed plot any houses on that site will inevitably suffer the same problems. My understanding is that the problem lies not with the connecting pipes from the house but rather with the main sewer line running along High Street, which is simply inadequate to cope with the quantity of sewage with which it is required to cope. To remedy this situation major work would be required along High Street, causing untold disruption.</p>

September, 2008

Submitted by	Comments
<p>David Wales [continued]</p>	<p>I do not believe that it would be feasible to carry out such remedial work, meaning that the houses built on this plot were it to be granted permission, would suffer from the same problems we do. I understand that the houses in Jaques Lane suffer similar problems with insufficient provision for sewerage, indeed that the sewer pipes there have to be pumped out regularly (at least once per year) and that there have been frequent problems with the sewers backing up, resulting on at least one occasion in a house being flooded by sewerage. The risk to public health, not to mention the claims for damages, cannot be overstated in light of this. If permission were granted for the proposed plot I believe that these problems would inevitably be exacerbated for the existing residents of Jaques Lane and would equally affect the occupants of the new houses.</p> <p>3. Increased risk of flooding As the committee are doubtless already aware, there is a flood plain area covering the southern area of the proposed plot. In addition, when we purchased our property in December 2007 we were told that, notwithstanding that no part of our land is covered by the flood plain, our property was still at a substantially increased risk of flooding, so much so that we were obliged to take out specific insurance against such a risk. Any development of the proposed plot will affect the area susceptible to flooding, not just the area officially designated 'flood plain'. This is due to two factors. Building on land decreases its ability to absorb rainfall. This is due to the greater area of flat and solid surface (road surfaces, pavement areas, roof surfaces, patio surfaces etc) compared to the porous undeveloped areas it replaces (in this case areas covered with grass). This will substantially increase the amount of rainwater running off this land, whilst at the same time reducing the area of undeveloped land to break up and reabsorb this run-off. The only direction for this run-off water to flow is south - downhill and towards the river. The area around Clophill has an extremely unstable water table - it has been demonstrated more than once in recent times that development work in the village can affect the water table itself and result in greater risk of flooding. Development on the Fuller's Earth pits and recent development along the Causeway have both demonstrated this problem in recent years. If the proposed plot is granted planning permission then the risk of flooding will increase dramatically. The greater quantity of run-off rainwater draining south towards the river will almost certainly increase the incidents of flooding well above (i.e. north) of the designated flood plain. Indeed, although it is stated in the application that there are no proposals to build on the area of the plot suggested which are covered by the flood plain as currently designated, it is worth bearing in mind that the whole plot is regularly waterlogged, and flooding is not uncommon over the whole of its area. If the same problems are encountered as occurred during the development of the Fuller's Earth pits this will become even more problematic, and may call for a reconsideration of the extent of the flood plain area itself. This is likely to cover not only our land (with consequences for the value of that land) but also the land on which the new houses will have been built.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>4. Lack of amenities Clophill itself is a small village, albeit that it is growing and has been identified as a large village in the emerging core strategy. The village has no medical facilities of any kind – all residents are forced to register with general practitioners in either Maulden, Ampthill or Flitwick. There are a few businesses in the area to provide employment for the occupants of the village. The application is for the plot to be developed for housing only. Clearly the plot itself would not be suitable for any other form of use, given the increased demand this would place on access, amenities and sewerage this would create (see above). The development of this plot will not provide any relief for the lack of medical facilities or create any local opportunities for employment. Given that there are other sites proposed which are put forward for mixed use which would both provide the housing required by the emerging core strategy and facilitate the creation of other amenities to provide both medical care and employment, and given that at least two of the sites (number H032 and H039) would do so without putting additional pressure on the traffic and sewerage problems inherent along High Street, I would suggest that the development of the proposed site is not in the best interests of the village.</p>
Dr Leon A. Terry	<p>The proposed site is on agricultural land and directly backs onto the environmentally important 'Lakeland area'. This 'Lakeland area' has been allocated to provide a public amenity (nature conservation, area for walking, fishing and picnicking) through an agreement between Degussa Holdings [formerly Laporte] and Beds CC. The 'Lakeland area' is home to many different types of rare wildlife including badgers, barn owls, hares, foxes, green and greater spotted woodpeckers and Canada geese, many of which reside in the adjacent fields. The proposed site may threaten the environmental sustainability and ecological balance of the lakeland habitat. In addition, the proposed site does not have sufficient access to the main public highway (viz. High Street) since Jacques Lane is only single track with no pedestrian pathway or any turning circles for vehicles.</p>
G. M. Wolfenden	<p>My opposition is not NIMBYISM : Jacques Lane is narrow, poorly lit, badly paved, and, above all, it has a blind bend where house no. 11 is situated. Currently there are 21 houses on the Lane, it seems ludicrous to suggest almost (or, indeed, actually) doubling that number. The character of the Lane would be jeopardised totally.</p>
Geogina Martin	<p>Access from Jagues lane would cause a great deal of trouble for all those currently residing in Jaques Lane. It is a very narrow road.</p>
Hehman	<p>These are all in depth proposals on the south side of the high street which has been against "poking" for many years. The high street and its services would not support these developments</p>
K Breed	<p>There are already FAR too many vehicles requiring access to & mobility within Clophill village - the High Street is constantly lined with parked cars & Jaques Lane in particular could not cope with extra traffic, being little more than a track towards the southern end. Adding dwellings for residence or trading here would not be appropriate, nor would upgrading Jaques Lane to cope with more traffic - we live in a village & do not want to see village lanes turned into highways for the sake of "development" which would be of no benefit to, and probably even detrimental to, existing residents.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kim Bray	The development would have a serious adverse impact on the rural nature of the location. The proposal would double the volume of vehicle traffic along Jacques Lane, most of which is only single carriageway. There are no pavement which already causes a hazard for pedestrians, particularly children and the elderly. The development of the agricultural land would have a significant impact on the local wildlife habitat.
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	This submission contains many errors. The P.O. and store, public houses and village hall are all 1 mile away, where is the florists? There is no middle school in Clophill it is in Shefford. Pupils go to Harlington Upper School not Shefford. Flitwick station is 6 miles away. The public transport times appear to be guesswork and do not consider when and where one wants to go. Good public transport is only from the A6, a 20 min walk away. Development for 15-20 houses would mean an extra 20 to 40 cars on average using Jacques Lane and the High Street. This would considerably increase the traffic in Clophill.
Mr D Martin	Access to this site is an extremely narrow road and would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic.
Mr. J. Collins	Jacques Lane is a narrow dead-end lane with only one passing point and no turnaround facility. Any residential development would have a significant impact on the environment.
Mrs C Mathieson	Too close to flood plain particularly with forecasts of increased flooding in the future
Mrs Joanne Terry	The proposed site is on agricultural land and directly backs onto the environmentally important 'Lakeland area'. This 'Lakeland area' has been allocated to provide a public amenity (nature conservation, area for walking, fishing and picnicking) through an agreement between Degussa Holdings [formerly Laporte] and Beds CC. The 'Lakeland area' is home to many different types of rare wildlife including badgers, barn owls, hares, foxes, green and greater spotted woodpeckers and Canada geese, many of which reside in the adjacent fields. The proposed site may threaten the environmental sustainability and ecological balance of the lakeland habitat. In addition, the proposed site does not have sufficient access to the main public highway (High Street) since Jacques Lane is only single track with no pedestrian pathway or any turning circles for vehicles.
Mrs P Maughan	The proposal would more than double the traffic down Jacques Lane, which is single carriageway without pavements. It is already hazardous for pedestrians particularly children and the elderly. The site has already been subject to unsuccessful planning applications (11/2001/1555) and the same reasons apply to this much more significant proposal. The fields provide habitat for many species of wildlife, particularly frogs and toads, including natter jacks which migrate across the road from the field. Jacques Lane is still very rural and the proposed development would adversely impact on that. The field is higher than the properties opposite which are already affected by water run off and the development would be of particular concern to 20 and 22 Jaques Lane which are already lower than the road. The Lane has had a history of problems with the capacity of the sewers which have been unable to cope with the existing dwellings and would be completely unsuited to the increase.

Submitted by	Comments
Richard How	The access to the site is far to restricted to make this a suitable proposition for development.

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

Submitted by	Comments
K. Collins	Jacques Lane is a narrow dead-end lane with the only one lay by for passing of vehicles. Any large vehicles have to reverse one way as there is no turning space. Any development would constitute a significant impact on the countryside environment.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H042**

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
G. M. Wolfenden	High Street is very congested - especially at school time. Adding to the traffic seems a really bad idea.
Jayne Hunt	This site could have the potential for provision of a few homes but not as many as is suggested as this would be detrimental to the local environment. Housing should be provided which is affordable. I think that Clophill has potential to provide a maximum of 20 homes (which is probably a fair share) and there are a few sites which could be used to provide this rather than concentrating all the new homes in one big area. This would have less impact environmentally and socially.
Wendy Tooney	Will cause considerable congestion cannot be supported by correct 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
Brian Adams	The High Street is the main artery of the village and is already severely congested. The development would be some 30 mins round trip walk from the shop/post office and therefore increased car use would create further parking problems around the Green.
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Cora Sheppard	In my opinion the site is not suitable to develop due to the high volume of traffic already using the high street. Additionally these houses would be back build to the High Street development line.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!
Duncan Beattie	This further damages the conservation area and puts further pressure on the already busy high street.
Geogina Martin	Access from Clophill High Street. Clophill already has enough congestion on the high street in this particular area at this time with school etc.
Hehman	These are all in depth proposals on the south side of the high street which has been against "poking" for many years. The high street and its services would not support these developments.
Jem Giles	Clophill is overcrowded by traffic, over populated and the village is being destroyed by over building. Houses being squeezed into front gardens and openings being made onto an already crowded high street - especially surrounding St. Mary's church. Jacques Lane is too narrow to accept two way traffic. Vehicles park on grass verges to allow passing, including my front drive which is being damaged.
K Breed	Congestion on Clophill High Street (off which access would be) is already bad. Developing this previously green area would simply bring more traffic: no benefit to the existing community.

