

SHEFFORD 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.

SHEFFORD APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
Ms Nicola Bickerstaff	Strutt And Parker	H019, H171/E43
Miss Angela Smedley	Dlp Planning Ltd	H055, H162, H163, H171/E43, H213

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H019

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
Derek Thurland	New infant and junior school spaces must be provided to support this and other proposed local development. The impact on the northern boundary - Queen Elizabeth Close, must be minimised from a visual point of view. This development could help maintain or develop the towns infrastructure -shops/ police/fire service etc.
Easton	It would meet the potential requirements for new homes and infill current development.
Nicola Bickerstaff	While we support the proposal to allocate the land for residential use, the site would be more sustainable as a larger mixed use development along with site H171/E43, offering local employment opportunities for new residents as well as a mix of housing that would be well integrated within the town.

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
Ian Rawet	There are no proposals for job creation which means that residents will be commuting for work. Reliance on the existing bus services that only service local villages or to Bedford and Hitchin is inadequate. The development supports the local economy whilst creating a high impact on the Doctor's surgeries. The access to and from this site should only be through the roundabout on Ivel Road Churchill Way so as to avoid further traffic problems on Ivel Road north of the roundabout. The prospects of future development that in-fills between Hitchin Road and the A600 by pass should also be considered. These plans should provide for pedestrian and cycle access (and alternative routes for the emergency services) from any adjacent future developments that may be outside of the time frame under consideration so as to integrate with Churchill Way cycle routes. The plans should retain mature hedgerows and tree plantations.
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	If this site were to be developed access needs careful consideration. Access of the roundabout seems most unsafe.
Russ Leith	All the utility-services infrastructure in Shefford are at saturation; as are medical services and educational provision. Provided these existing inadequacies are met, transport links improved and traffic congestion/parking addressed, then this site has potential.

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Shefford's capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
Gary Boyle	Access to this site (from Ivel Rd) will cause major traffic congestion on what is already a very busy road and one which is ill-equipped to cope with existing traffic. Significant development (i.e. Churchill Way estate and housing over the bridge and into the industrial estate) has already occurred, and this together with the recent opening of the Tesco Extra on the bypass has further detracted from the area causing serious congestion, both on Ivel Road and onto the bypass at certain times of the day. Any further development in this area will exacerbate this problem. It will also impact the local countryside and existing housing.
H Pratt	This is a large area of green belt land which if developed would change the size and appearance of Shefford too much.
Julia Martin	This site is 200 metres from a site which was bought for development over 10 years ago and has been never used (Shefford Football Club). The identification of another site seems to suggest land grabbing rather than planning, as if houses were needed, then the football site would have houses on it now. Ivel Road is already a dangerous road with speeding cars- further traffic joining at the roundabout would cause severe traffic problems for what is a residential street. The nature of planned commercial development is not specified and so could change the whole nature of the residential environment. My home and others on Ivel Road will be blighted by the eyesore of hundreds of houses, excessive traffic and commercial buildings. I object very strongly to this development.
Julian Harcourt	Shefford is a rural community and a very pleasant one to live in. The proposal to develop the land from Ivel Road to the Carriage House roundabout will kill that rural setting, put a strain on the surrounding roads, especially the A507 which is already far busier than was originally anticipated. The local infrastructure will be stretched far more than is sustainable, especially with such a small town centre that is currently just right. This proposal is ill thought out and detrimental to the local community and must be stopped. Shefford has already grown more than it is capable of sustaining.
Kathleen D Woods	The proposal housing development on this site would further badly impact on the introduction of Shefford. With the increase in traffic on the roads they will soon become overcrowded, causing traffic chaos. The local infrastructure is okay but not best suited to support an increase in inhabitants as many facilities are under increase pressure. The development of more accommodation on this site will have no benefit to the towns.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Maralyn Martin	Green belt land should not be used for further development. As Tesco now has a mini supermarket in the town, they should be made to sell their site in the town centre for affordable housing.
Miss Angela Smedley	The site is open in nature and is highly visible along Ivel Road and the A607 to the south. The southern boundary to the site consists of a short hedge as is the western boundary and would therefore be visible across the fields when entering the town from the south. Any development at this location would not be contained by surrounding development and would be highly visible on the approach to the town on Ivel Road, whilst travelling along the A607 to the south and from the residential development to the west and north. Development in this location for 170 dwellings would put pressure on local roads and services and would undoubtedly significantly impact the countryside. The existing residential development to the north is vastly screened with mature hedges and trees and a substantial gap remains between that development and the A607 of open countryside. To encroach into this space with new residential development would lose this important undeveloped gap at this location.
Mr & Mrs A Clark	Shefford is a marker town. We do not have enough facilities ie. shops, school spaces, health centre space (at present) not enough parking etc.
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	The development of this site would cause a considerable increase in traffic flow in Ivel Road which is heavily congested with resident on street car parking and also car parking allied to Brewers Court, the commercial site at the bottom of Ivel Road, which has insufficient parking provided on site. Any development on this site would need to be designed to blend with the profile of the ground which slopes steeply upwards away from the entry point. Any structures on this site would appear to be a strident feature at the entry point to the community. It was turned down as development land by the Inspector at the setting of the last local plan due to its high visibility from the approach to Shefford. This development would not be of sufficient size to support any additional shopping outlets. There is a Tesco Express within a few minutes walk. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H019 will cause. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr P Gallant	Living in Queen Elizabeth Close we have grave concerns about the impact of further development on Ivel Road. Existing traffic is heavy, with no obvious traffic calming measures possible, due to the need for emergency vehicle access. We encourage our children to walk to schools locally, but with even more traffic proposed, how long will it be safe for them to do so? Please consider how this impacts on existing residents.
Mrs J Howieson	Existing schools in Shefford are over-subscribed. This area was in the green belt until the bypass was put in. We should not lose more farmland. The additional traffic using Ivel Road is already a problem (with speeding and parked cars) - the potential of another 170 cars using this access would make this road a nightmare for users and house owners. The sewage system cannot cope now.
Mrs M Lewis	Schools and surgeries in Shefford are working to full capacity without added complications of further housing. There have been numerous accidents on the A507 some of them fatal. Housing on this site would bring added danger. Housing of this nature might be better placed in villages where post offices and schools are threatened closure.
Mrs Meadows	I believe before more building is approved in Shefford, there should be careful consideration to the infrastructure and whether the town can support any more growth. The schools are approaching capacity, there are frequent power cuts, there is nothing for teenagers to do, Some roads in the town are practically impassable because of the amount of cars parked on them. Shefford is a lovely place to live and an ideal size.
N Martin	There is no need for further development in this area. The area has already expanded too much.
Pauline Cocevar	PLEASE build on infill sites, derelict and brownfield sites before paving over acres of green farmland! Have you not discovered the soaring cost of wheat (via your bread purchases) now that China wants to eat like the first world and grains are being used for bio fuels instead of food? Better that we protect our farmland now, before it gets built on.
PR.Welch	As regards impact on environment: since the Churchill rd. Estate has been built there has been a noticeable increase in foul air smells from the increased number of stench pipes., with this development the smells will be only get worse. there is also foul air smells in Ivel rd.
Richard Ownsworth	Homes in construction and H163 road access will become very heavy. Entrance Queen Elizabeth Close is blind summit once committed turn right no option but to continue causes concern as parked cars on Ivel Road with no openings to move into. Cars use Ivel Road at excessive speed. Congestion complicated by H019/171/E43/162 will add to the problem. Access via Queen Elizabeth Close to H162 situation extreme. Industrial use of H019 at lower end inappropriate situated adjacent existing homes causing unsightly views also traffic problems. Why has the council allowed redevelopment of perfectly good industrial sites for domestic use only to consider locating new sites in residential areas? Local councillors opinion future development in Shefford best suited on H287 accommodate requirements for new homes and provision of new sports facilities. H287 cause least impact on local residents and potentially the easiest to develop. This site has good road access to the town and also Bedford.

Submitted by	Comments
Stuart Baddeley	I think development in Shefford should be limited to smaller scale schemes that are contained within the current town boundaries. The use of agricultural land should be avoided where possible. This site in particular is on a hill and therefore the visual impact would be large. This site is also situated some distance from the local facilities on the edge of the town, ideal for commuters looking for the A507 but the distance would lead to increased traffic in the town centre, to the middle and lower schools and on level road.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H055

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 Geoffrey C Barham	<p>The development of this site would go some way towards the community's required housing provision. It is outside the current development boundary but would be a sensible addition to the community's area. It should be noted that approximately 50% of the indicated area falls with the floodplain and is prone to flooding during winter periods. Flood protection and floodplain mitigation would be needed. It would be essential to have any development in this area assessed by the Ivel Drainage Board. The section of Stanford Road that borders the site to the north is particularly hazardous due to the approach speed of vehicles, particularly LGV's, and would benefit from a layout that reprofiles the bend and provides a roundabout at the junction with Lucas Way. The new roundabout could also provide access to the site. A local 'convenience store' would be supported by this development and if located correctly could be used by the residents of the nearby existing estate. Sheffords medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H055 will cause. The proposed medical new facility would be located at the opposite end of the community, more than twice the distance of the existing medical facility. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>
P.J. Patmore	<p>The exit for this site of up to 200 dwellings would be on the edge of town onto an already busy road with a dangerous bend at the edge of the present development area. any extra traffic would need a new roundabout by Shefford Mill to gain safe exit from the site. Any extra community facilities would be needed. The land to the south of Shefford Mill needs to keep its rural outlook and as it is on the floodplain development of public open access space with enhanced public footpaths would advantage the town.</p>

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there isn't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
A.M. Palmer	No new facilities are proposed. Drainage will not sustain. Power is always going down. Sam Whitbread has not got more capacity.
Alison Palmer	There is not sufficient infrastructure to support this development. The road leading to this development, which is already heavily used, would be much busier and more congested causing more pollution and noise to existing residents in the area. The drainage and sewage systems are already struggling to cope and potential flooding risks would be increased. The electricity supply can often not cope with the current demand, so any additional demands would result in further problems and power cuts.
D.C. Elvin	Stanford Road is already a very busy main road with narrow sharp bend in it and as such. Does not need more traffic which will naturally come from a large new housing estate. Also the sewerage main in Stanford Road at times cannot cope with the flow now let alone another housing estate running into it. In the past we have not been able to use our w/c or bath and have had raw sewage in our garden. It is not something I want to happen on a more regular basis.
David Elvin	I strongly disagree with this proposed build. That land is needed for farming and should be protected to protect the farming industry; it is also a necessary flood plane. The sewage system simply could not cope with increased demand and the road could not support the traffic.
Easton	Potential flooding, near/on the flood plain.
Glenda Tizard	2 issues: 1. This proposal will build substantially on the River Flit floodplain. 2. This will contribute to oversubscription of lower and middle schools.
H Pratt	This is green belt land which provides appealing views when approaching Shefford from Sandy.
Jonathan Elvin	The site is grade a agricultural land and should be protected. Increased housing will put even more traffic on the busy road. The sewage system already fills up and floods our drive with raw sewage how will it cope with more houses? The land is also a flood plane which floods regularly. The land is also the home and habitat of wildlife and should be protected because of that.

