

## LANGFORD 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.

**LANGFORD APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
Mr Paul Watson	Phillips Planning Services Ltd	H164

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H004**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D Traherne	Most traffic movements to and from this site in all directions would not add to the congestion in the High Street area. (During construction and in use). Development on this site would not be prominent from any direction apart from the immediately adjacent existing houses. Bus stop close by with service connection to two railway stations and Biggleswade.

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
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Potential accident black spot with traffic travelling from A1 over railway bridge.
Miss S.L.T.Braybrooke	I am very concerned about further infilling of the village. More housing will simply increase the amount of commuters with no significant benefit to the community, village life or the level of public transport provision, whilst increasing the burden on the roads. I think this development is one of the more acceptable of all those proposed, although I would rather there wasn't any at all. The proposal says 'the narrow strips of agricultural land are unsuited to modern agriculture' – why not use this site for allotments or manage it for wildlife?

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
Allen Stephens	Good growing area for crops, as there is a massive food shortage forecast shouldn't we be looking at Brown Fields instead of green ones? The Sewers are already overflowing and we suffer many power cuts in the village.
David & Caroline Hawks	This site requires access down a narrow residential road and is totally unsuitable for the proposed use.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
M M Keen	Too much overcrowding of the village. That's what all the new building will cause if it goes ahead. We bought in the village to be able to live in relative peace not on a building estate.
Mr & Mrs Brown	Many people of our village are sick of Mid Beds trying to turn it into a town. Build your houses elsewhere, they are not wanted here.
Mr J L Humphreys	It looks like the scheme is too near housing and fields which Langford is well known for. Why take so much land. We moved from London to enjoy the countryside. Soon we won't be able to walk anywhere - just concrete. There is too much traffic in Langford now.
Mr Paul Brown	The site is an area where there is lots of wildlife etc. (it's the countryside).

Submitted by	Comments
Mr R T & Mrs M R Chamberlain	1. Taking valuable farm land 2. Having just had ten years of quarry, and still have another ten years to go. I think it's time to give us a bit of a break 2. We have hardly any public transport come through the village - only 4/5 buses a day 4. The road in and around broom are not suitable for this major plan.
Mrs Pamela Marsh	This would not have potential to support local services. On the contrary, local services would, I suggest, be unable to support this site.
Nina Mclvor	We moved to Cambridge Close 5 years ago, as we liked the fact that we had fields behind us, it was very quiet. It would cause major problems, with traffic to gain access to this plat, as was discussed when they tried to allow the bike track up by the railway line.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H025**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D Traherne	Most traffic movements to and from this site in all directions would not add to the congestion in the High Street area. (During construction and in use). Development on this site would not be prominent from any direction apart from the immediately adjacent existing houses. Bus stop close by with service connection to two railway stations and Biggleswade.

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
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors' surgery. Potential accident black spot with traffic travelling from A1 over railway bridge.
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	I am very concerned about further infilling of the village. More housing will simply increase the amount of commuters with no significant benefit to the community, village life or the level of public transport provision, whilst increasing the burden on the roads. I think this development is one of the more acceptable of all those proposed, although I would rather there wasn't any at all. I would like to know what 'package of measures to reduce dependence on the car' that this development would provide, I am struggling to imagine what that could mean especially in relation to the number of people in 46 dwellings that would need to travel to widely distributed places of work.

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
Catherine Jarvis	I note that this site mentions that it would have a package to reduce use of the car. Langford is a village with only a few shops and this site being at the opposite end of the village to the school and shops I cannot see how this site would result in reduction of use of the car. Langford has one main road through it and having yet more and more housing would increase congestion and traffic with cars speeding through the village. This will have an impact on the local community and safety of the children. Langford does not have the facilities i.e. school and playgroups to cope with this much housing, this goes for all the proposed sites.
Joanne Smith	This is a greenfield site on the edge of the village, I feel future development should be infill or on brownfield sites (but not by building on existing gardens). The access to the site would be dangerous, coming as it does at an already busy junction with poor sight lines from the railway bridge. Shops, businesses and services sited here would not be accessible to most people in the village. If development does go ahead here, a children's play area for this end of the village is desirable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Mr & Mrs Brown	Many people of our village are sick of Mid Beds trying to turn it into a town. Build your houses elsewhere, they are not wanted here.
Mr J L Humphreys	It looks like the scheme is too near housing and fields which Langford is well known for. Why take so much land. We moved from London to enjoy the countryside. Soon we won't be able to walk anywhere - just concrete. There is too much traffic in Langford now.
Mr Paul Brown	This site is farm land that is farmed all year round. Not good for housing/green belt.
Mrs Pamela Marsh	Local services would have some difficulty in supporting a development of this size. The doctors' surgery operates only 3 or 4 days a week and for people unable to get to Biggleswade it is barely sufficient.
Nina McIvor	We moved to Cambridge Close 5 years ago, as we liked the fact that we had fields behind us and it was very quiet. It would cause major problems with traffic to gain access to this plot, as was discussed when they tried to allow a bike track up by the railway line.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H067**

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
Keith Wright	The transport to and from this site would not have to go through congested centre of Langford. Going to A1 would not need to pass any houses on right and only a few on left, access being straight onto Cambridge Road to east of Station Road roundabout, approx 10 metres towards railway from existing concrete road. Traffic to west from site only needing to use Cambridge Road then out to Fuillage onto Henlow Road.
Me D Traherne	Most traffic movements to and from this site in all directions would not add to the congestion in the High Street area. (During construction and in use). Development on this site would not be prominent form any direction apart from the immediately adjacent existing houses. Bus stop close by with service connection to two railway stations and Biggleswade.
T. Burton	I have farmed part of this land for over forty years (no longer) and am concerned that the land is falling into decay. It makes sense to me - to extend Cambridge Way into this area for similar development, with no detriment, and with benefit to the village.

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
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Potential accident black spot with traffic travelling from A1 over railway bridge. A development of this size would have to be supported by the council. It is arguably, the only site in the village where some new development could possibly take place. However the number of dwellings proposed is excessive. Access onto Cambridge Road is a concern.

