

NORTHILL 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.

NORTHILL 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 MP Bryant & Mr TA Bryant	C/O Frazer Hickling Phillips Planning Services Ltd	H018, H029, H139, H229, H231, H234

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H018

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
Alan Wakeford	Site is close to the centre of the village and next to roads through and to and from the village. It is also near the very limited facilities we have in the village i.e. the shop/post office, churches, village hall and lower school. Near to a pickup point for pupils catching a school bus.
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	This site would be suitable for a small scale development of 10-15 dwellings with easy access from existing roads and minimal impact on existing local community.
Sam Franklin	Reference Number H018 – Pound Field, The Pound, Upper Caldecote Upper Caldecote is identified as a large scale village in the Core Strategy and small scale development is considered here whilst this site has capacity for 96+ dwellings in reality a scheme which incorporates a smaller number together with landscaping, etc may be appropriate on this site. The land is of high agricultural classification however the majority of land in Upper Caldecote is Grade 1 or Grade 2 Agricultural Classification and all of the competing sites in Upper Caldecote are similarly classified.

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
A Goodman	I have concerns about any further development in Upper Caldecote due to the lack of facilities, public transport and access to local facilities. Any increase in traffic crossing the A1 to access facilities in Biggleswade would cause concern as the A1 crossing at the end of Biggleswade Road is already a death trap and access via the roundabout by Sainsburys often means queuing for 10 - 15 minutes. I am even more concerned if by affordable housing you mean household's that would probably have no transport and that would mean crossing the A1 by bike/foot where no crossing exists, again putting lives at risk. Consideration would need to be given to some sort of pedestrian crossing over the A1.
Richard Cass	Of all the sites in Upper Caldecote this site provides the most significant benefits with the least detrimental issues. The benefits are: 1 Potential to provide a roundabout to slow traffic entering and leaving the village. 2 Provide a basis for a footpath to link Upper Caldecote with Ickwell. A much supported facility both in Upper Caldecote and Ickwell. 3 Enable a Public House to be provided for the village. 4 Give additional support to the Post Office and shop. 5 Allow safer vehicular access to the local road network. All the other proposed sites in the village would have fewer benefits and be more likely to create flooding and traffic problems. They would also be more detrimental to the local environment.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues
C. Cheshire	<p>Out of scale for size of village. No good public transport links. No good local facilities. Road links to Biggleswade would need improving, A1, Sainsburys roundabout. No pedestrian access to local town (Biggleswade) would need bridge over A1 This development would increase on traffic on local roads that are already busy. Should focus new builds on sites adjacent to facilities and local towns, Sandy, Biggleswade etc due to access to shops, doctors, Public Transport all within walking distance, essential for people with potentially no private transport.</p>
Graham Neill	The crossroads are already an accident hotspot without adding to the problem.
Helen Papworth	<p>Outside settlement area Would require roundabout at the Pound Road junction to cope with additional cars (approx 200 (2 per most households))</p>
J K Pressland	Too larger development compared to Caldecote versus other villages. Development should be targeted at towns (Biggleswade, Sandy etc) due to access to facilities and public transport etc.
J Lincoln	<p>No good access to local towns, need to cross A1, proper crossing required if development goes ahead pedestrian and road. Limited buses to Bedford and local towns would need improving. Only 2 small shops in village not suitable for main shops. No pubs or entertainment in village. Traffic would cause issues for small estate and elderly residents.</p>
J. Taske	Development to large for village size
Jo Wilson	You will destroy the village of Upper Caldecote, destroying any community. It is very short-sighted to think that a village such as this could support any development! I suggest someone really looks into this instead of just obeying orders!
L F Wagstaff	The only positive thing about development on these sites is the provision of a relief road if this means traffic bypasses the village centre. It should also be considered that Broom village will be being subjected to another big gravel quarry to the south if this site is developed.
M Barnes	This size development would only work if other local facilities were included and A1/Biggleswade access improved
Mr D.Cox	<p>Access to facilities limited and involves crossing over to Biggleswade or Sandy. I do not see the point in allowing any further development in a village that has limited shops and no other facilities other than in fill of single houses. Any larger development will lead to further exclusion of individuals due to limited public transport.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D.Nicholas	Too larger development for the village size and facilities, Caldecote should have been excluded from development like Ickwell, Northill etc. This type of development is not suited to a village the size of Caldecote due to the issues of facilities (2 small shops not suitable for main shopping, no doctors etc. no youth facilities. A development of this size would cause chaos on the A1 crossings already stretched and dangerous.
Mr M P Bryant & Mr T A Bryant	The site severely suffers from any physical sense of enclosure. The boundaries of the proposed site (or smaller site) would be ill defined and require significant landscape planting and earthworks to create any sense of enclosure. The flat topography of the site and surroundings mean that any development will have a significant impact on the local environment spatially; it does not harmonise with the existing village form and would result in an incongruous extension into the open countryside.
Mr R J Hall	The suggested number of houses is too many. The site could support a few houses. However, the only current local infrastructure it could support would be the Post Office, two small convenience stores and the local school. In order to gain access to any other facilities the residents would require transport. Given the paucity of busses, this could only be at the expense of more cars leading to greater congestion.
Mrs Ann Coutts	Too dangerous due to village cross roads at the corner of the site. Local health service is insufficient to support development of this size. Also bus service. We have no village pub.
Mrs J D Green	The potential to support shops in Upper Caldecote - most people would use Sainsburys. Public transport would need improving.
Mrs Mary Howell	This site along with most of the others suggest for Upper Caldecote is far too big. The site right on the crossroad would mean more traffic problems and a roundabout or traffic lights would be needed to control this already dangerous crossing.
Mrs Ward	Biggleswade Road is not capable of handling the extra traffic neither are there schools and appropriate public transport links without creating more bottle necks onto the A1
Payne	Development of this site would need careful consideration, RE: site access given Sandy/Shefford Road is busy and the cross-roads have been site of accidents due to visibility issues from Ickwell. Site development would create a precedent for future development and would destroy village character.
Peter James Hodgson	Perhaps I am being biased as I happen to live opposite the proposed site, which I was informed on buying the property it was a green belt area. The Vinegar Hill Rd/Hitchin Road is now very busy and there have been numerous accidents on the crossroads although there has a 30 mph flashing speed limit, which is not a deterrent.
Peter Roberts	Proposal far too large for village and any access to village facilities would require crossing a dangerous crossroads. Any development would need major road alterations to make safe.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
R.Lindsay	<p>Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furloughing the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?</p>
Ronald Brian Stocks	<p>I consider this development would be outside the footprint of the village and as such would strongly oppose it.</p>
Stephanie Windsor	<p>A few houses perhaps but definitely not a development of this size.</p>
Steven Wilson	<p>This development is outside of the current village envelope and on greenfield sites. This is a small village, public transport is poor, and doctor surgery places are limited. The total planned development for Upper Caldecote totals 531 units; on average I would expect at least 2 cars per unit. This would mean 1062 extra cars on the road. The majority of these cars would be joining the A1 every day, making the already congested and dangerous A1 access more so. It would appear the village will double in size; this would destroy the community spirit that this village enjoys. All developments should be considered in the context of the impact on the existing community, any developments should integrate, NOT create separate communities!</p>
W. Walker	<p>Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, Northill, and Old Warden etc.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H029

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
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	This site would be ideal for a small scale development of about 10 dwellings fronting onto The Pastures which would have minimum impact on the village. Any large scale development off of Biggleswade Road has the potential to vastly increased traffic flow as the Biggleswade Road/A1 junction is unsuitable to access the A1 southbound which would direct a lot of traffic all through the village to access the A1 at Biggleswade roundabout which is already a busy junction with significant congestion at peak times. All Upper Caldecote residents would benefit from a footbridge crossing the A1.
Payne	The development of this site would enhance the village, and due to its existing boundaries would not create a precedent for the new development
R Maudlin	There are two shops and post office, sports facilities, recycling bay all in easy walking distance of them. It does fill in an area that does not look out of place if built on.
Sam Franklin	Reference Number H029 - Land at Water Lane Farm Upper Caldecote is identified in the emerging Core Strategy as a large village. Small scale development would be considered here. This site could provide up to 60 houses on land which is in the centre of the village and close to the major facilities of the village including the school, shops and places of worship. There is sufficient space to provide open space, a public house and there is good access to the playing fields and sports facilities of Upper Caldecote. Whilst the land is identified as of high grade agricultural classification the majority of land in Upper Caldecote is similarly classified. The site could provide a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing depending on the local requirements. There is adequate space for car parking and other amenities. It is recognised that whilst the site could accommodate 60+ houses there is scope for a smaller development with more open space, landscaping, etc.

