

## OLD WARDEN 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.

**OLD WARDEN APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: E52**

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  |
|----------------|---|
| Christine Muir | E52 - I would strongly urge you not to consider the idea of seasonal holiday cottages or mobile homes as part of this employment development. This area is not appropriate for that sort of holiday development. The proposed lakes are not large enough to sustain permanent or semi-permanent dwellings as part of a leisure package. The area could sustain Travel Inn type accommodation and perhaps a small fishing and boat hire business. As for student accommodation, this has no place here and should rightly be a development adjacent to the existing college at Shuttleworth. |
| Fiona Buchan   | The site is huge - I would want to know how much holiday accommodation, student accommodation etc. would be built and could have an impact on the countryside.  |

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

| Submitted by | Comments   |
|--------------|--|
| Mrs J A Reid | We support the use of this land for recreational fishing, walking paths, cycle network linking Biggleswade and Old Warden/Shuttleworth - in a manner similar to Graffham Water. We don't think it is suitable for holiday homes/mobile homes as this would affect the rural nature of the countryside. |

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  |
|---------------|---|
| A R Baines    | Not happy about further loss of agricultural land.  |
| Alan Eastham  | This site and the subsequent quarries have been an eyesore on the approach to Broom for 10 years and will continue to be so for another five, at least. The community was always promised that the area would eventually be reinstated to agriculture and possible recreation. These conditions were included within the planning permission. Following the recent granting of permission for a further 15-25 years of quarrying south of Broom, with similar promises of restoration, it is an appalling betrayal of taxpayers that such development should be even considered.  |
| Alison Palmer | When quarry site approved some 15 years ago, it was agreed to turn area back to lakes and countryside. Also, any buildings presumably will be erected on un-quarried area - which means butting up to the edge of Broom. This is not sustainable land and any building work will disrupt the village life in Broom and cause destruction of wildlife habits in the area. Currently we have up to 8 Reed Buntings and numerous Goldfinches, Chaffinches and Bramblings (birds) visit our garden in Broom daily. Also a further quarry is opening up adjacent to the existing one, creating enough disruption to our village. |

| Submitted by  | Comments  |
|---------------|---|
| No name given | <p>Re: LDF Mid Beds Housing/Employment Survey ? ?Take Survey? We have specific points to make in relation to both proposals H185 (housing) and E52 (Commercial/employment development) as follows:- H185. This site is totally unsuitable for the following reasons a) It contains the current Broom sewage pumping station. b) It contains the contaminated site of the previous sprinkler system and drying beds. c) It is traversed by the Broom Village stream which drains the fields and road all the way from Stanford then through High Street. This is prone to flooding. d) It devours sections of a Public Bridleway and a Public Footpath. e) It is the business centre of the Jordan family vegetable growing and packing business who have cropped this land for over 80 years. f) It is the staging post and environmental Nature Reserve for wild animals numerous species of birds and amphibians (toads, frogs and newts) some of which are protected under EU LAW! It has to compensate for all the field hedges destroyed by the quarrying. The Council own unused development land at the end of Kings Road which can accommodate Broom's future housing needs. E52. There is absolutely no need for this fanciful development. a) The blackened area indicating the outline of? Broom Quarry? As provided under Mid Beds LDF? Site Allocations Southill? is totally incorrect and excessive by some 15/18%. The southern end of the quarry as outline involved Grade One Agricultural land producing valuable vegetable cops which has never been part of the quarry! b) Planning permission was strictly given for sand/gravel extraction followed by restoration to agriculture not tourism holiday accommodation mobile homes etc. c) The lakes are providing a large Nature Reserve for hundreds of wildfowl and should be preserved as such without disturbance of College extensions and students etc. d) The farcical claim by Shuttleworth that capacity may increase from the existing capacity of 496 students to 1400 over the next 10 years is but a pipe dream with no feasible basis. At the present time Shuttleworth provides many day courses which do not require accommodation. e) This site is within easy access of existing or under construction recreational activities e.g.: New Centre Parks at Flitwick, NIRAH Aquatic project at Stewartby, Woburn Safari Park, Whipsnade Zoo, RSPB Sandy, Butterfly empire St Albans, Grafham Water etc etc.</p> |
| Allan Butcher | <p>We were promised that having suffered the Quarry workings that the land would be returned to agriculture and nature reserves, this proposed building or the college totally goes back on this promise. There new Quarry makes the B658 very busy and therefore not suitable for any college or Hotel on this site. This out of all the proposed sites is the one that changes Broom from a quite village into a suburb of Biggleswade. Let Shuttleworth build this on the estate as they alone are the only ones who will benefit form this.</p>   |
| B M Twitchin  | <p>This development would only create a minimum of job to the detriment of the character of the landscape. Newly established lakes provide habitat for a large number of protections and conservation rather than ruined by development. They offer recreation (bird watching, walking, riding etc) for the local community. The existing farm land should be protected. It produces vegetables for local shops and area should be encouraged in the light of climate change. Furthermore it would completely change the character of Broom Village which needs respite now after years of quarrying.</p>   |