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
Donna Pashley	This development would greatly impact upon my life as houses would look down upon us and I am sure houses being higher than us would block light out from our home. If I wished to live in a town then I would move to one. The reason that I live in a village is for village life. There are a number of animals that habitat here; this would also greatly affect them. It would be a crying shame to spoil the countryside, I work for a housing contractor so am fully aware of the need for housing but Langford currently has a large building development ongoing and I feel another one so large would totally change the village, more amenities would be required, we would change from a village into a small town, this is something we as a family wish not to be part of.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Julian Vaughan	The road access to this site which would presumably be through Cambridge Gardens & Cambridge Way is too narrow to accommodate any increase in traffic.
M M Keen	Too much overcrowding of the village. That's what all the new building will cause if it goes ahead. We bought in the village to be able to live in relative peace not on a building estate.
Mr & Mrs Brown	We want to keep our village a village; we don't want to live in a town. Build your houses elsewhere.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	Same as H004
Mr J L Humphreys	It looks like the scheme is too near housing and fields which Langford is well known for. Why take so much land. We moved from London to enjoy the countryside. Soon we won't be able to walk anywhere - just concrete. There is too much traffic in Langford now.
Mr Paul Brown	The site is an area where there is lots of wildlife etc. (its the countryside). This site is farm land that is farmed all year round. Not good for housing/green belt.
Nina McIvor	We moved to Cambridge Close 5 years ago, as we liked the fact that we had fields behind us and it was very quiet. It would cause major problems with traffic to gain access to this plot, as was discussed when they tried to allow a bike track up by the railway line.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H123**

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
Glynis Henville	This and other sites will create a large increase in the population of Langford. Where are the plans for new shops, clinics, schools and facilities for youths who are already causing problems in this village as they have nothing to do?
June and Derek McDonald	Only homes to be built along the roadside to match up with existing housing. Do not take our Arable Land. It is necessary to keep this for future crops.
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	I am about further infilling of the village. More housing will simply increase the amount of commuters with no significant benefit to the community, village life or the level of public transport provision, whilst increasing the burden on the roads. However, I think this development is the most acceptable of all those proposed.
Richard Arnott	Housing mix should be actively reviewed within all new build proposals. Not only "affordable homes" but to address the chronic shortage of bungalows in Langford. Such developments would be support the Governments proposals on new housing regulations for homes for older people to continue to live independently. (e.g. downstairs toilets, wide doorways and eliminate the need for wider stairways).

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
Amy Sunderland	The village would suffer and the already busy roads and stretched services would collapse!
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, dreadful congestion on only road, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Dreadful impact on Station Road and Cambridge Road. Schools not big enough to cope. Upper School either in Shefford or Biggleswade.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Mr & Mrs Brown	We want our village to stay a village. NO more houses please. We want our village to stay a village. We haven't chosen to live in a town so we don't want the houses built.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	The village can not cope with any further building. We choose to live in a village & we want to continue living in a village. Our infrastructure can not cope, we continually have power cuts & our roads are grid locked.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H148**

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
Andy McGowan	Again small is better, and can add to the value of the village. Speaking to others the issue is that Langford is a village and not a town and should remain so. It does not have the infrastructure to take bigger build areas without significant investment "before a build"
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, dreadful congestion on main road through village, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Exit on too small a road.

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
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	Langford people want to keep Langford a village. We don't want your houses here.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	This is the beginning of encroachment on a large green central part of the village which would if built on would turn the village into a town which is totally unacceptable.

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

Submitted by	Comments
John Brown	My concern is that we are at No 56 Station Road and when we bought an additional plot of land from the then owners, Rogers, you refused permission to convert its use to garden. It has had to remain as paddock and consequently no building is allowed on it. My question is - how can you therefore allow building on the land next to it? I would quite happily sell this piece of land for building should the above development be approved because it would then have access.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H155**

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
Alan Sizer & Mrs S Sizer	The Boot Site (No. H155) is on a flood plain and regularly flooded - we've lived in Common Road for 18 years. Access very poor - on to Cambridge Road. Site is next door to our cottage - if you build on flood plain we will flood as well - (concrete as opposed to field). Water regularly floods, coming down Cambridge Road ending in Common Road. Sewage Smells regularly - drainage unable to cope now - further development would be a hazard. Our view will be impaired. Also no AMENITIES at this end of village, all gone - no shop - no pub!
Amy Sunderland	The boot ph has been in Langford since I have. This would be ridiculous to knock this pub with its lovely garden down for yet more houses in a lovely little village. This would be one less place for all the high number of new residents to go!!!!
Christine Lloyd	This will destroy the only community facility at this end of the village. Potential loss of wildlife on the common land and in the gardens. At the opposite end of the village to the schools, surgery, church - increase in traffic going on main through road to get to the above.
E.F. & P.W. Brady	Being within the floodplain this site is totally unsuitable, it is total madness to even consider it it for development, new buildings would be at risk and become un-insurable, existing properties will be compromised. Demolishing The Boot Public House is totally unacceptable, records show that this establishment was first licensed in 1776 and to this day is very much a well known land mark and surely must merit some significant local historical status. The exiting sewage system is already on overload and is extremely unsatisfactory; continually the pumping station deteriorates and is unable to cope. additional properties will only add to the problem. 4) Common Road is basically a Lane with no through access, more properties means more vehicles, increased congestion, particularly when accessing Cambridge Road. 5) In general, this site is total nonsense and should be disregarded accordingly, for the sake of the village and in particular the residents of Common Road.
Graham Marshall	If Langford is to be extended then leisure facilities should be retained not removed. The Boot PH is the only leisure facility at this end of the village, its removal does not support proposed new housing.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Judy Cummings	Not only is this potential site on a flood plain thus causing a risk to existing cottages, it is an area of much wildlife that would be affected, Common Road is not wide enough. There are no shops at this end of the village. We moved to Common Road to live in the country, please don't spoil what is at present a wonderful location to live. I welcome you to visit my garden to understand why we don't want further development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	I am concerned about the fact that this is in the floodplain and the further infilling of the village. This development will destroy the character of that part of Langford, and also a business that presumably brings people into the village. Currently Langford still has a rural feel at the Southern and Northern ends and any development in those areas simply serves to give the local area (Henlow-Langford-Biggleswade) an increasingly crowded, unattractive and urbanised feel. I think this development is not acceptable.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	We are sick of Mid Beds eroding our village community. We are NOT a town & don't want to be one. NO more building in Langford.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	Unbelievable that a new facility, as in a popular restaurant in going to be knocked down for housing, also this is totally unacceptable as it is on a flood plain. In the light of recent flood issues this should never even be considered.
Mrs J A Peach	You have recognised this area is on the flood plain. No further comment necessary.
Mrs J L Humphreys	This site is not appropriate as the "Boot pub" has been on that spot for 200 years.
Mrs Pamela Marsh	This land is, I believe, where a local public house now stands which has recently been refurbished and is now a pleasant restaurant. It is also on a busy roundabout and has a small road leading to a conservation site it is also within the floodplain.
Roy Humphreys	Site housing the Boot? It one of only three in the village. I think it needs to be kept in the village for social reasons.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H160**