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
Helen Papworth	Possibly a suitable infill, not sure whether access could cope with additional traffic.
Stephanie Windsor	A few houses perhaps but not a development of this size.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Wakeford	Site is on prime agricultural land. A limited single street from the adjacent housing estate might be acceptable. All the limited facilities in the village are at the far end of the village except for a rundown small shop that nobody uses. School bus stops nearby. Traffic from the development would have to use Biggleswade Road which is already heavily congested at times. Local sewers are already overloaded.
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues.
D B Humphries	Much smaller development could be acceptable. Very few facilities available in the village which will result in a large increase in traffic.
J.Taske	Development too large for village size.
J K Presland	Too larger development compared to Caldecote versus other villages. Development should be targeted at towns (Biggleswade, Sandy etc) due to access to facilities and public transport etc.
J. Lincoln	No good access to local towns, need to cross A1, proper crossing required if development goes ahead pedestrian and road. Limited buses to Bedford and local towns would need improving. Only 2 small shops in village not suitable for main shops. No pubs or entertainment in village. Traffic would cause issues for small estate and elderly residents.
Jo Wilson	You will destroy the village of Upper Caldecote, destroying any community. It is very short-sighted to think that a village such as this could support any development! I suggest someone really looks into this instead of just obeying orders!
L. Bain	The drains on Water Lane are already inadequate for the current houses and backup when there is heavy rain. Before this site is considered for development this problem must be addressed. Congestion around Upper Caldecote is already a problem, crossing the A1 at Tingays Corner is extremely dangerous and traffic at the roundabout (Biggleswade North) queues back to golf centre/Broom turning. There are already 2 buses taking children to Biggleswade schools, extra buses and parents transporting children will only add to the problems at the A1 roundabout.
M. Barnes	This size development would only work if other local facilities were included and A1/Biggleswade access improved
Mike Berry	This area of Upper Caldecote has a problem with sewage/drainage. Contractors employed to rectify problems, usually blockages, state that the system is incapable of supporting the existing housing effectively. Biggleswade Road is already a nightmare to navigate which would be made worse with increased traffic flow. It has an accident black spot at both ends. These comments apply partly and in some cases wholly to the other sites proposed in/off Biggleswade Road, Upper Caldecote.
Mr Brian Day	This is a lovely field separating two housing developments, building on this and the other large proposed sites in this village would turn it into a town, not a good idea for the area!!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D.Cox	<p>Access to facilities limited and involves crossing over to Biggleswade or Sandy.</p> <p>I do not see the point in allowing any further development in a village that has limited shops and no other facilities other than in fill of single houses. Any larger development will lead to further exclusion of individuals due to limited public transport.</p>
Mr M P Bryant & Mr T A Bryant	<p>It is not clear where access to the site would be taken from, but it is assumed an access point could be gained from the pastures. Given the scale of development proposed could this existing access support the additional vehicle movements from 60+ new dwellings without compromising highways safety?</p> <p>In spatial terms this site sits between existing development parcels, however, this is not a good location because of two landscape issues. Firstly this site as a green space within the settlement contributes to its character and appearance by allowing views out into the open countryside. This is assisted by little landscape enclosure. Secondly, the lack of defined boundaries means that development will have a significant visual impact to the detriment of the village setting.</p>
Mr R J Hall	<p>The suggested number of houses is too many. The site could support a few houses. However, the only current local infrastructure it could support would be the Post Office, two small convenience stores and the local school. In order to gain access to any other facilities the residents would require transport. Given the paucity of busses, this could only be at the expense of more cars leading to greater congestion.</p>
Mr. D.Nicholas	<p>Too larger development for the village size and facilities, Caldecote should have been excluded from development like Ickwell, Northill etc. This type of development is not suited to a village the size of Caldecote due to the issues of facilities (2 small shops not suitable for main shopping, no doctors etc. no youth facilities. A development of this size would cause chaos on the A1 crossings already stretched and dangerous.</p>
Mrs D Pleasants	<p>The drains and sewage in this area are insufficient to cope with anymore new buildings, also the schools would not be able to accommodate extra children, and there is nothing for children and youths(except for playing fields) for them to do</p>
Mrs J D Green	<p>The potential to support shops in Upper Caldecote - most people would use Sainsburys. Public transport would need improving.</p>
Mrs L R Pitts	<p>Spoil village, dangerous, too much traffic going into Pasteures and onto Biggleswade Road. Noisy, spoil look of village, and the green. Very busy, too many houses. We are a small village; don't spoil it by local farmers getting rich quick.</p>
Mrs Mary Howell	<p>This site, should it be allowed, will double the size of the nearby Shakespeare site already there. Together with sites H229 and H234 a total of more than 200 houses right in the middle of this part of the village will more than double those already there. Traffic and parking already causes problems.</p>
Mrs Ward	<p>This is valuable farm land which will be required to support the growing need for more crops due to the emergence of China and India and the corresponding food shortages.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs. R. Randle	<p>Access from this site would I presume be from Biggleswade Road, a road which is already congested at many times of day as many of the properties there have no provision for off road parking, any development would add to this problem. The village already lacks services for teenagers/young people and a development of this size would add to the number without being large enough to bring with it additional facilities.</p> <p>Caldecote is an agricultural community and the proposed development site is under continued cultivation.</p> <p>Development of this nature would adversely affect the nature of the local community.</p>
Peter Roberts	<p>Development too large for village and in location that would spoil it. The increase of traffic in Biggleswade road would be too much to be safe and the "The Pastures" junction would become dangerous as visibility is poor and is main pedestrian access to children's play area.</p>
R. Lindsay	<p>Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development.</p> <p>Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village.</p> <p>Not sufficient GP services already.</p> <p>Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services.</p> <p>Local hospitals already overstretched.</p> <p>Too much traffic on local roads.</p> <p>Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially.</p> <p>Water services stretched.</p> <p>Loss of Grade A agricultural land.</p> <p>Furthering the village as a dormitory village.</p> <p>What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?</p>
Richard Cass	<p>This site provides a visual break from existing development and enhances local amenity and environment.</p> <p>Any development here would severely increase the risk of flooding - surface and foul water and create traffic issues in Biggleswade Road.</p>
W. Walker	<p>Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, Northill, and Old Warden etc.</p>
Wayne L Holley	<p>I believe that villages are supposed to be villages and towns are supposed to be towns. People want to live in villages because they offer a small tight-knit community at the cost of not having many of the facilities that towns offer. As you expand the size of the villages, we end up with a town like atmosphere - no-one knows anyone - but without any of the facilities. By concreting over the green parts in the middle of the village you change the whole feel of the village and the immediate access to the green surrounding it for everyone. Adding a small estate or a few houses here or there on the outside, such as Pound Close, is not so bad. Sixty houses is a huge development.</p>

Ref Number: H076

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
Stephanie Windsor	Small scale for the right reasons with eco-elements.

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
Alison Johns	Minor development might be ok.
D James	A smaller development would be preferable to the larger developments suggested.
W. Walker	A development of this size is more in keeping with the villages.