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	Building on this site would encourage backland development in what is otherwise a linear village. A couple of dwellings as near as possible to the High Street would be all that would be acceptable here. Note that 124 High Street is a listed building. The bus service passing adjacent to the site on High Street runs a mere 6 times a day (no service on Sundays). Distance to the village's local services (shop/P.O., pubs and principal bus service) is some 1.2km, which most people would not walk.
Michele Munro	Development on this site is inappropriate as backland development on the South side of the High Street has not been permitted previously, especially as the demolition of a property to carry out such a development would have to take place. It would have a significant impact on the vast wildlife of this rural backland.
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	Some incorrect information has been supplied for this site. Clophill does not have a Middle School, it is in Shefford. Older pupils are bussed to Harlington, not the Shefford Upper School, and is difficult to reach by Public Transport. The P.O./store and the social centres of Clophill are 1 mile away as is any good public transport, a 20 min walk from the site. The public transport information needs revising. Car use would increase. The petrol station is 1.5 miles away on the A6. This is the wrong side of the village for 12-15 dwellings and likely to add 12-30 extra cars.
Mr D Martin	The high street is too narrow and at all times of the day and night has vehicles parked all along the area making it a single carriageway at all times.
Mrs S Ratcliffe	To build on this site would only encourage home owners all down the length of Clophill high street to sell their gardens for development. Building behind existing properties will only devalue them and also the houses on the other side of the high street will also be affected. Clophill High St already suffers with drivers driving at speed as well as issues with parking particularly at this site, congestion will only increase with possible accidents an issue. To build at this site will only set a precedent and increase the village to a small town, which is something I strongly oppose.
Robert Miller	The area in question forms part of the larger flood plain and therefore development of this site is absurd. Backland development is intrusive of the existing rural environment of the area.
Silverwood	Site is within conservation area, densely wooded and supporting an abundance of wildlife. Development would materially alter listed buildings in and around the site.
Tina Keech	This proposed site is on the flood plain which is highly inappropriate to be developed on. Flooding after rain is excessive on this land. Demolishing a perfectly good house to develop on the back land is ludicrous - no backland development has been permitted on the South side of High Street in the past and would set a precedent for future development. The wildlife on the said land is extensive and demolition of the property and proposed subsequent new road would only add to an largely dangerous spot on the High Street due to parked cars/lorries and speeding cars (often at a speed in excess of 50mph). This part of Clophill is largely rural and such a development on the blackland would be against rural village life and the reasons why people choose to live in such a place.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Turner	I would not support any further development at the rear of houses on the south side of the High St.. The Flit Valley should be retained as a wide green corridor for wildlife.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H073

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
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	The site information is incorrect in that the upper school used by Clophill pupils is Harlington. This site is near the social centres, P.O./store and public transport from the A6. The biggest problem will be car use on the narrow roads.

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
Gillian Wolfenden	My comments re High Street for the previous survey apply to this one, too.
J. Collins	Site is nearer to village 'hub' than the others. Would have minimal impact on environment, but would have to observe conservation area requirements. Access by Kiln Lane would not seem to present any difficulty.
K Breed	8-10 dwellings is too many. It would not be unreasonable to expect 2 cars per household, thus 20 extra cars requiring access & parking! This area of Clophill is comprised of country lanes that cannot cope with an increase in traffic volume of this magnitude & improving these lanes to fully-fledged highways is not in keeping with the spirit of the village.
K. Collins	Site would have minimal impact on countryside - local environment but would need to keep within countryside requirements. Traffic access by Kiln lane would not seem to present any problems. This site nearer to village 'hub' than any of the others
Michael Brooks	The proposal for terraced houses is a welcome change from the usual schemes for large detached properties; there is a need for smaller units. Nevertheless, 8-10 dwellings would represent overdevelopment of the site, given its location on the very edge of the built-up area of the village: half this number would be acceptable. Access would be from Kiln Lane which itself is only accessed from the main part of the village up the very narrow Mill Lane (which has no footway): this is another reason why the number of dwellings on the site should be restricted.
Mr & Mrs M Everitt	Basically in agreement with this proposed development provided housing is built in sympathy and character with the surrounding area which is on the edge of Clophill conservation area. However, it should be remembered that this proposal would need to have access to what is currently a very narrow lane.
Mrs J Breed	Proposition for low cost starter homes for local residents is attractive.
S W Barratt	Clophill has suffered much "in fill" housing development over the years. The mitigating factor in this case might be the type of housing being proposed; IF the final planning approval is "8-12 cottages" and not 3-4 detached "executive houses"...
Turner	This site would have to be sensitively developed if at all being partially within the conservation area. The main problem is traffic access via Back St or Mill Lane. Both roads are extremely narrow and any increase in traffic could be a problem at times, especially if there was an event on at the village hall.

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
Brian Adams	The narrow lanes existing for centuries that knit together Clophill will not take a significant increase in traffic flow without increasing danger to pedestrians and destroying the quality of life. The High Street is the main artery of the village and is already severely congested.
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!
Duncan Beattie	The road access is very poor on what is a narrow lane with a virtually blind turn. Further traffic on this tiny lane is unsustainable and very dangerous; especially when considering the number of children who use it (the lane provides access to the toddler playground, the swings, the recreation ground and the village hall). The development is also within the conservation area and a small estate of new housing is totally unsuitable.
Geogina Martin	Anything requiring further traffic up essentially very narrow roads would be disastrous.
Jayne Hunt	I believe that there are more appropriate sites in Clophill for development. This site is in the conservation area and would impact on a small lane which has problems with parking already. The look of the area would not be enhanced by any development here, even if it was "tastefully" done.
Mr D Martin	From the construction of one or two properties this could be OK but for 8 or 10 adjacent roads are too narrow to cope the increase volume of traffic.
Mrs S Ratcliffe	Previous planning applications for this site was rejected for approx 2 properties because of where its situated, access onto the nearby lanes (which are already difficult to drive down)and how it will effect the local environment. How can the new owners now think that they can build approx 8 new dwellings? Kiln Lane , Mill Lane and Back Street are unable to cope with existing traffic if you look at parking and vehicles short cutting through to get to the A6.Historically Clophill House has immense presence on the village high St, to build within its grounds would be inexcusable and plain greedy. I totally disagree with this site and I do not wish to have the view from my home destroyed by looking at new builds. I oppose this site most definitely.
R Munday	No mention is made of access. If the access is to Kiln Lane then the traffic movement will impact on Mill Lane, Back Street, and Little Lane, which are the only means of access to the A6 or High Street. These roads have no capacity for additional traffic and this would create dangers for all road users. Exit via Little Lane would impact on the already severe congestion and danger to children around St Marys School. Exit alongside London House directly on to High Street would itself be dangerous given the already congested nature of the narrow High Street at this point and proximity to Causeway, Mill Lane, and Cainhoe Road junctions.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roger and Diana Diggins	From the map and the detailed descriptions this appears to overlap with the existing Conservation area and we feel strongly that this should be protected and new development discouraged (including infill!) Access would be difficult, presumably to Mill Lane, to say the least.
Silverwood	Proposed site is within the conservation area of the village, any development would materially alter mill lane which has remained virtually un changed for over 100 years. Site is densely wooded and rich in wildlife. Site would potentially require dismantling of extremely old sandstone walls either side on the lane .Mill lane is very narrow any access onto lane would pose a considerable danger to traffic and pedestrians.
Tina Keech	This new development would ultimately be in Mill Lane/Kiln Lane. Mill Lane is a small narrow lane leading from the High Street up to Back Street and Kiln Lane. It does not have the ability to cope with increased traffic leading to any new development and therefore is highly unsuitable to be considered.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H093

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
Turner	I would support smaller scale development on this derelict site. The access is on to a relatively narrow road which might cause problems.

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
Jayne Hunt	This site could be developed for housing but perhaps there are better sites in Clophill. One of the main reasons for my not preferring this site is that Great Lane is not the safest lane for walking as there is no pavement and there is a number of bends in the road and cars do go down there quite fast. I think that this development would add to this problem.
K Breed	Increases in traffic volumes would be a problem. Assume 2 cars per household - sufficient parking spaces would have to be provided on site as Great Lane, giving access to the quarry, is a single track road & could not accommodate any on-street parking. Developing/widening this lane simply to accommodate parking is not in keeping with the spirit of the village & would be wholly unacceptable, as would squeezing dwellings onto the site & simply ignoring the need for on-site parking provision resulting in new residents competing for parking spaces on other roads which are already over-stretched.
Michael Brooks	This is a highly sensitive site and most likely has wildlife interest which should not be compromised. Access is poor along the narrow Great Lane which has no footway. Allowing for both of these points, 2 or 3 sensitively-designed and optimally-orientated small cottages could be accommodated here. Any more could affect the wildlife interest and generate too much additional traffic for the road. No bus services pass the site: the nearest runs a mere 6 times a day (250m away). However, local services (shop/P.O., pubs and main bus services) are 1km away.