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
Christine Lloyd	Access onto busy through road especially with the increased traffic from the Garfield Farm Development currently being built - already a roundabout in use and this exit would not merge onto the roundabout and there is a roundabout at the end of station road as well.
Peter Tyler	We live in the 2nd house in on the south side of Pound Close and are the only original property owners having bought new 25 years ago in 1983. During these years on two (2) occasions flooding from the river Ivel has been sufficiently deep enough to enter the bottom of our garden but not deep enough to enter the house. The flood plain is necessary on the rare occasions the river overflows and without some measures to improve this any new builds will at some time in the future be affected by flooding but it may not be for many years but of course no one knows!
David Russell Associates	The site is perfectly in scale with predicted growth levels for a large village. The land proposed for new homes is partly within the existing settlement boundary. It is not affected by existing District Plan constraints and is not within a floodplain. Land to the west in the same ownership is partly within a floodplain, and this area is proposed as an amenity space, and would effectively be an extension to the existing playing field that adjoins the site to the north. The site is in a sustainable location well placed towards the middle of Langford to support the village's existing services. The site is in a secluded location just west of the High Street and its development would have little impact on the surrounding countryside. The development would result in significant improvement to the local environment.

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
Greg & Alison Smyth	The size of this development is in keeping with a village location. However, the site would form an intrusion into the open countryside and to existing properties where the proposed site is located. The proposed access is also a problem because it is close to but not on a mini-roundabout on the A6001, which could be dangerous for cars turning into or out of the site. There is often overspill from the pub car park with cars parking on double yellow lines along the main road causing visibility problems for traffic. This issue would be worsened if some of the car park was used for access to the site as more pub users would park in the road.
J. Shipman	Access is possible but will be congested / dangerous due to conflicts with other road junctions.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.

Submitted by	Comments
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	The proposal says: 'only 5 detached dwellings due to the presence of the floodplain', surely, it's the extent of the development that is relevant not the number of buildings. Any development in or near in the floodplain will almost certainly mean changes to the local hydrology and consequently the floodplain dynamics. This could cause problems for the existing buildings. I think this development is not acceptable.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	Langford residents choose to live in a village why are Mid Beds set on turning our village into a town & destroying our community. Build your houses else where.
Mrs Tyler	Thank you for the literature you sent, which I didn't ask for. My question was then Pound Close was built 25 years ago. They could only build six houses because of the flood plain, now you propose to build 5 houses. What as happened to the 'flood plain'.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H164**

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
J. Shipman	Sensible location and use.
Jenny and Larry O’Ross	As this is sheltered flats for the elderly would support. Not likely to have too much impact on traffic congestion and any impact on the habitat is offset by the benefit for the elderly.
Paul Watson	The proposals for this site will produce much needed sheltered accommodation for the elderly. The site will also provide land for a local cemetery and is supported by the parish council.

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
Glynis Henville	We need sheltered housing and a new cemetery in Langford. Is it in bad taste to place them together? This site is not ideal for sheltered housing as there are no facilities at all within easy walking distance. This would be better placed at H232 - nearer to the Church, pub and shops.

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
Amy Sunderland	This proposed site is one of the only areas of green left along the main road. It provides a natural environment for wildlife and leads to the river. What a shame it would be to have a view only of other buildings. This is not what I moved to a village for. The small Doctors surgery in Langford only opens in the mornings and they already have a high number of patients and with homes for the elderly, who seem to have a high number of health problems this will be an issue. Church Street itself already has Traffic issues with a large number of Lorries and other vehicles which travel through the village at high speed, I would be concerned about this. Also their visitors will add to the already high number of vehicles, as would funeral goers if the Cemetery was put in place. I also think we have a very pretty village and would be very concerned if this lovely area of greenery were to be replaced by an ugly set of modern buildings.
Dr Robin Moore	Developments are already underway in Langford (e.g. Langford View) and there is a clear danger that the character of the village is going to be lost. Developments on the outskirts of the village such as this one are particularly unsuitable as they are a cause of village sprawl and loss of the rural feel.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	I am very concerned about the proximity to the floodplain and the further infilling. Not in flood plain does not mean that changes to the local hydrology due to development will not change the floodplain dynamics. Sheltered accommodation for the elderly is a positive feature but the height of a group of flats worries me, I cannot quantify the effect on the rural aspects and open views to the river. How many elderly people want to live next to a cemetery! Non-commuting residents do have a benefit to community & village life &(one hopes!)public transport. Currently Langford still has a rural feel at the Southern and Northern ends and any development in those areas simply serves to give the local area (Henlow-Langford-Biggleswade)an increasingly crowded, unattractive and urbanised feel that is not in keeping with the social and economic history and current reality of the county. The new quarry will also soon be appearing on the Eastern horizon. I think this development is not acceptable.
Paulette Martin	I do not have an objection to a Cemetery being built on this land but additional housing will eliminate the wildlife which lives on the land.
Valerie Klitsidis	The road leading from church street across this area to the fishing lake is very busy and has a noise impact as cars pass along the gravel drive; I would think that a quieter site would be better for the elderly. This obviously wouldn't affect a cemetery. It is a very long walk to the post office and a fair distance to the local Doctors surgery from there. The green spaces within Langford have been rapidly filled with houses in the last few years and it is slowly loosing its village appeal.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs Spencer	This is the only site that would benefit the people of Langford. If these were built it would free up other houses so no further building would be needed. Providing Langford people were given priority.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H195**

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
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, dreadful congestion on main road through village, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Tremendous congestion could be caused by exiting out of Gurneys Lane onto Church Street already a chicane there to slow traffic down. Cars parked all along Church Street when Football matches taking place on playing fields opposite. (Sunday mornings chiefly).