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
Andrew Thiedeman	This proposal is totally inappropriate; the Greenfield site is in an area with poor public transport, no amenities. Access and egress is only possible via the A1 thereby increasing the carbon footprint as residents need a car. The country ecosphere can only be further harmed by this development
Helen Papworth	No demand in Lower Caldecote for play area (unlike the rest of the parish) Planning application for 2 houses has previously been refused A1 access via slip road is dangerous - especially exiting

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H100

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

Submitted by	Comments
C Rose	A small development would allow for reasonable natural growth in the village.
John Dawson	If houses are needed in Northill, this site is of suitably modest size. It is well placed adjacent to the main population centre and existing services. It is also within easy walking distance of the church, village hall, public house and school

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
Chris Hall	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sand Lane, particularly the narrow far end, cannot accommodate more traffic. 2. Sewerage facilities are already overloaded. 3. Mid Beds DC gave undertakings (through Cllr. P Turner) at the time of the Chantry [Illegible] Peace development, that there would be no further encroachment at the end of Sand Lane.
D Wright	<p>Increase in village population by 5-10%, no increase in infrastructure. Increased traffic flow in village.</p> <p>Loss of social land used by local residents for leisure activities.</p> <p>Increased development in other locations within parish particularly in Ickwell and Upper Caldecote will have a significant impact on traffic flow through village.</p>
Grimes	Access to the site could not be achieved without further disruption to existing dwellings or without encroaching onto agricultural land outside of the village limits.
Helen Papworth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Current vehicular access at top (west) end of Sand Lane is already a BIG problem, without additional homes being built further down 2) No obvious access to the site at the bottom of Sand Lane
Nick Evans	This is totally unnecessary creeping of the village into the countryside, and the village does not have the infrastructure to cope with this influx and would change its character.
Name not given	Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, and Old Warden etc.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Barbara Farquhar	I feel that further development here would put strain on an already busy site road. Also Northill has few facilities to support increase in population.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H139

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	Providing access could be obtained to the site without major impact on the existing community. Traffic would impact on the village. The village would benefit from a safe crossing being provided to allow pedestrian access across the A1 to Biggleswade as at present most residents travel to Sainsburys/Biggleswade by car travelling all around the village to avoid turning south onto A1 from Biggleswade Road.

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 Ward	If this site is used to provide cheaper housing for locals it could be of benefit.
Payne	This site is better suited to development and would complement the Pastures/Harvey Close developments already situated south of housing in Biggleswade Road.
Peter Roberts	All proposed developments are too large for village. Biggleswade road is narrow. However, this site may be the best choice for this village but improved play area for children must be a condition of development. Also, closure of A1 road crossing for safety and to limit Biggleswade Road traffic should be required, as should a safe pedestrian crossing for the A1 to allow access to Biggleswade town. (Footbridge).
Richard Cass	Flooding and Traffic problems likely with development here. Affordable housing desirable though. Smaller number of houses would make development here more acceptable.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A Goodman	Concerns previously raised regarding access to local facilities in Biggleswade as no real facilities exist in Upper Caldecote. We do have 2 small shops but they are not suitable to live from so people would need to cross the A1 to go to Sainsburys etc. I would be concerned that if "affordable houses" were built on this plot or any of the others this would lead to pedestrian traffic crossing the already dangerous A1. If Doctors, Healthcare need were to be met for young mums this would also mean pushchairs crossing the A1 and I would not want to be responsible for allowing that!
Alan Wakeford	Site is behind existing houses on Biggleswade Road and to allow access an existing house would have to be demolished. Even further away from the very limited existing facilities than H018 and H029. Traffic from the house would have to use Biggleswade Road which is already very congested at times. Local sewer is already overloaded. Walking access to Lower School is not viable and bus services are very limited.
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues, especially through the small estate that would be used for access.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Beryl Levy	The village has no real amenities that could be used by people living in social housing, there is a village shop but this is only suitable to buy emergency goods and you could not buy a complete Sunday roast at the shop. The public Transport links are limited and the roads could not take the additional traffic that would increase as a result of additional housing. This particular site is not suitable as it would take the traffic via a small road and past some bungalows for elderly residents.
C Cheshire	This development will bring additional traffic through a small housing estate and in front of a number of retirement homes. The village has no real facilities and cannot support additional housing without further improvements to facilities, road junctions A1, Sainsburys roundabout, and public transport links.
D James	This would bring additional traffic down our road where children play and elderly residents are enjoying their retirement time in peace. A development of this size does not fit well in the village and as we have no facilities will only add to the overall traffic in the village. More consideration should be given to developments where facilities already exist and access can be gained from a main road rather than through a small estate road with a large number of pedestrians. Also living to the West of the A1 it would be better to consider development to the East that do not involve crossing the A1.
Helen Papworth	Access? If via the pastures, already congested and would need a dwelling pulled down to get through to site. If via footpath from Biggleswade Rd, it is only a footpath and too narrow for 2 cars to pass side by side.
J K Presland	Too larger development compared to Caldecote versus other villages. Development should be targeted at towns (Biggleswade, Sandy etc) due to access to facilities and public transport etc.
J Lincoln	No good access to local towns, need to cross A1, proper crossing required if development goes ahead pedestrian and road. Limited buses to Bedford and local towns would need improving. Only 2 small shops in village not suitable for main shops. No pubs or entertainment in village. Traffic would cause issues for small estate and elderly residents.
J. Taske	Development too large for village size.
Jo Wilson	You will destroy the village of Upper Caldecote, destroying any community. It is very short-sighted to think that a village such as this could support any development! I suggest someone really looks into this instead of just obeying orders!
Linda Smith	The traffic problems we have with continuous speeding, causing threat to accidents from traffic coming on the A1 will (illegible). We have no facilities to support more houses socially where families are living.
M Barnes	This size development would only work if other local facilities were included and A1/Biggleswade access improved. This would also put additional traffic through a small estate and be out of character for the village.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D. Cox	<p>Access to facilities limited and involves crossing over to Biggleswade or Sandy.</p> <p>I do not see the point in allowing any further development in a village that has limited shops and no other facilities other than in fill of single houses. Any larger development will lead to further exclusion of individuals due to limited public transport.</p> <p>I am also not aware of the need to expand the Football Club as I believe they are already struggling to support the present facilities?</p>
Mr D.Nicholas	<p>Too larger development for the village size and facilities, Caldecote should have been excluded from development like Ickwell, Northill etc. This type of development is not suited to a village the size of Caldecote due to the issues of facilities (2 small shops not suitable for main shopping, no doctors etc. no youth facilities. A development of this size would cause chaos on the A1 crossings already stretched and dangerous. This would also increase the traffic through a small residential development with small children playing and retirement homes in addition to being outside of the village boundary and on grade A agricultural land. I notice the comment about letting the playing fields have the additional land, as far as I understand they do not need any more land and are struggling financially to maintain what they have.</p>
Mr M.P. Bryant & Mr T.A. Bryant	<p>The site's lack of enclosure and accessibility would be our main concern. The field's existing access point, reaches Biggleswade Road on the inside of the bend; therefore, could sufficient visibility be achieved to create a safe access. Furthermore, if third party land is required to create an access is the site deliverable? In landscape terms the lack of enclosure by defined landscape of topographical features means that any development would have a significant visual impact to the detriment of the village setting</p>
Mr R J Hall	<p>The suggested number of houses is too many. The site could support a few houses. However, the only current local infrastructure it could support would be the Post Office, two small convenience stores and the local school. In order to gain access to any other facilities the residents would require transport. Given the paucity of buses, this could only be at the expense of more cars leading to greater congestion.</p>
Mrs D Pleasants	<p>The drains and sewage in this area are insufficient to cope with any more New Builds, also the schools would not be able to accommodate extra children, and there is nothing for children and youths (except for the playing fields) for them to do.</p>
Mrs J D Green	<p>The potential to support shops in Upper Caldecote - most people would use Sainsburys. Public transport would need improving.</p>
P. Goodman	<p>The access to this site would be via a small estate access road and is not suitable for the increased traffic that would result from this development.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
R.Lindsay	<p>Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furthering the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?</p>
W.Walker	<p>Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, Northill, and Old Warden etc.</p>

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

Submitted by	Comments
Lesley Brook	<p>Concerned about the number of houses proposed in Upper Caldecote - several hundred.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H212

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
S J Melvin	I only agree if there are 2 houses, not more on the green.