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
A Gardner	Great Lane is very narrow and could not cope with the traffic that building 8 houses would cause. The site is far too small to build anywhere near that number of houses. It possibly could accommodate 1 large home but the sand banks would constantly cause problems without a very unsightly retaining wall.
Bradshaw	number of homes inappropriate - one or two could be accommodated comes out on single track road with no pathway, not suitable for dense housing. Inappropriate mix of houses for street scene. site has been plentiful wildlife and flora/fauna.
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!
Dr Roger Christopher	Construction of 6-8 dwellings would require the removal of the existing earthen banks; these hold many mature trees and their removal would detract from the environment in this part of Great Lane. The site is good for local wildlife although I believe sand martins have ceased to breed there. A row of terraced houses would not be in keeping with the surrounding housing - mainly individually designed detached houses and bungalows. If housing sites are in desperately short supply, a modest development (2-3 dwellings, retaining the banks) may be inevitable. This part of Great Lane is narrow and twisting and has no pavements (existing or possible); parking on the Lane should not be assumed as part of this development.
Geogina Martin	As with other sites, the roads around are narrow and any further traffic would cause access problems.
M Sutton	This site is ridiculous. 2 houses at most, but would ruin the countryside aspect
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	The site is very small and in a narrow lane. This would probably mean that cars would be parked in the lane causing traffic problems. The site is a good 20 minute walk from good public transport links, the village P.O. and social centres.
Mr D Martin	Bearing in mind that this site is on an extremely narrow one track road the number of properties would create too much traffic and cause some severe accidents.
Mrs A Christopher	The proposed development is too big for what is a small and difficult site. Great Lane is not suitable for heavy vehicles; construction traffic would be detrimental to existing properties and cause physical damage to the road itself which is not in the best of condition. Of particular concern would be the negative impact on the local environment of removal of all or even part of the high bank which borders the Lane - although its height might have been artificially increased at some time in the past, the bank has matured over several decades and now has a natural appearance and also includes several large, mature trees. Although in the past this site was presumably a sandpit and held a small factory, it is now well overgrown with ground cover, shrubs and trees and is definitely a wildlife habitat, especially for small and often overlooked creatures such as small mammals, butterflies and invertebrates.
R Munday	Great Lane already has sever traffic congestion problems at the junction with High Street, especially during school term when children are arriving at St Marys School at the same time as commuters are leaving for work. Mothers are obliged to park in Great Lane, near the junction with Little Lane and High Street and on both sides of High Street. Additional traffic from this proposed development would aggravate the problem and unacceptably increase the danger to children. Also the exit from the proposed development on to Great Lane is at a poorly-sighted bend in the road and traffic movement on and off the development would itself pose a severe hazard.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roger and Diana Diggins	This is an area of natural beauty. The junction of Great Lane and the High Street is already congested and dangerous at peak times especially with through traffic, with many school children being dropped off in the area.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Derek Mellor	The lower 600 yards of Great Lane is narrow, unstraight and has no footpath. There is already a traffic problem. Even a small development would add to that problem.

Ref Number: H094

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
Bradshaw	Number of houses should be few, access should not be on to great lane - single track with no pathway.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H150

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
Jayne Hunt	This site could be used for housing on a small scale. Housing should be provided which is affordable. I think that Clophill has potential to provide a maximum of 20 homes (which is probably a fair share) and there are a few sites which could be used to provide this rather than concentrating all the new homes in one big area. This would have less impact environmentally and socially.
Turner	I would support this site as a frontage development only.

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
Elizabeth Hentian	A few possible linear modest properties on Eastern (left hand side going from Shefford Road High Street end) odd numbers only. No in depth as too much traffic for lane.
K Breed	Increases in traffic volumes would be a problem. Assume 2 cars per household - sufficient parking spaces would have to be provided on site as Jaques Lane is a single track road & could not accommodate any on-street parking. Developing/widening this lane simply to accommodate parking is not in keeping with the spirit of the village & would be wholly unacceptable, as would squeezing dwellings onto the site & simply ignoring the need for on-site parking provision resulting in new residents competing for parking spaces on other roads, especially the High Street, which are already over-stretched.
Michael Brooks	Jacques Lane is very narrow and could not support development on the whole of this site without widening and the provision of a footway, which would change its rural character. Note that the supporting information says that the site is not in the floodplain whereas the rear of the site clearly is. The site is somewhat distant (about 1.5km) from local services (shop/P.O., pubs and principal bus services); the nearest bus service to the site (approx 250m) runs a mere 6 times a day (no service Sundays). Development here should only front Jacques Lane and not extend deeper into the site. A mix of dwellings including semi-detached and terraced should be included, not 100% detached. Please note that there is an error in the supporting information provided for this site: it says that "There is currently no health provision in Silsoe ..." This should, of course, mean Clophill.
S W Barratt	Flood plain permitting!!!!
W. Toony	Will cause considerable congestion cannot be supported by correct infrastructure.

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
Brian and Eileen Martin	Poor access via narrow lane with sharp bend (Jacques Lane). Traffic already destroying verges and ditches, the latter magnifying drainage problems. (NB Council will not maintain ditches) Good agricultural land which should be retained to make good future food shortages.
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales	<p>OBJECTIONS TO PLANNING APPLICATION PLOT NUMBER H150</p> <p>I have a number of objections to the proposed planning application for this site, which fall into a number of categories.</p> <p>1. Effect on Sealawn Boarding Cattery</p> <p>Any development of this site will have a direct impact on the business we run from our property. Sealawn Boarding Cattery is a local business, which has been established and run from this site for more than 30 years. We have a very loyal client base covering 5 counties (Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire), and we are dependent on the repeat business derived from this client base. Sealawn Boarding Cattery provides employment to local people. We employ up to 20 staff during our busiest periods, and since these tend to coincide with school holidays the work we offer is ideal for young people, both of school age and local undergraduates returning during college and university holidays. In addition we provide year-round employment for 3 staff, and this includes some of the older members of society who otherwise may have difficulty finding employment. The main reason that the cattery is so successful, and the principal point of our marketing of the cattery, is the peace and tranquility we can provide by being situated in Clophill. Our customers are concerned that their cats should not be disturbed during the time they stay with us. We do all we can to ensure than any such disturbance is kept to a minimum. The proposed plot lies directly along the west boundary of our land. The boundary is marked by a low open-meshed wire fence and some very thin trees. The driveway used by our customers for access, the area in which they park and the reception building to which they must report on arrival all lie directly against this boundary, and as such this is where all of our customers form their first impressions of Sealawn Boarding Cattery. Were the planned application to be granted planning permission there would be a direct impact on the business, both in the short term whilst building work was being carried out, and in the longer term once the land is occupied. Any such building work would inevitably cause the usual noise, dust, vibrations and fumes associated with a building site. The current boundary will do nothing at all to restrict or prevent the clients' perception of the cattery. I do not believe that any other form of boundary, be it fencing, thicker or higher tree line or even solid wall will have any more effect on this problem. In the longer term new houses being on that site would greatly affect our business. Increased numbers of people using the land which lies along the boundary line will inevitably lead to more noise, and to noise at different times of day as it will be caused by different people living different lifestyles. In addition any housing built on this plot will almost certainly include off-road parking allocation. This will bring the noise of traffic down from High Street to directly against our boundary, and again no provision for increasing the density or height of the boundary will reduce this. As stated above, ours is a business which is dependent on peace and tranquillity. If this peace and tranquillity is broken, both in the short term and in the long term, as a result of this site, the impact on our business will be substantial. We purchased the business in December 2007 and as such are in the first year of operation. This has obvious implications for our initial mortgage repayments. If the building</p>

September, 2008

Submitted by	Comments
<p>David Wales [continued]</p>	<p>work were permitted during this time it is entirely likely that our business could be forced to close.</p> <p>2. Access</p> <p>The only means of access to the proposed plot would be along High Street and down Jaques Lane. High Street already suffers from traffic congestion daily, as a result of two factors: the volume of traffic and roadside parking. I believe that both of these will be aggravated by the building of a housing development on the proposed plot. Due to previous development through the middle of Clophill the volume of traffic along High Street is already much greater than the street was originally designed to accommodate. High Street is a relatively narrow two-lane road, bounded by houses on both sides, in many cases so close to the road itself that there are no pedestrian pavements. If the proposed plot were to be granted permission the volume of traffic will inevitable rise. Whilst there are bus services through the village, the nearest rail link (which will inevitably be used by a high proportion of those looking for housing in High Street) is in Flitwick, which realistically is only accessible by road. The proposed plot lies towards the eastern end of the village, and there is road access running out east along Shefford Road and joining the A507 opposite the Beadlow Manor. However it is unrealistic to suggest that the occupants of these new houses will use this route, when the more convenient route is directly along High Street and onto the A6. In any event it would be impossible to enforce such a route on the occupants of the new houses.</p> <p>In the absence of off-road parking, many people who live along or off High Street park on the road. This restricts the effective width of the road, making it passable to only one car at a time across several stretches. The effect of this is to create queues of traffic in both directions waiting to take their turn to manoeuvre around these obstructions.</p> <p>The result, in my view, will inevitably be that the volume of traffic along High Street will increase, leading to ever greater congestion along an already busy road.</p> <p>Further, any access will be along Jaques Lane. This is the single carriageway road with housing on both sides. Again widening this road would not be feasible. Increasing the density of the housing along this road will create greater traffic problems along a road already ill-equipped to manage the amount of traffic which uses it.</p> <p>3. Sewerage</p> <p>The provision for sewerage for the proposed plot would have to be derived from the main sewer line running along High Street. Our sewerage line in connected to this line also, and as our property lies in a similar area to the proposed plot I would suggest that it would be a good point of comparison.</p> <p>Our sewerage needs are very limited, encompassing a small 2 bedroom bungalow and one lavatory provided for the use of our staff during their working hours. The sewerage provision is inadequate even for such low level of usage. We are forced to employ a sewerage pump (as our land lies downhill from the main sewer line, as will the houses to be built on</p>