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
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Margaret Fisher	Access is a nightmare, the narrow lane identified is difficult to cope with now (4 users plus farm vehicles) also I would like to know how MBDC will manage to excess of development proposals that this consultation will inevitably generate.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	Stop trying to turn our village into a town. We don't want any more houses.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	It is well known to all local people that this area floods & the water runs down this lane on to the mail road. This is also a single track farm lane so totally unsuitable to build any dwellings.
Richard Arnott	Access via Gurneys Lane is impractical, frequent use by farm vehicle, bad visibility (south), and dangers caused by the nearby traffic calming would significantly increase risk of traffic accidents.
Tony Fisher	Access onto a main road (already congested) via a narrow lane with no footpaths will just create risk or danger. The lane is used by farm traffic who already have difficulty in navigation and access.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H232**

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
Catherine Jarvis	I cannot believe that building on the flood plain is being considered, in light of changing climate and recent severe flooding over the country last year, building on the floodplain will put pressure on the existing drainage and other housing in the village.
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, dreadful congestion on only road, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Encroach on flood plain which is a nature haven.
Glynis Henville	Would destroy current outlook across the river for existing homes and enjoyment of riverside walks.
Graham Marshall	Extending the development to the River lvel is detrimental to the village environment and why would we build in a flood plain. Developments to the east of the village seem much more sensible. Will any improvements be made to public transport to support this expansion? Public transport at the moment is awful and far below that provided to Biggleswade and Henlow.
J. Shipman	Access to site is/will be difficult and dangerous.
Jenny and Larry O’Ross	Impinges far too much on the riverside environment with consequent impact on wildlife and habitat. Will spoil the rural nature of the area. there is insufficient infrastructure and there will be too much traffic congestion.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	I am very concerned about the proximity to the floodplain and the further infilling of the village. A great deal of work has been done in recent years to improve the condition of the river and surrounds and biodiversity of the wildlife, and consequently the amenity value. More housing will simply increase the amount of commuters with no significant benefit to the community, village life or the level of public transport provision, whilst increasing the burden on the roads. Currently Langford still has a rural feel at the Southern and Northern ends and any development in those areas simply serves to give the local area (Henlow-Langford-Biggleswade)an increasingly crowded, unattractive and urbanised feel that is not in keeping with the social and economic history and current reality of the county. I think this development is not acceptable.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	We want to keep our village a village, no more building in Langford.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	We want our village to stay a village; building on this scale will turn it into a town which we do not want. Again, mention of building on flood plains which would be disastrous.
Mr Brandrick	I thought this site was to be excluded from development as it is flood plain and backs down to the river?
Sian Parker	I would be worried about the impact on the river and the floodplain and the knock-on effect on existing riverside properties.

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

<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Comments</b>
J. Prodger	Development needs to be kept well away from river IVEL. Will impact on amenity land alongside river through Langford.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H252**

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
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, dreadful congestion on only road, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Encroach on flood plain which is a nature haven. The impact on the volume of traffic in High Street would be tremendous and increase congestion. The destruction of the flood plain and the impact this would have on the Nature Site is untenable. This would take away facilities already enjoyed by the community and visitors undertaking the Kingfisher Way long distance footpath.
Graham Marshall	Building up to the River lvel would have detrimental impact upon the environment of the village. There is no reason to build in the flood plain. The proposals to the east of the village more than contribute to the villages share of development.
Greg & Alison Smyth	Much of the site is outside the settlement boundary for Langford. The site does not constitute a natural extension to the village and would form an intrusion into a pleasant rural area in which there is a general presumption against development except in the proven interests of agriculture. The site is also adjacent to a nature reserve and forms part of open countryside, which adds a great deal to village life. The site would be detrimental to the local environment. The site is in and around a floodplain. The access is from the front of No. 40 High Street. This is situated on a dangerous bend heading northbound along the High Street and visibility is poor. The local infrastructure is not suitable - no supermarket and no rail links. The lower school is unlikely to have the capacity to cope with the number of pupils this proposal would bring. The development would increase the traffic flow along the A6001, which already has significant traffic movement through the village.
J. Shipman	Site on flood plain. Access is very difficult /dangerous.
Jenny and Larry O’Ross	120 houses is just too many for the site This site is close to a conservation area and will have an enormous impact on wildlife and natural habitats. It is also in the lvel flood plain It will spoil the rural aspect of the riverside environment there is insufficient infrastructure /in adequate road system and the resulting traffic congestion and pollution will be considerable.
John Monair	Current infrastructure e.g. sewerage cannot cope with existing population of Langford. The increase in traffic, both private and public, would exacerbate traffic problems already existing in the village.
Lyndsey Bignell	Terrible idea in flood plain. Current meadows contribute to wildlife value and importance of adjacent CWS. Sewers etc are not up to development on this scale.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	No more building in Langford. We want to keep our village a village we don’t want to live in a town.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	Flood plain again!!!! Not acceptable to have a development of this size in the village. All the extra vehicles it would create would make our village impossible to travel through.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
David + Caroline Hawkes	<p>With regards to the 1st 2 questions - these are biased questions in that it is self evident that more people will create more patronage for local businesses and that developers have to pay an infrastructure levy. These questions and the answers gained do not and should not outweigh the clear negative impacts of large developments on small villages. With reference to this submission and in addition to our comments on the survey form, we wish to make the following comments.1. The owners of No 40 High Street applied via New Road Developments Ltd in 2007 to Mid Beds District Council for planning permission to build 1 replacement bungalow and 2 new 4 bed detached houses on this site, a total of 3 dwellings. Planning permission was refused by the council on the following grounds; a) "The proposed development extends beyond the Settlement Envelope into the open countryside and it would therefore have an adverse impact on the character of the area. As such it is contrary to Policies HO6 and CS19 of the Mid Bedfordshire Local Plan 2005" and, b) "The proposed development, by nature of the sitting and juxtaposition of Plot 3 with the site boundary, would fail to provide adequate buffer landscaping with the surrounding countryside and would have a detrimental impact on the visual appearance and rural character of the locality; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DPS11 of the Mid Bedfordshire Local Plan 2005". Given that submission H252 calls for "up to 120 dwellings" it is inconceivable that the requested development would fit in with any aspect of the local plans, given that a request for 3 dwellings was refused just last June! It is obvious that any granting of planning permission for this site for more than 2 dwellings would leave the council in a very strange position, given the reason they gave for the previous refusal. 2. The submission for H252 states that access to the site would be gained by demolishing No 40 High Street, Langford. The "Assessment of Proposed Access Arrangements" submitted with the now-rejected planning application last year stated that: a) "Visibility to the South is still restricted by the gate at No 42 and the front garden hedge at No 42. Further down it is restricted by the garden wall at No 44" and, b) "It is fair to say that whilst the visibility from the access cannot be improved to the point where it would comply with the requirements for a completely new access as set out in DB32, it is nevertheless somewhat improved from that which currently exists". It is clear from these 2 statements provided by the applicants for planning permission last year that they cannot provide a safe entry and exit from the site for any sort of large development and that face alone ought to be enough to rule out this site forever. The roads in the village are few, Langford being a long-and-thin village as are many others in the area. It therefore follows that many properties access directly on to these roads and that new accesses need to impinge as little as possible on existing traffic flows, these being substantial due to the "few roads for many vehicles" situation we have here.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
<p>David + Caroline Hawks [continued]</p>	<p>The site is also close to the part of High Street (A6001) known locally as Chapel Hill. This is a narrow piece of the road with bends at the entrance and exit to it and with a pronounced slope as well as designated parking spaces close to the Post Office and local shop. Vehicular near-misses and driver arguments are already commonplace here. The footpaths are very narrow, especially on the outside of the downhill bend and as such already present a hazardous environment for pedestrians. The Parish Council have tried to address this location and it's issues on a number of occasions but, to date, no satisfactory means of improvement has been found. The layout of properties and associated land means that is essentially impossible to alter in any meaningful manner. The addition of a very significant number of extra vehicles on to this piece of road would only exacerbate the problems on an already difficult piece of the major road through the village. 3. Part of the site is within the floodplain and close to a County Wildlife Site and Local Nature reserve and as such it seems ludicrous to suggest any development here, let alone something of this scale. The requested development would overwhelm the area, disturb the local wildlife and damage the visual and recreational environment within the village, as many residents walk the footpath opposite the site on a very regular basis. These fields provide an appropriate rural backdrop to a very pleasant walk from Langford Mill to either Chapel Hill footbridge or Boot Bridge. How many people will still want to walk this route if they are overlooking 120 houses? Very few indeed seems to be the likely answer! 4. The creation of 120 homes would have a major impact upon the current healthcare arrangements in the village. It is quite common at present for the current surgery to have no doctor available on any given day, forcing all the residents to go to Biggleswade for healthcare on those days. The surgery is incapable of expansion due to its location in the ground floor of a converted house. There appears to be 1 phone line and space for 1 admin computer at present and quite how such a setup could cope with another 240-360 residents is totally unclear. Conclusions:- The site submitted under H252 has already been rejected by Mid Beds District Council in June 2007 for a much smaller development. By that applicant's own submission, it is not possible to make a completely new access to the required standards. The major road nearby is already a matter of recorded concern for local councils. This site would have a very negative impact upon local wildlife, the rural nature of the village and on the recreational activities of villagers of all ages. It is therefore our very strongly held view that this site should not be included on the list of preferred options for the area. For other specific comments please see attached letters.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss S.L.T. Braybrooke	I am very concerned about the proximity to the floodplain and the further infilling of the village. Even development in the portion of the site not in the floodplain does not mean that changes to the local hydrology due to development will not change the floodplain dynamics. This could cause problems for the existing buildings. A great deal of work has been done in recent years to improve the condition of the river and surrounds and biodiversity of the wildlife, and consequently the amenity value. The wildlife from the adjacent LNR/CWS no doubt benefits from and makes use of the open land. In social terms, more housing will simply increase the amount of commuters with no significant benefit to the community, village life or the level of public transport provision, whilst increasing the burden on the roads. I think this development is not acceptable.
Mrs A E Burgess	While it has been stated that the site is not liable to flooding from the River. It is a known fact that part of the site behind 2 and 2a High Street has been flooded from water running from fields and draining onto the land. This would prove a great problem for properties in front of the development and the occupiers of houses if the development went ahead. The site also has a large range of wildlife using it.
Mrs Olive Ravenall	No.
Tracy Auld	I strongly disagree with this proposal, I do not believe this village has the level of infrastructure to support this.