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
Helen Papworth	No public transport. Listed buildings alongside, also conservation area. Access of Thorncote Green would create many problems (unmade up and un-adopted road).
Victoria Cichy	Although I have no objection in principle to the provision of one or two additional houses to what is a very small hamlet, any proposed development must take into account the problems that already exist regarding low level flooding and sewerage for some of the properties on the Green which would be exacerbated by additional housing stock.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Avril Bird	Please change the Mid Beds comments section as this site is not in Lower Caldecote!!!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H229

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
Mr M P Bryant & Mr T A Bryant	Please refer to our previous representations made under the "Call for Sites" consultation. Additional: The site benefits from enclosure within a mature landscape setting. Of all the sites being promoted, this site will have the least visual impact in both near distance and long distance views. If development is to be allocated within Upper Caldecote this site should be given serious consideration.
Mr R J Hall	The suggested number of houses is too many. The site could support a few houses. However, the only current local infrastructure it could support would be the Post Office, two small convenience stores and the local school. In order to gain access to any other facilities the residents would require transport. Given the paucity of buses, this could only be at the expense of more cars leading to greater congestion.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Wakeford	Site is behind the existing houses on Biggleswade Road. The access shown is a narrow farm track between two houses. A small tractor can just squeeze through. To enter the field a bridge over Caldecote Brook would be necessary. The field contains a large irrigation reservoir which would have to be filled in and could not then be built on. There is also a large spoil heap from when the reservoir was dugout. A permissive footpath runs along the northern edge of the sight. Is near to a local shop that nobody uses and is some distance from the extremely limited facilities that we have in the village ie the shop/post office, churches, village and lower school. This land is no longer in use and as a consequence has become a good area for a wide variety of wildlife away from the "prairie" fields of intensive farming nearby. Local sewer is already overloaded.
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues.
C. Cheshire	Out of scale for size of village. No good public transport links. No good local facilities. Road links to Biggleswade would need improving, A1, Sainsburys roundabout. No pedestrian access to local town (Biggleswade) would need bridge over A1 This development would increase on traffic on local roads that are already busy. Should focus new builds on sites adjacent to facilities and local towns, Sandy, Biggleswade etc due to access to shops, doctors, Public Transport all within walking distance, essential for people with potentially no private transport.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
D Towson	It seems that very little thought has been given to the impact of increased traffic, the possibility of increased crime rates and the lifestyle of the existing residents who moved here to be in a village location!
Helen Papworth	Back infill Loss of agriculture Access??
Ian Campbell	Biggleswade Rd is already a busy road; more houses mean more cars making more congestion points along an already hazardous road. Too many houses on this proposal. Smaller infill sites would be more suitable.
J K Presland	Too larger development compared to Caldecote versus other villages. Development should be targeted at towns (Biggleswade, Sandy etc) due to access to facilities and public transport etc.
J. Taske	Development too large for village size
Jo Wilson	You will destroy the village of Upper Caldecote, destroying any community. It is very short-sighted to think that a village such as this could support any development! I suggest someone really looks into this instead of just obeying orders!
M. Barnes	This size development would only work if other local facilities were included and A1/Biggleswade access improved.
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	This site is unsuitable for development as the proposed access is via a narrow farm track giving tractors access to the field network. Any widening of this would be of major impact to the dwelling on either side and has the potential to create a dangerous junction as there is a village shop opposite which has regular lorry deliveries as well as shoppers parking. The area would also be outside the existing village framework and threaten one of the small areas of woodland left in the village.
Mr and Mrs T W Pitts	Spoil village, very dangerous access onto Biggleswade Road opposite shop bus stop, school bus. Volume of traffic increase making it very dangerous mornings and evenings when going and coming to and from work. Local farmers getting rich and not caring about the harm they are doing to the village and the environment.
Mr D.Cox	Access to facilities limited and involves crossing over to Biggleswade or Sandy. I do not see the point in allowing any further development in a village that has limited shops and no other facilities other than in fill of single houses. Any larger development will lead to further exclusion of individuals due to limited public transport.
Mr D.Nicholas	Too larger development for the village size and facilities, Caldecote should have been excluded from development like Ickwell, Northill etc. This type of development is not suited to a village the size of Caldecote due to the issues of facilities (2 small shops not suitable for main shopping, no doctors etc. no youth facilities. A development of this size would cause chaos on the A1 crossings already stretched and dangerous.
Mrs J D Green	The potential to support shops in Upper Caldecote - most people would use Sainsburys. Public transport would need improving.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Mary Howell	This site, should it be allowed, will double the size of the nearby Shakespeare site already there. Together with sites H029 and H234 a total of more than 200 houses right in the middle of this part of the village will more than double those already there. Traffic and parking already causes problems. Plus we have no community centre, doctor's surgery; we don't even now have a pub!! And probably shortly won't have a post office.
Mrs Sheila Portch	I strongly disagree with the idea of building on this site as this will directly affect my property 103 Biggleswade Road Upper Caldecote. the access which has been named is directly next my property and is virtually a dirt track I cannot see how lorries carrying building materials can possibly move along this track it will interfere with my and my neighbours privacy and peace and quiet, I feel most upset that the field in question has been designated for building 77 houses. I feel this will devalue my property and block out the beautiful views over the countryside also there is a lot of wildlife which will be affected.
Mrs Ward	There is no road to this proposed site from Biggleswade Road. The lane leading from the rear into Biggleswade Road is too narrow and access could mean the loss of existing housing. At the moment middle and senior children are bussed to school in Biggleswade and this would mean extra pressure on transport and schools in Biggleswade which already have to cope with huge proposed developments.
Mrs. R. Randle	Biggleswade Road is already congested with parked vehicles at many times during the day as many of the existing properties do not have provision for off road parking and this site would add to the volume of traffic using the road. Access to the A1 at the end of Biggleswade Road, especially for traffic turning right is already difficult due to the volume and speed of the traffic and extra vehicles using the junction would add to the dangers and problems. There is little for young people/teenagers to do in the village and the planned development would seem unlikely to be large enough to bring with it increased provision whilst adding to the numbers.
Payne	It is not appropriate to double back accommodation in this location. The site also has poor access.
Pete Roberts	Access to Biggleswade road difficult in an area where it is narrow and has blind spots. Therefore, dangerous especially as in that area many playgroups use village hall etc so lots of children walking, crossing road. Development also too big.
R B Stocks	Consider this site to be outside the footprint of the village and therefore undesirable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
R.Lindsay	<p>Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furthering the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?</p>
Richard Cass	<p>This site creates similar problems to those of H234. Potential flooding, traffic issues in Biggleswade Road. Also access would remove two dwellings. The area is notable for wild life habitats and provides a welcome wooded area. Removal would further urbanise the local environment.</p>
Steven Wilson	<p>This site is outside of the village envelope on greenfield land. This is a small village, public transport is poor, and access to doctors is currently very difficult. The total planned development numbers 531 units, on average I would expect at least 1062 cars to be added to the roads. The vast majority of these cars would want to access the A1 on a daily basis at a already dangerous and congested roundabout. Looking at the proposed sites it would appear the village would double in size; this would destroy the community spirit that this village enjoys. All developments should be considered in the context of the impact on the existing community, any developments should integrate into that community; not create new communities!</p>
W. Walker	<p>Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, Northill, and Old Warden etc.</p>

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

Submitted by	Comments
Lesley Brook	Concerned about the number of houses proposed in Upper Caldecote - several hundred.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H231

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
Mr M P Bryant & Mr T A Bryant	Please refer to our previous representations made during the "Call for Sites" consultation. Additional: Given the location of the settlement and its position within the hierarchy, the objector wishes to clarify that if more modest development was to be allocated to Upper Caldecote, half the site could be developed in a linear form along the Biggleswade Road, in a similar form to the general extension of the village. The development could take the form of frontage development with a shallow plan residential layout to the rear. Supporting landscape proposals on the remaining land could create a defined visual barrier and add ecological value to the area.
Payne	This site ... into H229 could be seen as a co-ordinated approach to meet new housing needs without creating precedent for the future.