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>the proposed plot) but this is prone to breakdowns and in any even still results in our sewer lines blocking or backing up.</p> <p>If permission is granted to the proposed plot any houses on that site will inevitably suffer the same problems. My understanding is that the problem lies not with the connecting pipes from the house but rather with the main sewer line running along High Street, which is simply inadequate to cope with the quantity of sewage with which it is required to cope. To remedy this situation major work would be required along High Street, causing untold disruption. I do not believe that it would be feasible to carry out such remedial work, meaning that the houses built on this plot were it to be granted permission, would suffer from the same problems we do.</p> <p>I understand that the houses in Jaques Lane suffer similar problems with insufficient provision for sewerage, indeed that the sewer pipes there have to be pumped out regularly (at least once per year) and that there have been frequent problems with the sewers backing up, resulting on at least one occasion in a house being flooded by sewerage. The risk to public health, not to mention the claims for damages, cannot be overstated in light of this.</p> <p>If permission were granted for the proposed plot I believe that these problems would inevitably be exacerbated for the existing residents of Jaques Lane and would equally affect the occupants of the new houses.</p> <p>4. Increased risk of flooding</p> <p>As the committee are doubtless already aware, there is a flood plain area covering the southern area of the proposed plot. In addition, when we purchased our property in December 2007 we were told that, notwithstanding that no part of our land is covered by the flood plain, our property was still at a substantially increased risk of flooding, so much so that we were obliged to take out specific insurance against such a risk. Any development of the proposed plot will affect the area susceptible to flooding, not just the area officially designated 'flood plain'. This is due to two factors.</p> <p>Building on land decreases its ability to absorb rainfall. This is due to the greater area of flat and solid surface (road surfaces, pavement areas, roof surfaces, patio surfaces etc) compared to the porous undeveloped areas it replaces (in this case areas covered with grass). This will substantially increase the amount of rainwater running off this land, whilst at the same time reducing the area of undeveloped land to break up and reabsorb this run-off. The only direction for this run-off water to flow is south – downhill and towards the river.</p> <p>The area around Clophill has an extremely unstable water table – it has been demonstrated more than once in recent times that development work in the village can affect the water table itself and result in greater risk of flooding. Development on the Fuller's Earth pits and recent development along the Causeway have both demonstrated this problem in recent years.</p> <p>If the proposed plot is granted planning permission then the risk of flooding will increase dramatically. The greater quantity of run-off rainwater draining south towards the river will almost certainly increase the incidents of flooding well above (i.e. north) of the designated flood plain. Indeed, although it is stated in the application that there are no proposals to build on the area of the plot suggested which are covered</p>

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>by the flood plain as currently designated, it is worth bearing in mind that the whole plot is regularly waterlogged, and flooding is not uncommon over the whole of its area. If the same problems are encountered as occurred during the development of the Fuller's Earth pits this will become even more problematic, and may call for a reconsideration of the extent of the flood plain area itself. This is likely to cover not only our land (with consequences for the value of that land) but also the land on which the new houses will have been built.</p> <p>5. Lack of amenities</p> <p>Clophill itself is a small village, albeit that it is growing and has been identified as a large village in the emerging core strategy. The village has no medical facilities of any kind – all residents are forced to register with general practitioners in either Maulden, Ampthill or Flitwick. There are a few businesses in the area to provide employment for the occupants of the village.</p> <p>The application is for the plot to be developed for housing only. Clearly the plot itself would not be suitable for any other form of use, given the increased demand this would place on access, amenities and sewerage this would create (see above). The development of this plot will not provide any relief for the lack of medical facilities or create any local opportunities for employment.</p> <p>Given that there are other sites proposed which are put forward for mixed use which would both provide the housing required by the emerging core strategy and facilitate the creation of other amenities to provide both medical care and employment, and given that at least two of the sites (number H032 and H039) would do so without putting additional pressure on the traffic and sewerage problems inherent along High Street, I would suggest that the development of the proposed site is not in the best interests of the village.</p>
Dr Leon A. Terry	<p>The proposed site is on agricultural land and directly backs onto the environmentally important 'Lakeland area'. This 'Lakeland area' has been allocated to provide a public amenity (nature conservation, area for walking, fishing and picnicking) through an agreement between Degussa Holdings [formerly Laporte] and Beds CC. The 'Lakeland area' is home to many different types of rare wildlife including badgers, barn owls, hares, foxes, green and greater spotted woodpeckers and Canada geese, many of which reside in the adjacent fields. The proposed site may threaten the environmental sustainability and ecological balance of the lakeland habitat.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed site does not have sufficient access to the main public highway (viz. High Street) since Jacques Lane is only single track with no pedestrian pathway or any turning circles for vehicles.</p>
G. M. Wolfenden	<p>Apart from my comments about the high volume of proposed development, my earlier remarks re Jacques Lane apply in entirety here, too. It appears the whole of this land is liable to flooding and, therefore, is highly unsuitable for housing.</p>
Geogina Martin	<p>Jacques Lane is narrow. Problem with traffic.</p>
Hehman	<p>These are all in depth proposals on the south side of the high street which has been against "poking" for many years. The high street and its services would not support these developments.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
J. Collins	Jacques Lane is a narrow dead-end lane with one passing point and no turnaround facility. Any residential development would have a significant impact on the environment. Site on or very close to flood plain.
K. Collins	Jacques Lane is a narrow dead-end lane with one lay-by for passing of vehicles. Any large vehicles have to reverse one way as there is no turning place. Any development would constitute a significant impact on the countryside environment. Site very close to flood plain.
Kim Bray	Much of Jacques Lane is single carriageway and without pavements, posing an existing hazard to pedestrians particularly children and the elderly. Additional traffic caused by this development would significantly increase the hazard. In addition, the whole of the proposed site is subject to regular flooding. This development would have an adverse impact on the rural nature of the Lane
Mr and Mrs K.Sampson	The information given for this site has been poorly researched. Public transport times seem to be guesswork and do not take into account times when one can travel or which part of the day. Good public transport is only from the A6 a 20 min walk away. The time for Upper school is by school bus. Pupils from Clophill go to Harlington, not Shefford. The village shop, P.O. and social centres are all at the west end of the village, resulting in car transport being used. Development of the east side of Clophill will mean a considerable increase in car travel and an increase in dormitory use.
Mr D Martin	The access road is too narrow to take the increase in use I also believe the land is also liable to flood.
Mrs C Mathieson	Too close to flood plain particularly with forecasts of increased flooding in the future.
Mrs Joanne Terry	<p>The proposed site is on agricultural land and directly backs onto the environmentally important 'Lakeland area'. This 'Lakeland area' has been allocated to provide a public amenity (nature conservation, area for walking, fishing and picnicking) through an agreement between Degussa Holdings (formerly Laporte)) and Beds CC. The 'Lakeland area' is home to many different types of rare wildlife including badgers, barn owls, hares, foxes, green and greater spotted woodpeckers and Canada geese, many of which reside in the adjacent fields. The proposed site may threaten the environmental sustainability and ecological balance of the lakeland habitat.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed site does not have sufficient access to the main public highway (High Street) since Jacques Lane is only single track with no pedestrian pathway or any turning circles for vehicles.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs K Bray	<p>The whole of the proposed site is subject to flooding and, despite ditching, contains standing water for much of the year. This problem would be exacerbated if the proposal H041 proceeds in any way.</p> <p>The ground is particularly soft and properties on the same side of the lane have a history of subsidence. Number 20 which is adjacent to the site has been underpinned twice.</p> <p>Jacques Lane in a single carriageway, winding road without pavements and poor visibility. It currently poses a hazard to pedestrians, particularly the elderly and children. This makes the Lane unsuitable for any further development.</p> <p>There have been issues in relation to the sewer capacity over the years and I am concerned that they would not be able to support additional dwellings.</p> <p>The field provides habitat for a wide variety of birds, frogs and toads which migrate through the field.</p>
Mrs P Maughan	<p>The whole of the proposed site is subject to flooding and, despite ditching, contains standing water for much of the year. This problem would be exacerbated if the proposal H041 proceeds in any way.</p> <p>The ground is particularly soft and properties on the same side of the lane have a history of subsidence. Number 20 which is adjacent to the site has been underpinned twice.</p> <p>Jacques Lane in a single carriageway, winding road without pavements and poor visibility. It currently poses a hazard to pedestrians, particularly the elderly and children. This makes the Lane unsuitable for any further development.</p> <p>There have been issues in relation to the sewer capacity over the years and I am concerned that they would not be able to support additional dwellings.</p> <p>The field provides habitat for a wide variety of birds, frogs and toads which migrate through the field.</p>
Ray Wolfenden	<p>The proposed site is very close to the flood plain and access for traffic along Jacques Lane is already a major problem in that it is impossible for 2 vehicles to pass in many places.</p>
Tina Keech	<p>Jacques Lane is a small road leading from the High Street. It does not have the ability to cope with increased traffic leading to any new development.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H157

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
Elizabeth Hentian	The village needs a few smaller properties, without spoiling its character and becoming an urban sprawl. The school has capacity for additional pupils.
Gillian Wolfenden	This land does appear to be suitable for infill development.
Jayne Hunt	This could be used for housing on a small scale. Pavement should be extended so that residents can walk into the village. Housing should be provided which is affordable. I think that Clophill has potential to provide a maximum of 20 homes (which is probably a fair share) and there are a few sites which could be used to provide this rather than concentrating all the new homes in one big area. This would have less impact environmentally and socially.
Mr D Martin	Could be used as on the edge of the village. Would still cause some traffic problems.
Turner	I would support smaller scale development here.