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Caldicott	Stanford Road is dangerous and busy now. Sat navs are directing traffic from the A1 through to Bedford via this route already. These extra homes would create severe congestion at peak periods. Present child access to country walks and play areas is by crossing Stanford Road. Traffic calming would be needed on this arterial route. This site is a swamp unsuitable for building creating run off into drains that do not cope now. We have been subjected to sewage overflow 3 times last year, twice this year already. The extra houses would exacerbate this situation further.
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>Development would be visible across the adjoining fields and Shefford Mill area. To encroach into this land would lose this important undeveloped gap at this town edge boundary.</p> <p>Approximately 2/3 of the site lies within floodplains with the proposal stating that said areas would be set aside for public open space leaving 1/3 of the site for residential development. This would lead to the northernmost part of the site being developed with a large undeveloped area between it and the existing residential development to the south. This would be completely incongruous and further severing residential development from the town.</p> <p>The resultant land of approx 2.76ha would be proposed for 200 dwellings providing a density of 72 dw/ha. This is extremely high and would be completely out of character with the surrounding properties. In addition development here for 200 dwellings would put pressure on local roads and services and would undoubtedly significantly impact the countryside.</p>
Miss Victoria Elvin	This site will cause more traffic problems and accidents on an already very busy road. It will also increase the volume of sewerage to an already overloaded system leading to more instances where raw sewage covers the drives and gardens at Stanford Road. It is also a flood plain which regularly floods and is Grade A agricultural land.
Mr A. G. Ransom	Traffic in Stanford road is totally chaos at peak times. Sewage is a major problem already. Electricity supply is chaotic at best.
Mr D J Noon	Disagree entirely with this site being developed because of it being built on the flood plain. As this part of Shefford is prone to flooding this will only increase the problem and cause distress and inconvenience to the neighbouring properties.
Mrs Elvin	<p>This site will cause more traffic on an already very busy road which has seen many accidents already.</p> <p>It will also increase the volume of sewage which the drains back up over our drives on a regular basis at the moment leaving raw sewage to be cleaned away, which is a health hazard.</p> <p>This is also a flood plane and regularly floods, where will the water go if the buildings are allowed?</p>
Mrs Lesley Cahill	The proximity of this proposed development to the river, and the anticipated existing impact on sewage and road systems would be highly detrimental. Building on what is effectively a floodplain is also somewhat irresponsible in light of recent flooding in other parts of the county and the consequences of this.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	The proposed development is too large. The lower part of the site is a flood plain. It would impact the open countryside and the wildlife which use the river corridors. It is outside the development envelope. The land is Grade A agricultural land. NO MORE HOUSES should be connected to the sewage system until it has been upgraded! The traffic on this road is already too heavy and too fast an increase would make it worse.
Mrs M E Valentine	Access onto Stanford Road would cause a hazard. The area is too close to the river and would increase the likelihood of flooding. This development would have an adverse effect on wildlife and their habitat close by the river, and would destroy the current wild, unspoilt wooded area. I have concerns about drainage coping with the increased surface water run off, and also about the antiquated sewerage system in Shefford coping with additional housing. NB: It is very difficult to give reasoned answers to your questions because your map doesn't show land on which planning permission has already been granted, nor is it up to date in terms of land already built on.
Mrs S Caldicott	The road, river and sewers cannot support development of this site. The road is too busy and dangerous, the river overflows and the sewers overflow as it is.
Nicola	It is on the flood plain and also it's not suitable. Why cram as much in for the sake of it - does not make sense.
P W Best	Main consideration should be the existing fowl drainage problems already in existence for residents of Stanford Road.
Patricia Lowings	This is an area of floodplain and is marshy. Building 200 units would result in other areas of the town - Southbridge Street, Northbridge Street and Stanford Road as well as road off Purcell Way to the east being more likely to flood.
Pauline Cocevar	PLEASE build on infill sites, derelict and brownfield sites before paving over acres of green farmland! Let us not even talk of the Tesco-owned site on the High Street in Shefford (a derelict old laundry). If green fields are built on before this site it will be a travesty for the locals: green fields disappeared and STILL Tesco refuses to develop that eyesore. Please ask the Town Council about this if you doubt my words.
Sharon & Dean Shields	Shefford's infrastructure is already overloaded by the current developments being undertaken, the schools are oversubscribed and overloaded, as is the Doctors Surgery, with frequent and prolonged Power Cuts affecting parts of the town on a regular basis, and the sewer system collapsing in some areas. This and other proposed developments will blight what is a thriving rural country town and turn it into another sprawling overdeveloped area in which I will not want to live.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H141

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
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
Miss Lorna J McGregor	This would mean further erosion of the flood plain. Shefford has already suffered episodes of flooding. Already problems with flooding episodes - this could only exacerbate the problem.
Mr + Mrs Hobbs	Amphill road site will create more traffic. The schools are filled. We have huge lorries taking a short cut through Shefford. As it is in Shefford is a nice village. There are smaller villages who could be rejuvenated, leave us alone.
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	This would be a sensible development, however the fact that it is adjacent to flood plane should require a full flood risk assessment that should be included in any planning application detailing the proposed flood mitigation measures. Access to the site is from a busy section of roadway and special attention should be paid to the visibility splay on any access road or driveway. Sheffords medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H141 will cause. The proposed medical new facility would be located at the opposite end of the community. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.
Paul FJ Mackin	This would be a sensible development, it is adjacent to flood plane should require a full flood risk assessment that should be included in any planning application detailing the proposed flood mitigation measures. Special attention should be paid to the visibility splay on any access road or driveway. Sheffords medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Public transport to the area is minimal.

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
Keith Dear	If the proposed development has the potential for increasing the frequency and severity of flooding further downstream then it would be a retrograde step to allow this development. The flood plain between The Hollies and the river is already subjected to frequent flooding to a level that threatens a number of houses in The Hollies that are just beyond the current flood plain boundary.

Ref Number: H162

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
Anthony D Brown	Site a joins the Shefford Memorial Association playing field which could support any additional play facilities, also it could fund the much needed rebuild of the current building. A new medical centre is planned to be built on the opposite side of Hitchin Road which would be well placed to serve the additional new houses on the outskirts of the town so some employment development should be given a high priority.
M. Harradine	If a football pitch was provided on this site it would then also release the site H163 Ivel Road, so Shefford and Mid Beds would get 370 houses well above the target.
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	This site is not easily accessed from the existing roads and would form a large cul-de-sac. The additional traffic caused by access from Hitchin Road would be unacceptable. The 'additional information' makes mention of an 'additional sports pitch'. The sports pitch is already proposed as part of an arrangement for another development (H163 the old football field), in Shefford. Sheffords medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H162 will cause. The proposed medical new facility would be located at the opposite end of the community. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.
Phillips Planning Services LTD on behalf of Samuel Beadie (Investments) LTD	Full details of the site are set out in the supporting statement and appraisal statements which have been submitted in respect of the site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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
Derek Thurland	<p>The proposed public access through Queen Elizabeth close is not acceptable.</p> <p>If the H162 and H019 developments go ahead, then access should be provided from H162 through H019/H171 sites, effluxing at the roundabout opposite Churchill Way.</p> <p>The boundary with Queen Elizabeth Close should be protected from visual and positional impact of any built housing/infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposal would contribute to the use of local facilities ie shops schools etc. The new health centre is a condition of the go-ahead for this site; and must be in place before any developments are given the ok.</p>
Ian Rawet	<p>There are no proposals for job creation within these plans. Reliance on the existing bus services that only service local villages or to Bedford and Hitchin is inadequate.</p> <p>The development supports the local economy whilst creating a high impact on the Doctor's surgeries.</p> <p>The prospects of future development that in-fills between Hitchin Road and the A600 by pass should also be considered. These plans should provide for pedestrian and cycle access (and alternative routes for the emergency services) from any adjacent future developments that may be outside of the time frame under consideration so as to integrate with Churchill Way cycle routes.</p> <p>The demolition of existing housing whilst the plot is not land locked should be avoided. A suitable cycle and footpath route to Ivel Road could be provided via the playing fields and Elm Road</p> <p>The plans should recognise the rural aspect and retain mature hedgerows and tree plantations with the potential for more playing areas.</p>

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
Donna Butler	We do not believe that Queen Elizabeth Close can provide suitable access to H162 and Ivel Road certainly cannot handle more traffic as currently there are a lot of parked cars and further housing would lead to more congestion.

Submitted by	Comments
Gary Boyle	<p>Although the plan describes access via Hitchin Road, it also discusses a footpath link via Queen Elizabeth Close, which presumably involves the demolition of a house at the end of the close, which is currently owned by a property developer. Initial concerns would be the increased foot traffic through a quiet, private estate of 40 houses, to access 320 dwellings of mixed usage. This would be wholly inappropriate and would seriously impact a small attractive estate that was never designed to be a thoroughfare. In addition it opens up the possibility that this (one day) could be made into vehicular access and would then seriously devastate the pre-existing housing, with impact on traffic within Ivel Road also. It will also impact the local countryside and existing housing in terms of quality of life, noise levels, and pollution as local public transport is wholly inadequate. Current infrastructure (local roads, drainage, etc) is not designed to cope with this amount of increased housing.</p>
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>The site is segregated from the town, located amongst farm buildings and substation. A large field lies between the town & proposed site which provides this severance. There are no bus links to the site, with no footpaths on the site side of Hitchin Road which is also a national speed limit rd.</p> <p>The info provided outlines that the site could be developed for mixed-use inc some employment development. Such areas would need to be defined to enable proper assessment of the site. It further adds that new community facilities could be accommodated inc sports pitches though Shefford already contains a large number of pitches and it would not be ideal for such facilities to be located at this segregated site.</p> <p>The development of this site within the open countryside would destroy the dispersed nature of built development at the settlement edge. The important transition between town and countryside that is present at this site would be lost along with views across the site.</p>
Mr & Mrs G A Andrew	<p>Shefford cannot sustain more housing/business development as schools, doctors, dentists, police, utilities are not coping now let alone with further major developments.</p> <p>If it is your intention to force through these new developments without consultation and debate with the residents of Shefford i fear you will see what extreme damage you will cause to the future of Shefford and its residents. This is not a large town and is not what the residents want, we came for the peace and community spirit that Shefford offered and you are slowly destroying it.</p> <p>Where are they all going to work?</p>
Mr & Mrs A Clark	<p>Shefford is a market town. We do not have enough facilities ie. shops, school spaces, health centre space (at present) not enough parking etc.</p>
Mrs D Butler	<p>I am a resident of Queen Elizabeth Close and our house backs onto the fields in question for residential development. Whilst I would obviously rather view the beautiful countryside rather than a residential development, my main concern for this proposal is flooding. As soon as we have a little rainfall our garden contains approx 4-6 inches of water on our patio. If the field is developed then I would worry further that we would experience flooding of a higher degree due to the fact the land couldn't absorb more of this rainwater as there would be houses on the land meaning that Queen Elizabeth Close would flood even more as the rainwater would drain down from the housing development, surely this is a serious concern that needs to be addressed and I therefore strongly oppose the housing development.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs K Gallant	We have major concerns about the potential access to this proposed development through Queen Elizabeth Close. Having purchased our home deliberately for its quiet location, restricted size and the lack of through traffic we are alarmed to see this may change with the new proposals. There seem to be more obvious development opportunities, which would not impact in such an intrusive way into an existing community. We would actively be objecting to this current proposal for this reason.
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	This site if developed would be an unwelcome extension outside the development envelope and would be an intrusion into the open countryside. It is too large.
Mrs N Brixley	The size of this development is of great concern. Not only will the infrastructure of Shefford not support this, but also the character of Shefford will be changed irrevocably. Community spirit and the small town feel will be further eroded. Why can't the quota be filled by using infill sites rather than large, characterless estates??
Nicola Brixey	If a development of this size is allowed to proceed, Shefford will have taken another step down the road to becoming a soulless, characterless housing estate. Why is it not possible to fulfil the housing requirement with small infill projects? Please think about the people living in Shefford and don't give in to the greed of the big developers!
P.r.Welch	I disagree with the need for this development on adverse environmental reasons, ie.disruptive pedestrian access. Violation of countryside views.
Paul FJ Mackin	This site is not easily accessed from the existing roads and would form a large cul-de-sac. The additional traffic caused by access from Hitchin Road would be unacceptable. The 'additional information' makes mention of an 'additional sports pitch'. The sports pitch is already proposed as part of an arrangement for another development in Shefford. Sheffords medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Public transport to the area is minimal.
Pauline Cocevar	PLEASE build on infill sites, derelict and brownfield sites before paving over acres of green farmland!
Richard Ownsworth	Traffic problems and severe impact on Queen Elizabeth Close if used as access.
S.F.Snedker	An attempt to obtain planning permission for this site has failed in the past, as it is most unsuitable. I have twice pointed out and objected too in the past.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H163

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
Anthony D Brown	Traffic using Ivel Road will be an additional problem to the current congestion and safety hazards of this road. New football ground urgently wanted and must stay as a requirement of any approval of this site.
Easton	It would meet the potential requirements for new homes and infill current development.
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	This is a sensible use of this land, however the area has been known to flood therefore a full flood risk survey should be carried out and the results included with any planning application detailing the proposed flood mitigation measures. There is a covenant in place that requires a suitable alternative football ground to be provided. This provision is in exchange for providing and social housing. It is imperative that a site is found and developed as a football field rather than any cash equivalent that may well get diverted away from the community of Shefford. Access to the site is from a busy section of roadway and special attention should be paid to the visibility splay on any access road or driveway. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H163 will cause. The proposed medical new facility would be located at the opposite end of the community. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still be required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	I would support the development of this site PROVIDING an alternative football pitch is provided.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Paul FJ Mackin	<p>This is a sensible use of this land, a full flood risk survey should carry out and the results included with any planning application detailing the proposed flood mitigation measures.</p> <p>There is a covenant in place that requires a suitable alternative football ground to be provided.</p> <p>It is imperative that a site is found and developed as a football field rather than any cash equivalent that may well get diverted away from the community of Shefford.</p> <p>Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present.</p> <p>The Middle and Lower schools are full now.</p> <p>The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs.</p> <p>Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>

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
Ian Rawet	<p>There are no proposals for job creation within these plans which means that residents will be commuting for work. Reliance on the existing bus services that only service local villages or to Bedford and Hitchin is inadequate.</p> <p>The development supports the local economy whilst creating a high impact on the social structure and Doctor's surgeries.</p> <p>There are already traffic problems on Ivel Road north of the roundabout. There is a risk that development would exacerbate this. The prospects of future development that in-fills between Hitchin Road and the A600 by-pass should also be considered. These plans should provide for pedestrian and cycle access (and alternative routes for the emergency services) from any adjacent future developments that may be outside of the time frame under consideration so as to integrate with Churchill Way cycle routes.</p> <p>The plans should recognise flood plain risk.</p>
Pauline Cocevar	<p>This site would likely benefit from development, currently it is used by some to dump rubbish, but are you sure about the proximity to the river?</p>