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

| Submitted by      | Comments  |
|-------------------|---|
| Barbara Spencer   | If developed this site would alter the small village of Broom unrecognisably it would join the village of Upper Caldecote to Broom. There is no existing social infrastructure to support the development.  |
| Brent Fielder     | We were promised by the landowners, The Shuttleworth Trust, that after the fifteen years of gravel extraction that we have endured they would turn it all into sailing and fishing lakes and wildlife conservation. They now want to put industry and a massive college on our doorstep and renege on their promise. After all of the years of hassle and rubbish from this site (five years still to go) we deserve what we were promised, a natural restoration.  |
| Brigitte Twitchin | The commercial use of this site would have a profound impact on the village of Broom. After years of having to put up with the quarrying to the North and now also East and south of the village it is totally unreasonable to inflict developments like a holiday park, mobile homes and other tourist uses on the residents and the countryside. The newly created lakes should be available to the local population for recreation, walking, bird watching, nature trails. Commercial development of this kind should be rejected outright. While the college relocation, if it were in the very north of the site, near the roundabout would be acceptable, with easy access to the B658, it should be kept well away from the lakes. Instead the area should be put forward as a Nature Conservation Area.   |
| Colin Wark        | Yet another attack upon Broom after the latest quarry decision. This and the other planned developments in and around Broom will turn Broom from a pleasant village into a crime zone. A continued show of "no regard for the residents of Broom."  |
| David Yates       | The creation of a few jobs on this site is vastly outweighed by the environmental impact on the area. Broom has had enough with quarry after quarry. If Shuttleworth wish to build a new college , why cannot it be within the grounds of the existing estate? Building a college on the quarry site would be the tip of the iceberg for this area and would lead to other development on this land, which I believe is not suitable for purpose.   |
| Denise Clarke     | The people of Broom were promised by Shuttleworth, I have the document, that if they allowed Shuttleworth let Tarmac extract gravel for fifteen years, then at the end of that time this area would be a paradise. It had conservation, sailing, angling, nice walks and agriculture. They now lie and propose industrial units and a college for 100 students. This is despicable. The industrial units would bring in lots more white vans speeding through the village as a short cut to and from the proposed warehousing and distribution centre, at least the quarry lorries were banned from Broom, try stopping white-van-man. I note that there is not a single proposal for Southill where the Shuttleworth Directors live, no houses and no industry, not only that but they want rid of the college from there and treble it in size and stick it on us, what a surprise! |
| F Wandlowsky      | Absolutely not! The area is a habitat to various flora and fauna, some are considered to be rare and endangered. Has anyone taken this into consideration? The information is vague to the point of being laughable. What about the supposed restoration of the quarry?   |

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

| Submitted by   | Comments  |
|----------------|---|
| Gary Field     | Building to support the public use of this area I feel is acceptable, after all part of the conditions for the gravel pits were landscaping for public use, toilets and other amenities for the public enjoying the area, so long as they are not intrusive & suit the area, I feel would be welcome. But why should land be given to the Shuttleworth college? they & the Whitbread estate own most of this part of the county! do we really need to add to their estate portfolio? If they need land - they have plenty of it!!                               |
| J Butcher      | This site will have a great impact on Broom. Broom was promised that once the quarry had finished in this area it would revert back to agriculture, nature reserves and some recreational facilities. Not a college etc. The area that Shuttleworth wants to use for students comes right up to and around some of Broom. Broom might as well become part of the college campus!!!  |
| John Dawson    | The site is of high present and potential recreational value, criss-crossed with public paths and readily accessible from Upper Caldecote. This is a large village, likely to expand further, and which has otherwise few facilities for informal outdoor recreation like walking, riding and cycling off the road. The planned restoration of the site after gravel extraction (by 2012) will further enhance its value and no development should be allowed which threatens this  |
| John Tucker    | District Councils comments about ease communication to A1 is totally wrong. This junction is already far too busy- at peak times long tailbacks are experienced. Further traffic would be a disaster!   |
| K Tuck         | As the quarry in that area is coming to a close people were promised that the Broom residents would benefit from a peaceful landscape that will allow the wildlife to flourish after enduring years of quarrying. This site will mean that local people will not be able to enjoy any of the landscape in its full beauty   |
| M Tait         | Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe. The quarry should be restored as was originally promised.  |
| M. Franey      | I strongly oppose the environmental impact of this development. It will adversely affect the residents of Kings Road and High Road, Broom, destroying all natural amenities north of Broom Village  |
| Martin Filkins | I strongly object to E52 on the basis that residents were promised by the landowners, The Shuttleworth Trust, that after the fifteen years of gravel extraction we have endured they would turn it all into area for sailing and fishing lakes and wildlife conservation. It now appears they are renegeing on this promise and want to put industry and a massive college on our doorstep. After all of the years of upheaval, dust, disturbance and rubbish from this site (five years still to go) we deserve what we were promised - a natural restoration. |

