

## EYEWORTH 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.

**EYEWORTH APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

**Ref Number: H343**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs Adam & Emma Gibbons	Eyeworth has no employment and no schools or care facilities - all of these are located miles outside of the village. We have no sewers or mains gas supplies and very little public transport. The proposed development is on a very narrow country lane which will cause many problems both during construction and on completion of additional houses.
Mr Andrew Bird	Eyeworth is a very small hamlet with very little near by. Anyone living here must own a car and Sutton Road is already too busy, I feel this would only add to this problem. I also think this wouldn't be a very suitable site for affordable dwellings as it is very expensive to live here and defeats the idea of this type of build.
Mr Kevin Lander	Eyeworth is a small hamlet community with no real facilities, which is part of its charm. The proposal amounts to infill, which will impact on the high water table. This, when allowed in the past, has had a detrimental effect on existing houses, which has often caused extra expense to those involved. There is no new employment in the area. There are no new social facilities which could warrant expansion.
Mr Richard John Lenton	Do not see where both developments will be of any benefit to the village (only financial gain to the landowner) as there are no play facilities for children, street lighting on the main road or local amenities.
Mr Terence Willis	This is a local known "high" water plain area. Klargester/cespit/sewer floods after consistent rainfall. Man holes fill completely with water; it takes sometimes weeks for it to soak away. I believe if this area is built upon this then adds further to our water disposal problem. Accepting the new properties, water will soak into a nearby ditch but that will do nothing for existing properties.

**Ref Number: H344**

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

<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Mr Kevin Lander	There have been no new facilities to attract new residence. There has been no new industry to the area to attract new residents. Sutton road is an unclassified road and if this proposal was granted it would add to the danger in the area.
Mr Richard John Lenton	Do not see where both developments will be of any benefit to the village (only financial gain to the landowner) as there are no play facilities for children, street lighting on the main road or local amenities.

**EYEWORTH APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	H322, Highridge, Woodend Road Cranfield	Cranfield Footpath No 22 runs from the High Street, along the NE boundary of the proposed site, and then around the northern end of the runway. If this site is developed, this public right of way should remain intact.
Keith Buck	Cranfield	I feel very strongly about this matter being a resident in the village. We have a major infrastructure issue in Cranfield particularly with traffic and schools. The traffic flow through the village is terrible and will not improve until the A421 duelling gets the go ahead. We cannot keep letting housing development happen and not think about the wider picture of traffic in conjunction with Highways - not simply looking at Cranfield but the impact of all other developments around Cranfield and the expansion of Milton Keynes. We MUST do something to reduce the volume of traffic through the village as of TODAY and not allow any more houses to contribute to this - we will have village standstill in a few years. The schools in the village are also at capacity. We have developer contributions from Home Farm to do something about this and possibly build a new lower school. We cannot let further development come along and ruin this plan or go through a second phase of school expansion. In addition we already have some infill developments likely to happen i.e. Cranfield Motors - these must contribute to your housing allocation (i.e. 50-250 in number) - we get limited developer contributions from such infill developments and suffer from additional housing creep in this way. We are also seeing major expansion at Cranfield University which causes more infrastructure pressure on the village and surrounding roads. The fact the University have put in an allocation on the airfield site is ridiculous - this has already been rejected and consulted with the secretary of state who rejected this site for Home Farm - throw this out straight away. I will be talking to the Parish Council and getting them to respond on this matter also. If you would like to stand on the high street in the morning with someone from Highways then be my guest - you will see the direct extent of the traffic problem which is contributing to poor road safety and pollution.
Elinor Ashby	Cranfield	See Appendix Three.
Rosie Davey-Hunt	Cranfield	See Appendix Three.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Name	Subject	Comment
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	H344 Land at High Street Eyeworth	FP2 runs parallel to and to the north of the proposed site. No objection.