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
No name given	<p>I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Shefford's capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.</p>
No name given	<p>People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.</p>
No name given	<p>People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Gary Boyle	<p>This level of development (ie.52 dwellings) is the type and level of development which should be supported and is sustainable within Shefford and the surrounding area in the light of the desire to provide more housing. The problem with this site is that it is wholly inappropriate being on existing floodplain and requiring access via Ivel Road which cannot cope with the existing traffic which uses it. Furthermore even this number of houses would impact local infrastructure (schools, medical centre, sports facilities) given the numbers of houses that have already been built in the last 10-15 years without any investment in true infrastructure.</p>
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>The proposed site is located to the south of Shefford Town at the Shefford Town Football Club. The site is proposed for redevelopment for residential use though relocation of the football club has not occurred and the facility would be lost as a result of the allocation. Allocation of the site would be premature in the light of the football club not yet being relocated.</p> <p>The site is totally open and provides an important gap between the housing development to the north and south with the river located to the west beyond the open space and children's play area. Land levels are significantly lower than the adjacent housing developments with this dropping further towards the river. Development would appear incongruous at this level with its neighbours.</p> <p>Due to the proximity to the river part of the site lies within a flood plain and therefore development of this area would need to be avoided with further investigatory works required to develop any part of the site</p>
Mr & Mrs A Clark	<p>Shefford is a marker town. We do not have enough facilities ie. shops, school spaces, health centre space (at present) not enough parking etc.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H213

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there isn't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
Anthony D Brown	Flood plain restrictions. Site should not be developed until the medical centre proposed for Hitchin Road is up and running.
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>The proposed site lies to the rear of housing off Mayfield's/adjacent to Shefford Business Park. The plan illustrates no access to the site from any highway. The closest point of potential access from a highway from the adjacent dwelling though a garage stands in the said path. Access cannot be taken from within the Business Park as this is private land also.</p> <p>The site also lies within a flood zone and therefore only half of the site is proposed for development with mitigation measures required. This would need further investigation as to what could be potentially possible at the site if anything.</p> <p>Whilst residential development of this site would not be completely out of character due to neighbouring residential development its development is completely flawed with no access provision and the limitations of the flood zones.</p> <p>In addition the development only proposes 3-5 dwellings which will not impact on the numbers of dwellings required by the Council, which seeks 50-250.</p>
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	H213 Land rear of Mayfield's, Shefford. This development suffers with very poor access. It is possible that property would have to be demolished in order to give vehicular access. The land is on flood plane and would need flood mitigation and protection. This land is not suitable for residential development. Any Planning Application should be refused on the above grounds. Should development take place the population increase would be insignificant in relation to Health Care and schooling facilities.
Paul F Mackin	<p>This development suffers with very poor access. It is possible that property would have to be demolished in order to give vehicular access. The land is on flood plane and would need flood mitigation and protection.</p> <p>This land is not suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Any Planning Application should be refused on the above grounds.</p> <p>Should development take place the population increase would be insignificant in relation to Health Care and schooling facilities.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roger Fowler	This land is at substantial risk of flooding. It would be foolhardy in the extreme to allow any houses to be developed on this land. The access to this land is also completely inadequate; it is impossible for an ambulance or fire tender to negotiate the extremely narrow driveway. If this driveway were to support multiple properties it would become intolerable for existing property holders.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs A. Bennett	This site is the obvious one to locate the new Shefford health centre rather than H222 which is a half a mile out of the town and difficult for elderly people to reach. There is no bus service to H222.

Ref Number: H222

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 Geoffrey C Barham	<p>This development although within the Clifton Boundary is a sensible use of land. The development when taken with the additional plot on site ref.H2298 would provide approximately 50% of the communities' contribution to the housing requirement. It will be located next to the proposed new medical centre and is immediately adjacent to the Upper School. The Middle and Lower Schools are some distance away and will no doubt add to traffic movements with parents taking children to these schools. Part of the 106 agreements for this site could be the provision of a new access road to the Upper School. This development is sufficient to support a small number of 'general' stores, as it is some distance from the shopping centres of Shefford and Clifton. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H222 will cause. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>
Paul FJ Mackin	<p>This development a sensible use of land. The Middle and Lower Schools are some distance away and will no doubt add to traffic movements with parents taking children to these schools. Part of the 106 agreements for this site could be the provision of a new access road to the Upper School. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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 Lorna McGregor	If this site was developed it MUST include sport or open countryside provision.
Phillips Planning Services LTD on behalf of Samuel Beadie (Investments) LTD	The promoted site seeks to utilise a new roundabout junction on Hitchin Road to gain necessary access. It would appear that reliance is placed on the roundabout junction approved under reference 01/01600/FUL and recently reviewed as reference 07/01082/FUL. Our client notes that the ability to deliver the access road depends upon the co-operation of our client as part of the roundabout location. No approach has been received by our client from the owner of this promoted site to link in with the roundabout. Any access to the roundabout would be subject to a successful negotiation of an agreement with our client. In the absence of such an agreement the promoted site will not have the benefit of the crucial access.

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there isnt the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
A Welsford	Clifton is a village and has a lack of shops as it is. Doctors' surgery is very busy now with an influx of families it would be worse. In any event, the fields seem to be disappearing now. Find brownfield sites instead of greenfield.
Aaron smith	Development will place strain on local infrastructure, schools and create significant additional traffic problems, in area that has problems already.
Anna grist	Important to maintain space between the 2 villages of Shefford and Clifton, and these developments would join them. Clifton is a lovely small village in the country and these developments would destroy this. Also this would cause even more congestion through Clifton.
B Livesey	An important green break between Clifton and Shefford.
C.Campbell	Shefford Road is already heavily congested and putting 120 more dwellings nearby is just plain crazy! Also the infrastructure is just not in place for the village, and where would people work?
Charmaine Rogers	There is already a heavy flow of traffic through Clifton. We have a site proposed within a flood plain. We do not have the infrastructure within Clifton to absorb any more housing. We have already had a huge building development with Clifton field's site.

Submitted by	Comments
Clifton Improvement and Preservation Society	While the site might support local services, no weight should be attached to that given the harm done to character and amenity of the village and well established planning policies. 1. The Society is of the view that the provision of sites for housing development in Shefford should pay special regard to the requirement of maintaining the identity of the villages of Shefford and Clifton. The Local Plan as approved firmly supported the provision of a gap between the settlements to maintain a rural barrier and a visual division. While that has been eroded by the extension of Samuel Whitbread School and a protruding dwelling on the recent development on the edge of Shefford north of Pedley Lane, the Society believes there is a strong justification for the maintenance of a rural gap on the boundary of Shefford. While it is acknowledged that Shefford is a Minor Centre, there are nine such centres and the requirement in CS13 is for only 950 dwellings. It is that figure which should be spread, no necessarily evenly. Arlesey with its station should be adopted as the major site for this development. 2. On the basis of an even spread of housing this site pre-empts the whole allocation for Shefford until 2026. 3. This site intrudes visually into the open countryside and affects the setting in Shefford. There are less conspicuous sites on the north and western boundaries of Shefford. 4. The site encroaches into the beginning of the rural gap and would urbanise views from the Southdown the hill from Wren Park towards Shefford from which there are wide country views. It is in conflict with national and local policy to protect the open countryside.
Deborah Pugh	Size of developments out of proportion. Existing roads could not cope with increased traffic. Quality of life be greatly reduced.
Hogarth	Surely another opportunity for greedy landowners and develops to make a mint, before leaving the locals with the aftermath.
J R Elliott	Drains are often blocked and roads flooded. There is heavy traffic going through the village already and lots of pollution. This beautiful village does not have the infrastructure to take on this development.
John & Margaret Portess	The proposed development will affect the character and environment of a rural location, fill the gap between and merge Clifton and Shefford, and cause unreasonable traffic congestion.
John Chalmers	This is too large a development to allow Clifton to keep its identity and not become merged with Shefford.
Lauren Pitcher	This development will add to traffic congestion on the A507 and Shefford Road.
Liz Durrant	Concerned about impact on schools and roads.
Mark Rowe	This village will no longer be a village if you keep forcing housing on us. I moved here 4 years ago to live in a village. I have worked hard to be able to move to a village. If I wanted to live in a town I would not have moved out of one. I see no plans to increase investment in our infrastructure only in making money for the builders and tax man. Where are the plans for new facilities? Upgraded Park, new library, doctor, and chemist? Where are the plans to improve bus services and road connections? Where are all these people going to work and how will the A507 cope its already jammed at rush hour. This is ill conceived and unacceptable.
Michael and Anne Harris	We strongly disagree with the development of this site as we feel the boundary between Clifton and Shefford would be lost with the result that Clifton would loose its identity and just become part of Shefford.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>The site is segregated from the town located amongst a small amount of dwellings with no relationship to the built-up area to the north. A large agricultural field lies between the town and the proposed site providing this severance. There are also no bus links along this route, which is subject to national speed limit.</p> <p>It is proposed that this site combined with further land to create community facilities. If so the combined sites should be considered together and not separately or the merits can not be assessed. Secondly, Shefford and Clifton should remain as separate entities and linking the residential developments undermines such.</p> <p>The development of this site within the open countryside would destroy the dispersed nature of built development at the settlement edge. The important transition between town and countryside that is present at this site would be lost through an allocation for residential development. Views would be lost to the school buildings across the site.</p>
Mrs J O'Connor	I came to Clifton village because it was a small village, for peace and tranquillity do not want Clifton to be turned into a small town. We are quite alright as we are.
Mrs L Bowen	Clifton should remain a SMALL village. The proposed site is farmland and should not be built on whatsoever. It will do nothing at all to enhance the lives of the people living in Clifton and will only put a strain on the existing facilities. It is not surprising that so many people are leaving the U.K. when Councils are taking away the green belt areas and destroying village life.
Mrs Michelle Pitiu	The village school is already full; there is no infrastructure in place. Drains in the village are always getting blocked. There is so much traffic, already on the roads through the village.
Mrs. P Wormald	Questionable whether within Clifton boundary.
Mrs rosemary Byrom	I am dismayed and angry to think of such a large swathe of countryside being developed, especially in view of the inadequate sewage and electricity capabilities of the area. In the past four months there have been several power cuts. Sewage has been a problem in shefford, and for years we have heard that our sewage system is inadequate. The school system is not geared for more students on such a scale.
P Ames	This with 198 320/360 new houses vastly too many. Enormous traffic impact on Hitchin Road and Shefford town centre. Neither Clifton nor Robert Bloomfield could cope with the expected increase in children taken with Shefford developments should be turned down.
P.E Livesey	An important green area to separate the village of Clifton from the town of Shefford.
Pauline Cocevar	<p>PLEASE build on infill sites, derelict and brownfield sites before paving over acres of green farmland!</p> <p>For this one, you talk of combined ownership of all the land surrounding to set up a housing development with complete infrastructure. Are you talking about a totally new town? The scale of this beggar's belief. Absolute madness!</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
R Sheppard	No more housing should be permitted in Clifton: The infrastructure - electricity, water, sewage, roads, NHS etc. & schools are already too full. At present, most residents have to commute - usually by car - to work, leisure, education and health facilities. In the light of the governments concerns about Global Warming and Climate Change, even this current pattern of commuting is unsustainable. Increasing the commuting by building extra homes - without first providing good quality jobs and facilities - would destroy the government's chances of meeting its targets to combat Climate Change. It would also destroy the fertile farming land which will become increasingly vital as food becomes ever more scarce and expensive. No more housing should be permitted in the Henlow / Clifton / Shefford area until after the infrastructure has been upgraded and there is at least one good quality job available locally - without commuting - for each existing household.
R. Brown	Very concerned about drainage, and excessive traffic.
Robert A. Agass	The volume of additional traffic through this area plus the strain on local village resources make this proposed area of development totally unsuitable.
Stephen Melia	This is within the Parish of Clifton, and any development here would be closing in the countryside gap between Clifton and Shefford.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Lin & Jeff Hurst	Until the infrastructure is sorted, there is not point in building houses. Electrical supplies. Sewage/water. Transport. The Community College is already full - it needs space to expand. Why not save this site for the school!
Mrs C Dawson	Clifton is a great village; please keep it so with minimum development.
Paul A J Marshall	Regardless of site, unless accompanying proposals are produced re. Schooling and other infrastructure, explanations on how access will be managed in terms of traffic; I do not see how it is possible to even propose such options. Clifton especially is a small village with facilities that match this criteria and o the highest standards. Unless someone can outline the above additional supporting plans, I do not have the vision to see how the impact could bring positive benefits.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H235

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. Leland Golding, Mrs. Jeannette Golding	Part of this land is owned by myself (as a paddock) as well as my home at 189 Clifton Road Shefford. A right of way to the land is adjacent to my property which may be a possible road access to the site (most certainly if 189 Clifton Road, Shefford was demolished.) Samuel Whitbread Community College is within a 2 minute walk, Post offices at Clifton and Shefford are approximately equidistant & the site is also very close to Millennium Green which could be used for recreational facilities. In the 25 years we have lived at this address, we have never seen this area flooded. This is also an ideal infill area which would not cause expansion into the Greenbelt.

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 Geoffrey C Barham	This development is within the Clifton boundary. It is partly on flood plane and has been flooded within recent years. A full flood risk assessment must be completed showing flood mitigation and prevention measures and be included in any planning application. It is located close to the Upper School. The Middle and Lower Schools are some distance away and will no doubt add to traffic movements with parents taking children to these schools. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H235 will cause. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.
P Ames	Maybe if less than 50 then this would be ok.
Paul FJ Mackin	It is partly on flood plane and has been flooded within recent years. A full flood risk assessment must be completed showing flood mitigation and prevention measures and be included in any planning application. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Public transport to the area is minimal.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Cocevar	50, at least, seems like an acceptable number of dwellings. Perhaps we could have some sensible -sized houses built just this once, rather than dozens of rabbit-hutch one-bed flats and immense 4/5-bed houses with 2/3 bathrooms? We are not all singletons or families possessed of 4 children!
Peter Topley	This site falls within the parish of Clifton and therefore should not be included in the Shefford proposal.