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
Brian and Eileen Martin	Too small to make any impact on local services.
J. Collins	This site is presently unused/overgrown and could be developed with minimal impact on the local environment and no detriment to the countryside. This site would also have good access from the existing Shefford Road. It would blend in with the existing Castle Hill Court development.
K Breed	Increases in traffic volumes would be a problem. Assume 2 cars per household - sufficient parking spaces would have to be provided on site as Clophill High Street could not accommodate any on-street parking - it is constantly lined with parked cars already. Squeezing dwellings onto the site & simply ignoring the need for on-site parking provision resulting in new residents competing for parking spaces on other roads, specifically the High Street, which are already over-stretched would be unacceptable.
K. Collins	This site would have good access from the existing Shefford Road. Site is presently overgrown and unused, and could be developed with minimal impact on the local environment. It could be designed to blend in with the existing Castle Hill Court. Small development and have no detriment to countryside.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roger and Diana Diggins	A small development such as this, outside the existing Conservation area would be in keeping with other small developments already built in the village and so long as properties are of a nature to be affordable, rather than predominantly large detached properties, we are not against such developments. Obviously we wish to protect the character of Clophill as a small, friendly community. Access to the Shefford Road further away from the High Street, although not ideal, is far better than many of the other options proposed.
W. Toony	Will significantly detract from village amenities it will add to congestion.

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
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!
Dr Leon A. Terry	The proposed site acts as a natural punctuation between Clophill Village and rural Clophill and serves as a significant boundary. Part of the site falls outside the existing Village Development Envelope. Such development would be in risk of setting a precedent for further string development in an already elongated village. The proposed site is approx. 1 mile away from the nearest local shop (Post Office) and public house.
Geogina Martin	Further development in this area will increase current traffic congestion.
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	The submission contains a number of errors. The Upper School used by Clophill pupils is Harlington (very difficult to get to by Public Transport) not Shefford. Clophill does have a P.O./store but it is 1 mile away, as are the social centres and good public transport. The site is too far from the hub of Clophill, and will result in many more cars being used through the already congested High Street.
Mrs Joanne Terry	The proposed site acts as a natural punctuation between Clophill Village and rural Clophill and serves as a significant boundary. Part of the site falls outside the existing Village Development Envelope. Such development would be in risk of setting a precedent for further string development in an already elongated village. The proposed site is approx. 1 mile away from the nearest local shop (Post Office) and public house.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	This is a good site, filling a gap between existing built developments. It is somewhat distant (about 1.4km) from local services (shop/P.O., pubs and principal bus services); the bus service past the site runs a mere 6 times a day (no service Sundays). Despite these points, the site is suitable. It is noted that the developer proposes a mix of semi-detached and terraced houses: this is what the community needs, rather than more large detached dwellings. If the District Council is minded to allocate this site, then it should do so on the condition that this mix of dwellings is adhered to. It would be useful if a small number of the units were to be affordable housing. The footway will need extending along the south side of Shefford Road. Please note that there is an error in the supporting information provided for this site: it says that "There is currently no health provision in Silsoe ..." This should, of course, mean Clophill.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H268

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
W. Tocmcy	This site is greenfield should not be sacrificed for housing as will significantly detract from the conurbation also impact on congestion to traffic and services.

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
A Gardner	How would a village the size of Clophill cope with a development of this size. Clophill would become a small town. Access to this site would be a real problem, without links directly into the A road system. Building on or around the Green Sand Ridge is not something that should not be allowed. If continue building on the green belt there will be no green space left between Clophill and Bedford.
Brent Benjamin	Any development here would overlook the village and severely impact on the character of Clophill. No development should be allowed.
Brian Adams	The narrow lanes existing for centuries that knit together Clophill will not take a significant increase in traffic flow without increasing danger to pedestrians and destroying the quality of life. The High Street is the main artery of the village and is already severely congested. The area of the Old Church is one of the most attractive assets of the village and the visual/ recreational attributes would be destroyed if surrounding building is allowed. The development would be some 30 mins round trip walk from the shop/post office and therefore increased car use would create further parking problems around the Green.
Brian and Eileen Martin	Major detrimental impact on countryside and local environment.
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!
David Martin	This site combined with site H269 would increase the current properties by 60% and the current infrastructure would not be able to cope. These fields should return to growing crops.

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales	<p>I have a number of objections to the proposed planning application for this site, which fall into a number of categories.</p> <p>1. Access</p> <p>The only means of access to the proposed plot would be along High Street. High Street already suffers from traffic congestion daily, as a result of two factors: the volume of traffic and roadside parking. I believe that both of these will be aggravated by the building of a housing development on the proposed plot. Due to previous development through the middle of Clophill the volume of traffic along High Street is already much greater than the street was originally designed to accommodate. High Street is a relatively narrow two-lane road, bounded by houses on both sides, in many cases so close to the road itself that there are no pedestrian pavements.</p> <p>If the proposed plot were to be granted permission the volume of traffic will inevitable rise. Whilst there are bus services through the village, the nearest rail link (which will inevitably be used by a high proportion of those looking for housing in High Street) is in Flitwick, which realistically is only accessible by road. The proposed plot lies towards the eastern end of the village, and there is road access running out east along Shefford Road and joining the A507 opposite the Beadlow Manor. However it is unrealistic to suggest that the occupants of these new houses will use this route, when the more convenient route is directly along High Street and onto the A6. In any event it would be impossible to enforce such a route on the occupants of the new houses.</p> <p>In the absence of off-road parking, many people who live along or off High Street park on the road. This restricts the effective width of the road, making it passable to only one car at a time across several stretches. The effect of this is to create queues of traffic in both directions waiting to take their turn to manoeuvre around these obstructions.</p> <p>As stated above, I anticipate that the development of the plot in question will include off-road parking allocations for the houses built on the plot. Even if this is the case, and even if the allocation is generous enough to make the provision for 2 cars per household (which seems unlikely given current planning practice), there is no way of ensuring that the occupants of the new houses will restrict themselves to no more than two cars per household. Many families now house grown-up children, either during the early stages of their working lives or during higher education. In those cases many households have more than two cars. In that case the only other place for the additional cars to park will be along High Street.</p> <p>The result, in my view, will inevitably be that both the volume of traffic along High Street and the roadside parking will increase, leading to ever greater congestion along an already busy road.</p> <p>2. Sewerage</p> <p>The provision for sewerage for the proposed plot would have to be derived from the main sewer line running along High Street. Our sewerage line is connected to this line also, and as our property lies in a</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>similar area to the proposed plot I would suggest that it would be a good point of comparison.</p> <p>Our sewerage needs are very limited, encompassing a small 2 bedroom bungalow and one lavatory provided for the use of our staff during their working hours. The sewerage provision is inadequate even for such low level of usage. We are forced to employ a sewerage pump (as our land lies downhill from the main sewer line, as will the houses to be built on the proposed plot) but this is prone to breakdowns and in any even still results in our sewer lines blocking or backing up.</p> <p>If permission is granted to the proposed plot any houses on that site will inevitably suffer the same problems. My understanding is that the problem lies not with the connecting pipes from the house but rather with the main sewer line running along High Street, which is simply inadequate to cope with the quantity of sewage with which it is required to cope. To remedy this situation major work would be required along High Street, causing untold disruption. I do not believe that it would be feasible to carry out such remedial work, meaning that the houses built on this plot were it to be granted permission, would suffer from the same problems we do.</p> <p>3. Increased risk of flooding</p> <p>Any development of the proposed plot will affect the area susceptible to flooding, not just the area officially designated 'flood plain' area found to the south towards the river. This is due to two factors.</p> <p>Building on land decreases its ability to absorb rainfall. This is due to the greater area of flat and solid surface (road surfaces, pavement areas, roof surfaces, patio surfaces etc) compared to the porous undeveloped areas it replaces (in this case areas covered with grass and trees). This will substantially increase the amount of rainwater running off this land, whilst at the same time reducing the area of undeveloped land to break up and reabsorb this run-off.</p> <p>The only direction for this run-off water to flow is south – this will inevitably be along Old Church Lane, downhill to High Street and from there on towards the river. This will result in the run-off rainwater running through the land owned by those who live south of High street, causing increased problems with flooding over their land. In addition, as stated above, the run-off rainwater will run towards the river where it will meet an area already designated as flood plain, increasing the risk of flooding not only on that area but also on any adjacent land.</p> <p>It is worth mentioning at this stage that Old Church Lane already suffers from flooding due to run-off rainwater whenever there is any noticeable rainfall.</p> <p>The area around Clophill has an extremely unstable water table – it has been demonstrated more than once in recent times that development work in the village can affect the water table itself and result in greater risk of flooding. Development on the Fuller's Earth pits and recent development along the Causeway have both demonstrated this problem in recent years.</p> <p>If the proposed plot is granted planning permission then the risk of flooding will increase dramatically. The greater quantity of run-off rainwater draining south towards the river will almost certainly increase the incidents of flooding well above (i.e. north) of the designated flood plain. If the same problems are encountered as occurred during the</p>

