

## MOGGERHANGER 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.

**MOGGERHANGER APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

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 Graeme Free	DLA Town Planning Ltd	HO44

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H044**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Graeme Free	The inclusion of the site within the Moggerhanger village envelope would create a more defensible boundary with Park Road and Bedford Road, thus preventing any further extensions to the village. Moreover, the site would provide much needed mixed dwellings in this rural location. The development of the site for housing would support the existing village services such as schools, local shops and a Public House that are required by the village in order to create a sense of community and increase the vitality of the area. Moreover, the additional houses that would result from development on the site would potentially support new services in Moggerhanger such as a GP Surgery and increased bus services.

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
R Whitlock	Road access at Park Road/Bedford Road would be least disruptive to village with an improved roundabout - type function, which could have the secondary effect of slowing A603 traffic down.

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
Angela Simmons	This is greenbelt land and should not be selected for housing or mixed development over and above Brownfield sites and empty properties have first been developed. There is very poor infrastructure and public transport is inadequate even for the current community. There are no doctors, dentists or other facilities in the area and to develop this land would, in effect, mean the development of a total community from scratch. There is already too much heavy traffic (Andersons, Abbey Corrugated) along these country lanes damaging roads, hedgerows and undermining the structure of properties.
Mrs Eva Aldridge	There is no pavement link between this site and the other facilities ( e.g school, playground /playing field, pub church/shop). All pedestrians will need to cross the A603 (a busy trunk road) before reaching a narrow pavement along the northern side of the A road. This will be particularly difficult for parent and toddlers and pushchair users as A603 will need to be crossed, close to the bend, in order to reach the pavement. The narrowness of the pavement will not encourage walking to the lower school, particularly if there is more than one child or the possibility of meeting pedestrian(s) coming in the opposite direction. Is this site within the setting of Moggerhanger Park (Grade 1 listed building)?

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Aldridge	This proposal does not meet the requirements of the local community in terms of affordable housing. There are no footpaths adjacent to the proposed development and access to local facilities, etc. will entail crossing a busy A road. The proposed development is close to a grade 1 listed building.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H154**

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
R Whitlock	If road access from Blunham Road, then ok as long as no provision were "sneaken in" for future access to the field behind. Any further development behind "the Guinea" could make the existing crossroads worse (more dangerous), thereby demanding a roundabout at this location, which could spoil this part of the village.
Richard Thompson	As a resident of Moggerhanger, I appreciate that this land is ideal for housing infill. However, additional housing units will not benefit the village unless new services are also introduced. For example, there are no shops in the village, with the exception of a very small church run shop. The only downside I can envisage is the introduction of more vehicle movements along Blunham Road. Very much doubt the Highways department will approve junction onto an already busy Bedford Road (A603).

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
Mrs Eva Aldridge	There is no affordable housing element incorporated into this proposal. Traffic slowing down and delayed from turning into new entrance of the housing estate could cause an obstruction backing onto the A603. An increase in parked cars along Blunham Road by The Guinea pub could also give rise to similar problems, particularly at school drop off / pick up times.
Simon Aldridge	The proposed development does not meet the needs of the local community - there is no affordable housing element. The proposed development does not meet government guidelines on density requirements.

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
Angela Simmons	This is greenbelt land and should not be selected for housing or mixed development over and above Brownfield sites and empty properties have first been developed. There is very poor infrastructure and public transport is inadequate even for the current community. There are no doctors, dentists or other facilities in the area and to develop this land would, in effect, mean the development of a total community from scratch. There is already too much heavy traffic (Andersons, Abbey Corrugated) along these country lanes damaging roads, hedgerows and undermining the structure of properties.