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Shefford's capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there isn't the places, the set up for (illegible) etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
No name given	The proposed site for 50 homes on land to the rear of Shefford Road Clifton. Would add more congestion to the already congested area of Shefford Road. With all the cars and buses going to and from Samuel Whitbread College. Cars are parked on the road and sometimes on the paths all day from the college, so if you built 50 houses, this would mean maybe another 100 cars. Tying to get out onto a busy congested road
No name given	The proposed site for 50 homes on land to the rear of Shefford Road, Clifton. Would add to more congestion, to the already congested area of Shefford Road. With all the cars and buses going to and from Samuel Whitbread College. Cars are parked on the road and sometimes on the paths all day, from the college, so if you built 50 houses, this would mean, maybe, another 100 cars trying to get out onto a busy, congested road.
A Welsford	Clifton is a village and has a lack of shops as it is. Doctor's surgery is very busy now with an influx of families it would be worse. In any event, the fields seem to be disappearing now. Find brownfield sites instead of Greenfield.
Alison Smith	This site is within the floodplain and therefore should not be developed due to this potential problem. It also is right on the boundary between Clifton and Shefford and if developed will mean the merging of Shefford with Clifton. Both the lower schools at Clifton and Shefford are I believe already struggling with the demand for places and as such would not be able to cope with the increased demand from a further 50 dwellings.

Submitted by	Comments
Anthony John Tobitt	The site is an extension of one recently developed and further intrudes into pen countryside and its eastern land. Such development effectively to the north of Pedley land should be resisted as it impinges on the events of open country which presently exist towards Stanford. Further, it develops even further the jungle of development which has occurred and constitutes to the physical merging or submerging of Clifton by neighbouring Shefford. If these places are to be separate entities, then this proposal only contributes to the blurring of boundaries.
B Livesey	This site appears to have no access and the houses could not be insured due to flood risks.
Charmaine Rogers	There is already a heavy flow of traffic through Clifton. We have a site proposed within a flood plain. We do not have the infrastructure within Clifton to absorb any more housing. We have already had a huge building development with Clifton fields site.
Chloe Campbell	This is disgusting planning to build on flood plains!!!! Already suffering from numerous power cuts due to grid overload. Horrific congestion on Shefford Rd already due to Samuel Whitbread School resulting in dangerous parking along this road. Samuel Whitbread has already been extended and over subscribed as are other local schools. Doctors already over subscribed! Local facilities such as shops are in very short supply, already having to travel to the likes of Hitchin and Bedford. Very few local jobs for us already here! Most people have to travel long distances to gain employment. This development would eat into our already dwindling greenbelt, ruining our village and a house that I have lived all my life! I am very much against this and hope my voice will be heard!
Clifton Improvement and Preservation Society	While the site might support local services, no weight should be attached to that given the harm done to the character and amenity of the village and well established planning policies.
D. Dewbery	The site has limited access onto a busy road, would be unsuitable for infrastructure but would impact on existing infrastructure. the area is subject to flooding, although not in a flood plain, a development would worsen this situation. the existing services can hardly cope, this would compound the existing situation.
G Thorpe	Just one comment Flood plain FLOOD plain!!!! - see Oxfordshire for details.
Hazel Collard	Do not want any more houses built in Shefford road. The proposed plot #235 will go right behind my parents house in Shefford road. Clifton used to be a lovely village when we moved here 45years ago. Now it is noisy, the crime rate has risen; traffic congestion is worse, litter etc, access the plot h235 will be where my parents house is.
Henry Gouck	Local facilities are already overstretched, for example 2, 3 day wait to see doctor, kids wandering streets with nothing to do ,more housing means more kids wandering street with nothing to do, what plans will be put in place to expand local schools, no amenities to cater for more residents. Clifton road and Shefford road already very congested with traffic at peak times therefore more traffic and more congestion. What will the impact be on the green belt area between Clifton and Shefford will it become one big town and lose their identities?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Saunders	This site is restricted by the access arrangements. New Road, without significant widening and alteration cannot be used. It cannot cope with traffic most times of the day now. The good point being it does currently act as a major traffic calming measure without humps. Access to this site from Shefford Road is also unsuitable as the proposed road width and the available vision splays will restrict the safety of any new or amended junction. The site is an obvious place for infilling and high density would accord with the properties previously built in the nearby Alexander Close area.
J R Elliott	Drains are often blocked and roads flooded. There is heavy traffic going through the village already and lots of pollution. This beautiful village does not have the infrastructure to take on this development.
John Smith	Traffic congestion - especially at peak times when large volumes of traffic are already in the area due to the large upper school. Also traffic from this site would also either have to travel through Clifton or Shefford thus causing environmental impact for both these communities. Schools are also over subscribed with existing numbers of children requiring places according to articles in the local press.
Liz Durrant	Concerned about impact on village life especially roads and schools.
Liz Lewis	Main road through area and junction to Pedly Lane already causing problems. Cars constantly parked outside school obstructing road. Also more children to go to school causing overspill of more cars to Bury Road and Ashdown Road.
Lyndon Lewis	H235 is on floodplain and should be left for just that. There are already issues with power supply to the area with regular cuts this year already. Also traffic on Shefford/Clifton Road is high and constantly at high speed putting school children at risk and other road users.
M.Harradine	Building on or near a flood plain, with this country's recent history, must surely make this a site to be avoided, especially as many of the other sites are well away from the danger of flooding. The access to this site will be very close to the Samuel Whitbread School entrance and will add further to the existing congestion in this area.
Mark Rowe	This village will no longer be a village if you keep forcing housing on us. I moved here 4 years ago to live in a village. I have worked hard to be able to move to a village. If I wanted to live in a town I would not have moved out of one. I see no plans to increase investment in our infrastructure only in making money for the builders and tax man. Where are the plans for new facilities? Upgraded Park, new library, doctor, and chemist? Where are the plans to improve bus services and road connections? Where are all these people going to work and how will the A507 cope its already jammed at rush hour. This is ill conceived and unacceptable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Angela Smedley	Approximately half of the site lies within a floodplain and therefore development of this area would need to be avoided with further investigation necessary for any potential development to the southern part of the site. Beyond the site the land rises to the north where views of this open countryside are possible from the existing residential development along Shefford Road and development of the site would block such views. The proposed access to the site is taken directly off Shefford Road and is a narrow track situated between two walls from adjoining properties. The access current serves the agricultural use to the rear and the sites development would intensity vehicular movement along this route causing increased noise and disturbance at this location. The access is extremely narrow and has poor visibility especially from the westerly direction along Shefford Road and development for 50 dwellings would result in substantial highway safety issues.
Mr & Mrs A Clark	Shefford is a market town. We do not have enough facilities ie. shops, school spaces, health centre space (at present) not enough parking etc.
Mr & Mrs Bond	Traffic congestion will be even more dangerous if the entrance comes out on the Shefford Road with 1000 pupils being bussed in to the school opposite. Apart from cars parked each side of the road. The land suggested in H235 was used during world war to dump military waste!! Vapour in the past has been seen smoking.
Mr A. G. Ransom	Absolute chaos at school times without more traffic. Electricity supply and sewage cannot cope already.
Mr and Mrs Andrews	Entrance/exit of new development accessed via Shefford/Clifton Road, an already very busy main road through the village and would add to potential hazard at and around the school entrance and increase traffic flow. If development occurs on flood plain there will be a severe increase risk of flooding to existing residential dwellings adjacent to flood plain. Adverse effects on the established wild life including endangered and protected species such as water voles and newts which are present in this area.
Mr. C Kane	Re site no. H235 Road leading off Clifton Road to proposed site is too narrow for public transport and fire services, also health and safety issues with pedestrians and traffic could not use this lane at the same time.50plus cars are going to find it impossible to enter the main road especially at opening and closing of the school hours. As the site is a flood plain we find it a ridiculous proposal. At this time we are getting continuous problems with the electricity going off and the problem with our sewerage system does not improve and can only get worse should more houses be build on this site.
Mr Goldsmith	I strongly protest against this application and will protest of any development. The land in question is home to newts, kingfishers and house sparrows which are all under threat.....! The houses that back onto the site appreciate the country views as many of the residents are long term.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Graswell	We have considerable concerns about the lack of vehicle access to this area. It will result in the loss of a view from the back of our home, and result in possible depreciation in the value of our house. Further concerns are the increased volumes of traffic on Shefford road, as a result of increased number of vehicles in this area and other suggested building plots around Clifton. I have concerns that the general village nature of the area will be lost and so to the country atmosphere. As these will belong to Shefford, it will result in an area of division.
Mr J. Jefford	Entrance to site: The main road is too busy, especially with the school, community centre entrance opposite. Rubbish dump (not household rubbish): Rubbish and material from RAF Henlow during the 1940s runs along the bottom of the field Disused sewage bed: At the bottom corner was used for the prefabs at Southfields, Shefford until main sewer was put in, was filled in and sheds put on top. All these areas would have to be thoroughly cleared. This site is most unsuitable for development.
Mr L. Mabbott	The piece of land in question is not suitable for housing due to it only being accessible from a single track drive of which two detached houses stand on either side. The land was used as a Victorian dump in which is buried toxic medicine bottles and clinker (coal waste) An underground fire also raged for nearly 10 years undermining the mount at the rear of the plot and making the land unstable I also understood from the previous land owner when he was alive that there was a covenant on the land stating that it could only be used for agricultural / live stock grazing. The land has been known to flood in the past with a stream next to the plot and the river lvel (navigation) within 200 metres I have gained this information from my previous neighbour Mr L. Hyde who once owned and farmed this land. I have spoken to some of my neighbours who all have similar objections.
Mrs D Brown	I have lived at this address for 59 yrs. During this time I worked at G.E.S, RE4 Henlow. There was one shed called "crystals" and I know that military waste from there was dumped on the proposed site. This waste was highly poisonous as it contained germanium. I and my neighbours have seen vapours moving from where this mound was. To think of building houses and gardens there is not only dangerous just plain stupid. Also more houses mean more traffic. With Samuel Whitbread opposite we have a job getting in and out of our driveway as it is now with all the mothers bringing the pupils to school and meeting them. You cannot move along here mon - Fri. with the amount of rates one has to pay I think it's time the residents were given a little space and a lot more consideration.
Mrs E H Collard + Mr M W Collard	My husband and I are both disabled and because of the school opposite we can not get out of the front gate because of cars, school buses etc. More traffic would cause havoc. I have lived here for 48 years and bought my house because of the view at the bottom of the garden. The site belonging to Mr. Newman was previously owned by the Hyde family who told us the Newman land was a dumping ground for years. Chemicals were dumped there from RAF Henlow. The ground has been smouldering and burning for years and I was told radon gas was present. Mr Hyde said the ground contained very dangerous elements. There is also a flooding aisle being near to the river. Mr Hyde said he often found his sheep and pigs lying dead without any reason. They were disposed of in the butchers shop long since closed and Mr Hyde is now dead.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs. J O'Connor	I came to Clifton village because it was a small village, for peace and tranquillity do not want Clifton to be turned into a small town. We are quite alright as we are.
Mrs J.Y. Mack	No access or exit to site The sewerage has been overloaded for some years so its bound to make matters worse. The students from Sam Whitehead College use Ashdowne Rd & Bury Rd as a car park so therefore block entrances for ambulances and fire appliances.
Mrs L Bowen	This is green belt and should definitely not be used for housing. We moved to Clifton to live in a small village - not a large village. The way the Council is wanting to build both ends of Clifton it will no longer be a village but will be joined to Shefford at one end and joined to Henlow at the other and will loose its village identity forever.
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	This site would impinge on the floodplain and therefore increase the risk of flooding episodes.
Mrs M E Valentine	This development would cause traffic congestion in Shefford Road close to the busy entrance to Samuel Whitbread School. The north end of the site was used as a rubbish tip over 25 years ago and could be contaminated. There used to be underground fires smouldering. It is too close to the lvel overflow ditch and would increase surface water run off. NB: It is very difficult to give reasoned answers to your questions because your map doesn't show land on which planning permission has been granted, nor is it up to date in terms of land already built on. It's therefore impossible to judge the scale of overall development in the area.
Mrs Michelle Pitiu	The village school is already full; there is no infrastructure in place. Drains in the village are always getting blocked. There is so much traffic, already on the roads through the village.
P.E Livesey	This site is right on the boundary with Shefford hence Clifton and Shefford would coalesce even more. The villages and towns in this area are very individual and it would be a shame if they lost their own identity.
R Sheppard	Should be kept for agriculture. No more housing should be permitted in Clifton: The infrastructure - electricity, water, sewage, roads, rail, NHS etc. & schools are already too full. Already, most residents have to commute - usually by car - to work, leisure, education & health facilities. The government's targets for controlling Global Warming & Climate Change make even this current pattern of commuting is unsustainable. Building more houses without first providing good quality local jobs & facilities would increase commuting; reducing the governments chances of meeting its targets to combat Climate Change. It would also destroy the fertile farming land which will become increasingly vital as food becomes ever more scarce and expensive. No more housing should be permitted in the Henlow / Clifton / Shefford area until after the infrastructure has been upgraded and there is at least one good quality job available locally - without commuting - for each existing household.
R.Jones	This is a terrible idea! Building on floodplains is idiotic! Congestion is terrible on Shefford road during the day (ask any resident) and this will just make things worse....all you are doing is adding more and more housing but no facilities or jobs to back it up. Also, do u realise how contaminated this land is? Rubbish, human and animal waste, plane parts (dumped from RAF Henlow in 40s and 50s) and part of it was alight for years! Are you absolutely sure our health is guaranteed? I'm not sure that you can. I urge you to re think this application.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Robert A. Agass	This proposed area of development is already situated in a congested area of traffic passing through the village and vehicles belonging to local residents. The local services of amenities - schools, village shop, would not be able to cope with a development of this site.
Sharon & Dean Shields	I am unsure where the potential access would be for this site as it is currently accessed by a single track path which runs at the back of our garden, this would greatly impact on our quality of enjoyment of our property, I would also be greatly concerned by access issues onto Shefford Road at a point where the entrance for Samuel Whitbread school is potentially opposite or certainly extremely nearby and for the safety of the safety of the students going to and from school, there are already parking and traffic issues during the school run hours as it is without adding other potential problems to the area. Shefford's infrastructure is already overloaded by the current developments being undertaken, the schools are oversubscribed and overloaded, as is the Doctors Surgery, with frequent and prolonged Power Cuts affecting parts of the town on a regular basis, and the sewer system collapsing in some areas.
Stephen Melia	This is in the Parish of Clifton, and cannot be considered an extension of Shefford! Decreases village boundaries and any countryside gap between Shefford and Clifton. No sensible access. In flood plain.
The Collard Family	We have lived in Shefford Road, Clifton for 45 years. When we first moved to Clifton it was a beautiful village, but it has changed over the years, and not for the better. Where Samuel Whitbread School used to be a big open field. There is always a lot of litter blown in from the school into our front garden from the school (including bottles, cans); there are always a lot of cars in the morning and afternoon. Every day cars are parked outside our house obstructing our driveway. Clifton used to be a lovely village, but over the years it has become very noisy, lots of extra traffic, litter, crime, etc. In the last few years our family have had our cars scratched and windows broken by "yobs" coming into our driveway at night. Several of our neighbours have had their houses broken into and robbed, even during the daytime. We frequently have "yobs" congregating behind We feel that the situation would only get worse should extra houses be built in Shefford Road Clifton.
Tom Eason	It would be an error to extend boundaries of the village and fill in between Clifton and Shefford.
Tom Murphy	I am a very concerned resident that would be affected by any development to the rear of the existing properties. My chief concern is purely fiscal as once you build houses on or anywhere near a floodplain the cost of house insurance for the whole postcode goes through the roof. This would have a detrimental affect on about 30 households. Heaven forbid if there was a flood. The experience of those residents in Kingfisher Way should be a sobering reminder of what happens to houses built on a floodplain. Assuming the access road would run from the site directly to Clifton road it would feed into the Clifton road at a point where local traffic is at its worst most mornings. Having looked at the other proposed sites it strikes me that there are better alternatives than the one proposed here. I know this does sounds a bit not in my backyard but I feel for just the two reasons outlined above the development should not proceed.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Goodsell	<p>Dear Sir / Madam, It is outrageous to suggest developing the site which you refer to as H235. Apart from the more usual impact on the neighbourhood issues which I shall look at later, there are more important site contamination issues to be looked at. Any resident with long standing ties to the area will know that there is a strange "mound" in the site referred to as H235 and an old livestock building. What seems to have been overlooked in proposing this site is that these features hide environmentally dark secrets. The mound was used up until around half a century ago as a rubbish dump for the area. During world war two, RAF Henlow dumped what was termed as military waste there. This could contain anything, as records are not likely to have been kept. I do know that RAF Henlow had what was termed as REU (Radio Engineering Unit) on its site, which had semiconductor facilities and "crystals" (diodes) in particular. Crystal diodes in that area were based around an element called Germanium, which is highly poisonous. To even think about putting homes with gardens on this ground is not sound thinking. Even all these years later, in the right conditions vapour can be seem rising from this mound. Any decontamination work, to make the site safe, would, given current dumping laws on removed materials, render the scheme unviable economically. The livestock building has its own surprises underneath. Nearby the site, on the opposite side of the road, there is an area called "Southfields." This was originally developed as a "prefab" housing site. Before Clifton and Shefford had mains sewerage, a duct system crossed the old A507 (before it was bypassed) to the site now referred to as H235, where there was a large communal cesspit/ waste facility, next to the rubbish "mound". When mains sewerage came, it was filled in with more rubbish / waste (again no records of what is down there) and the livestock buildings which are still in evidence today were erected on top. Other issues to be looked at are the lack of mains sewer facilities to cope with any further development in the area, as the system is already causing problems from being overloaded from existing developments. The Samuel Whitbread College / School, with around one 600 enrolled already, has problems at the start and close of the school day in terms of traffic congestion, which will be exacerbated with more housing(remember houses bring vehicles and potential pupils.) There are also policing issues to look at. When the composer's estate which fronts the Shefford millennium green site was built, there was seven years of youth problems which hit the area. Not because of people moving into the site, but because such developments behind existing homes create rabbit warren type escape routes for the lawless. I, although currently living in sandy, have elderly family adjacent to the H235 site, and I will be required to return there to ensure care. I don't think a congested, lawless, contaminated eyesore, causing poor sewerage for the whole district, is what anyone wants. I certainly do not.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs C Dawson	Clifton is a great village; please keep it so with minimum development.
Paul A J Marshall	Regardless of site, unless accompanying proposals are produced re. Schooling and other infrastructure, explanations on how access will be managed in terms of traffic; I do not see how it is possible to even propose such options. Clifton especially is a small village with facilities that match this criteria and o the highest standards. Unless someone can outline the above additional supporting plans, I do not have the vision to see how the impact could bring positive benefits.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H287