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

Submitted by	Comments
J. Prodger	Development needs to be kept well away from River IVEL. Will impact on amenity land alongside river through Langford.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: E04**

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

Submitted by	Comments
P. Williams	This should provide housing for people within the area, first time buyers, parents, children or people working in the area. This site is totally unsuitable for commercial use as access is past housing in a narrow road.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andy Fleckney	Already too much traffic in East Road, with only one way in and out. Infrastructure not suitable for scheme.
Andy McGowan	This field is an encapsulated piece of grade one agricultural land. I am aware that there had been a number of unsuccessful attempts to gain planning permission. My issue with the council would be what change of policy would allow it to be changed so that it can be build on. My neighbours and I have already formed a group and have a solicitor should any attempt be made to change this use against council and government regs.
Angus Howe	Langford is part Biggleswade district which has a policy of removing industry outside residential district to where access is close to A1 and not through a residential site such as East Road and St Andrews Way, which is most unsuitable for goods vehicles such as heavier lorries which in future are likely to become longer and heavier. 270 jobs! Where will they all park? A lot will park on the roads outside the site causing chaos on the surrounding roads including A600.
Christine Lloyd	Too few facilities, dreadful congestion in East Road which would impact on the only road through the village at the junction of East Road and Church Street, only one lower school, limited public transport, part time doctors surgery. Always cars parked on grass verges at entrance to East Road. Increase in commercial traffic. Large lorries passing near lower school and the proposed nursery entrance.
Dr Robin Moore	This proposal poses a clear danger to the maintenance of Langford as a village with a rural feel. The road through Langford is already too busy and this proposal would simply add to the growing problem.
F. James	St Andrews Way is totally unsuitable for access to offices and storage units.
Gage	Living in St Andrews Way, this site would have a major adverse effect upon our living standards. St Andrews Way is not a particularly wide road to accommodate industrial traffic and increased traffic would have a detrimental effect on peoples lives. The vast majority of residents here are elderly and increased traffic could pose a danger. As to supporting local facilities I feel it would do the opposite as our facilities in the village are very limited anyway i.e. doctors only open am Mon-Fri and buses once an hour in general.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Graham Isaac	Poor access will severely affect residents of lower East Road & St. Andrews Way. The small office units are unlikely to be able to be let resulting non of the "promised ?" jobs being available and in either a derelict site or future "change of use" planning submission. If approved light pollution measures & limitations to office access opening hours should be put in place and enforced.
J B Carley	(1) Planning permission for development has been refused on several occasions over the past 25 years. (2) This site is top quality agricultural land - at least half the area was cropped for hay in 2007. (3) Access from St. Andrews Way is not currently available. East Road is narrow and congested and will not support additional traffic generated by housing and 270 employees. (4) Density of proposal is excessive and would be oppressive to existing residents with loss of local countryside. (5) Why is B2 and B3 development being proposed for small office units.
J Shipman	Access is a problem via St Andrews Way.
Jan Baldwin & Barrie Ellis	See attached sheet.
John Allen	The site lies outside the village development limit for Langford as defines in the adopted local plan and outside the settlement envelope as defined in the adopted M.B.L.P policy H4 of the defined village limits therefore this proposal is contrary to this policy. Furthermore the local roads are totally unsuitable for the increase in traffic 270 jobs and the unspecified housing would bring to the area. This site has had at least 4 unsuccessful planning applications in the past 20 years.
John Monair	The current infrastructure e.g. sewerage etc. cannot cope with the current population of Langford. St Andrews Way is a very restricted access to the proposed site, also parking in East Road would make access difficult. The public transport currently in existence are virtually non-existent, therefore traffic through the village would be greatly increased. Light industrial units are notoriously bad for littering.
Louise Brown	We want to keep our village a village.
Lyndsey Bignell	I do not feel that this is a suitable place for industrial development. The site is surrounded by existing residential areas and this would have an unacceptable impact. The access to the site is not suitable, with all vehicle movements via a currently quiet cul-de-sac and the bottom of east road. There are already traffic issues at the bottom of east road, with cars from the cottages on Church Street being forced to park here with no alternative. This area cannot safely withstand such additional traffic movements. Any development of such nature should be located directly from the main road through the village, or at the very least be accessed from the main road. Previous applications to develop land opposite east road at Mushroom farm have included traffic lights on the main road and east road. If both of these developments are allowed, it will bring terrible traffic congestion to this part of the village.
Margaret Bignell	East Road between Church Street and Queens Way is always congested with cars parked on both sides with people using the shop and hairdressers and residents in church street who have no parking facilities. It is often difficult for cars to drive down/up the road and lorries and large vehicles would cause hazardous situations. I haven't answered the question about existing facilities within easy travelling distance is very ambiguous and should be clear on such an important subject.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs M Lake	There is already an industrial estate at Cow Close between Langford & Biggleswade, which would be much more appropriate. It is ludicrous to consider an industrial site be it large or small in the centre of the village. The local road network with proposed access via East Road & St Andrews Way would be ridiculous. How many mini roundabouts would be planned for one High Street? On the whole, all these proposed developments would be devastating for Langford, whilst we realise the need for housing. The structure/plan needs to be looked at with a view of the villagers not just the developers.
Mr & Mrs Paul Brown	Stop trying to ruin our village. NO more building here.
Mr & Mrs Spencer	Totally unbelievable that this is being considered for an industrial estate even with small units, it being along side our village school. Also the proposed route for lorries etc to & from the estate is through a small narrow (currently) cal de sac. We do not want an industrial estate in our village, industrial estates are situated in towns NOT villages.
Mr Lake	There are empty industrial units in Biggleswade, a village like Langford does not need or require such development. The roads and sewers can not cope at the moment. How long before you build on the Platine Field why not build on Chicksands next to you new offices instead of building in a village.
Mrs Pamela Marsh	The proposed access to this site is totally unsuitable. Lorries and cars would have to travel along East Road which is congested because of parked cars. St Andrews Way would be adversely affected because it is only a small car.
Mrs S Devlin	St Andrews Way is unsuitable for access by industrial vehicles as it is narrow and only suitable for residential use by the small number of housing units currently there. I understand that the industrial units located near the A1 as you enter Biggleswade from Langford are to be re-located to Stratton Park & that the site is to be developed for housing so that heavy traffic is taken away from the centre of Biggleswade. If the site in Langford is developed for storage & general industrial use the traffic will be back on the same road.
Patricia Ann Allen	The unused field is grade 1 agricultural land and should be preserved as such. Part of the field is being used to produce a hay crop and a successful crop was raised last year. St Andrews Way is too narrow to cope with the amount of traffic this mixed development will create. There is also potential for traffic chaos at the junction of East Road and Church Street. St Andrews Way and East Road are totally unsuitable for the heavy traffic that he industrial units will generate.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Patricia J Barwell	B2 General Industrial & B8 Storage/Distribution additional info states small office units which is it? How many dwellings are proposed? Small office units could be good for Langford however I do not think this is the right site Access roads unsuitable for industrial vehicles or increased traffic from new homes There is not adequate public transport The Governments recommendation for parking spaces per square footage of office space is inadequate will lead to vehicles parking in the residential area There will be noise generated for such a development There will be additional light pollution caused by the need for security This development needs considerable thought it would completely change this area from is current attraction of a quite and relatively road safe environment. I notice the existing use of site is quoted as an unused field Is this since the developers bought the field? I can recall this field being cultivated yearly.
Paul Bradfield	A mixed site seems a strange idea. Generally there is an attempt to separate housing infrastructure and industry; e.g. Biggleswade. To have offices for what? There are few businesses which are purely offices that work well. At present there are plenty of offices for let in and around the Biggleswade area. (And to support this comment in Biggleswade High Street, there is at present an office block being converted into flats). If this site was for affordable housing, made available under covenant, then at least young local people would be not obliged look elsewhere for homes.
Richard Bignell	Already existing unused industrial areas in Biggleswade. These are better located for the A1. Industrial development in the village will bring traffic problems and congestion to the village. The main entrance is not acceptable coming into the heart of an existing residential area. East road already has traffic problems with parked cars and there is only one way out. There are already existing problems with infrastructure such as sewers and schools etc. This would create too much additional pressure.
Steven Bignell	There are currently business sites in the area being pulled down and having houses built on them. Biggleswade has many factory units that are unoccupied that are much better situated with easy access to the A1 with no impact on any residential area. If it is foreseen that there will be an increased need for this type of development perhaps we should stop the change of use of these sites from business to housing now. The access point from East Road is already congested with traffic. People park on both sides of the road making negotiating it now very difficult at times. East Road and St Andrews Way are residential streets a development of this type here would have a severely detrimental impact on the people living here both to their safety and quality of life. The additional impact on the rest of the village would also be unacceptable. The burden of the extra vehicles would all have to use the main road going through the village, there being no other way to get to the site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Early on during the initial consultation period the proposal description text was changed from B2 (light industrial) and B8 (storage and distribution) to B1 Office and residential. The submitted proposal remained the same. All respondents who had previously commented on this site were given an opportunity to resubmit their comments to take account of the change in the proposal’s description text.

Following this invitation, 25 additional comments were received, of which 24 did not think that this site was appropriate for future development. These comments are shown below.