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
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	This site would only be suitable for a small development of about 10-15 dwellings as anything larger would have a major impact on the village with increased traffic. The Biggleswade Road/A1 junction is not suitable for turning south as all traffic from this site would go through the village. A pedestrian crossing (footbridge) across the A1 would benefit all villagers and would reduce traffic and carbon emissions.

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 Wakeford	This is a huge development. There are currently approx. 550 houses in the village. The proposed 531 additional houses most of which are on this site would completely swamp the existing village overnight and substantially change its character for the worst. With one shop/post office, one shop everyone avoids and a lower school of limited capacity would mean our few services would be swamped. Access to this site would be from Biggleswade Road which is already heavily congested at times. It is further away from all our existing facilities than all other proposed sites in Caldecote. The local sewer at times cannot cope with the existing sewage flow a major amount of infrastructure development would be required.
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues.
Helen Papworth	204 dwellings! Would increase size of Caldecote by 45% - v. considerable impact 400 vehicles!! - Going to A1 at Tingey's corner (to end of Biggleswade Rd) - v dangerous! Trade off with footbridge over A1?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
J K Presland	Too larger development compared to Caldecote versus other villages. Development should be targeted at towns (Biggleswade, Sandy etc) due to access to facilities and public transport etc.
J. Taske	Development to large for village size
Linda Smith	The traffic problems we have with continuous speeding, causing threat to accidents from traffic coming on the A1 will (illegible). We have no facilities to support more houses socially where families are living.
Maisie King	A lot more traffic will be using the A1. I think sites nearer to the village proper would be more suitable. The traffic would use the Sainsburys roundabout for their A1 access instead of Biggleswade road.
Mr D.Nicholas	Too larger development for the village size and facilities, Caldecote should have been excluded from development like Ickwell, Northill etc. This type of development is not suited to a village the size of Caldecote due to the issues of facilities (2 small shops not suitable for main shopping, no doctors etc. no youth facilities. A development of this size would cause chaos on the A1 crossings already stretched and dangerous.
Mr R J Hall	The suggested number of houses is too many. The site could support a few houses. However, the only current local infrastructure it could support would be the Post Office, two small convenience stores and the local school. In order to gain access to any other facilities the residents would require transport. Given the paucity of buses, this could only be at the expense of more cars leading to greater congestion.
Mr R Thomson	Site is also unsuitable as it is green-field site outside the settlement envelope, and would mean the loss of high-quality farmland.
Mrs J D Green	The potential to support shops in Upper Caldecote - most people would use Sainsburys. Public transport would need improving.
Mrs Ward	This is an enormous development for a small village on land that might still form part of the improved A1. The development will not be large enough to create new infrastructure so putting increasing strain on existing facilities in Biggleswade. The cross over to the A1 is already dangerous and the queues to access the A1 are horrendous at the best of times. A recipe for disaster.
Mrs. R. Randle	The access from Biggleswade Road to the A1 is already hazardous due to the speed and volume of traffic on that road, development would mean more vehicles and therefore increased danger. Biggleswade road between the proposed site and the village crossroads is already congested with parked cars as many of the properties have no provision for off road parking, further development would add to this congestion. The existing plans leave space between Woodlands and the established village properties and in order to preserve the nature of the village this space should be preserved.
Peter Roberts	Far too large and poor location even if smaller.
R.Lindsay	Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furthering the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Richard Cass	Site too large and visually intrusive. Significant traffic and drainage problems likely.
Richard Smith	Biggleswade Road already suffers from too much traffic and there have been a number of serious accidents at the junction to the A1, which is already dangerous without the significant increase in traffic as per the proposal.
Robert Smith	The junction of Biggleswade Road and the A1 is a danger spot. Biggleswade Road itself is already suffering a significant amount from speeding motorists struggling to adjust from motorway speeds down to anything like 30mph. This proposed development could also compromise any future plans for upgrading the A1.
Stephanie Windsor	A few houses perhaps but not a development of this size.
Steven Wilson	This site is outside of the village envelope on greenfield land. This is a small village, public transport is poor, and access to doctors is currently very difficult. The total planned development numbers 531 units, on average I would expect at least 1062 cars to be added to the roads. This development would send at least 408 cars through the heart of the village on a daily basis! The vast majority of these cars would want to access the A1 on a daily basis at a already dangerous and congested roundabout. Looking at the proposed sites it would appear the village would double in size; this would destroy the community spirit that this village enjoys. All developments should be considered in the context of the impact on the existing community, any developments should integrate into that community; not create separate enclaves!
W. Walker	Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, Northill, and Old Warden etc.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Lesley Brook	Concerned about the number of houses proposed in Upper Caldecote - several hundred.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H234**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr M P Bryant & Mr T A Bryant	Please refer to our previous representations submitted during the "Call for Sites" consultation. Additional: The proposed site is well-contained by ever-maturing landscape. It is well located within the curtilage of the village in close proximity to community facilities. The site is unconstrained, in a single ownership with good access onto Biggleswade Road. If development is allocated to Upper Caldecote the site must be given serious consideration.

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
Stephanie Windsor	Again it depends on the size of the development - it seems too large at the moment. That is substantial in such a small village coming onto a small 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
Alan Fowler	The access to the site will have a major impact on the adjacent house (37 Biggleswade Road) and on the Copse which is a natural wildlife area (notwithstanding the preservation order on the trees).
Alan Wakeford	This site is behind existing houses on Biggleswade Road. Access onto Biggleswade Road is via an existing narrow farm gate into a field that is not wide enough for a single carriageway. There are no alternative access points and an existing house would have to be demolished. Although reasonably near the very limited facilities that we have in the village access to the site would be from Biggleswade Road which is already very congested at times. The local sewer is already overloaded so any development would exacerbate the situation.
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues.
D Towson	It seems that very little thought has been given to the impact of increased traffic, the possibility of increased crime rates and the lifestyle of the existing residents who moved here to be in a village location!
Helen Papworth	Back infill Loss of agricultural land Very Visible from Bandy Rd
J .Taske	Development to large for village size
J K presland	Too larger development compared to Caldecote versus other villages. Development should be targeted at towns (Biggleswade, Sandy etc) due to access to facilities and public transport etc.