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
Anthony D Brown	Location would also support some employment development due to its good road safety. Essential that some social facilities are included due to its out of town location. Should contribute to a link road from Bedford Road to Stanford Road.
Mr. R. J. Patmore	A small development on a main road into town would not make a great difference to traffic or visible impact but what is proposed is too large. The north of the site is on rising ground with major visible impact. The infrastructure of Shefford particularly sewage, drains and electricity supply regularly fail and any new developments would not be acceptable if they added no present problems. Also to the south of the site, a rural public right of way would be affected.
Paul FJ Mackin	This would be a sensible use of this land. The 106 Agreement for this development could include a link road from the Stanford Road taking traffic out of the town area. It would also need to provide an underpass crossing the B658 Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Public transport to the area is minimal.

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
Maralyn Martin	I disagree with any more large developments in shefford; however should this go ahead this site is the best one.
Michael Brooks	Although appearing as a logical urban extension to Shefford, the site as identified extends too far west and intrudes into open countryside. The provision of a new football ground on the extreme edge of the site is questioned: better to locate this nearer to the town centre otherwise everyone will travel to it by car. Strict control of any floodlighting is essential. Development should permit and contribute to a Shefford northern bypass for the B658 linking Bedford Road and Stanford Road to avoid through traffic having to come into the town and out again.
Peter C Martin	I don't agree with any large new housing developments in Shefford. However, this is probably the best site.

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
A K Linley	It would be built on a very attractive area and spoil the look of the run into north west Shefford.
Chris Steeples	Shefford is a rural market town and as such needs a rural gateway. The development of this site would urbanise Shefford and spoil the local visual amenity.
G Pollard	Increase transport in the town. Will cause flooding in surrounding areas.
H Pratt	This is an area of beautiful countryside that would change the look of Shefford for the worse and increase its population too much.
M J Linley	It would be catastrophic to build on this land as the approach from Bedford into Shefford would be ruined by housing. This particular area is such a beautiful one; to be built on would be tragic.
Mr & Mrs A Clark	Shefford is a market town. We do not have enough facilities ie. shops, school spaces, health centre space (at present) not enough parking etc.
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	This site represents and unwelcome extension outside the development envelope. It would represent an unwarranted intrusion into the open countryside.
Paul Wisby	There seems to be plenty of areas within Shefford without expanding into the countryside around.
Pauline Cocevar	500 dwellings. Bonkers. Where the school places, free spaces in the surgery are, jobs, GUARANTEED electricity connections that Shefford does not have at the moment?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H298

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
M. Green	266 in no way represents 39% of this area. 66 seems more appropriate.
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	<p>This development although within the Clifton Boundary is a sensible use of land. The development when taken with the additional plot on site ref.H222 would provide approximately 50% of the communities contribution to the housing requirement. It will be located next to the proposed new medic centre and is immediately adjacent to the Upper School. The Middle and Lower Schools are some distance away and will no doubt add to traffic movements with parents taking children to these schools. Part of the 106 agreements for this site could be the provision of a new access road to the Upper School. This development is sufficient to support a small number of 'general' stores, as it is some distance from the shopping centres of Shefford and Clifton. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H298 will cause. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>
Paul FJ Mackin	<p>This development is a sensible use of land. . Part of the 106 agreements for this site could be the provision of a new access road to the Upper School. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs. Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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
Michael Edwards	As the Chair of Governors at Samuel Whitbread Community College which backs onto the proposed possible development, I am concerned that there has been no consultation. This is far too big a development for this area, both in terms of numbers of people, and the additional load on infrastructure such as roads and schools. (I cannot comment on water, gas, drainage, electricity etc). School playing fields must be protected, and ideally extended. If there is any development here it must be smaller, and have high ecological/sustainable credentials applied in the Planning Constraints. I would be looking for a zero-energy development and one with high quality design standards, NOT a standard housing developer estate.
Phillips Planning Services LTD on behalf of Samuel Beadie (Investments) LTD	The promoted site seeks to utilise a new roundabout junction on Hitchin Road to gain necessary access. It would appear that reliance is placed on the roundabout junction approved under reference 01/01600/FUL and recently reviewed as reference 07/01082/FUL. Our client notes that the ability to deliver the access road depends upon the co-operation of our client as the owner of part of the roundabout location. No approach has been received b our client from the owner of this promoted site to link in with the roundabout. Any access to the roundabout would be subject to a successful negotiation of an agreement with our client. In the absence of such an agreement the promoted site will not have the benefit of crucial access.