**EYEWORTH APPENDIX THREE**  
Letters and Reports

<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Subject</b>
The Rambler's Association	Various sites
Mr & Mrs Gibbons	H343 Eyeworth



Groups:  
North Beds Saturday Ramblers  
Ivel Valley • Lea & Icknield  
Leighton Buzzard • Ouse Valley

**BY EMAIL**

Your ref:

Dear Ms Cowley

**Site allocations DPD: Second Issues and Options Consultation**

Thank you for your letter postmarked 27 June 2008 inviting the Ramblers' Association to comment on this consultation. On behalf of the Ramblers' Association, I am responding specifically on potential development sites that may affect Public Rights of Way and/of permissive paths. Comments are provided on an individual site basis and are sequenced according to parish. At the end, there are comments on site documentation.

To aid conciseness, 'FP' and 'BW' are used in some cases as abbreviations for 'Footpath' and 'Bridleway' respectively in references to public path numbers.

Yours sincerely

Roger Chick  
On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association

Cc Siobhan Vincent, Rights of Way Officer, MBDC  
Chris Meadows, Chairman, Beds Area FP Committee, Ramblers' Association (email)  
David Binns, Beds Area FP Committee, Ramblers' Association (email)

## MBDC Site allocations DPD: Second Issues and Options Consultation Ramblers' Association comments

### Ampthill

- **H363 Land off Swaffield Close**

This potential site is crossed by public right of way Ampthill FP11, part of the Greensand Ridge Walk route. It is most important that this footpath access to Ampthill Park is maintained unchanged. In particular, the existing hedges comprise many different species and offer character and variety along the length of the path. The hedges will need to be maintained at the present 2-3 metres height in order to provide a screen against any residential development. Any proposal to substantially alter the character of this path would be opposed by the Ramblers' Association.

### Arlesey

- **E12a Land at Chase Farm**

Arlesey FP1 touches the southern boundary of the site. Tree screening along the southern boundary of any factory or similar buildings would help reduce visual impact to footpath users.

### Biggleswade

- **H347 Land at Potton Road – Strong Objection**

This potential site is bounded along the west side by Biggleswade BW9 and along the north side by FP12. These are much-used rural paths connecting to Biggleswade Common, Sandy, and to the path network. Development of this site is undesirable as it would result in creeping urbanisation and extension of the settlement envelope north of Biggleswade. This would further encroach on the existing path network.

The proposed development would result in additional traffic to/from the town centre and to/from the A1. This would exacerbate the existing congestion in Potton Road, St John Street, and at the junction of Sun Street with Shortmead Street. This congestion can be expected to worsen with the 95 dwelling development already planned for the area south of Potton Road. This site is unsuitable for development. We strongly object to this site and request that it is rejected and excluded from further consideration.

- **H366 Land at Furzenhall Road/Potton Road – Strong Objection**

This potential site is crossed diagonally by Biggleswade FP10 and bounded along the northern edges by FP14, FP10, and BW9. These are much-used rural paths connecting to Biggleswade Common, Sandy, and to the path network. Development of this site is undesirable as it would result in creeping urbanisation and extension of the settlement envelope north of Biggleswade. This would further encroach on the existing path network.

Development of this site would be totally inappropriate. It would result in a significant increase in traffic to/from the town centre and to/from the A1 that would overload the existing road infrastructure causing severe congestion in particular in Potton Road, St John Street, and at the junction of Sun Street with Shortmead Street. We strongly object to this site and request that it is rejected and excluded from further consideration.

### Clophill

- **H316 The Field, Little Lane – Objection**

Clophill Footpath No 4 crosses the site diagonally from the southeast corner of the site in Little Lane. The proposed development would adversely affect this popular footpath, which would require diversion. The section of Little Lane along the proposed site is only single car width, has high banks, and is not suitable for the proposed development. Additional traffic arising from the development would conflict with the safety of pedestrians using the lane, including those accessing the footpath. The suggestion of widening the lane and adding a footway

## MBDC Site allocations DPD: Second Issues and Options Consultation Ramblers' Association comments

would adversely affect the pleasant nature of the lane and the environment. The proposed development is inappropriate. We object to this proposed site.