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

| Submitted by             | Comments  |
|--------------------------|---|
| Matthew Studdert-Kennedy | Quarry was supported by Kingshill parishioners and planning granted on the understanding that it would be restored to agricultural land with a strong nature conservation bias. Proposal goes directly against this and would have enormous impact on the great variety of important and also rare wildlife that have made areas restored so far their home. Proposal is also extraordinarily vague and shows no consideration for residents affected nor proposes any real benefit to an already disrupted community by 15 years of quarry. There is scope for college to expand in current location (I work there and have worked as an architect/planner). There isn't scope to develop nature conservation as sensitively as (illegible) have done. Don't let it be ruined!   |
| Miss K Gilbert           | Planning permission given from gravel extraction and reinstatement to agriculture not Hotels, Holiday accommodation and other ancillary use   |
| Mr & Mrs M Biishop       | There is already going to be extra traffic on the Shefford -Sandy road caused by the new Quarry between Broom and Stanford. The road is already too busy. More traffic would be a problem. The area has become a haven for a huge variety of birds and wildlife. Further development would seriously affect them. A big development in that area is not in keeping with the countryside   |
| Mr and Mrs Rondel        | This outline of Broom quarry is incorrect. Planning permission was given on the understanding that it would be restored to agricultural and not to holiday accommodation etc. Shuttleworth provide a lot of day courses which do not require accommodation.   |
| Mr D Rhoden              | This site will have a significant impact on the surrounding country side and potentially restrict access for the local residents. In addition this site will have an impact on the Trunk road network with the access onto the A1 at Sainsburys roundabout. The governments policy is to identify sites within brown field sites and at locations that are sustainable, this site offers neither of these. It only as the potential to destroy the village and have a significant environmental impact on the surrounding area. This area has had sufficient damage do to it as a result of the quarrying currently in progress. Overall this sites is ill conceived with more negatives than positives.  |
| Mr E.G. Davies           | There is absolutely no need for this fanciful development. a) The blackened area indicating the outline of 'Broom Quarry' as provided under Mid Beds LDF "Site Allocations Southill" is totally incorrect and excessive by some 15/18%. The southern end of the quarry as outline involved Grade One Agricultural land producing valuable vegetable cops which has never been part of the quarry! b) Planning permission was strictly given for sand/gravel extraction followed by restoration to agriculture not tourism holiday accommodation mobile homes etc. c) The lakes are providing a large Nature Reserve for hundreds of wildfowl and should be preserved as such without disturbance of College extensions and students etc. d) The farcical claim by Shuttleworth that capacity may increase from the existing capacity of 496 students to 1400 over the next 10 years is but a pipe dream with no feasible basis. At the present time Shuttleworth provides many day courses which do not require accommodation. e) This site is within easy access of existing or under construction recreational activities eg: New Centre Parks at Flitwick, NIRAH Aquatic project at Stewartby, Woburn Safari Park, Whipsnade Zoo, RSPB Sandy, Butterfly empire St Albans, Grafham Water etc etc. |

| Submitted by    | Comments  |
|-----------------|---|
| Mr Paul Burns   | The site is supposed to cover the old gravel works behind broom however site shaded area on map is significantly larger than the gravel works. There was an area around the end of the village excluded from the site which remained farm yard and for crops. The agreement for the gravel pits was that they would be returned to farm land/country side on completion, with park and nature areas. Not an industrial/ holiday complex. Would destroy the feeling of a village, adding more traffic etc into the village.  |
| Mr. I. Rondel   | I believe that dark workings are behind this, some people have a death wish for the village of Broom and surrounding villages. This area has been punished enough, with quarries for the past 15 years. You are destroying the very life of village existence. This village of Broom is a tranquil, peaceful village, we want it to continue , I suggest that the councillors who want to expend house building do so in their own villages and towns.  |
| Mrs J M Collins | Planning consent given for the quarry on this site required restoration to agricultural land with a fishing lake, boating lake and public footpaths. A car park, some storage for small boats and a small visitor centre providing refreshments, would be appropriate. A large scale business, storage/distribution centre is not needed as there is a business park to the south east of Biggleswade with vacant space. The expansion needed by Shuttleworth College would be better provided near to the existing college at Shuttleworth house. It is wrong and against government policy to use this Greenfield site, high grade agricultural land, for employment which could be provided on local brownfield sites. |
| Mrs Beth Burns  | The site is supposed to cover the old gravel works behind broom, however site shaded area on map is significantly larger than the agreed gravel works. There was an area around the end of the village excluded from the site which remained farm yard and for crops, woods etc. The agreement for the gravel pits was that they would be returned to farm land/country side on completion, with park and nature areas. Not an industrial/ holiday complex. Would destroy the feeling of a village, adding more traffic etc into the village.   |
| Mrs C M Cernik  | Broom is a small village with no employment other than agricultural, therefore these proposals will not support local services employment opportunities but actually diminish farming activities. The proposals are totally inappropriate given the nature of the village which is a self contained unit. It is residential and would be harmed by commercial development.  |
| Mrs D. Weston   | Planning permission for the gravel extraction was conditional only on the site being reinstated to agriculture plus lakes! The map area of the quarry is far larger than it actually was. it came nowhere near Broom Louses. The site is an ideal Wildfowl Nature Reserve and should be maintained as such and nothing else.  |