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system cant take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I dont agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there isn't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
A M Leake	Clifton would not be able to support the number of occupants in these houses with services needed i.e. Transport schools roads etc.
A Welsford	Clifton is a village and has a lack of shops as it is. Doctors surgery is very busy now with an influx of families it would be worse. In any event, the fields seem to be disappearing now. Find brownfield sites instead of greenfield.
Aaron Smith	Development will place strain on local infrastructure, schools and create significant additional traffic problems, in an area that has problems already.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Alison Smith	This site would lead to severe traffic congestion in this area and further into the village itself, Henlow and Shefford. Access from the site off Shefford Road appears to be at/near a very dangerous bend causing potential for accidents. This site is also on the outskirts of the village and development would mean almost merging with Shefford. A development of this size would also change the village and increase the size by approx 25%. This in itself will have a detrimental effect and a considerable pull on resources, the infrastructure and demand of the lower school, middle and upper schools. If a site of this size is required then areas for new villages should be considered and not the continuation of increasing existing ones.
Anthony John Tobitt	This site is relatively high ground and any development on it would be visually prominent to the surrounding area. Furthermore its development would further the already considerable intrusion of effectively Shefford developments towards Clifton. The gap between the village and Shefford is already minimal. Should this small gap disappear a continuous urbanised sprawl would exist from the west of Shefford to Henlow with now only 1 small field separating Clifton from Henlow.
B Livesey	The scale of this site would overwhelm the whole area. It would be nothing but urban sprawl.
Casson	If developed this site will effectively join Clifton to Shefford with no space between representing urban sprawl we live in a village because we want village life, views of the countryside - not to live in urban sprawl this development will mean that Clifton loses its identity as a village. The local services and infrastructure cannot support such a large development.
Charmaine Rogers	There is already a heavy flow of traffic through Clifton. We have a site proposed within a flood plain. We do not have the infrastructure within Clifton to absorb any more housing. We have already had a huge building development with Clifton fields site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Clifton Improvement and Preservation Society	<p>While the site might support local services, no weight should be attached to that given the harm done to character and amenity of the village and well established planning policies. 1. The Society relies on the General Representation attached. 2. The site is wholly unrelated to the existing structure of Shefford and would be a major extension intruding into the countryside of that village. The total of 230-226 dwellings would be an excessive release of housing "in Shefford" from the whole allocation for the settlements outside the Minor Centres. 3. The Society does not accept the need for 400 dwellings to be accommodated in the Larger Villages and the Small Villages. It refers to its representation to Core Strategy Preferred Options Document (no. 07/00423) in which the figure suggested is 250. It relies on the Policies relating to sustainable development: see Paragraph 3.6.2, CS6, CS8, CS12 and paragraph 6.2.10. It is clear on the basis of 39 Large and Small Villages that if allocations are to be made consistent with the Preferred Policy Options any release of land at Clifton is unnecessary. Even 400 dwellings within these settlements with modest adjustments for social housing to meet local needs is more than likely to be met within existing settlement envelopes. Any allocation of land around the villages is likely to lead towards executive-style housing, will not relate to local employment and increase movement by car. This should be avoided as contrary to Government Policy on sustainable development and the reduction of CO2 emission. 4. The site, even if in recreational use in part, would seriously compromise and erode the gap between settlements which exists. Recreational use south of Shefford Road would 'urbanise' the gap, which should retain a 'rural' agricultural use. Playing fields would visually appear as a link between the settlements of Shefford and Clifton amounting to a 'visual' merger. 5. The development intrudes materially into the rural countryside seen from the Hitchin Road south of Wren Park. 6. Release of the site would be a significant loss of open countryside contrary to national and local policy. 7. The proposed in wholly contrary to the Preferred Options Policy as they relate to the village of Clifton. 8. Access from the A507 (old road) now Shefford Road so close to the bend would be undesirable on safety and traffic grounds.</p>
D. Dewbery	<p>Many of the planning criteria are in error. Medical facilities are already saturated beyond the new facility. Work and shopping centres are not available. Travel links are poor and heavily congested. Schools are full to even consider adding more housing in this area is madness. Although not in a flood plain, the area is subject to regular flooding, more building will worsen this.</p>
E Aston	<p>Merger with Clifton, Shefford and Clifton lose identity.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Emma Sewell	<p>As much of the site is close to Samuel Whitbread School, it would probably be beneficial to both the school and the larger community if were to be used to provide extra recreational facilities (e.g. playgrounds, youth club, leisure centre, swimming pool).</p> <p>Whilst I can see the potential for supporting existing social infrastructure, I would be concerned about placing a few hundred additional houses on this site because of a) the additional strain that this will place on existing services (mainly lower and middle schools) and b) the increased numbers of cars that would inevitably end up on the surrounding roads. Last year the Council deemed that Clifton was already too dangerous to support a walking bus for children to use to get to school. In a smallish community like Clifton it makes sense to try and encourage as many people as possible to leave their cars behind for journeys like the school run but this will not happen if the roads become impossible to cross safely.</p>
F R Gibbs	<p>With the existing development in this area, any further development would cause too much traffic congestion. Parking for school pick-up already causes a bottleneck on Clifton Road. Furthermore, this green site is the only division between Clifton & Shefford. Why build an extension to Shefford on this site in Clifton? What provision will be made for parking at Arlesey train station to accommodate the additional influx of people this development will bring? Also, the increase in population will only put further strain on already stretched services i.e. schools, medical centre, roads, power and sewerage etc.</p>
F.D Needham	<p>Development of this site would join Clifton and Shefford and the whole area would become an elongated spiral with the main facilities at one end-Shefford. It MUST be resisted.</p>
G Smith	<p>There are too many proposed houses to be supported by the existing facilities in the village and by the current road lay out.</p>
J R Elliott	<p>Drains are often blocked and roads flooded. There is heavy traffic going through the village already and lots of pollution. This beautiful village does not have the infrastructure to take on this development.</p>
Jayne Agass	<p>I feel very strongly about the use of school/college playing fields being used for additional housing stock. The priority is for there to be outside sporting facilities for all young people. This is so that they can reach their full potential as sportsmen and promote a healthy lifestyle. Lack of exercise is increasingly contributing to health problems in both young and old people and to remove this resource will be detrimental to the future health of the nation. Peoples first introduction to sport is through schools and colleges and to remove this facility will run the risk of a shortage of sportsmen to represent their club, county or country in the future and create future health problems for future generations.</p>
John & Margaret Portess	<p>The proposed development links Clifton and Shefford in an obtrusive way which will change the character and environment of a rural location and unavoidably produce traffic congestion.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John and Jane Mortimer	<p>Given the many other smaller proposals for Shefford is this huge development really necessary?</p> <p>By its very nature it blurs the boundary between Shefford and Clifton, the 'minor service centre' and the 'large village' and intrudes seriously into the important countryside gap between the two communities. Admittedly some of this area will be playing fields and public space so that the important countryside gap will, though considerably transformed, be to a degree retained in some form or other. Some people may argue that this could even be an enhancement.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the appearance of that area of Shefford Road in front of Samuel Whitbread Community College will be completely different. Agricultural land will become playing fields. From the small drawings on my computer screen it was difficult to make a truly informed judgement. I look forward to a further period of consultation.</p>
John Chalmers	As this is defined as an extension of Shefford, I believe this is too large a development to allow Clifton to keep its identity and prevent it being merged with Shefford.
John Smith	<p>This site should not be developed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Considerable increase in traffic congestion 2) Considerable impact on the environment and existing residents in noise pollution, air pollution, anti-social behaviour, crime etc 3) Potential for traffic accidents as access appears to be on/near dangerous bend 4) Will change Clifton as a village - increase size by some 25% 5) Site on edge of Clifton so will mean more merging with Shefford 6) Strain made on infrastructure and schools.
Liz Durant	Concerned about impact on village life especially roads and schools.
Marc Revell	Erosion of green boundary between Clifton and Shefford to create uber village. Insufficient infrastructure in place.
Mark Rowe	<p>This village will no longer be a village if you keep forcing housing on us.</p> <p>I moved here 4 years ago to live in a village. I have worked hard to be able to move to a village. If I wanted to live in a town I would not have moved out of one.</p> <p>I see no plans to increase investment in our infrastructure only in making money for the builders and tax man. Where are the plans for new facilities? Upgraded Park, new library, doctor, and chemist? Where are the plans to improve bus services and road connections? Where are all these people going to work and how will the A507 cope its already jammed at rush hour.</p> <p>This is ill conceived and unacceptable.</p>
Martin Harwood	The infrastructure cannot cope! Sewers, electric supply cannot cope at present, the mains electric cable was put in in 1946! = 4 power cuts since December 07. This is not an appropriate development for Clifton, much more sense to develop brown field sites e.g. RAF Henlow! Finally, S.W.C.C is up to capacity already.
Michael and Anne Harris	We strongly disagree with the development of this site as we feel the boundary between Clifton and Shefford would be lost with the result that Clifton would loose its identity and just become part of Shefford.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>The site is open in nature and highly visible from many vantage points due to its lack of boundary screening which allows for views across the site and surrounding fields to the school buildings. Development of this site within the open countryside would destroy the dispersed nature of built development at the settlement edge, by providing a plot of housing on entry to the village which would be followed by an empty agricultural field before connecting with the village settlement boundary. Views would be lost to the school buildings across the site and across fields to the north.</p> <p>Access would need to be achieved from Hitchin Road (subject to national speed limit) or Shefford Road at the point of the extremely dangerous bend with vehicles travelling at high speeds.</p> <p>Development of this 15.9ha site would visually dominate the built environment of both villages as the scale of the site and any potential development there would be too vast for a village of this size.</p>
Mr & Mrs Glover	<p>The amount of traffic this would create both during and after development would be prohibitive for those already commuting along the A507 during work time periods. Access to the A507 during work periods is bad enough at this present time.</p>
Mr F Murrill	<p>Shop & public transport in Clifton could not cope with further 230-266 dwellings.</p> <p>Users of Whitbread College are unnecessarily parking off site and parking in Clifton Road/Shefford Road/Pedley Lane. The increased traffic to proposed dwellings would significantly add to congestion.</p>
Mr. G. Leeson	<p>There are vague proposals RE: community use this is totally insufficient detail to support a sensible use of land here. It does suggest possible later manipulation to change the 39% residential up heads.</p>
Mrs C Wischhusen	<p>This site will only serve to destroy the nature of Clifton as a village by merging it even more with Shefford. People moving there will most likely use the town of Shefford for their shopping as there are bigger shops there. How will the lower school, which is already totally oversubscribed, cope with additional demand on its resources? Clifton is in danger of losing everything that makes it a great village to live in by this ill-conceived rush to build houses in what is supposed to be a conservation area. Does that count for nothing? I am appalled that the government thinks that it is right to increase the size of a village by 25% when there are plenty of better alternatives. We should not be looking at building on greenfield sites but on brownfield sites, and not in rural areas but large towns. (And Shefford is not a large town).</p>
Mrs E Needham	<p>Will join two villages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -most purchasers are likely to be commuters, causing huge amounts of extra traffic -access to site off main road dangerous due to location next to S bend

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Herdis J Taylor	<p>Ref: H298 it would appear access is only to and from Shefford Road. This road is already quite busy specially at certain times of day with the increase of fast moving traffic from Samuel Whitbread's. Regarding the infrastructure, it would appear the schools are already full, not to mention trying to get an appointment at the surgery.</p> <p>As for sewage, existing pipes are already old, in some cases very old. Electricity supplies are experiencing problems, judging by the number of power cuts this winter.</p> <p>The environmental impact on the village of Clifton would be immense, to would loose its village 'feel' and just become yet another large scale 'housing estate'. It would reduce the quality of life for the exiting residents of this village.</p> <p>May I take this opportunity to thank our local parish councillors for having given Clifton residents the option of a meeting in Clifton...</p>
Mrs J OConnor	I came to Clifton village because it was a small village, for peace and tranquillity. I do not want Clifton to be turned into a small town. We are quite alright as we are.
Mrs L A Bowen	Again this is green belt land and should never be used for housing.
Mrs L Dawes	The link between Shefford and Clifton needs to be green - this will bring housing close to a large school. 230/266 homes - impact on the V.A Lower school, local Middle School and health services. Where would the road to feed these properties be as the bend it butts on to is already dangerous.
Mrs Lorna J McGregor	This proposed development is too large, would threaten to amalgamate Shefford and Clifton, and represents an intrusion into the open countryside. It is beyond the development envelope.
Mrs M Pledger	<p>Disagree with the District Council that this is part of Shefford - this is part of Clifton and needs to stay undeveloped in order to provide a defining boundary for the community.</p> <p>The proposed development joins Shefford Road Clifton at a very dangerous bend in the road.</p>
Mrs Meadows	I believe before more building is approved in Shefford, there should be careful consideration to the infrastructure and whether the town can support any more growth. The schools are approaching capacity and I do not think that it is in the towns best interest to build on or near the schools playing fields, there are frequent power cuts, there is nothing for teenagers to do, some roads in the town are practically impassable because of the amount of cars parked on them Shefford is a lovely place to live and an ideal size please do not spoil it.
Mrs Michelle Pitiu	the village school is already full, there is no infrastructure in place. Drains in the village are always getting blocked. There is so much traffic, already on the roads through the village.
Mrs. P Wormald	Strongly concerned about flooding and road access.
Olive Tuffrey	H298 links Henlow/Clifton and Shefford together. This is an important gap and gives separate identity to Clifton as a large village.
P Ames	This with 222 up to 360 houses plus development in Shefford would create a traffic disaster in Shefford. Schools in the area (apart from s Whitbread) could not cope.

Submitted by	Comments
P.E Livesey	The scale of this development would destroy the nature of Clifton. It is on the boundary of Shefford making Clifton coalesce yet again. Mid beds planning were always keen on what they described as a green wedge between villages. The green wedge on the Shefford side of Clifton was the field between Clifton and sam.whi!Knolls farm!even though sam.whit was on the wrong side of it. Please can we retain this.
Peter Topley	Intrusion into the green area between Clifton and Shefford. The provision of additional recreational facilities and open space is vague and does not indicate what the potential damage to the environment.
R Sheppard	<p>No more housing should be permitted in Clifton! The infrastructure - electricity, water, sewage, roads, NHS etc and schools are already too full. No more housing should be permitted in the Henlow/Clifton/Shefford area until the infrastructure has been upgraded AND there is at least one good quality job available locally - without commuting - for each existing household.</p> <p>Should be kept for agriculture. No more housing should be permitted in Clifton: The infrastructure - electricity, water, sewage, roads, rail, NHS etc. & schools are already too full. Already, most residents have to commute - usually by car - to work, leisure, education & health facilities. The governments targets for controlling Global Warming & Climate Change make even this current pattern of commuting is unsustainable. Building more houses without first providing good quality local jobs & facilities would increase commuting; reducing the governments chances of meeting its targets to combat Climate Change. It would also destroy the fertile farming land which will become increasingly vital as food becomes ever more scarce and expensive. No more housing should be permitted in the Henlow / Clifton / Shefford area until after the infrastructure has been upgraded and there is at least one good quality job available locally - without commuting - for each existing household.</p>
R. Brown	Very concerned about drainage and exceptional traffic on Shefford road.
R. Klemptster	<p>Development on this scale would be detrimental to the village of Clifton. The roads infrastructure already struggles to cope at peak times. The character of village life would be adversely affected.</p> <p>This development is much too large. It would impact both on Clifton and Shefford and would join the two. The road is very busy and would not be able to cope with any additional traffic. Development would be detrimental to both Shefford and Clifton.</p>
Ray Turner	We would regard this as a greenfield site and any development on this site would destroy the countryside on the village boundary.
Robert A Agass	This is part of an existing school field which should not be touched. The government are encouraging the population to get our children involved in sport and outside activities, how can this happen if school fields are targeted for housing development.
Stephen Melia	Parish of Clifton, not an extension of Shefford! Should remain green wedge between the two. Any building here would have desire consequences on the traffic problems experienced today.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Suzann Wells	The infrastructure of the village is unable to cope with this increase in dwellings. The roads cannot take more traffic without congestion and greater pollution. This would make Clifton bleed further into Shefford, therefore where would the village end and the town begin. Cliftons character will be lost by increasing the number of dwellings by this size. Isn't there a covenant restricting building in Clifton? There seems to be a movement against protecting village life.
Wendy Chalmers	<p>This huge development would be totally out of character with the area. It would not constitute an extension of Shefford it would merge Shefford and Clifton. This would result in the loss of identity of the village of Clifton.</p> <p>As village dwellers we do not wish to retain that separate identity. If we had wished to live in a town we would have bought a house in a town. Village should not have their identity threatened by such irresponsible developments.</p>