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>development of the Fuller's Earth pits this will become even more problematic, and may call for a reconsideration of the extent of the flood plain area itself.</p> <p>4. Lack of amenities</p> <p>Clophill itself is a small village, albeit that it is growing and has been identified as a large village in the emerging core strategy. The village has no medical facilities of any kind – all residents are forced to register with general practitioners in Maulden, Ampthill or Flitwick. There are a few businesses in the area to provide employment for the occupants of the village.</p> <p>The application is for the plot to be developed for housing only. Clearly the plot itself would not be suitable for any other form of use, given the increased demand this would place on access, amenities and sewerage this would create (see above). The development of this plot will not provide any relief for the lack of medical facilities or create any local opportunities for employment.</p> <p>Given that there are other sites proposed which are put forward for mixed use which would both provide the housing required by the emerging core strategy and facilitate the creation of other amenities to provide both medical care and employment, and given that at least two of the sites (number H032 and H039) would do so without putting additional pressure on the traffic and sewerage problems inherent along High Street, I would suggest that the development of the proposed site is not in the best interests of the village.</p>
Derek Mellor	<p>Traffic would exit onto Great Lane. Southern 600 yards of Gt Lane is narrow, unstraight and has no footpath. Traffic is already a problem. This scale of development would make the traffic problem impossible. Any development here, large or small, would be intrusive to the countryside, visually and with respect to the rural environment.</p>
Dr Leon A. Terry	<p>The proposed site is on agricultural grazing land and is not adjacent to any other dwellings. It is outside The Village Development Envelope and is in an area of outstanding beauty with views of the unspoilt rolling landscape and the Old St. Marys Church.</p> <p>The site is isolated and currently acts as a natural divide between Clophill Village and rural Clophill. Such development would be in risk of setting a precedent for further string development in an already elongated village, leading to a domino effect as other residences along Shefford Road have substantial land. Access via the single dirt track (without pavement) of Old Church Path is totally inadequate for such a sizeable development. The proposed site is 1 mile away from the nearest local shop (Post Office) and public house. Such a significant development is clearly unsuitable for the infrastructure of a small village.</p> <p>The site is prone to flooding; most recently on the 16th and 27th March (photographic evidence available on request). On both occasions the proposed site was under several centimetres of water and remained so for over 24 hours. Clearly, given predicted future climactic uncertainty, the proposed site is unsuitable.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Dr Roger Christopher	H268 (with or without H269) would create a village within the Clophill village - or actually a village on the outskirts of the existing village. It is far too large and would overwhelm Clophill, and destroy a large area of open rolling countryside. Access via Great Lane would be unsustainable as the lane is narrow, winding and has no footpaths (or room for them) at several points. There is insufficient room for cars to pass without stopping or slowing and pulling over.
Elizabeth Hentian	Completely off scale and unsuitable site in all respects.
F Wood	These two sites are well outside the village settlement and do not boarder any development boundary. H268 Great lane access is too narrow. H269 access would be over the partially private single track (un-tarmacked) this is the green sandridge walkway.
Geogina Martin	No good access from anywhere but great lane and this is too narrow to accommodate it. It is outside the village envelope and building what is requested here could put huge stresses on current roads and schools.
Gillian Wolfenden	The proposed development is far too big.
Jayne Hunt	Great Lane is not suitable for a huge development on this scale. Clophill does not have the infrastructure to cope with such a large development. Even a smaller scale development could be problematic with additional traffic on Great Lane which has no pavement and is not safe for pedestrians already. There are better sites proposed within Clophill.
K Breed	This is a huge greenfield site around which many footpaths are enjoyed by residents specifically because they are in unspoilt surroundings. Development of this site is completely out of keeping with the spirit of any village & that of preserving British countryside & wildlife. Access is along single-track roads & 'improvements' would ruin community spirit. There are better-suited, smaller sites in & around Clophill where development may take place without forcing village residents to become town ones. The appeal of Clophill would be much diminished should it double in population. Obviously large, virgin greenfield sites are preferred by developers due to fewer building requirements (E.g. they do not have to analyse soil as with brown field sites) the promise of high returns on "luxury houses in a country setting" & high density can be achieved in areas with no existing structures to plan around or remain in keeping with. The council must protect small communities from these opportunists.
Kim Williams	Roads around the site are far too narrow to accommodate the increase traffic which would result from a development on the site.
Laura Johnson	This would be far too much impact on the environment. The site proposed is all most as big ad Clophill itself. The danger to the countryside would be enormous.
M Sutton	Far too large development. Would destroy the local landscape

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	<p>This site is far too large for the size of Clophill and is well outside the established built-up part of the village. Great Lane is a narrow road without a footway and could not take the additional traffic; even pedestrian use of this lane is hazardous. The site is not served by public transport and is unlikely to be in the future. Note that the site is currently experiencing natural regeneration of beech, oak and wild rose species: if this were permitted to continue the result would in time be a valuable addition to the woodland resource at no public cost! A proposal has been submitted to the County Council for the diagonal path across this site to be added to the Definitive Map. Please note that there is an error in the supporting information provided for this site: it says that "There is currently no health provision in Silsoe ..." This should, of course, mean Clophill.</p>
Mr & Mrs M Everitt	<p>Proposed development is too large and will spoil the present environment of the village and could lead to further future infill and merging with other listed development areas.</p> <p>Also local infrastructure including roads, water, sewage and other services together with the need to provide other essential services, e.g. Doctor surgeries, schooling and community centres would require major consideration prior to any such development.</p>
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	<p>The massive development envisaged would create a blot on the landscape, and not improve the views to the old church. The applicant has Flitwick station as 3 miles away, it is 6. Good public transport is from the A6, 1 mile away, as is the village shop and P.O. and the social centres of the village.</p> <p>This proposed development would increase the number of cars by 200+, causing major traffic problems. The village would not gain any new facilities but just cause a large extension into the countryside.</p>
Mrs Anne Christopher	<p>H268 (esp. with H269) is too big and would overwhelm Clophill. Proposed access via Great Lane is totally unsuitable for heavy construction vehicles and the likely increased volume of traffic. Gt Lane leading to High Street is narrow, winding road edges are soft verges/banks; there are no footpaths nor room for any. In many places two cars cannot pass without stopping or slowing down and pulling over. There is a problem with parking/congestion at the High Street junction at school starting/leaving times. The High Street itself is already a problem without more traffic: with existing roadside parking, it is often impossible for two cars to pass without one pulling in.</p> <p>H268 would be detrimental to the local environment and countryside - a large area of open, green, rolling fields and pasture with views to the Greensand Ridge and Old Church would disappear. The public footpath adjoining the site to the north is part of the scenic Greensand Ridge Walk and would also be adversely affected.</p>
Mrs C. Mathieson	<p>Would spoil nature of Clophill as a village.</p> <p>An area of natural beauty for leisure activity.</p> <p>No suitable access.</p> <p>Insufficient services to support this proposal.</p>
Mrs J Breed	<p>Completely inappropriate use of virgin land spoiling rural landscape and this development would swamp local community.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Joanne Terry	The proposed site is on agricultural grazing land and is not situated near to any other dwellings. It is outside The Village Development Envelope and is in an area of outstanding beauty with views of the unspoilt rolling landscape, wooded areas and the old St. Marys Church. Access via the single track (without pavement) of Great Lane is totally inadequate for such a sizeable development. The site is $\frac{3}{4}$ mile away from the nearest local shop (Post Office) and public house. Such a significant development is clearly unsuitable for the infrastructure of a small village
Mrs S Ratcliffe	It would be utterly ridiculous to build on this site the access is from a narrow lane, the amount of cars generated from a site such as this would dramatically effect its rural location. The local school and amenities would be unable to cope and the village in which I love to live would become a town and loose its identity. The site is situated within open countryside and it would be criminal to destroy natural wildlife and its habitat.
Mrs Susan Samm	To put a large scale development in Clophill would be criminal, Clophill is a lovely village - not town and the main road can not take any more traffic. Just no please!!!!
R Munday	Great Lane already has sever traffic congestion problems at the junction with High Street, especially during school term when children are arriving at St Marys School at the same time as commuters are leaving for work. Mothers are obliged to park in Great Lane, near the junction with Little Lane and High Street and on both sides of High Street. Additional traffic from this proposed development would aggravate the problem and unacceptably increase the danger to children. This is rural greenbelt well outside of the envelope of the village and a favourite area for ramblers and walkers for many years.
R. J. Patmore	both sides are not appropriate for up to 400 dwellings with access via single track by roads. a development on either site would greatly impact on the rural surroundings including the network of footpaths that would be swamped. There are limited options to improve road access to either site, a much smaller development on H268 site would be possible but not 180 homes.
Roger and Diana Diggins	An area of natural beauty near the Greensands Ridge - unspoilt countryside. It would devastate the area and the character of the village. It would also overload existing facilities and the road infrastructure. Access from Great Lane to the High Street is already dangerous at peak times. Providing services - gas, electricity, sewerage etc would cause further damage to the environment and be very costly.
Ms Tina Keech	Church Path, as the name suggests, is a very small and narrow gravel road which leads up to the old church ruin. Wholly unsuitable for any more traffic to use it as does at present and therefore no access is available to the site.
	Great Lane is unable to cope with the amount of traffic that such a development would create.
turner	This development is not appropriate for the village of Clophill. It affects the Greensand Ridge Footpath and the setting of a listed building. The Old Church at Clophill is one of the Greensand churches typically set on the ridge above and outside the village proper. Along with Maulden and Millbrook churches it is a striking example of our heritage and its character and setting should be preserved for future generations.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H269

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
W. Toony	Housing on this site will significantly detract from the village attributes and cause congestion.