### Cranfield

- **H322 Highridge, Woodend Road**

Cranfield Footpath No 22 runs from the High Street, along the NE boundary of the proposed site, and then around the northern end of the runway. If this site is developed, this public right of way should remain intact.

### Eyeworth

- **H344 Land at High Street**

Eyeworth FP2 runs parallel to and to the north of the proposed site. No objection.

### Harlington

- **H329 Land South of Pilgrims Close – Objection**

Harlington FP22 crosses the NW part of the site and FP4 runs inside of eastern boundary formed by Sundon Road.. This proposed site is Green Belt land and should therefore be protected from development. We object to this site.

### Henlow

- **E75a Henlow Aggregates, Arlesey Road – Objection**

This proposed site, adjacent to site E76a, is bounded by two public rights of way. Henlow FP7 runs along the east boundary of this site; FP8 runs along/inside the south boundary. These are both much-used routes. The proposed development and vehicular movements would adversely affect the views and pleasure in using these popular rights of way. The Ramblers' Association object to this proposed site.

- **E76a Henlow Lakes, Arlesey Road**

This proposed site, adjacent to site E75a, is bounded by public and permissive paths on all sides. Henlow FP8 runs along the west boundary, FP8 runs along/inside the south boundary, and permissive paths run along/inside the northern and eastern boundaries. Sympathetic development for proposed leisure and recreation use could be acceptable subject to existing public rights of way not being affected. Possible scope for additional rights of way and/or permissive paths.

### Lidlington

- **H211a Land at Sheeptick End, Lidlington**

Lidlington Footpath No A5 is a dead-end route that crosses the site diagonally from the eastern corner. The footpath would probably require diversion if this site is developed.

### Maulden

- **H341 Brookside Farm, New Road**

Maulden FP4 runs adjacent to the eastern boundary of the proposed site. This is an important linking path to walking routes to the south of the A507, and will need to be maintained in its present status.

**MBDC Site allocations DPD: Second Issues and Options Consultation  
Ramblers' Association comments**

## **Northhill**

- **H313 Land rear of 128-130 Hitchin Road, Upper Caldecote**  
No public or permissive path touches or crosses the potential site. However, Northhill FP5 crosses the open land between Ickwell and Upper Caldecote about 150 metres to the north of the site. This is a very well used and pleasant path whose amenity would certainly suffer if the envisaged 14 houses were erected so close and on a site projecting into the very open landscape between the two settlements.

## **Potton**

- **H325 The Sheepwalk Site, rear of Sheepwalk Close, Bury Hill**  
Potton Footpath No 1 runs along the short north boundary of this proposed site. The site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and the proposed development would therefore be inappropriate.
- **H354 Land at 68 Biggleswade Road**  
Potton Footpath No 4 runs along the south boundary of the site. Proposed development could be acceptable providing footpath is retained intact.
- **H358 Land adjacent to Westbury Homes Development, Bedford Road**  
This potential site is bounded to the south by Old Bedford Road / Potton BW9. It is an extension of previously proposed site H290 (not H260 as stated in documentation). We have no objection providing vehicular access is restricted on the section of bridleway west of the site.

## **Ridgmont**

- **H364 Land between Eversholt Road and Church Street – Strong Objection**  
Ridgmont Footpath No 8 passes through this site between Eversholt Road and Church Street and Footpath No 9 passes along the NE boundary between the end of Church Street and the site of Segenhoe Church. FP9 forms part of The John Bunyan Trail. The proposed site is within the Green Belt and should therefore be protected from development. We strongly object to this site and request that it is rejected and excluded from further consideration.

## **Sandy**

- **H320 Land adjacent to the A1 Beeston**  
Sandy Bridleway No 8 runs along the NW boundary of proposed site. The site is 50% within the Flood Zones 2 & 3 and unsuitable for proposed development.
- **H346 & E81 Hamlet End House and adjacent land, Girtford – Strong Objection**  
Moggerhanger FP3 and FP4 run along the east and west sides of the River Ivel to the west of the proposed site. Views from these popular and much used routes would be adversely affected by either proposal for development of this site. Moggerhanger FP10 and Sandy FP38 are to the southwest south of the site. The site is entirely within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and is unsuitable for either proposed development. We strongly object to this site and request that it is rejected and excluded from further consideration.
- **H368 Land adjacent to Pope's Farm, Tempsford Road**  
Sandy Footpath No 1A runs along the south boundary of the proposed site. No objection provided RoW remains intact.