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs C Dawson	Clifton is a great village, please keep it so with minimum development.
Paul A J Marshall	Regardless of site, unless accompanying proposals are produced re. schooling and other infrastructure, explanations on how access will be managed in terms of traffic, I do not see how it is possible to even propose such options. Clifton especially is a small village with facilities that match this criteria and to the highest standards. Unless someone can outline the above additional supporting plans, I do not have the vision to see how the impact could bring positive benefits.
C. Protopapa	Clifton is a small village, it has narrow roads and cannot cope with a lot more traffic. It has a little school which is full to capacity now and cannot cope with lots more children. It only has two shops. There is nothing here for young people to do. If you build lots more houses you must find some amenity for them otherwise you will just end up with "no go" house estates. Were people will be afraid to go out.
Lin & Jeff Hurst	Until the infrastructure is sorted, there is not point in building houses. Electrical supplies. Sewage/water. Transport. The Community College is already full - it needs space to expand. Why not save this site for the school!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H302

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 Geoffrey C Barham	The effect of this development on local facilities would be negligible. However it is in Clifton and it does adjoin flood plane land. A full flood risk assessment must be completed showing flood mitigation and prevention measures and be included in any planning application. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.
Paul FJ Mackin	The effect of this development on local facilities would be negligible. However it is in Clifton and it does adjoin flood plane land. A full flood risk assessment must be completed showing flood mitigation and prevention measures and be included in any planning application. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.
Peter Topley	As for h235, including this proposal within the shefford plan is illegal due to it being within the parish of Clifton.
R Sheppard	No more housing should be permitted in Clifton: The infrastructure - electricity, water, sewage, roads, rail, NHS etc. & schools are already too full. Already, most residents have to commute - usually by car - to work, leisure, education & health facilities. The government's targets for controlling Global Warming & Climate Change make even this current pattern of commuting unsustainable. Building more houses without first providing good quality local jobs & facilities would increase commuting; reducing the government's chances of meeting its targets to combat Climate Change. It would also destroy the fertile farming land which will become increasingly vital as food becomes ever more scarce and expensive. No more housing should be permitted in the Henlow / Clifton / Shefford area until after the infrastructure has been upgraded and there is at least one good quality job available locally - without commuting - for each existing household.

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
A Welsford	Clifton is a village and has a lack of shops as it is. Doctor's surgery is very busy now with an influx of families it would be worse. In any event, the fields seem to be disappearing now. Find brownfield sites instead of greenfield.
Charmaine Rogers	There is already a heavy flow of traffic through Clifton. We have a site proposed within a flood plain. We do not have the infrastructure within Clifton to absorb any more housing. We have already had a huge building development with Clifton fields' site.
Clifton Improvement and Preservation Society	While the site might support local services, no weight should be attached to that given the harm done to the character and amenity of the village and well established planning policies. 1. The Society relies on the General Representation attached. 2. No access is indicated to this site. The Society would not support a new access on the front of Shefford Road so close o the bend and in a vicinity where there is now extensive school parking limiting the effective carriageway. 3. It is conceded that apart from the impact on the visual amenities of houses on the frontage any development would have little effect on the village as a whole.
Janet Baker	Small area of land already densely populated with new/recent builds -too many houses (4) for small area/access. -safety/access concern - pavement width for cars for 4 houses and traffic impact on very busy stretch of road with parking, coaches etc. for Sam Whitbread school. -impact on privacy/quality of housing for existing dwellings.
John Oliver	This vicinity has already experienced considerable increases in traffic and further levels of noise caused by the development at the old nursery plot- "Clifton Fields"; this development will exacerbate this state of affairs and add to the already unsatisfactory situation.
John and Jane Mortimer	This area of Shefford Road is already very congested with a long line of parked cars extending towards the S bend. Further development just here seems unnecessary.
Liz Durrant	Concerned about impact on village life especially roads and schools.
Lyndon Lewis	H235 is on floodplain and should be left for just that. There are already issues with power supply to the area with regular cuts this year already. Also traffic on Shefford/Clifton Road is high and constantly at high speed putting schools children at risk and other road users.

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Rowe	<p>This village will no longer be a village if you keep forcing housing on us. I moved here 4 years ago to live in a village. I have worked hard to be able to move to a village. If I wanted to live in a town I would not have moved out of one.</p> <p>I see no plans to increase investment in our infrastructure only in making money for the builders and tax man. Where are the plans for new facilities? Upgraded Park, new library, doctor, and chemist? Where are the plans to improve bus services and road connections? Where are all these people going to work and how will the A507 cope its already jammed at rush hour.</p> <p>This is ill conceived and unacceptable.</p>
Mike Baker	<p>Have asked Chris Duffy to provide more detail on the potential development but concerns include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Access to the site. * Significant amount of recent development in this area has already had a significant impact on the density of homes and reduction in garden space. * Disproportionate amount of additional impact on immediate environment for the benefit of only 4 new dwellings. * Impact on established vegetation and wildlife habitat.
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>The proposed site lies to the rear of housing fronting Shefford Road and adjacent to Clifton Fields new housing development. The plan illustrates no access to the site from any highway. The closest point of potential access from a highway is at the south eastern corner though this land is in the ownership of 1 Clifton Fields and a garage stands in the path of the potential access.</p> <p>Beyond the site the land rises to the north where views of this open countryside are possible from the existing residential development along Shefford Road and development of the site would block such views.</p> <p>Whilst residential development of this site would not be completely out of character the site lies adjacent to a floodplain additional investigation regarding flood mitigation may be required.</p> <p>Aside from the loss of the openness/lack of any access route to the site the development only proposes 4 dwellings which will not impact on the numbers of dwellings required by the Council.</p>
Mr. Graswell	<p>We have concerns about the vehicle access to this area. It will result in raid volumes of traffic and possible reduction in the value of our house, as the area becomes less countryside and increased urbanised.</p>
Mrs Donna Montanaro	<p>Clifton road is a very congested road especially opposite the Samuel Whitbread community collage. By adding further development directly opposite the community collage would potentially put lives at risk during the busy start and finish times of the school day because of traffic entering and leaving the proposed new site.</p> <p>There has been significant infilling already behind No. 200 and 198 Shefford road with two large houses and a block of flats this has not been reflected on your plans that have been presented for consultation.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Donna Montanaro	The key question for the planning system is whether the proposed use of the site would be acceptable in land use and environmental terms. This means that the issues of increased litter, noise and nuisance to local residents, and increased parking difficulties and traffic congestion are all valid concerns Clifton road is a very congested road especially opposite the Samuel Whitbread community collage. By adding further development directly opposite the community collage would potentially put lives at risk during the busy start and finish times of the school day because of traffic entering and leaving the proposed new site. There has been significant infilling already behind No. 200 and 198 Shefford road with two large houses and a block of flats this has not been reflected on your plans that have been presented for consultation.
Mrs J O'Connor	I came to Clifton village because it was a small village, for peace and tranquillity do not want Clifton to be turned into a small town. We are quite alright as we are.
Mrs. Michelle Pitiu	The village school is already full; there is no infrastructure in place. Drains in the village are always getting blocked. There is so much traffic, already on the roads through the village.
Stephen Melia	No access.
Tony Montanaro	Clifton road is a very congested road especially opposite the Samuel Whitbread community collage. By adding further development directly opposite the community collage would potentially put lives at risk during the busy start and finish times of the school day because of traffic entering and leaving the proposed new site. There has been significant infilling already behind No. 200 and 198 Shefford road with two large houses and a block of flats this has not been reflected on your plans that have been presented for consultation.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
John Gingell	Attempted additional access to the site from either the Shefford Road or the Clifton Fields enclave would raise serious safety issues, particularly in relation to the Clifton Fields entry road which has an awkward "blind bend" in its design that masks oncoming traffic from the view of turning vehicles. Overall it is hard to see what positive support to "existing or new social infrastructure" a development like this could make.
Mrs C Dawson	Clifton is a great village; please keep it so with minimum development.
Paul A J Marshall	Regardless of site, unless accompanying proposals are produced re. Schooling and other infrastructure, explanations on how access will be managed in terms of traffic; I do not see how it is possible to even propose such options. Clifton especially is a small village with facilities that match this criteria and o the highest standards. Unless someone can outline the above additional supporting plans, I do not have the vision to see how the impact could bring positive benefits.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H306

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
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
Easton	Potential flooding, near/on the floodplain.
Glenda Tizard	Proposal to build on the floodplain of the river. This should be avoided.
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	This is area is not suitable for housing do to it being almost completely on flood plane. The access road shown is insufficient for this number of houses. Any application should be refused on the above grounds.
Paul FJ Mackin	This is area is not suitable for housing do to it being almost completely on flood plane. The access road shown is insufficient for this number of houses. Any application should be refused on the above grounds.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Keith Dear	If there is a potential for increasing the frequency and severity of flooding further downstream (i.e. beyond the existing boundary of the current flood plain between The Hollies and the river this site should not be developed.

Ref Number: H309

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 Henry Pratt	Smaller infilling sites are preferred to sites on agricultural/farm land.

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 Gary Boyle	Whilst only a small site on Ivel Road any further housing planned in this area will exacerbate problems of access and high traffic which currently use this road and already pose safety issues for pedestrians, cyclists and car users alike.
Mr Mark Rowe	Seems ok, fits in with existing space.

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 Chris Steeples	Ivel Road is already over congested. This tiny garden infill is a complete waste of time. You should not even be considering this in your plans. Flood risk is significant. Avoid. "No significant contribution to support existing local services" - does not meet your criteria.
Mr Ian Rawet	The site would have to provide access from Ivel Road that is narrow with street parking that has to service a bus route and emergency services access. This road is also used by locals from Shefford and Clifton to access the A507/A500 by-pass, the fuel stop and shopping areas. With such a narrow road and only limited footpaths the area is severely stretched for safety reasons. Not only is the flood plain an issue but drainage from the surrounding land has to be considered. Surface water has to be controlled with suitable catchment areas. This site is in the wrong place and of the wrong size to provide such facilities
Mr Paul Mackin	This area is shown to be on the flood plain by the indicative flood plain map published in 2001 and is known to flood on regular occasions. Building on this land would only increase the problem of flooding in the down stream (town centre) area.
Mr Richard Fordham	I have concerns about this site due to implications for traffic and safety issues on Ivel Road which is already a well used and dangerous road, especially for pedestrians.
Mr Russ Leith	Congestion in Ivel Road is already a major problem for local residents; further development would compound this problem. Flooding is also an issue in this area.
Mrs Elaine Fordham	This site will add to traffic congestion to Ivel Road. There are many parked cars and safety is already an issue.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Margaret Valentine	Existing facilities such as Doctors Surgeries and schools are not sufficient to support the existing population now, and I don't believe additional facilities would be provided in time for the influx of additional householders. I do not believe that existing planning rules allow sufficient parking facilities for homes built and that the surrounding roads cannot cope with further traffic resulting from additional housing.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H351

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 Paul Mackin	Development of this area would be a sensible addition to H302 and H235. Taken together they would produce a block of development that would have the potential to support a local shop. Public Transport links would need improving.

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 Gary Boyle	Issues of additional housing in and around Shefford without the necessary upfront investment in infrastructure (schools, health, public transport, enhancement of power and drainage systems).
Mr Ian Rawet	Without job creation in the area the families that live in this housing will have to commute for work. With adequate public transport this can only be by road. Access to the by-pass from this site should be developed so as to ensure that the increase in traffic on the narrow roads currently being used by the locals should not have further impact on the safety of the residents that live on these streets.

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
Miss Anna Grist	I think that building 60 homes in this area will cause lots of traffic congestion at rush hours, i think there is not enough room at the local doctors surgeries or schools for this amount of extra people in the village. The extra traffic would also be worrying due to the fact that it is very near to the school and could cause road safety issues for children crossing on the bend from Pedley lane to the school.
Mr Barry Livesey	This site is in Clifton full stop. It is not in Shefford and should not be treated as a part of Shefford via some phony "envelope" mechanism. There is no sensible access to this site. Neither onto Pedley Lane or via Clifton Fields is acceptable.
Mr Henry Pratt	Smaller infilling sites are preferred to larger agricultural/farm land sites.
Mr John Chalmers	I am particularly concerned about any proposals that will encroach on the gap between Clifton and Shefford. The identity of Clifton would be in serious danger if development is allowed along Pedley Lane. I am also concerned about the additional vehicle access that would result from such a development as I believe facilities are already over-stretched and dangerous situations arise at the junction of Pedley Lane. When the nursery site was originally developed, assurances were given that development would not move any further along Pedley Lane and I trust that this situation has not changed.