**Ref Number: H273**

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
Angela Simmons	This is greenbelt land and should not be selected for housing or mixed development over and above Brownfield sites and empty properties have first been developed. There is very poor infrastructure and public transport is inadequate even for the current community. There are no doctors, dentists or other facilities in the area and to develop this land would, in effect, mean the development of a total community from scratch. There is already too much heavy traffic (Andersons, Abbey Corrugated) along these country lanes damaging roads, hedgerows and undermining the structure of properties.
Mrs Eva Aldridge	The proposal increases the traffic which will need to use St Johns Road and Bedford Road and Park Road and Bedford Road junction which is already difficult due to the poor slight lines. Pedestrians will need to cross the A603 to reach the facilities which can only be safely crossed at the pelican crossing. There is no proposed enhancement for the village in either facility nor to increase numbers of affordable housing. The proposed numbers of houses would be out of proportion to the existing village.
R Whitlock	I think this would be a poor choice, due to the likelihood of road access on to Blunham Road (even if not listed in report). Best access to A603 would be roundabout at Park Road, which could open up (H044) to additional development. Access on to Park Road would be a bad idea, impacting on local traffic.
Simon Aldridge	The proposed development has no provision for affordable housing. There is no pavement adjacent to the proposed development and pedestrian access will entail crossing a busy A road. The proposed development is close to a grade 1 listed building.
Stuart Hutchings	To build upon this site would destroy a lovely part of farming countryside.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H065/E37**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Edwin G.P.Aldridge	This site has good access off secondary roads, which will not lead to congestion or cause accidents. There is no need for extra road works outside the site. There are two primary schools nearby, both of which would welcome more pupils, and have room for them.
Mrs Eva Aldridge	The best proposal for Moggerhanger.
Simon Aldridge	This proposed development will provide a high proportion of affordable housing. There is also the possibility of providing employment opportunities and a footpath linking to existing footpaths and employment sites. It is environmentally sustainable.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Lee Harrison	Housing at this site is remote from the two villages it is supposed to be located between and is not supported by amenities.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Angela Simmons	This is Greenbelt land and should not be selected for housing or mixed development over and above Brownfield sites and empty properties have first been developed. There is very poor infrastructure and public transport is inadequate even for the current community. There are no doctors, dentists or other facilities in the area and to develop this land would, in effect, mean the development of a total community from scratch. There is already too much heavy traffic (Andersons, Abbey Corrugated) along these country lanes damaging roads, hedgerows and undermining the structure of properties. This proposed development land backs onto my property and would, consequently, damage my environment and one of the main reasons I purchased the property (being protected green belt land).
Sally Saville	The site is in open countryside and as such any development would be detrimental to the landscape. The site is not sufficiently close to Moggerhanger to offer any improved facilities for the village. Neither Moggerhanger nor Blunham are not close enough to become part of the new community nor to provide any community facility e.g. to travel to the village school from most areas of the proposed development would involve a car journey. The existing nursery is a local resource which would inevitably be affected, or even replaced, by the new development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: E63**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Lee Harrison	Site is currently highly visible across open flat farmland - it would be very visible in this location and detract from the rural nature.
Mrs Eva Aldridge	There is a high pressure gas main crossing the site which has a 40 foot wide reserve in which building works cannot take place. There are residential properties opposite the site.
Simon Aldridge	There is a high pressure gas main running through the middle of the proposed site. There is a footpath running along the edge of the proposed site. There are residential properties opposite the proposed site.

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
Angela Simmons	This is Greenbelt land and should not be selected for housing or mixed development over and above Brownfield sites and empty properties have first been developed. There is very poor infrastructure and public transport is inadequate even for the current community. There are no doctors, dentists or other facilities in the area and to develop this land would, in effect, mean the development of a total community from scratch. There is already too much heavy traffic (Andersons, Abbey Corrugated) along these country lanes damaging roads, hedgerows and undermining the structure of properties.
Sally Saville	the site covers a large area adjacent to the main road, and therefore its impact on the open countryside would be significant the road is already heavily used by lorries to abbey at south mills and the existing business park on the ridge way causing congestion at the junction with the main A603 any employees could only access the workplace by car adding to the congestion.

**MOGGERHANGER APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
J.K.N. Dawson, Ramblers' Association	E63, Moggerhanger	This is flanked on the south by FP6, whose safety is already threatened by the heavy industrial vehicles using the same private road to access the Ridgeway Business Park. Any further development must provide for the segregation and safety of pedestrians using this path. (Please see appendix three for cover letter)

**MOGGERHANGER APPENDIX THREE**  
Letters and Reports

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Subject</b>
David Russell Associates on behalf of Charles Wells Limited	H154 Moggerhanger
J. K. N. Dawson, Ramblers Association	E63 Moggerhanger

## Site Allocations Survey

### ***Moggerhanger - Site H154 - Land r/o The Guinea PH, Bedford Road***

The LPA's initial comments identify Moggerhanger as a small village in the emerging Core Strategy, where allocations will be considered where there is an exceptional need for development. Of the sites being promoted in Moggerhanger, this site matches best the village's scale and its potential housing needs.