## MBDC Site allocations DPD: Second Issues and Options Consultation Ramblers' Association comments

### Silsoe

- **E86 Land adjacent to Taymar Nursing Home, Barton Road**  
Public right of way Silsoe Bridleway No 6 is accessed from Barton Road via a pleasant grass path enclosed on both sides by trees that borders the northern edge of the site and continues eastwards. The Ramblers' Association have no objection to this proposed site providing the path and trees along the north boundary remain intact, the trees providing natural screening.

### Stotfold

- **H331 Silverbirch Field, Taylors Road**  
(This site is identical to E77)  
Stotfold FP7 runs along a small part of the southwest corner. It is noted that a large proportion of the site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and the proposed development would therefore be inappropriate.
- **E05a Land West of A1, North of A507**  
Stotfold FP5 and FP26 touch the SW corner of the site and continue as FP3. Only very general indication of proposed use is provided (Types B2 and B8). If carried forward, screening would help reduce visual impact of resultant development to footpath users.
- **E77 Silverbirch Field, Taylors Road**  
(This site is identical to H331)  
Stotfold FP7 runs along a small part of the southwest corner of the site. The proposed use for leisure in conjunction with adjacent playing fields could be compatible with a large proportion of the site being within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The alternative proposed use for offices would be inappropriate.

### Woburn

- **H365 Land North of Timber Lane**  
Woburn Bridleway No 20 runs to the southeast of the site. Footpath no 21 runs to the east. If this site proceeds, our main concern would be that BW20 and FP21 are not obstructed temporarily during the building works or permanently by the development. FP21 is an important route to the paths beyond.

### Site documentation comments

Site maps provided in the A4 Site Allocations documents for this consultation are inferior to the maps in the documentation for the 400-site February 2008 consultation, e.g. compare maps for fairly similar Potton sites H290 and H358. On some maps, details are faint and even roads are not clearly shown, e.g. maps for Meppershall, Potton, Sandy, and Steppingley sites. Site maps provided for both consultations omit public rights of way and road names.

Location maps would benefit from being slightly larger and clearer (e.g. Biggleswade site H332). The A3 size composite maps are excellent and invaluable for site location. They provide useful details that are absent on the (albeit much smaller) individual site maps, such as road names and indications for playing field, works, path, track, etc.

Where present, public rights of way crossing or bounding a site are mentioned in the 'Current Local Plan and other constraints' section for some sites. However, this is not consistent and such indications are missing for many sites.

We request that subsequent consultations provide plans showing public rights of way and that text for each site indicates if any rights of way cross or adjoin the site.

Mr & Mrs Gibbons

Dear Sir / Madam

Ref: H1343

We would like to appeal most strongly against the proposed residential development (ref H1343) at Sutton Road, Eyeworm.

The location of the land is a small village with no amenities, very little public transport, no employment opportunities and is physically located on a narrow country lane.

Additionally, the area is not on main sewers or gas which overall means access to infrastructure is inconvenient and expensive and not at all suitable for affordable housing, or otherwise.

The physical location of the village itself also means that it is not environmentally-friendly to build more housing here as to reach anywhere (work, shops, doctors, schools) it will be necessary for the residents to drive.

Unfortunately at this time, we can only consider any proposals to expand Eyeworm an unnecessary exercise.

Yours most sincerely

**EYEWORTH APPENDIX FOUR**  
Respondent's Postcodes

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Below is a list of respondents' postcodes (where available) who submitted surveys or representations in other formats, about sites in the parish or about Eyeworth in general.

Postcode
MK40 3JJ
SG18 8EA
SG19 2HH
SG19 2TP