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

| Submitted by     | Comments  |
|------------------|---|
| Mrs J Ablett     | Quite simply this is not what the village of Broom was promised once the current gravel extraction works were complete. In proposing this development the landowner is reneging on the promises he made in published literature at the time which he should not be allowed to get away with. We have had to endure 10+ years of gravel extraction works and to turn this vast expanse of land into a commercial development is an absolute disgrace. It is also totally unnecessary. There is land available on their existing site where a new college could be built. Distribution and warehousing are available in Biggleswade. Public transport links are non-existent and road links heavily used already. |
| Mrs J Hall       | I think we have had enough of the quarry for the time being. Give us a break of a few years and then do it.   |
| Mrs K Davies     | Firstly the site map is incorrect! Broom quarry was buffered from the village by at least 400 metres. The southern end therefore encompasses undisturbed grade one agricultural land. Producing valuable vegetable crops. The quarrying planning permission stated the site be restored to agriculture not development! There are many recreational sites in within the area already with a new Centre Parcs under construction at Flitwick. The Nirah aquatic project at Stewarby. Butterfly empire at St Albans. Woburn Safari Park. Whipsnade Zoo. RSPB Sandy etc.   |
| Mrs K Gordon     | A proposed site of this size would stop Broom from being a small rural village. I understood that quarries could not be built on.   |
| Mrs R.Anderson   | Do not agree with this site being used as an industrial area or as an overspill for Shuttleworth College. The College has its own land should it wish to expand. Good idea for holiday accommodation and recreational use.  |
| Mrs. Filkins     | I strongly object to E52 on the basis that residents were promised by the landowners, The Shuttleworth Trust, that after the fifteen years of gravel extraction we have endured they would turn it all into area for sailing and fishing lakes and wildlife conservation. It now appears they are reneging on this promise and want to put industry and a massive college on our doorstep. After all of the years of upheaval, dust, disturbance and rubbish from this site (five years still to go) we deserve what we were promised - a natural restoration.  |
| Mrs Jean Cameron | The road network around this area is already sufficiently busy without the need to create more traffic. Leisure use of the site would be appropriate but only in a way which would not include large amount of traffic accessing the site. The junction of Gypsy lane and the road with access to the A1 is very busy at present and with additional traffic to come from further quarrying activities would be a very dangerous junction.  |
| Nick Walker      | The site is a combination of immature and mature woodland with a significant amount of wildlife. It is also a popular destination for local walkers, runners and exploring children. It does not seem right to allocate this land as commercial land when so much surrounding land in Mid-Beds is fit for purpose. There is a local shop in Haynes and in Shefford. Also, why to build a facility which would blight the landscape, and does nothing for the local population. Enhancing the biking facility and amenity will only attract more people from all over the country, (not local tax payers) creating pollution (car journeys), rubbish/litter, and ambulance.                                      |

| Submitted by      | Comments  |
|-------------------|---|
| Patrick Spencer   | These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.  |
| Paul Scutchings   | Absolutely not suitable. That development is 4 times the size of the village.   |
| Peter Twitchin    | Proposals would utterly change the character of this relatively small but significant landscape. Since extraction of gravel, lakes have attracted significant wildlife especially birds – many bird watchers now visit the area. The new footpaths and nature trail have offered local people including those from Biggleswade recreation in natural surroundings. Could lakes area be adopted by RSPB as extension to Sandy HQ? Area includes former sewage plant which needs consideration. Proposed business area would be totally inappropriate due to location and road links and not offer significant job opportunities. Hotel and tourism centres totally inappropriate on a landscape which should be returned to agricultural use and nature reserve. Footpaths for the public are at a premium in the area due to Whitbread and Shuttleworth ownership. E52 area offers just one small landscape for the public to enjoy once Tarmac have restored the land. Young deer stray onto this area on a regular basis and should be protected. |
| R A Collins       | When the Broom North quarry was approved in the 1990s the Shuttleworth Trustees issued a document promising it would be restored to agricultural land, woodland, wildlife conservation and lakes. This proposal for industrial use, student accommodation, new college, holiday cottages/mobile homes is totally at variance with this, and complete abnegation of the promises made to the people of Broom. The agricultural land should be restored as promised, not eliminated - it will be increasingly needed in the future as world food and energy shortages increase. There is already traffic congestion at the exit from the site via Hill Lane to the A1 during rush hours (i.e. much of the day).   |
| Sandra Giddings   | Planning permission was granted for the quarrying on this site on the understanding that the land was restored to agricultural use in the main with fishing, recreational and nature areas available to suitable organisations and local inhabitants. Consideration was given to traffic access issues. This new proposal changes the use entirely as a significant development which will severely impact traffic on the already dangerous Gypsy Lane and very busy Shefford Road. To make this a "holiday area" and relocation of the college will have a devastating effect on the agricultural use and tranquil area proposed. There is insufficient public transport to support a major tourism centre; the proposed industry will adversely affect the local villages in terms of traffic around peak periods.  |
| The Taylor Family | This site is extremely inappropriate for this scale of development. It will adversely effect the community in terms of noise level, traffic congestion - Broom is a small village community that does not need commercial or college campus-style disruption on any scale. We feel extremely threatened with such a proposal.   |

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

| Submitted by | Comments   |
|--------------|--|
| W Scutchings | The roads approaching this site are small country lanes with restrictions for lorries; they would need to be made much wider to accommodate lorries. Tourism would be fine because of the lakes with hotel and boatyard.   |
| Wendy Field  | I feel that the residents of Broom have already contributed more than their fair share of the burden of providing suitable development in our small area by having to put up with the quarry workings for a substantial amount of years in order to provide the raw materials for such work to be possible. We were ignored completely by local government AGAIN recently and feel that it is time our voice was heard for a change. |