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

Submitted by	Comments
P. Williams	I agree that the area could be developed for housing, I disagree with 2 things:- Office space is not required in Langford, some existing have laid empty or been demolished, the entrance to the site should be from Church Street, not St. Andrews Way. There is enough traffic, parked cars, children playing, old people now, with often not enough room for emergency vehicles. This housing should mainly consist of appropriate dwellings for local people, first time buyers, young people, not expensive houses that attract people from other areas that work away from the area and neither get involved or care what happens to this community. The company building the site pocket the money without ensuring the balance of local people is maintained. In this present climate, I hope this chance to build eco-friendly housing, solar power, wind power, reed beds and soakaways is not missed and the existing drainage is not, once again, stretched to the limit causing floods or pumping of sewage to be carried out. P.S I have been on holiday and I know this is late but still receives your consideration.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr John Allen	All comments on my form for B2 and B8 still apply to this latest submission and I trust they will be transferred to this form. In addition, I note that Langford Parish Council's response to E04 states: It would create heavy traffic movement leading out onto the main high street which already has problems, whilst the council would like to create additional jobs in the village, the size and location of this development is inappropriate. This comment, I assume, is still relevant.
Mr Patrick Gage	Only one local shop approximately half a mile away with very limited parking. The only school is a lower school which is popular with surrounding villages so places are hard to get. Existing facilities within Langford are very limited, the main shops are in Biggleswade, public transport virtually none with the possibility of cutting out the one bus link. This site would cause immense problems for local residents in St Andrews Way, plus surrounding areas. Major reconstruction of roads would need to accommodate the increase in traffic. The lives of the locals would be made unbearable.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Susan Greenfield	Don't want the village to get any bigger than it is. There's plenty of empty office space elsewhere i.e. Sandy, Biggleswade, Henlow.
Mr Andy McGowan	1. Langford does not have the infrastructure for development of this size. 2. Attempts to obtain planning on this site has been turned down many times for good reasons - "grade one agricultural land"; nothing has changed. 3. It will devalue the price of adjacent housing. 4. No access from St. Andrews Way. Owners of site sold off access rights in Church Street years ago. 5. St. Andrews Way is a quiet cul-de-sac, this significant change will have a profound affect on local residences. 6. Better site for business near Biggleswade Bridge. 7. Langford is a village - not suited to building of businesses.
Ms Karen Jones	1. Significant effect on our privacy from business premises and housing. 2. Overbearing effect on local community - no infrastructure good enough. 3. Noise, disturbance to community, turn village into town, devalue property etc. 4. Previous applications refused, what has changed? Nothing! Grade 1 agricultural land. 5. No access from St. Andrews Way or Church Street - cul-de-sac should remain. 6. Ref business - poor public transport will not support premises - requiring use of vehicles, making a quiet village very busy. 7. Biggleswade A1 bridge industrial area has space for business areas. 8. Significant enhancement of services before arrival of housing.
Mrs Denise Gage	Would greatly increase traffic in a very quiet residential road. Lack of infrastructure and facilities in village would be affected. Buses run infrequently at certain times of the day. St. Andrews Way is made up of mainly elderly residents. Increased traffic would be lost.
Mr Michael Wilkinson	This site was previously turned down for one of the reasons it was grade "A" agricultural land (what has changed?). Access to the area would impose commercial traffic is already at congestion level especially during events, school and commuter periods.
Mrs Elizabeth Ross	1. Local social service - maybe school and doctors. 2. Social infrastructure - none! 3. Traffic - how will a potential 300/400 cars access Church Street from East Road? There are already problems associated with this junction i.e. bend and fast traffic. 4. Sewerage - the village already has problems, adding more houses will create more problems. 5. Electric - Langford has a lot of power cuts, more houses etc. will create more problems.
Mrs Louise Brown	The residents of Langford want to live in a village and not a town which the council seems intent in changing Langford to. Why do we need new houses when the current large estate in the village being built has been boarded up by the builders, work has stopped as the houses aren't selling! The residents of Langford want to live in a village, bringing office units is the start of changing the village to a town which we don't want. The District Council's comments that Langford is a large village is totally against the wishes of the residents and only because they continue to give planning permission for yet more houses.
J. Monair	The current infrastructure (sewerages, drainage etc.) cannot cope with the existing population of the village. The access to the proposed site, via East Road, into St. Andrews Way is narrow and there are parked cars/vans restricting access and making it difficult/dangerous to reach the site. The secondary access would endanger school children. The bus service is inadequate for people employed on the proposed site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Peter Bowyer	St. Andrew's Way is a cul-de-sac and the width of the road is only 14 feet wide, so very unsuitable for heavy lorries with building materials. There is only one shop/post office at the other end of the village, one school is already full up and there is one doctors' surgery which is open 8.30-11.30 am, not always Monday to Friday.
Mrs Sylvia Delvin	This development requires access and egress via St. Andrews Way which is a narrow road built to cope with the traffic for less than 20 dwellings, I understand that this road is not fully adopted. Any on-street parking in St. Andrews would severely disrupt the traffic flow from the new houses/offices.
Mrs Patricia Barwell	As per my first objection, I do not feel there is an adequate road structure to/from St. Andrews to/from East Road and, subsequently, access to the main road is potentially dangerous. I do not believe there will be adequate parking for the offices, I know the government guidelines and they will not be adequate which will result in cars parking wherever they can. The public transport for this village is appalling; therefore employers/employees will have to travel by their own means. Biggleswade is a growing town with a good business park close to the A1. This is where an office building should be.