Submitted by	Comments
Jo Wilson	You will destroy the village of Upper Caldecote, destroying any community. It is very short-sighted to think that a village such as this could support any development! I suggest someone really looks into this instead of just obeying orders!
M. Barnes	This size development would only work if other local facilities were included and A1/Biggleswade access improved.
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	This site is outside the confines of the village and a development in this area has potential to create major impact on existing residence. Biggleswade Road in this location is very often congested with services/functions being held at both churches and church halls. A much smaller scale development may be acceptable.
Mr D.Cox	Access to facilities limited and involves crossing over to Biggleswade or Sandy. I do not see the point in allowing any further development in a village that has limited shops and no other facilities other than in fill of single houses. Any larger development will lead to further exclusion of individuals due to limited public transport.
Mr D.Nicholas	Too larger development for the village size and facilities, Caldecote should have been excluded from development like Ickwell, Northill etc. This type of development is not suited to a village the size of Caldecote due to the issues of facilities (2 small shops not suitable for main shopping, no doctors etc. no youth facilities. A development of this size would cause chaos on the A1 crossings already stretched and dangerous.
Mr R J Hall	The suggested number of houses is too many. The site could support a few houses. However, the only current local infrastructure it could support would be the Post Office, two small convenience stores and the local school. In order to gain access to any other facilities the residents would require transport. Given the paucity of buses, this could only be at the expense of more cars leading to greater congestion.
Mrs Mary Howell	This site, should it be allowed, will double the size of the nearby Shakespeare site already there. Together with sites H029 and H229 a total of more than 200 houses right in the middle of this part of the village will more than double those already there. Traffic and parking already causes problems. Plus we have no community centre, doctor's surgery; we don't even now have a pub!! And probably shortly won't have a post office.
Mrs Sara Fowler	Access to this site is severely limited. Traffic is already a problem in Biggleswade Road. Small woodland area yet again in danger as well as the loss of wildlife and pasture areas. The congestion at the local church probably wont increase!
Mrs Ward	Another ill thought out large development on farm land which will be required to feed the nation. The roads through the village are not capable of supporting the traffic nor are there facilities available to support the infrastructure. Once again the access to the A1 is not suitable for an in increased population.
Payne	This site is too deep, road frontage developmentfill may be more in keep with surroundings.
Peter Roberts	Far too large and in difficult dangerous location. Biggleswade Road narrow and blind and bust with pedestrians, often children using village hall etc. so access would be dangerous.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
R B Stocks	Consider this site to be outside of the footprint of the village and therefore undesirable
R.Lindsay	Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furthering the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?
Richard Cass	This site is totally inappropriate. It would create potential for flooding and severe traffic problems in Biggleswade Road. The creation of a further development behind existing properties in a small community would affect local amenity and the environment.
Steven Wilson	This site is outside of the village envelope on greenfield land. This is a small village, public transport is poor, and access to doctors is currently very difficult. The total planned development numbers 531 units, on average I would expect at least 1062 cars to be added to the roads. The vast majority of these cars would want to access the A1 on a daily basis at a already dangerous and congested roundabout. Looking at the proposed sites it would appear the village would double in size; this would destroy the community spirit that this village enjoys. All developments should be considered in the context of the impact on the existing community, any developments should integrate into that community; not create separate enclaves!
W. Walker	Why allowing any further development in a village that has limited facilities when there are plenty of submissions for the required number of properties that are adjacent to larger towns and would not have an impact on traffic and put people in a position where they would need to use a car to gain access to facilities. Single developments should be allowed where gaps exist but nothing more than this (this should also be allowed in Ickwell, Northill, and Old Warden etc.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Lesley Brook	Concerned about the number of houses proposed in Upper Caldecote - several hundred.

Ref Number: H288

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
Alison Johns	Too large would cause traffic issues.
Andrew H Binning	There is already too much traffic using the roads through the villages of Ickwell and Northill to get to Bedford or in the other direction the A1 and Biggleswade. Building on this site would exacerbate this problem. The present infra structure would not support a development of this size without significant upgrades to water supply, mains drainage and possibly electricity. Flooding has been a problem (due to sewer capacity) in the past and this development would be likely to cause further problems. Developing this site would destroy the village character and as the nearest shop/ post office is likely to be a target for closure; there are no facilities nearby without going to Biggleswade. Public Transport is minimal and not really an option for accessing services in Biggleswade or Bedford, hence car use will increase dramatically. The average speed and volume of traffic through the villages needs to be reduced and through traffic directed via Main Roads i.e. A603/A1.
Ann Clements	Consider this site to be quite unsuitable. It would detract from the country quiet location and destroy habitat for the local wildlife and flora and fauna. This is a very prestigious village small community and the proposal to build 100 properties on this small site would seriously overload road structure with congestion through the villages - it is hard to access A1 at the moment sometimes 10/15 mins waiting.
C Rose	A development of this size would devastate the existing community, swamping the current houses overloading the village school.
Douglas Collier	This site (100 houses) is completely out of scale in this village. It will contribute nothing to the social infrastructure. If new housing is require - a small amount of infilling is possible or a minor extension of the ribbon development which is a feature of the area.
Helen Gater	What about the bats that are living in the Dutch Barn??
Helen Papworth	100 dwellings would just about double the size of Ickwell (125 houses) Wildlife - barn owls Close to brook Access off Caldecote Rd - traffic speeds as enters village.
John Barrall	Neither Ickwell (where development is proposed) within the parish of Northill nor Northill itself is appropriate. There is no shop in the village and the village school would not be able to take extra children even at the rate of .5 children per house-nor could upper Caldecote take them-especially should the proposed development take place there. Doctors are several miles away. Roads could not cope with the amount of increased traffic which would occur. Presumably, many newcomers would be commuting to "somewhere".
John Dawson	This site is far too big - such an estate development would more than double the size of Ickwell, which is essentially a hamlet where there is no exceptional need for development at all. It is also in the wrong place - as far as it is possible to get along a busy road from Northill, where church, school, pub and possible shop are all situated.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
L.A.Kendrick	Excessive increase in traffic would ensure a large percentage increase in the population which would change the nature of the small village environment.
Mr & Mrs P Akerman	The development is on such a large scale it would overwhelm this small community of Ickwell and the already busy roads would not cope as they are currently being used by large lorries and cars as a short cut and this would create major safety issues. Note, there are currently large tail-backs onto the A1 at the Biggleswade North roundabout.
Mr T M Clements	Ickwell does not have the infrastructure to absorb more housing. Also would impact on the preservation of this small village. Access would be totally inadequate!
Mrs J M Collins	Mid Beds want to provide new sites for 400 new houses in the 39 villages in their area by 2026. The fair share for a small village like Ickwell is no more than 10 houses. 100 houses is far too many. This is a greenfield site on good agricultural land, which should be kept for food production.
Nick Evans	This would double the village of Ickwell and ruin its character.
OJ Wells	This site is completely out of scale to the rest of the village as a suitable development. Ickwell is in effect a hamlet and any development should be on a much smaller scale such as in-filling. Seems as is the existing road which is cluttered with random parking would make serious problems on this busy road between Bedford and Biggleswade.
P. Faulkner	Overloading existing drainage system Overloading schools.
Peter Bygraves	Strongly disagree with this site
R.Lindsay	Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furthering the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?
SJ Melvin	Provision would only be acceptable if a shop was included in the development, but I would worry about increasing the size of the village by a very large percentage.
T leitch	This is valuable farm land on the outside of the village envelope and does not in any way contribute to the village. Currently the services to the area are inadequate and could not support this many new houses and occupants. The area is also on a flood plane next to the streams and ditches in a hollow.
Terry Winter	A development of 100 properties would double the size of the village. This is entirely disproportionate. Pressure would undoubtedly be brought to bear by the incoming residents for more local services to be provided within the village - rather than travel to (say) Biggleswade - thus destroying its character.

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
Barbara Farquhar	<p>A development of 100 houses would double the size of the hamlet and completely change the wonderful atmosphere of this historic area.</p> <p>The hamlet has no facilities to support any increase in population. No shop, no church, no pub, no school, no play facilities for children.</p> <p>Also, importantly, the site in question is the hunting area for the local barn owls. Reducing the habitat for these fairly rare birds would be dreadful.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H289

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
C Rose	A modest development designed in keeping with the appropriate local considerations and aesthetic appearance would not be unreasonable.
S J Melvin	I'm not sure about the access and parking facilities.

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
Alison Johns	We should not be looking at impacting small villages.
Christine Hook	Currently this site is a livery yard run on a managed DIY basis for privately owned horses/ponies. It is a local amenity, very well situated on the outskirts of the village and well served by bridleways which are used extensively by local horse riders who have very little road work to do before reaching the bridleway network. Horse riding is a very popular pursuit and a great hobby for adults and children alike and this site is of immense value to not only Ickwell but also the surrounding nearby towns. What would happen to the horses? Would alternative provision be made for them? There are two very old barns on this site which are homes to bats. What will happen to them if these barns are demolished?
Douglas Collier	This site is hidden away accessed by a private road. Development here would cause a ghetto whose inhabitants would be divorced from the village and they would be isolated. If new housing is required a small amount of infilling is possible or a minor extension of the ribbon development which has occurred.
Helen Papworth	Conservation area in picturesque hamlet Local horse owners would lose their livery Two agricultural barns, which could be restored to make 2 houses?
Nick Evans	This would more than double the size of Ickwell village and irreversibly damage its character.
O J Wells	This site is a working farm yard and a conservation area. Two large historic farm barns are a feature which should be conserved. The area is used as well as a training business for local people and keeps with the rural character of this village. A conservation order on the barns would be good.
Robin Spicer	This site is used as a conservation area and is of high value for wildlife having Copses, woods and stream passing along the boundary. The ability to take extra cars is severely restricted at all 3 A1 junctions. The existing villages of Ickwell and Old Warden already suffer from being used as alternative rat runs for community traffic.
T leitch	This site is right next to listed buildings and with preservation orders on them. The site is on a sharp blind bend. The area is insufficient for 8 dwellings that will merge well with the listed buildings next door. The area has many trees on it with preservation orders that cannot be removed.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H291

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
No name given	This site is small enough and the proposed house numbers not so large as to have a major impact on traffic, whilst increasing support for the Post Office and school.
Mr & Mrs Wilkinson	Development of this size is acceptable.