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

| Submitted by | Comments   |
|--------------|--|
| Erica Wark   | I strongly object to proposal e52 on the grounds of the "holiday accommodation in the form of seasonal holiday cottages or mobile homes. Potential for providing an area of student accommodation, to cater for the growth of Shuttleworth college." - This is outrageous to suggest it in this area, it would destroy the natural beauty of the landscape, and is not in keeping with the character of broom; a small village with no amenities, and happy that way! Please understand that we wish to remain a small quiet village! Student accommodation would be terribly misplaced in broom! If this proposal is passed it means that promises have been renegeed upon: promises of a natural restoration from the quarry pits, with sailing and wildlife lakes, after 15years of quarrying (5 years still to suffer! Which I didn't want in broom in the first place!) Broom is not the place for this - Shuttleworth and Southill and the whitbread estates can do it on their own doorsteps - not on ours. |

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: E54**

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

| Submitted by | Comments   |
|--------------|--|
| Mrs J A Reid | We support the use of this land for recreational fishing, walking paths, cycle network linking Biggleswade and Old Warden/Shuttleworth - in a manner similar to Graffham Water. We don't think it is suitable for holiday homes/mobile homes as this would affect the rural nature of the countryside. |

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  |
|---------------------|---|
| Alan Eastham        | We were promised that the quarry site would be restored to agriculture after 15 years of exploitation. The landowners should be made to stick to this promise   |
| E.G & K.M<br>Davies | The site is totally unsuitable for its reasons. It lies to the west of the A1 and would create considerable traffic at the junction of the B658 and A1 roundabout causing havoc and mayhem on both routes. The site is in old warden parish.  |
| F Wandlowsky        | Absolutely not! The area is a habitat to various flora and fauna, some are considered to be rare and endangered. Has anyone taken this into consideration? The information is vague to the point of being laughable. What about the supposed restoration of the quarry?   |
| Kim Jeakings        | There are enough industrial sites in other areas with better transport links and the traffic that travels down the B658 is only increasing and there should be a status quo of sand/gravel lorries from the new broom stanford site after the end of the broom south hub and not allow any more increases in large HGVs travelling along such a minor but very fast road. It would do nothing to enhance the area nor will allow for using other forms of travel such as cycling as it is such a dangerous road. If it was allowed it would only increase the amount of traffic accessing the A1 roundabout. If there also was the recycling facility and gravel extraction which has been proposed for Gypsy Lane this would also increase the traffic. there are better sites closer to villages/towns in the area than this site |
| Miss K. Gilbert     | I think this site should be restored to agriculture as the original planning permission for the quarry required. The area around the roundabout on the A1 by sainsburys is already congested. Retail outlets are not needed here as the site is close to g&m gravers and Sainsburys.  |
| Mr & Mrs Rondel     | This site was supposed to be agricultural, when the quarry was finished. I do think that to change the original agreement with the villagers, is a betrayal of trust. and is tantamount to pandering to the land owners wishes. As there is no transport facility nearby, and would cause congestion on the B round running by, which is very narrow. I am totally disgusted with the planning committee to even think that they can get away with it. An high level of enquiry should commence as to the compatibility of the planning committee of this outrageous suggestion.  |

| Submitted by    | Comments  |
|-----------------|---|
| Mrs J M Collins | <p>Sainsburys supermarket, G&amp;M farm shop and a golf driving range &amp; sports shop are all very close to this site. More retail outlets are not needed here.</p> <p>The roundabout on the A1 close to this site is already very congested. Traffic on the A1 is already very heavy and likely to increase a lot with traffic from the additional housing already approved east of Biggleswade. This is not a good site for retail or distribution facilities.</p> <p>This site should be restored to agriculture, as required by the planning consent for the quarry.</p>  |
| R A Collins     | <p>When Broom North quarry approved in the 1990s the Shuttleworth estate issued a document showing the attractive uses it would be restored to. This area was to be restored to agriculture. Use for business, storage, distribution and retail is totally contradictory to this.</p> <p>There is already major traffic congestion on the road from this site to the A1 where traffic cannot exit to the roundabout because of the flow of A1 traffic for lengthy periods of the day.</p> <p>This site should be restored to agriculture as promised. We are losing too much agricultural production at a time when shortages of food and energy are developing</p> |

**Ref Number: E55**

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

| <b>Submitted by</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|---------------------|---|
| Alan Eastham        | The existing college campus has ample room for expansion, which should be confined to this area and not relocated or spread to E54  |
| Mr & Mrs Rondel     | I think this is the best site for expansion of Shuttleworth collage.<br>This for more perennial to building a new collage on agricultural land.   |
| Mrs. J M Colins     | I think Shuttleworth College should be allowed to expand its buildings on its present site. This is a much more acceptable proposal than the alternative proposal to build a totally new college on agricultural land outside Shuttleworth Park. Government policy advocates using brownfield sites in preference to greenfield wherever possible. Agricultural land needs conserving for food production.<br>More buildings could be added to the present college site without detracting from the historic house and its setting. |

**Ref Number: E57**

No comments were received about this site.