Mr Paul Bradfield	A. There were fewer houses in the 80s and Langford had 4 general stores/shops. The Shopping Basket closed in May this year and hasn't yet reopened. B. The village hall and other social places (pubs) are underused/ subscribed. The 'Red Cow' pub was converted to house 5-7 years ago. C. Facilities - such as? D. Only buses. E. If this development were to go ahead the congestion would be at the junction of East Road and Church Street. Seasonal farm equipment is moved up and down East Road and railway maintenance also use East Road.
Mrs Irene Sharpe	It is too close to the school. The roads are not suitable for more traffic, the local council hope to have the road downgraded to a "B" road. Existing traffic is too heavy for the village. Shopping at this end of the village is nil at this time. Buses are inadequate for modern needs. Just because we live in a village are we expected to be in bed after tea and stay in on Sundays? Lots of elderly people have no transport other than public.
Mr Andrew Fleckney	East Road/St Andrews Way are already too busy with traffic to accommodate additional developments, particularly at the junction with the A6001 (Church Street). This makes the site unviable without vehicular access to and from Church Street directly, if incorporated. There are currently empty office buildings in Biggleswade that should be used without constructing more in rural villages. The traffic issue also relates to residential development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Lyndsey Bignell	The main vehicle access to the site via St. Andrews way is totally inappropriate. It is unacceptable to bring this amount of vehicle movements into an established residential area. The bottom of East Road is already congested with parked cars. Significantly increased vehicle movements would be hazardous in this area and create congestion in a residential area throughout the day. Any development of this size should have direct access onto the main road, not through a quiet residential area. Previous applications for Mushroom farm (at the bottom of East Road) have indicated the need for the traffic lights. If the E04 development is allowed, traffic lights are not an option in the future - this amount of additional traffic held up by traffic lights would cause unnecessary congestion throughout the day. The land use - light industrial or office is irrelevant - it would generate the same amount of traffic which should only be allowed if there is a direct access to the main road.
Mrs Margaret Kempton	St. Andrews Way is only 14ft wide and half the boundary at the end of the road is in private ownership and the owner has no intention of selling. Nearly all the residents on this road are retired.
Mrs Margaret Bignell	We are surrounded by empty premises in nearby towns which are vandalised eyesores. Why build more premises in a totally unsuitable village site? The complete infrastructure of our village will not facilitate any further buildings. The access to this site is completely unsuitable to take more traffic. This would be dangerous.
Mrs Eileen Mabel Bowyer	With regards to the suggestion that the main access would be from St. Andrews Way, (this is only a small cul-de-sac) this would be very dangerous as the road is so narrow you would only have to park a couple of cars on the road and it would cause severe traffic congestion. I am not against the building of houses etc. in Langford but I feel the site you have chosen is not very appropriate. As I remark, there are surely many fields on the outskirts of Langford that would serve your purpose for plan E04 which would be welcome, especially if it means there would be work available for the local people. With regard to your plans for the site in Langford I do not think this is very acceptable. 1. We already have a number of houses that have just been built there. 2. There would be no guarantee that the jobs would go to the local people. 3. There is only one school in the village and that is full. 4. We only have one post office and one shop combined which is too far for a lot of people to get to, especially old age pensioners. 5. We have a doctors' surgery which is open from 8.30am-11.30am five days a week. If we are unable to get there, we have to get to the clinic in Biggleswade as the buses run only once every hour it is not a very convenient situation, especially if you are not feeling well. 6. There are some fields on the outskirts of Langford which could be surely built on. 7. As St. Andrews Way is a cul-de-sac it surely would be inconvenient for large lorries and heavy continual traffic to try and get through. It would only need someone to park in St. Andrews Way and that could cause a real traffic jam. Please don't spoil our village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Doris Wilkinson	Facilities provided in the plan may support a shop we have in this village, however the road infrastructure is not conducive to any further population of traffic.
Mr Richard G. M. Bignell	The infrastructure i.e. schools, doctors, sewerage and roads are already overstretched. There are empty premises in nearby areas which have closer links to the A1 and railway system. East Road is already congested with parked vehicles, the extra traffic would seriously add to this problem, particularly at the junction with the Biggleswade main road. The proposed development is, in my opinion, totally unnecessary and would be detrimental to the village.
Mr William John Kempton	St. Andrews Way is a narrow road only 14ft wide. The boundary between the site and St. Andrews Way is incorrectly shown on the site map which infers wrongly that this site borders the whole of St. Andrews Way as half of the length is privately owned and the owner is most unwilling to sell. Nearly all of the St. Andrew's Way residents are elderly or retired. This notification form arrived too late to meet the date of original specification of 19th August.
Mr E N Bowyer	With regard to your plans for the site E04 in Langford, I do not think this is very acceptable. We already have a number of houses that have just been built here. There would be no guarantee that the jobs would go to local people. There is only one school in the village and that is full. We have one Post Office and shop combined which is much too far for a lot of people to get to, especially old age pensioners. We have a doctors' surgery which is open 8.30am-11.30am five days a week. If we are unable to get in there, we have to go to the clinic in Biggleswade. As the buses run only once an hour, it is not a very convenient situation, especially if you are not feeling well. There are some field on the outskirts of Langford which surely could be built on. As St. Andrew's Way is a narrow cul-de-sac it surely would be inconvenient for heavy lorries and continual traffic to try and get through. It would only need someone to park in St. Andrews Way and that could cause a real traffic jam.