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
Alison Johns	This number of houses may be ok if no other developments can be found that are more suitable.
D James	A smaller development would be preferable to the larger developments suggested
Peter Roberts	Additional development should include traffic calming for safety
W. Walker	A development of this size is more in keeping with the size of the village

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
Gaynor Whelan	Hitchin Road is a very busy road and can be dangerous for getting in and out of your property & crossing the road. It doesn't help cars speeding. There is a small access road which goes round the back of properties from house No.82 to No.88.Both entries are almost hidden from the road and 1 is a public footpath which villagers use to walk dogs &family walks across fields to Ickwell. To allow traffic to join Hitchin Road from this site would be, rather irresponsible from a safety point of view. From my last enquiry with the Planning Department the "envelope" (I think the term used, basically the red line on the village plan that cannot be developed beyond!)Ended at the rear boundary of my property and the fields beyond this could not be developed on! I understand the "envelope" widens over time I would be interested where the "envelope" now lies!
Helen Papworth	Back infill - creates a dangerous precedent. Loss of agricultural land.
Jennifer Edwards	Hitchin road, upper Caldecote is already an extremely busy road with traffic coming from the a1, Bedford and residents from other parts of the village using this road. To build more houses along the Hitchin road would add to what is already a problem for many residents in trying to get out of their drives on to the road because of the sheer volume of traffic. I strongly believe that the new development should not be allowed as it is not an infill which would be more acceptable. i am strongly against any houses being built behind existing residential.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D.Cox	<p>If development was allowed in Upper Caldecote this would probably be the best option and size of development for the size of the village, larger developments of 3 houses + should be limited to town developments Biggleswade, Sandy etc, where infrastructure exists to support such developments.</p> <p>Access to facilities limited and involves crossing over to Biggleswade or Sandy.</p> <p>I do not see the point in allowing any further development in a village that has limited shops and no other facilities other than in fill of single houses. Any larger development will lead to further exclusion of individuals due to limited public transport.</p>
Mrs J D Green	<p>The potential to support shops in Upper Caldecote - most people would use Sainsburys. Public transport would need improving.</p>
Mrs Karen Howe	<p>Hitchin Road is already a very very busy, despite lorry banned it is used by lorries (not always to gain access to nearby farms!) the traffic is too fast and too heavy for the road. By consider this and other site in Upper Caldecote it is adding to the congestion on what is essential two main roads through the village! The village has already lost its community pub! by adding more and more houses it will also lose its "small village" community feeling as well! I am saddened to think these proposal are being considered.</p>
Payne	<p>This site has two potential access paths onto Hitchin Road, neither offer good access. To create back-filling a this site along with the potential conversion of redundant farm buildings creates a precedent for future development along the west side of Hitchin Road, which would totally destroy the character of the village. This should be actively refused.</p>
R.Lindsay	<p>Green field site breaking the village development limits and uses Grade A agricultural land also beginning of ribbon development. Too many additional cars adding further congestion to the A1 and hazardous travel in the village. Not sufficient GP services already. Not sufficient NHS/Private dental services. Local hospitals already overstretched. Too much traffic on local roads. Sewerage already unable to cope in the village - Water Lane and the village Common especially. Water services stretched. Loss of Grade A agricultural land. Furthering the village as a dormitory village. What has changed since 2006 when Upper Caldecote was designated a small village?</p>
Richard Cass	<p>Access onto Hitchin Road appears cramped and development is behind existing properties setting an uncomfortable precedent. The footpath appears to be affected.</p>
Ronald Brian Stocks	<p>This development would be outside the footprint of the village and a start towards joining Caldecote to Ickwell. One access would be over a public footpath and the other too narrow to support everyday traffic. It would be an accident waiting to happen. I strongly oppose it.</p>

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

Submitted by	Comments
Lesley Brook	Concerned about the number of houses proposed in Upper Caldecote - several hundred.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H313

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Philip Goodman	I believe that other places are better suited for development than Caldecote (Sandy, Biggleswade) where facilities already exist within a short distance and where there would be minimal impact to traffic. If any development were to happen in Caldecote or other villages West of the A1 this would increase the congestion due to people crossing the A1 to get to local facilities in Biggleswade, and the safety issue associated with crossing the A1.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Robert Hall	Whilst this site could support the G&M Growers complex and the village shop/sub-post office, it adds nothing to the village in the way of infrastructure. Moreover, as bus frequency is inadequate, it would add to the number of cars using the village road and Hill Lane; the latter increasing the problems at the Sainsburys roundabout at peak times. Undoubtedly there would be an impact on the countryside immediately adjacent to the site.
Mr Wilson	A density of 14 dwellings is too high, would support 1-2 dwellings which would integrate into the existing village, rather than creating a mini estate. All traffic from the proposed development of 14 units would have to exit onto Hitchin Road, the level of traffic would in my opinion be dangerous as we already have a problem with people using the village as a rat run from Bedford/Sandy A1 roundabout going through the village at excessive speed. Current infrastructure, i.e. doctors facilities and drainage would not support over development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H314**

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
Mrs Jean Collins	A small site with a small number of houses is appropriate for development in a village of this size.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Philip Goodman	I believe that other places are better suited for development than Caldecote (Sandy, Biggleswade) where facilities already exist within a short distance and where there would be minimal impact to traffic. If any development were to happen in Caldecote or other villages West of the A1 this would increase the congestion due to people crossing the A1 to get to local facilities in Biggleswade, and the safety issue associated with crossing the A1.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Robert Hall	Whilst this site could support the nearby village shop, it adds nothing to the village in the way of infrastructure. Moreover, as bus frequency is inadequate, it would add to the number of cars using the village roads and could increase the volume on Hill Lane; the latter increasing the problems at the Sainsbury's roundabout at peak times. However, it is also likely to increase the number using the dangerous exit from Biggleswade Rd onto the A1, both North & South, which would increase the probability of a serious, possibly fatal, accident on the A1. Undoubtedly there would be an impact on the countryside immediately adjacent to the site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E39

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

Submitted by	Comments
Christopher Wells	As well as being good for employment the location of this site - easy to access by car and near to open countryside may make is suitable for the development of a Community Facility aimed at Youth Groups like Guides or Scouts.
Peter James Hodgson	The local garden nurseries and the local post offices/shops. Although there could be difficulties with public transport to the work destinations from various areas.

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
A Gallichan	Road improvements needed, congestion would be issue. Floodplain???
Helen Papworth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would create problems at mini roundabout at sainsburys, and at Sun St, Biggleswade. 2. Why has this site, which is overlapped by proposal E65 got different owners/promoters? 3. Large house on corner v. attractive as enter Biggleswade - it would need to be demolished.