**OLD WARDEN APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

| Name   | Subject | Comment  |
|--|---------|--|
| J.K.N.<br>Dawson,<br>Local<br>Footpath<br>Officer,<br>Ramblers'<br>Association | E52     | This very large site is of very high present and potential recreational value. A worked out gravel quarry, it is crisscrossed with public footpaths and bridleways accessible on foot, horseback, or by cycle from Upper Caldecote, Broom , Southill and Old Warden villages, Ickwell and Biggleswade. Upper Caldecote in particular is a large village, likely to expand further, which has otherwise few facilities for informal outdoor recreation. The planned restoration of the site (by 2012) will further enhance its amenity value to the local communities, and not development should be contemplated which would threaten this. (Please see appendix three for cover letter) |

**OLD WARDEN APPENDIX THREE**  
Letters and Reports

| <b>Name/Organisation</b>            | <b>Subject</b> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| The Wildlife Trust                  | Various sites  |
| J.K.N. Dawson, Ramblers Association | E52 Old Warden |

Nicola Chessum  
Mid Beds District Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands  
SG17 5TQ

Date

### **Mid Beds District Council Site Allocations DPD: Issues and Options Consultation**

Dear Nicola

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

The Wildlife Trust has outlined below the ecological issues we are aware of associated with some of these proposed sites. Our comments are made with respect to the potential impacts developing these sites would have both on sites of importance to nature conservation (statutory and non-statutory), as well as on the wider biodiversity network of Mid Bedfordshire.

It is essential to ensure that an ecologically resilient and varied landscape, with a range of habitat types is maintained in Mid Bedfordshire. Maintaining and enhancing this essential biodiversity network will ensure that species retain the ability to move through the landscape as the effects of climate change become manifest. A failure to do this will see populations of species become further fragmented and segregated leading to eventual loss.

In maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity network, we refer not only to protecting statutory sites but also County Wildlife Sites (CWS). These non-statutory wildlife sites are the most important sites in wildlife terms, outside of those with statutory designations, and often of equivalent quality. To retain functionality in ecological terms, the biodiversity network needs sufficient linkages and buffers between and around sites to halt species loss. Also natural corridors such as river corridors are very important for an effective biodiversity network; all of which must be protected from development and damaging management.

Comments are outlined below according to parish, with the list below summarising those potential development sites to which the Wildlife Trust objects. It should not be assumed that sites excluded from this list would not have an adverse impact on nature conservation, and we expect that prior to any site being included within the final site allocations document an ecological assessment be carried out to determine the potential impacts on protected sites and species, and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) sites and species.

#### **Table of Proposed Sites at which the Wildlife Trust Objects to Development**

|                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| H055 (Shefford)        | H003/E27 (Arlesey)                                |
| H097 (Amphill)         | H023/E45 (Aspley Guise/Husborne Crawley)          |
| H122 (Amphill/Maulden) | H144/E36 (Lidlington/Marston Moretaine/Millbrook) |
| H166 (Biggleswade)     | E19 (Amphill)                                     |
| H193 (Maulden)         | E49 (Southill)                                    |
| H239 (Potton)          | E51 (Harlington)                                  |

H248 (Flitwick)

**Sites with objections and sites with comments.**

**Ampthill**

***H084***

The woodland to the south of the site forms part of the biodiversity network of the District, as such the Wildlife Trust expect that any development at this site be obligated to conserve, enhance and manage this woodland for the primary purpose of nature conservation.

***H097***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site. The proposed site is adjacent to Cooper's Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is the best remaining example in Bedfordshire of heathland situated on the acidic soils of the Lower Greensand ridge; several species rare in the County can be found here.

Heathland is easily damaged, and we are concerned that situating housing on the adjacent land will result in detrimental amounts of trampling, increasing accidental fires and a loss of the ecological integrity of Cooper's Hill as it becomes cut off from the surrounding countryside by development.

***H122***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, which involves landtake from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Cut-Throat Meadow) which is to the north of the site. The northern section of the proposed site also forms part of the biodiversity network of the District.

***H203***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Ampthill Cemetery and The Knolls CWS. Any development here should not cause any damage to the ecological integrity of the CWS. The site is also opposite a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Cut-Throat Meadow), and funding would be sought in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create on the site.

***E19***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Ampthill Tunnel CWS. Development at this site would also interrupt the biodiversity network of the District; which gives a link towards Warren wood; this linkage is essential to ensure Cooper's Hill SSSI is not cut off from the surrounding countryside.

***H080/E71***

This development is in the footprint of woodland over bluebells. While the existing buildings could be redeveloped with no further impact, additional development would damage this ancient woodland community and have a negative impact on biodiversity.

**Arlesey**

***H048***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Arlesey Meadows CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, as the River Hiz provides a vital corridor for species movement. River corridors should be protected from development to ensure they are able to continue providing ecosystem services such as floodwater control and carbon storage.

***H143***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Blue Lagoon CWS. Development here should not cause any damage to the ecological integrity of the CWS, and we would expect a significant area of chalk grassland to be created that will be managed for the primary purpose of nature conservation, in addition to the proposed country park.

***H156a, H156b and H165***

These proposed sites are within the biodiversity network of the District as the River Hiz provides a vital corridor for species movement. River corridors should be protected from development to ensure they are able to continue providing ecosystem services such as floodwater control and carbon storage.

### **H293**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also approximately 350m from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Arlesey Old Moat and Glebe Meadows). Funding would be sought in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure that such a large development would create, unless sufficient open space is provided on-site.