**LANGFORD APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Peter & Angela Lee	Langford	The question of where future development for house building in Mid Beds is indeed a vexed problem. I do not know of any suitable sites in other areas, but do know of one ideal site in Henlow. This is 'Dogs Ditch Field', a 4.25 acre site fronted on the Henlow - Clifton Road to Shefford and only about 400 yards from Henlow cross roads on the left hand side with housing on both sides of the site. It has been promoted by my family since the 1960s and the reason for it's refusal for planning in the past was that it would put undue strain on the Henlow -Clifton - Shefford road. With the building of the Henlow By-Pass this reason is no longer valid, since the road is now relatively quiet. Hoping that you will give this site your most earnest consideration.
Allen Stephens	Langford	Unfortunately I was unable to attend the display in Langford's Scout hut last night. But I understand that many houses are due to be built on the field at the end of Cambridge Way, where I live. How are you going to assure the people of Langford that all the infrastructure, which is failing, is up-dated without too much upset for those residents already living there? Every time we have heavy wind the electricity fails, it was either Friday the 8th of February or 15th when it last went off for a few hours. The sewerage farm on the end of the concrete road already has tankers removing ten or more loads every day; more houses will only make it less efficient. If Cambridge Way is used to convey the lorry loads of building materials, it will be very unsafe for old and young alike. The land is good and yields good grain, with food shortages forecast would it not be better to find Brown Fields instead of Green ones?
Allen Stephens	Langford	I am off duty soon as I'm at my desk early 07:15 most days. However had babysitting duties and families come first! That's another reason we like the area, close to fields and easy access to them. The road, Cambridge way is not robust enough for lorries carrying building materials, where would the access be from. The concrete road on the far side of the fields runs down to the Sewerage farm and is well used by tankers. It is narrow and only has a few passing places. The infrastructure would have to be made more robust to cope with the additional loads going to be put on it. I could see one farm buying all the strips and forming one large, easier to handle field.
Heidi Pegrums	Langford sites	I have already e-mailed with regard to further development in Langford, but more specifically, the small area highlighted in the plans between Station road and The Leys still has very poor access. It has been proposed before and I hope the objections noted then still count for something. The access shown is extremely narrow and more or less blind to traffic which is travelling from the A1 down Station Road.

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr Allen Stephens	General, Langford	<p>Thanks for the information contained in these documents. I still believe that consultation with local “folk”, not just land owners who stand to make a fortune by selling their sites, will give information on facts such as power and drainage. Where I live at 31 Cambridge Way, Langford, I would have an estate on my doorstep which although blocking the view would result in more power cuts in bad weather. Can you prove that the electric supply will also be modernised to minimise these cuts. Also the drains in our road fill and overflow during heavy rains. The land at the top of the road drains past the houses and this will just become worse. Sewerage will also back up, often the Water Company have had to use tankers to remove the slurry from the unit at the end of Cambridge Road near the Boot. This is very dangerous with cars rushing from the main road into Cambridge Road when others are trying to pass the tankers on there way down the same road. There have been times with two tankers parked behind each other making it doubly dangerous. Ask the people who live at the lower end of Cambridge Road and get their views.</p>