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
A Gardner	How would a village the size of Clophill cope with a development of this size. Clophill would become a small town. Access to this site would be a real problem, without links directly into the A road system. Building on or around the Green Sand Ridge is not something that should not be allowed. If continue building on the green belt there will be no green space left between Clophill and Bedford.
Bradshaw	this is absolutely not a site for development, it has no reasonable access, it eats into the rural and tranquil countryside. The access routes are both highly inappropriate and the negative impact on enlarging to such an extent outside central village (down single track/no pathway roads) would be entirely detrimental. Outside the VDL and would create a sprawling effect.
Brent Benjamin	No development should be allowed here as it would overlook the village and severely impact on its character.
Brian Adams	The narrow lanes existing for centuries that knit together Clophill will not take a significant increase in traffic flow without increasing danger to pedestrians and destroying the quality of life. The High Street is the main artery of the village and is already severely congested. The area of the Old Church is one of the most attractive assets of the village and the visual/ recreational attributes would be destroyed if surrounding building is allowed. The development would be some 30 mins round trip walk from the shop/post office and therefore increased car use would create further parking problems around the Green.
Brian and Eileen Martin	Major detrimental impact on countryside and local environment.
Carolina Giles	There is already too much traffic in Clophill and no more room for development. This is a village with very little services which can't support more houses.
Craig Mainprize	As a quiet village - any development on this scale will remove the identity of this ancient site. The village roads do not have the capacity for increased traffic and the increase of vehicles would surely impact the already fraught school times! No! No! No!

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales	<p>I have a number of objections to the proposed planning application for this site, which fall into a number of categories.</p> <p>1. Access</p> <p>The only means of access to the proposed plot would be along High Street. High Street already suffers from traffic congestion daily, as a result of two factors: the volume of traffic and roadside parking. I believe that both of these will be aggravated by the building of a housing development on the proposed plot. Due to previous development through the middle of Clophill the volume of traffic along High Street is already much greater than the street was originally designed to accommodate. High Street is a relatively narrow two-lane road, bounded by houses on both sides, in many cases so close to the road itself that there are no pedestrian pavements.</p> <p>If the proposed plot were to be granted permission the volume of traffic will inevitable rise. Whilst there are bus services through the village, the nearest rail link (which will inevitably be used by a high proportion of those looking for housing in High Street) is in Flitwick, which realistically is only accessible by road. The proposed plot lies towards the eastern end of the village, and there is road access running out east along Shefford Road and joining the A507 opposite the Beadlow Manor. However it is unrealistic to suggest that the occupants of these new houses will use this route, when the more convenient route is directly along High Street and onto the A6. In any event it would be impossible to enforce such a route on the occupants of the new houses.</p> <p>In the absence of off-road parking, many people who live along or off High Street park on the road. This restricts the effective width of the road, making it passable to only one car at a time across several stretches. The effect of this is to create queues of traffic in both directions waiting to take their turn to manoeuvre around these obstructions.</p> <p>As stated above, I anticipate that the development of the plot in question will include off-road parking allocations for the houses built on the plot. Even if this is the case, and even if the allocation is generous enough to make the provision for 2 cars per household (which seems unlikely given current planning practice), there is no way of ensuring that the occupants of the new houses will restrict themselves to no more than two cars per household. Many families now house grown-up children, either during the early stages of their working lives or during higher education. In those cases many households have more than two cars. In that case the only other place for the additional cars to park will be along High Street.</p> <p>The result, in my view, will inevitably be that both the volume of traffic along High Street and the roadside parking will increase, leading to ever greater congestion along an already busy road.</p> <p>2. Sewerage</p> <p>The provision for sewerage for the proposed plot would have to be derived from the main sewer line running along High Street. Our sewerage line is connected to this line also, and as our property lies in a</p>

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>similar area to the proposed plot I would suggest that it would be a good point of comparison.</p> <p>Our sewerage needs are very limited, encompassing a small 2 bedroom bungalow and one lavatory provided for the use of our staff during their working hours. The sewerage provision is inadequate even for such low level of usage. We are forced to employ a sewerage pump (as our land lies downhill from the main sewer line, as will the houses to be built on the proposed plot) but this is prone to breakdowns and in any even still results in our sewer lines blocking or backing up.</p> <p>If permission is granted to the proposed plot any houses on that site will inevitably suffer the same problems. My understanding is that the problem lies not with the connecting pipes from the house but rather with the main sewer line running along High Street, which is simply inadequate to cope with the quantity of sewage with which it is required to cope. To remedy this situation major work would be required along High Street, causing untold disruption. I do not believe that it would be feasible to carry out such remedial work, meaning that the houses built on this plot were it to be granted permission, would suffer from the same problems we do.</p> <p>3. Increased risk of flooding</p> <p>Any development of the proposed plot will affect the area susceptible to flooding, not just the area officially designated 'flood plain' area found to the south towards the river. This is due to two factors.</p> <p>Building on land decreases its ability to absorb rainfall. This is due to the greater area of flat and solid surface (road surfaces, pavement areas, roof surfaces, patio surfaces etc) compared to the porous undeveloped areas it replaces (in this case areas covered with grass and trees). This will substantially increase the amount of rainwater running off this land, whilst at the same time reducing the area of undeveloped land to break up and reabsorb this run-off.</p> <p>The only direction for this run-off water to flow is south – this will inevitably be along Old Church Lane, downhill to High Street and from there on towards the river. This will result in the run-off rainwater running through the land owned by those who live south of High street, causing increased problems with flooding over their land. In addition, as stated above, the run-off rainwater will run towards the river where it will meet an area already designated as flood plain, increasing the risk of flooding not only on that area but also on any adjacent land.</p> <p>It is worth mentioning at this stage that Old Church Lane already suffers from flooding due to run-off rainwater whenever there is any noticeable rainfall.</p> <p>The area around Clophill has an extremely unstable water table – it has been demonstrated more than once in recent times that development work in the village can affect the water table itself and result in greater risk of flooding. Development on the Fuller's Earth pits and recent development along the Causeway have both demonstrated this problem in recent years.</p> <p>If the proposed plot is granted planning permission then the risk of flooding will increase dramatically. The greater quantity of run-off rainwater draining south towards the river will almost certainly increase the incidents of flooding well above (i.e. north) of the designated flood plain. If the same problems are encountered as occurred during the</p>