### **E01**

Parcel 1 of this proposed site is within the biodiversity network of the District.

### **H227/E35**

This proposed development site is adjacent to Arlesey Meadows CWS, and forms part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Hiz should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage. The site is also less than 350m from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Arlesey Old Moat and Glebe Meadows). Funding would be sought in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure that such a large development would create, unless sufficient open space is provided on-site.

### **H003/E27**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Arlesey Meadows CWS. This site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, and the corridor of the River Hiz should be protected from development.

### **Aspley Guise**

#### **H001 and H303**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **H023/E45**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Braystone CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, and this area retains some very high quality fragments of neutral grassland now extremely restricted nationally. Development if allowed at this site must ensure that the important grasslands are retained and managed and that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Biggleswade**

#### **H053**

This proposed development site is less than 100m from Biggleswade Common CWS, part of which is also a Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Site (RIGS). Contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create on the site.

### **H082**

This proposed development site is approximately 200m from Biggleswade Common CWS, part of which is also a RIGS. Contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create on the site.

### **H166**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Biggleswade Common CWS.

### ***E58***

This proposed development site is adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS, and forms part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Clophill**

#### ***H032***

This proposed development site is adjacent (across A6) to Maulden Wood and Pennyfather's Hill SSSI, and less than 100m from Readshill Grassland CWS. The site also contains woodland. Development at this site should not threaten the ecological integrity of either site. Part of the site also forms part of the biodiversity network of the District.

#### ***H039***

The proposed development site is less than 100m from the River Flit CWS and Cainhoe Lakes CWS. Any development here should not threaten the ecological integrity of either site. The River Flit corridor should be protected to ensure it is able to facilitate species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Cranfield**

#### ***H026***

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### ***H180***

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### ***H105***

Development here needs to mitigate for the loss of grassland bird species such as skylark. It is known that Great crested newts are in the vicinity

### **Flitton and Greenfield**

#### ***H117 and H219***

These proposed development sites are less than 500m from Flitton Moor CWS and less than 750m from Flitwick Moor SSSI. The River Flit corridor is extremely important for nature conservation with Flitwick moor of national importance for biodiversity. Any development must not be permitted that would prejudice the ecological integrity of either site or the biodiversity network provided by the River Flit and its immediate area. Development of this size should provide adequate open space for new residents and should not incorporate the existing important and sensitive wildlife sites into calculations of open space provision. Mitigation is likely to be needed for loss of farmland birds in such a large area.

### **Flitwick**

#### ***H062***

The proposed development site is approximately 350m from Flitwick Wood CWS and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of this site.

#### ***H077***

The proposed development site is adjacent to Steppingley Hospital CWS and less than 500m from Flitwick Wood CWS/LNR. A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of either site.

#### **H248**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, as it is adjacent to Flitwick Moor SSSI. Flitwick Moor is the largest area of wetland in Bedfordshire and is outstanding for its botanical and invertebrate interest, as well as being of national importance for mosses and fungi. Building housing on the adjacent farmland will lead to irreparable damage of the special interest of the site through changes to the water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage caused by an unsustainably high number of visitors to such a fragile habitat. The inclusion of a woodland buffer as part of this proposal is not sufficient to mitigate for the development of 250+ houses adjacent to this nationally important site, and will do nothing to prevent damaging patterns of use developing through and around the SSSI, or diminishment of the water quality in the River Flit (itself a CWS).

#### **E07**

The proposed development is less than 500m from the nationally important Flitwick Moor SSSI. Any development here must be carefully planned to ensure there are no changes to the quantity and quality of water entering the River Flit CWS, which would have detrimental impacts on the special interest features of Flitwick Moor SSSI, as well as several CWS downstream.

#### **Gravenhurst**

##### **H207**

This area of scrubby woodland has local wildlife interest particularly for breeding birds. Its loss would impact on the biodiversity quality of the village.

#### **Harlington**

##### **E51**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this as it involves landtake from the River Flit CWS. The site is adjacent to Poplars Nursery CWS and surrounds the River Flit CWS for approximately 400m. Development at this site could have serious effects on the water quality of the River Flit, which in turn would result in impacts on sites of importance downstream, including Flitwick Moor SSSI. The River Flit corridor forms part of the biodiversity network of the District and should be protected to ensure it is able to facilitate species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

#### **Haynes**

##### **H283**

This proposed development site is less than 100m from Maulden Wood and Pennyfather's Hill SSSI. Development here must not threaten the ecological integrity of these sites, and contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create.

#### **Henlow**

##### **E76**

The eastern section of this proposed development site is adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS, and forms part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

#### **Houghton Conquest**

##### **H275**

The proposed development site is approximately 500m from King's Wood and Glebe Meadows SSSI. A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure

that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of this nationally important site.

### **E16**

This proposed site is a RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Site), and had a restoration plan to provide 91 hectares of habitat of biodiversity value. Many of the old clay pits in Marston Vale have been designated as CWS, and support important populations of birds, invertebrates and amphibians including BAP species and European Protected Species. The Wildlife Trust would like to see the retention of at least one of these clay pits for nature conservation and Green Infrastructure.