The site is located on the right side of Bedford Road for safe pedestrian access to the village's lower school, which is only 150 metres to the north in Blunham Road. There are regular bus services to Sandy and Bedford from nearby bus stops on the Bedford Road.

Developing the site will have little impact on the surrounding countryside and provide an effective rounding off of development on the western side of Blunham Road.

The provision of new homes on this site would provide a small allowance for meeting needs in the area, in scale with the village's size and settlement type.

More detailed information in support of the site is contained in the response to the consultation on the document "Site Allocations DPD - Invitation for the submission of sites for residential development".

*David Russell*  
*David Russell Associates*  
*14th March 2008*

*For Charles Wells Limited*



**Bedfordshire Area**

Groups:

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

**BY EMAIL**

Your ref: **LDF/SA/Site Allocations**

Mr Duffy  
Vision Twentyone  
Milton Hall  
Deansgate  
Manchester

Dear Mr Duffy

**Site allocations DPD: Issues and options consultation**

**Northill, Southill, Old Warden, Mogerhanger and Blunham parishes.**

On behalf of the Ramblers' Association, I am responding specifically for potential development sites within the parishes listed above on the single issue of possible impact each site may have on use of Public Rights of Way (also Permissive Paths if relevant). Only sites that may affect paths are listed in the comments that follow.

To aid conciseness, 'Footpath' and 'Bridleway' are abbreviated to 'FP' and 'BW' respectively in references to some public path numbers.

It is noted that the site plans provided do not show Rights of Way and it is requested that this omission is remedied at the next stage of consultation. It would also assist if parish boundaries could be shown on plans.

Yours sincerely

J.K.N. Dawson

Local Footpath Officer, Ramblers' Association

Mr. Chris Duffy,  
Vision 21, Milton Hall,  
Deansgate,  
Manchester M3 4BQ.

Cc Roger Chick, Beds Area Footpath Committee, Ramblers' Association (email)

### **Northill Parish**

**H231.** This site is flanked on the south by Northill FP7 and crossed NW to SE by FP9. Suggested development would affect the use, amenity and probably alignment of these paths, which are prospectively very important as routes Upper Caldecote to Biggleswade.

**H291, H234 and H229.** These sites are all flanked or touched by FP5 or FP12 respectively, whose amenity or safety might be affected.

### **Southill Parish.**

**E52.** See Old Warden.

**H184 and H241.** Traversed by important amenity path Southill FP6. Use and amenity could be affected by development.

**H183 and H185.** Traversed or flanked by important amenity paths FPs29, 30, and FP5 respectively. Use and amenity could be affected by development.

### **Old Warden Parish.**

**E52.** This very large site is of very high present and potential recreational value. A worked out gravel quarry, it is crisscrossed with public footpaths and bridleways accessible on foot, horseback, or by cycle from Upper Caldecote, Broom, Southill and Old Warden villages, Ickwell and Biggleswade. Upper Caldecote in particular is a large village, likely to expand further, which has otherwise few facilities for informal outdoor recreation. The planned restoration of the site (by 2012) will further enhance its amenity value to the local communities, and not development should be contemplated which would threaten this.

### **Moggerhanger Parish**

**E63.** This is flanked on the south by FP6, whose safety is already threatened by the heavy industrial vehicles using the same private road to access the Ridgeway Business Park. Any further development must provide for the segregation and safety of pedestrians using this path.

### **Blunham Parish**

**H197.** FP6 crosses this site near the eastern edge. Its use and amenity could be affected by development.

**MOGGERHANGER APPENDIX FOUR**  
Respondents' 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 Moggerhanger in general.

Postcode
AL3 4PW
AL4 8AY
MK40 3JJ
MK44 3NF
MK44 3NJ
MK44 3PD
MK44 3PH
MK44 3RA
MK44 3RF
MK44 3RQ
SG19 1NG