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
K. Coutts	This is not a site for building on. It is a flood plane.
M. Scott-Coomber	Flood plain and transport links. Undesirable intrusion onto green land by river and common.
Mary Burke	<p>Have already submitted form through the post, but am repeating my opposition on line because I am not sure my postal form has been received. Should form arrive, please retain either my postal submission or this on line submission.</p> <p>The proposed site is on flood plain, and this alone makes it untenable.</p> <p>It would scar the common somewhat, and also create a risk of pollution in and around the lvel, to which it would be undesirably close. It would certainly harm biodiversity. It would add traffic to the already busy shortmead street, and traffic over spilling onto that area of the common would be inconceivable.</p> <p>Surely this proposal is a non-starter?</p>
Mary Burke continued	Too near Biggleswade Common and River lvel, causing an eye-sore, not to mention possible industrial effluents and waste. Not to mention noise from commercial buildings. Would inevitably impact on local wild life and biodiversity too. It is a long way from other shops and transport facilities, would generate extra traffic on Shortmead ST and A1, and could bring traffic onto the common more then likely.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr. R. J. Mott	1. Using a flood plain to cover in buildings will create an increase in flooding over a wide area. 2. Road access through existing housing estate is undesirable.
N. L. Gurney	Unless a complete road on to the A1 is provided, existing roads through the estates cannot cope with additional flows of traffic or the town roads.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E65

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

Submitted by	Comments
Christopher Wells	Due to its easy access by car and being near open country side this site would also be suitable as a location for a community hall aimed at Youth Groups like Guides or Scouts.
Peter James Hodgson	The local garden nurseries and the local post offices/shops. Although there could be difficulties with public transport to the work destinations from various areas.

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
Helen Papworth	1. Traffic issues would be created at Sainsburys roundabout & at Sun St 2. Flood zone - not a good idea to relocate petrol station there
Pat Hamblin	Could be used to develop Sainsburys to make this a better facility, but not bigger.

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
J. A. Palmer	The areas are flood plains. Building would worsen the flood risk of adjacent residential properties.
K. Coutts	This is not a site for building on. It is a flood plane
M. Scott-Coomber	Flood plain and transport links. Undesirable intrusion onto green land by river and Ivel Walk.
Mary Burke	Too near Biggleswade Common and River Ivel, causing an eye-sore, not to mention possible industrial effluents and waste. Not to mention noise from commercial buildings. Would inevitably impact on local wild life and biodiversity too. It is a long way from other shops and transport facilities, would generate extra traffic on Shortmead ST and A1, and could bring traffic onto the common more then likely. Comments sent by post - Recorded Delivery - 19 March. Not sure they are received. Today is 27th. My comments are more or less identical to those I made on E39, E58 and E60. Proposed site on flood plain. Untenable. Too near Ivel and would mar common - not least the beautiful horizon. risk of contaminants flowing into Ivel. Would disrupt biodiversity. Would engender greater traffic on the already busy a1 and Shortmead street. to allow traffic onto the common would be inconceivable. Non starter
Mr. R. J. Mott	1. Using a flood plain to cover in buildings will create an increase in flooding over a wide area. 2. Road access through existing housing estate is undesirable.
N. L. Gurney	Unless a complete road on to the A1 is provided, existing roads through the estates cannot cope with additional flows of traffic or the town roads.

NORTHILL APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	H313 Land rear of 128-130 Hitchin Road, Upper Caldecote	No public or permissive path touches or crosses the potential site. However, Northill FP5 crosses the open land between Ickwell and Upper Caldecote about 150 metres to the north of the site. This is a very well used and pleasant path whose amenity would certainly suffer if the envisaged 14 houses were erected so close and on a site projecting into the very open landscape between the two settlements.
Barbara Farquhar	Northill/Ickwell	I looked with interest at proposed sites for development in Northill and Ickwell. Comments: 1. Sand Lane Northill. I feel that further development here would put strain on an already busy side road. Also Northill has few facilities to support increase in population. 2. East of Ickwell. A development of 100 houses would double the size of the hamlet and completely change the wonderful atmosphere of this historic area. The hamlet has no facilities to support any increase in population. No shop, no Church, no pub, no school, no play facilities for children. Also, importantly, the site in question is the hunting area for the local barn owls. Reducing the habitat for these fairly rare birds would be dreadful.
Cllr Christine Hawes	Northill/Upper Caldecote	I was amazed to read the details of the document concerning development in Northill Parish, not least because I am Chair of the Parish Council. It would have been most helpful to have been forewarned about these developments, if only not to appear gormless to the residents of Northill Parish. I am particularly concerned at the number and size of the proposed sites in Upper Caldecote. We may well be classed as a large village, but anybody living here will tell you that ours is a small community that could not take on the burden of more housing and people. Many "newcomers" to the village will tell you that they chose Upper Caldecote because of its rural nature and this is what we all value. We do not wish to be a dormitory town for Stevenage or even London. We love our village as it is and do not wish to be swamped by new development. Upper Caldecote is not as picturesque as Northill or Ickwell, but it should not be penalised for this. I know that nobody wants new houses "in their backyard" but I really believe that Upper Caldecote will not benefit from this excess of building. Yours faithfully Christine Hawkes

Name	Subject	Comment
Pete Roberts	Upper Caldecote	Whilst I have completed surveys for the individual sites affecting my village of Upper Caldecote I have a further general comment on the Northhill parish sites. At the presentation in our village hall the council reps said that development would be proportional to status ie large/small village. However, whilst U Caldecote appears to have few sites ruled out due to size despite all being far too large, both Ickwell and Northhill have comments suggestion that development is not an option unless exceptional - even for one of only two houses. My comment is why should they be effectively exempt whilst Upper Caldecote becomes the only option for the Northhill parish? If Caldecote as a large village had say 20 houses built why can't Ickwell and Northhill as a small one absorb 2? Anything else is not proportional as claimed by your staff..
J.K.N. Dawson, Ramblers' Association	H231, Northhill	H231. This site is flanked on the south by Northhill 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. (Please see appendix three for cover letter)
	H291, H234 and H229, Northhill	H291, H234 and H229. These sites are all flanked or touched by FP5 or FP12 respectively, whose amenity or safety might be affected. (Please see appendix three for cover letter)

Name	Subject	Comment
Jo Wilson	Upper Caldecote	<p>I have looked at the “talk to mid beds” website and read the literature that came to us about the proposed development for Upper Caldecote, the house build total is a proposed 531 houses. Well I don’t know whether you live in the village or near by or whether you (the council) have actually really thought about the impact on the village and mid beds as a whole, well, if all those houses were built, then you are talking at least 2 people per house which is at least 1,062 more people just in Upper Caldecote, those 1,062 would probably each have a car which would mean approximately 1,062 more cars on the road! Have you travelled on the surrounding roads at all, do you know what it is like now let alone with 1,062 more cars on the road. Also I don’t know whether you have needed to make an appointment at your local Doctors surgery? Were you successful, did you manage to get an appointment? Well if you did you were very lucky, at our surgery it is extremely difficult to get an appointment, it is almost impossible to get through at all, you have to set aside ½ hour in the morning whilst getting ready for work to attempt to get through. What is that going to be like with over 1,000 more people trying to get a Doctor’s appointment! What will happen to our green spaces, are we all going to be crammed in with no space to walk and get some fresh air, has anyone thought about the impact that will have on society, where will children play, where will dogs get walked, where will we walk, yes we walk daily on our beautiful countryside, we are not obese, (unlike a lot of the country), we work full time, pay council tax and what do we get for that, well we are shortly going to be in the minority, because if there are more houses built, we will definitely see an increase in crime because all the children will have nowhere to play and will be bored as there will be no green spaces to release their energy and everyone will be crammed in and have no space which will cause neighborhood arguments because people will be fighting for car parking spaces and there will be general unrest due to the lack of space. So the good natured community will be destroyed, just because no-one has really thought this through properly, no-one has looked at the bigger picture and is just seeing £ signs and doing what they are told, well SOMEONE needs to STAND UP FOR OUR COMMUNITY and say NO to more houses, our environment is too precious to destroy as is our quality of life, STAND UP TO THE GOVERNMENT and CARE, REALLY CARE for a change, don’t just sign more bits of paper, like it is just another thing to get done, this is OUR LIFE, OUR COMMUNITY, put a STOP to the beauracracy NOW, we do NOT NEED ANY MORE HOUSES, WE CANNOT FIT ANYMORE PEOPLE IN!</p>