Submitted by	Comments
David Wales [continued]	<p>development of the Fuller's Earth pits this will become even more problematic, and may call for a reconsideration of the extent of the flood plain area itself.</p> <p>4. Lack of amenities</p> <p>Clophill itself is a small village, albeit that it is growing and has been identified as a large village in the emerging core strategy. The village has no medical facilities of any kind – all residents are forced to register with general practitioners in Maulden, Ampthill or Flitwick. There are a few businesses in the area to provide employment for the occupants of the village.</p> <p>The application is for the plot to be developed for housing only. Clearly the plot itself would not be suitable for any other form of use, given the increased demand this would place on access, amenities and sewerage this would create (see above). The development of this plot will not provide any relief for the lack of medical facilities or create any local opportunities for employment.</p> <p>Given that there are other sites proposed which are put forward for mixed use which would both provide the housing required by the emerging core strategy and facilitate the creation of other amenities to provide both medical care and employment, and given that at least two of the sites (number H032 and H039) would do so without putting additional pressure on the traffic and sewerage problems inherent along High Street, I would suggest that the development of the proposed site is not in the best interests of the village.</p>
Derek Mellor	<p>Traffic would exit onto Great Lane. Southern 600 yards of Gt Lane is narrow, unstraight and has no footpath. Traffic is already a problem. This scale of development would make the traffic problem impossible. Any development here, large or small, would be intrusive to the countryside, visually and with respect to the rural environment.</p>
Dr Leon A. Terry	<p>The proposed site is on agricultural grazing land and is not situated near to any other dwellings. It is outside The Village Development Envelope and is in an area of outstanding beauty with views of the unspoilt rolling landscape, wooded areas and the Old St. Marys Church. Access via the single dirt track (without pavement) of Old Church Path is totally inadequate for such a sizeable development. The site is $\frac{3}{4}$ mile away from the nearest local shop (Post Office) and public house. Such a significant development is clearly unsuitable for the infrastructure of a small village.</p>
Dr Roger Christopher	<p>H269 (with or without H268) would create a village within the Clophill village - or actually a village on the outskirts of the existing village. It is far too large and would overwhelm Clophill, and destroy a large area of countryside. Access via Old Church Path is impractical because of the narrowness of the road. The alternative access via Great Lane would be unsustainable as the lane is narrow, winding and has no footpaths (or room for them) at several points. There is insufficient room for cars to pass without stopping or slowing and pulling over.</p>
Elizabeth Hentian	<p>Completely off scale and unsuitable site in all respects.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Geogina Martin	No good existing access except through hold church path which is an ancient footpath, not road. Development of this land would put undue stress on current infrastructure, roads, schools etc. It is outside the village development envelope.
Gillian Wolfenden	Again, this is far too big for the village.
Jayne Hunt	Clophill could not sustain a development of this scale and size and it would not be in keeping with the village. I beleive that this site is not suitable for any development as church path, the access road cannot cope with additional traffic and residents of church path and this proposed site will (and do) have problems with people driving to the old church.
K Breed	<p>This is a huge greenfield site around which many footpaths are enjoyed by residents specifically because they are in unspoilt surroundings. Development of this site is completely out of keeping with the spirit of any village & that of preserving British countryside & wildlife. Access is along single-track roads & 'improvements' would ruin community spirit. There are better-suited, smaller sites in & around Clophill where development may take place without forcing village residents to become town ones. The appeal of Clophill would be much diminished should it double in population.</p> <p>Obviously large, virgin greenfield sites are preferred by developers due to fewer building requirements (E.g. they do not have to analyse soil as with brown field sites) the promise of high returns on "luxury houses in a country setting" & high density can be achieved in areas with no existing structures to plan around or remain in keeping with. The council must protect small communities from these opportunists.</p>
Kim Williams	Roads around this site are far too narrow to accommodate increased traffic which results from a development on the site.
Laura Johnson	This would be far too much impact on the environment. The site proposed is all most as big ad Clophill itself. The danger to the countryside would be enormous.
M Sutton	Far too large development. Would destroy part of the local landscape.
Michael Brooks	This site is far too large for the size of Clophill. It is well outside the established built-up part of the village and nearly 1.5km distant from the shop and pubs. If Great Lane is to be used as the access via site H268, it is a narrow road without a footway and could not take the additional traffic; even pedestrian use of this lane is hazardous. If Old Church Path is to be used as the access, then it would need substantial upgrading as it is currently an unmetalled track with no segregated footway. The site cannot currently be served by public transport as there is no road access and is unlikely to be served in the future even if a new road were provided. Please note that there is an error in the supporting information provided for this site: it says that "There is currently no health provision in Silsoe ..." This should, of course, mean Clophill.
Mr & Mrs M Everitt	This proposed development is too large and out of character with the existing village environment. The suggested number of dwellings will have a major impact on the current infrastructure and hence require considerable upgrading of all necessary services and amenities to support such a significant increase in housing.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	Development here, particularly for 207 houses, would have a serious impact on the views to the old church from the south. The access to the site is not good enough for any building. The applicant claims Flitwick station to be 3 miles away whereas it is double that. Good public transport is from the A6 a good 20 minute walk away, as is the village shop and P.O., and the social centres of the village. This site would not contribute anything positive to the village. 207 houses would mean at least 220 extra cars using the narrow Clophill roads which are already congested.
Mr D Martin	Coupled with H265 this would increase the number of properties by 60% the infrastructure would not be able to cope.
Mrs C Mathieson	This quantity of housing would spoil the nature of Clophill as a village i) It would spoil the environment close to the village hall & sports field ii) No suitable access iii) Insufficient services to support this proposal.
Mrs J Breed	Completely inappropriate use of virgin land spoiling rural landscape + this development would swamp local community.
Mrs Joanne Terry	The proposed site is on agricultural grazing land and is not situated near to any other dwellings. It is outside The Village Development Envelope and is in an area of outstanding beauty with views of the unspoilt rolling landscape, wooded areas and the Old St. Marys Church. Access via the single dirt track (without pavement) of Old Church Path is totally inadequate for such a sizeable development. The site is ¾ mile away from the nearest local shop (Post Office) and public house. Such a significant development is clearly unsuitable for the infrastructure of a small village.
Roger and Diana Diggins	An area of natural beauty near the Greensands Ridge - unspoilt countryside. It would devastate the area and the character of the village. It would also overload existing facilities and the road infrastructure. Access from Great Lane to the High Street is already dangerous at peak times. Providing services - gas, electricity, sewerage etc would cause further damage to the environment and be very costly.
Turner	This development is not appropriate for the village of Clophill. It affects the Greensand Ridge Footpath and the setting of a listed building. The Old Church at Clophill is one of the Greensand churches typically set on the ridge above and outside the village proper. Along with Maulden and Millbrook churches it is a striking example of our heritage and its character and setting should be preserved for future generations.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H271

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
G. M. Wolfenden	The lower number of houses would be acceptable.
Jayne Hunt	A small scale development could be made here. The footpath would need to be extended so that residents could walk into the village. Housing should be provided which is affordable. I think that Clophill has potential to provide a maximum of 20 homes (which is probably a fair share) and there are a few sites which could be used to provide this rather than concentrating all the new homes in one big area. This would have less impact environmentally and socially.
K Breed	A small number of residential dwellings where parking is provided on site would be acceptable (assume 2 cars per dwelling). The construction of dwellings should only be on the understanding (in binding legislation if necessary) that the Village envelope will not be extended to incorporate them as this would provide opportunity for claims that further building is simply infill & result in progressive development of greenfield land in a village that already struggles to retain its small community feel & cope with rising traffic volumes.

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
J. Collins	This site would have good access from the existing Shefford Road.
K. Collins	There would be good access to this site from the existing Shefford Road.
Roger and Diana Diggins	Further to previous comments we are not against small developments of this nature in principle but we would like them to be built sympathetically in keeping with the character of Clophill and would prefer to see affordable housing built. If at all possible it would be best if it were ring fenced for young people who wish to remain in the village but are being priced out of the market. Access would not add too much to the congestion already experienced with a small development of this nature and certainly it looks to be close enough to the school for access by foot.
W. Toony	Will significantly detract from village amenities.

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
Bradshaw	Create a sprawling effect to village, comes out on brow of a hill and outside 30 mph restriction.
Brian and Eileen Martin	Detrimental to view of historic building (old church) and open countryside. Good agricultural land which should be retained to make good future food shortages.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Carolina Giles	Development of this site will start 'infill' between Clophill and Beadlow. There is enough traffic on the roads of Clophill already - we don't need more. This site is prone to flooding, photographic proof available!
Craig Mainprize	This site is an open countryside - it floods when it rains - pictures such as the A6 quarry's that must take precedence over removing our countryside!!! This allocation is small - why not develop single areas in order to guarantee to get the infrastructure correct and minimize the impact on our environment?? Sensible I think.
Geogina Martin	Although it make look like the householders cars would not have a huge impact on the surrounding area, at very busy times driving through Clophill is like an obstacle course further traffic would just add to the problem.
M Sutton	Would totally destroy Clophill as a village. This is an important part of the countryside and views would be destroyed.
Michael Brooks	This site is separated from the built-up part of the settlement by one field and is at the opposite end of the village (>1.5km) from the local services (shop/P.O., pubs and principal bus services). The only bus service that passes the site runs a mere 6 times a day (no service on Sundays). Egress from the site would be on the inside of a bend in Shefford Road. If the District Council were minded to recommend this site, then it should be a maximum of two units only, fronting Shefford Road, without the development going deeper into the site, away from the road.
Mr and Mrs K Sampson	The site is a 20 minute walk from good facilities i.e. good public transport, the village shop and P.O., and the social centres of the village. It is positioned to encourage infilling alongside it, further increasing the east end of the village without adding any facilities.
Mr D Martin	This land should remain for agriculture use only.
Mr Martin	This is agricultural land supporting a vast range of wildlife and in our view it is not suitable for residential development. There are adders and lizards around this area some of which may come under the protected species.
Mrs Joanne Terry	The proposed site is situated on a small gap of undeveloped countryside between Clophill village and 'rural Clophill'. It is an area of outstanding beauty with panoramic views of rolling hills and the historic site of old St. Mary's Church. It is highly important, in my belief, that this vital 'pocket' of open space is retained in order to prevent the erosion of the village's identity. This proposed site should be considered 'sensitive'; any development here would be in risk of setting a precedent for further ribbon development and in-filling along Shefford Road. This point should be carefully pondered, in view of the significant land-base situated near to the proximity of the site. In addition, the site is over 1 mile from any local amenities. Furthermore, the site is prone to flooding; most recently on the 16th and 27th March. On both occasions the site was waterlogged for a sustained period of time, thus making it highly unsuitable for development.
Turner	I do not support this development outside the village. It would further obscure the views of the countryside to the north of the road including the views of the Old Church, a listed building.

Ref Number: H316

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
Dr Leon Terry	The site is inappropriate due to poor access. Little Lane, as its name suggests, is single track without passing areas and without a footpath. There is not enough space to build a new footpath. The proposed area is one of the last intact meadows outside main Clophill Village and should be preserved.
Miss Kim Williams	Little Lane is too narrow to accommodate additional housing and traffic, even if widened it would impact on the houses already in Little Lane as gardens would have to be removed. If Little Lane is widened to accommodate these dwellings then the end of Great Lane would have to be widened which could possibly involve demolishing existing properties. Any development of The Field, Little Lane, Clophill would NOT preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. The junction of Little Lane with Great Lane is hazardous and cannot support increased traffic. There is also a public right of way across the centre of the field.
Mr Michael Brooks	This site can only be accessed from the very narrow Little Lane, which has steep banks beyond the existing dwellings. This bank would have to be cut into severely in order to provide access, and this would be unsightly and out-of-keeping with the surroundings. A public footpath crosses the site, forming part of a pleasant circular walk for residents, and the views from the top of the hill on this path are remarkable. Little Lane has the potential to be classified as a Quiet Lane under DfT criteria. This site should be rejected.
Mr Peter Patmore	The site is on a tiny single track lane with few passing points. It has a useful public footpath across the site as a useful non-road access to public recreation ground and village hall. If the development needs to widen the lane and provide a footpath, this will ruin a rural part of the village. I dont think this will be worth the gain of 5 houses.

Ref Number: H353

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
Mr Michael Brooks	Use of this site would represent backland development, somewhat isolated from the main built form of the village. If there were to be development here, it should be only a few dwellings and with access from Town Shott, not Great Lane. Perhaps agreement could be reached to provide a footpath across the rear of the site linking Great Lane with Old Church Path.
Mrs Caron Bradshaw	Provided the access to this was on to the high street - possibly by going past the property to which the land is attached and exiting on the high street this could work. However going through town shott or great lane would be inappropriate. This also could not be developed without impacting negatively on the character of the village and would lead to the development further back and towards Haynes of the fields. That would completely undermine the character of village.