### **Husborne Crawley**

#### **H023/E45**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Braystone CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, and this area retains some high quality fragments of neutral grassland now extremely restricted in Bedfordshire and nationally. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Langford**

#### **H252**

This proposed development site is adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel forms part of the biodiversity network of the District and should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Lidlington**

#### **H031, H211 and E47**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to Brogborough Lake CWS, which retains the last colony of Field Cow-wheat in Bedfordshire (one of only four sites nationally). This arable plant is on the UK BAP and any development at these sites must not threaten the integrity of the colony.

#### **H144/E36**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Heydon Hill CWS and involves landtake from Millbrook Warren CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **Marston Moretaine**

#### **H177**

This proposed development site is adjacent to Stewartby Lake CWS; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **E61**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### **H144/E36**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Heydon Hill CWS and involves landtake from Millbrook Warren CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **Maulden**

#### **H050, H116 and H221**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. They are also within 500m of Maulden Church Meadow SSSI. Development at these sites should provide sufficient open space to ensure the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of the SSSI.

### **H122**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, which involves landtake from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Cut-Throat Meadow). The northern section of the proposed site forms part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **H147, H149 and H204**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to Maulden Wood and Pennyfather's Hill SSSI. Development at these sites must provide adequate open space on-site for new residents to ensure that the ecological integrity of this nationally important site is not affected.

### **H172 and H173**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **H193**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, which involves landtake from the Flit Valley CWS.

### **H218**

Part of this proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also less than 200m from Duck End Marshy Grassland CWS. Should development go forward at this site, contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create.

### **H225**

This proposed development site is adjacent to the Flit Valley CWS; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity or hydrology.

### **H233**

This proposed development site is within 200m of Maulden Church Meadow SSSI; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **H281 and E18**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Millbrook**

#### **H144/E36**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Heydon Hill CWS and involves landtake from Millbrook Warren CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **Northill**

#### **H288**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **E39 and E65**

These proposed development sites are within 150m of the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS, and form part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Old Warden**

### ***E52 and E54***

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District, and Broom Quarry is also a RIGS. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Potton**

#### ***H010***

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also adjacent to Potton Brook, which holds one of the few remaining Water Vole populations in Bedfordshire. Water voles (from 6 April 2008) and their habitat are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and they are UK BAP Priority Species. Any development here must provide sufficient mitigating measures to ensure the Water Vole population is not threatened by disturbance, increased predation by domestic pets or changes to the water quality in Potton Brook.

#### ***H022, H054 and H290***

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at any of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### ***H239***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this as it involves landtake from Sandy Disused Railway CWS. The site also forms part of the biodiversity network of the District, and part of it is a RIGS.

### **Pulloxhill**

#### ***H152***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Pulloxhill North Marsh CWS; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **Sandy**

#### ***H151***

Part of this proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

#### ***H169, H170, H242 and E70***

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at any of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats. The sites are all within 200m of The Pinnacle CWS and Sandy Cemetery CWS and development of these sites must provide adequate open space on-site for new residents to ensure that the ecological integrity of these CWS is not affected.

#### ***H276/E13***

The majority of this proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Shefford**

#### ***H055***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from the River Flit CWS. The River Flit corridor forms part of the biodiversity network of the District and should be protected to ensure it is able to facilitate species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **H213 and H306**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to the River Flit CWS. The River Flit corridor should be protected and any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **H287**

This proposed development site runs adjacent to Old Warden Tunnel CWS for over 600m. Any development here must not affect its ecological integrity, and we would expect substantial and appropriate buffering to be put in place between the development and the CWS. A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site and ensuring that natural corridors are maintained throughout.

### **Southill**

#### **E49**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Rowney Warren CWS. This CWS is on acidic Greensand soils, and has potential, at a county level of importance, for creation of lowland heathland, a UK and Local BAP habitat. With sensitive siting of buildings and habitat creation and mitigation an acceptable plan could be proposed.

#### **E52**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District, and Broom Quarry is also a RIGS. Any development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Steppingley**

#### **H062**

The proposed development site is approximately 350m from Flitwick Wood CWS and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of this site.

### **Stotfold**

#### **H056 and E06**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

I hope that this information is instructive, I will be happy to answer any queries on the content of this consultation response.

Yours sincerely,

Laurie Jackson  
Planning and Biodiversity Officer (Bedfordshire)



**Bedfordshire Area**

Groups:

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

**BY EMAIL**

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

Mr Duffy  
Vision Twentyone  
Milton Hall  
Deansgate  
Manchester

Dear Mr Duffy

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

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely

J.K.N. Dawson

Local Footpath Officer, Ramblers' Association

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

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

### **Northhill Parish**

**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.

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

### **Southill Parish.**

**E52.** See Old Warden.

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

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

### **Old Warden Parish.**

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

### **Moggerhanger Parish**

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

### **Blunham Parish**

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

**OLD WARDEN APPENDIX FOUR**  
Respondents' Postcodes

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

| Postcode |
|----------|
| MK40 3JJ |
| MK43 7ST |
| MK45 3QG |
| SE18 GNJ |
| SG18 0NS |
| SG18 9DP |
| SG18 9DR |
| SG18 9EE |
| SG18 9EU |
| SG18 9LR |
| SG18 9NA |
| SG18 9NB |
| SG18 9NH |
| SG18 9NJ |
| SG18 9NN |
| SG18 9NR |
| SG18 9NW |
| SH18 9BO |