Submitted by	Comments
Clifton Improvement and Preservation Society	1) The society relies on the General Representation attached. 2) The site forms part of the open countryside which functions as a gap between settlements. The visual impact of the gap has already been harmed, as seen from the public highway, by a single house fronting Pedley Lane which affects a closure and diminution of the view. The development of this site would be even more harmful visually. 3) The current Local Plan strongly protects the countryside and emphasises the gaps between settlements as of importance. The Clifton/Shefford gap is fragile because of its narrow quality. It is important that the identity of settlements should be preserved. 4) The Society does not accept the need for 400 dwellings to be accommodated in the Larger Villages and the Small Villages. It refers to its representation to Core Strategy Preferred Options Document (No. 07/00423) in which the figure suggested is 250. It relies on the Policies relating to sustainable development: see Paragraph 3.6.2, CS6, CS8, CS12 and paragraph 6.2.10. It is clear on the basis of 39 Large and Small Villages that if allocations are to be made consistent with the Preferred Policy Options any release of land at Clifton is unnecessary. Even 400 dwellings within these settlements with modest adjustments for social housing to meet local need is more than likely to be met within the existing settlement envelopes. Any allocation of land around the villages is likely to lead towards executive-style housing, will not relate to local employment and increase movement by car. This should be avoided as contrary to Government Policy on sustainable development and the reduction of CO2 emission. 5) The effect of a dense development of 60 dwellings would urbanise the impact on the area and help to erode the countryside impact of the farmland around Clifton.
Mr Marc Revell	I feel that this site, which is opposite a school will impose excessive congestion on an already busy road, it is also going to cause services in the local area to be over subscribed. It further blurs the boundary between Shefford and Clifton and involves building on greenfield land.
Mr Mark Hyde	The site is located within a designated Important Countryside Gap, as identified in the Mid Beds Local Plan (2005). Any development within this area would reduce the existing physical and visual separation of the settlements. Development of the proposed site would promote the coalescence of Shefford and Clifton, which should be discouraged, and will adversely impact on the setting of the countryside. The site currently gains access to the highway network from Pedley Lane. If this existing access were to be utilised, it is considered that Pedley Lane and the junction with Shefford Road would not be able to accommodate the level of traffic generated from the development which would result in substantial highway safety issues. Similarly, it is outlined that access would be granted from the existing residential development of Clifton Fields. The highway network within this development is unlikely to be capable of accommodating the level of traffic generated. Beyond the site to the north is designated floodplain extends and as such, in line with Central Government guidance, development should be avoided that would increase the risk of flooding. Development in this location should be avoided. The site is promoted as an extension to Shefford which should be avoided in this location for the reasons set out above.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Mark Rowe	This is a disturbing site. We already have enough new housing and I see this as the green space being eaten away. Given ten years it will all be gone and it'll all be another boring, ill thought out housing estate. PLEASE PLEASE DO NOT BUILD MORE HOUSES HERE.
Mr Paul Griffiths	This is in Clifton, this would never be an extension to Shefford and will undoubtedly have an adverse impact on the countryside.
Mr Paul Marshall	Ref the proposed site, access would be a major issue. The proposal is next to a relatively new development which already has major problems with access and particularly parking due to the lack of parking space provided, of which the latter makes access around this development very difficult and increasingly dangerous. Access via Pedley Lane would be the only option which is a tiny, beautiful, but already dangerous country road, but one which currently gives nice views across the country side, which, with this development, the views would be no longer. This is one of only a few lanes in Clifton which gives a view of the country and fields and the development would take this away, which is clearly one of the main reasons why people live and visit the countryside. On a positive, any people additions to the village have the potential to bring extra business for the few local businesses (one shop, 2 x pubs, butchers, church), however, what needs to be researched and understood, is do current village people use these facilities and at what level, and would new people in new dwellings use them? If not, there is clearly no benefit to the local businesses.
Mr Paul Masters	Clifton is a village and development of the scale proposed will adversely impact the amenities. The infrastructure is already under pressure and will worsen if this is permitted.
Mr Richard Sheppard	This site is fertile farm land, stretching towards the flood plain. The existing vehicle access through the adjoining development is already poor & inadequate for the existing traffic. If this new development were to be allowed vehicle access onto Pedley Lane, this would cause extra problems with high speed traffic along Pedley Lane and at all of its junctions. Permitting this development on the fertile farm land to the north of Pedley Lane would set an unfortunate precedent: Before long, there all the fertile farm land to the north of Pedley Lane would be covered with houses. No more houses should be built in this area until after the existing seriously overstretched electricity, water, sewage, roads, transport, NHS and school infrastructure has been expanded to cope with the present population. At present, almost all residents have to commute out of the area for work, leisure and shopping. Most of these journeys are by car, some continue by the overcrowded trains. At a time of rising food prices and increasing fears about the cost & impact of car use; it really does not seem appropriate to sacrifice yet more of our fertile farm land to be covered with houses occupied by yet more people who will be dependent on their cars.
Mrs Jane Casson	Enough of this land has been developed already. If this number of houses are built here, there will be no gap between Shefford and Clifton which will lose its identity and become urban sprawl. this area is countryside enjoyed by locals for walking and will ruin open views of the countryside - why we live here

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Margaret Valentine	Existing facilities such as Doctors Surgeries and schools are not sufficient to support the existing population now, and I don't believe additional facilities would be provided in time for the influx of additional householders. I do not believe that existing planning rules allow sufficient parking facilities for homes built which results in on road parking causing a hazard, and I don't believe that the surrounding roads can cope with further traffic resulting from additional housing.
Mrs Pauline Livesey	This site is used for food production. We are currently suffering high prices; it is madness to destroy our agricultural land. This site would not be an extension of Shefford; it is well within Clifton and should be treated as such. Shefford and Clifton should not be allowed to coalesce.
Mrs Suzann Wells	The village infrastructure is unable to support further housing. Pedley lane is far too narrow to support more housing.
Mrs Wendy Chalmers	This further encroaches on the space between Shefford and Clifton - the maintenance of which is vital if the village of Clifton is not to merge with the much larger town of Shefford. This would destroy the strong sense of community currently so vital to the lives of the villagers of Clifton. It is also wholly inappropriate as Pedley Lane is narrow, the junction with the main road to Shefford is already very dangerous and the area is unsuited for the increase in traffic which such a large development would create.

Ref Number: H171/E43

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

Submitted by	Comments
Nicola Bickerstaff	<p>We support the proposal to allocate the land for a mixed use development which includes residential and B1 business uses. The proposal would offer local employment opportunities for new residents as well as a mix of housing that is well integrated within the town.</p> <p>Shefford, designated as a minor service centre, benefits from a good range of services. The proposed development at site H171/E43 would increase the viability of the local services such as the supermarket, schools, library, post office, bank, chemist, hardware store, and bakery. Shefford is supported by a number of bus routes that allow regular public transport access to Bedford (10 miles north west of the village), Luton (15 miles south of the village), Hitchin (8 miles south of the village) and other local settlements.</p> <p>The proposed development at site H171/E43 would provide a gateway development at an important access to the village from the A507, bounded by a landscaping screen.</p>

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Rawet	<p>It is good that there is job creation within these plans.</p> <p>The development supports the local economy whilst creating a high impact on the social structure and Doctor's surgeries.</p> <p>The access to and from this site should only be through the roundabout on Ivel Road / Churchill Way so as to avoid further traffic problems on Ivel Road north of the roundabout. The prospects of future development that in-fills between Hitchin Road and the A600 by pass should also be considered. These plans should provide for pedestrian and cycle access (and alternative routes for the emergency services) from any adjacent future developments that may be outside of the time frame under consideration so as to integrate with Churchill Way cycle routes.</p> <p>The plans should recognise the rural aspect and retain mature hedgerows and tree plantations.</p>

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 or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
No name given	I have opted to write my views on all the sites bar one on one sheet as I feel that Sheffords capacity to take more housing developments is already bursting at the seams. The sewage system can't take it - the infrastructure is not equipped for more housing, I don't agree with it at all.
No name given	People go out of Shefford for employment as there aren't the places, the set up for offices etc. I don't think that putting in new developments will help Shefford at all.
Chris Steeples	You can't fill the current employment from in the town - why look at creating more empty shells? Don't go here.
Derek Thurland	I cannot support the introduction of employment units on this side of Shefford. Having had spare capacity in the existing designated industrial area next to Somerfield's, permission was given for housing units to be built. Where was the logic in that? Now it is proposed to distribute employment units alongside housing builds. The proposal H171 also includes 3 story housing at the lower end of the Bridge Farm site, which exacerbates the real visual outlook and environmental problems from Queen Elizabeth Close to the development as proposed. The current infrastructure in Shefford of schools, shops and health centre could not support such a development. If housing development is really needed here, then proposal H019 is a more realistic solution.
Gary Boyle	I do not know where the access to this site would be. Any access from Hitchin or Ivel Road would generate far too much traffic for these roads and the existing housing to cope. Access from the current bypass would be the best option but even this will significantly increase local traffic congestion on a road which is now extremely busy for long periods of the day. The proposal to include light industrial usage within this plan also will exacerbate this, and surely this would be better sited elsewhere with pre-existing industrial units, and distinct from domestic dwellings. This level of development will also seriously impact the local countryside and existing housing in terms of quality of life, noise levels and pollution due to increased car usage as local public transport is wholly inadequate. Current infrastructure (local roads, drainage, schools, etc) is not designed to cope with this amount of increased housing.
Julia Martin	This site is situated only 200 metres from Shefford Football clubs ground which was sold for development over 10 years ago and never used. If houses are needed so urgently, then this site should have been developed a long time ago- it is astonishing to see it still featured as an option alongside these very new selected sites. This suggests land grabbing rather than actual requirements for housing. Shefford has a commercial/industrial area which features unused brown sites. To spread commercial buildings into residential areas will increase traffic on an already dangerously busy road. I oppose this suggested development very strongly on the grounds that existing sites have never been used and the residential nature of the street will be permanently destroyed. The disruption to houses opposite and adjacent to the site during development would be considerable and the effects permanent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Angela Smedley	<p>Mixed use development here for 267 dwellings would put pressure on local roads and services and would undoubtedly significantly impact the countryside. The existing residential development to the north is vastly screened with mature hedges and trees and a substantial gap remains between that development and the A607 of open countryside. To encroach into this space with new residential development would lose this important undeveloped gap at this village boundary.</p> <p>Development of the 14.6ha site would visually dominate the built environment of the town as the scale of the site and any potential development there would be too vast for a town of this size. The Issues and Options report specifies that there should be residential provision within Shefford for between 50 and 250 dwellings up to 2026. This site alone proposes 267 dwellings in one location and is above the requirement desired by the Council and would therefore be completely out of scale to those provisions.</p>
Mr & Mrs A Clark	<p>Shefford is a market town. We do not have enough facilities ie. shops, school spaces, health centre space (at present) not enough parking etc.</p>
Mr Geoffrey C Barham	<p>This development covers the area detailed in H019 and an additional area stretching up the hill beside the Shefford bypass. Therefore the same remarks apply. The development of this site would cause a considerable increase in traffic flow in Ivel Road which is heavily congested with resident on street car parking and also car parking allied to Brewers Court, the commercial site at the bottom of Ivel Road, which has insufficient parking provided on site. Any development on this site would need to be designed to blend with the profile of the ground which slopes steeply upwards away from the entry point. Any structures on this site would appear to be a strident feature at the entry point to the community. It was turned down as development land by the Inspector at the setting of the last local plan due to its high visibility from the approach to Shefford. This development would not be of sufficient size to support any additional shopping outlets. There is a Tesco Express within a few minutes walk. Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present. A new facility is planned but is still some time away from being completed due to lack of funding by the Primary Health Care Trust. The provision of additional medical facilities will need to be completed before an increase in population such as H171/E43 will cause. The Middle and Lower schools are full now. Any further population increase will need finance to be provided directly to the Middle and Lower schools so that additional classroom places and teaching staff can be provided. Should the school system change to a two tier system additional places will still required. The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for its present needs. Instances of sewage flooding gardens in areas of the town are regular events following just medium rainfall. Any additional housing will cause serious overflows accompanied by the associated health risks. Any new development will need to provide a completely new sewage system that flows directly away from the existing system in the town. Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Howieson	<p>This farmland was green belt until the bypass was built and should remain as farmland.</p> <p>The local schools are oversubscribed, where others in Bedfordshire are not.</p> <p>Why on earth would we allow further business/industrial use in Shefford, when there is already two fairly large industrial areas in Shefford.</p> <p>The increase in noise from peaceful farmland to over 200 houses and a business area would be detrimental to the housing nearby.</p> <p>Ivel road is already very busy and difficult to negotiate due to parked cars. It is only a narrow road with cars speeding out of Shefford. As much as we would hope that the traffic would exit onto the bypass, they would take the shortest route they needed, which would be Ivel road for Biggleswade and north.</p>
Mrs. Lorna J McGregor	The proposed development is too large, intrudes into the open countryside and would present a problem in accessing it safely.
Mrs M Lewis	The doctor's health centre in Shefford and all local schools are working to full capacity serving an already growing population. Further housing would cause added strain. We already have a business park in Shefford with further facilities in Henlow Camp. There have been several road accidents on the A507, some fatal. A development on this site would bring added danger.
Mrs Meadows	I believe before more building is approved in Shefford, there should be careful consideration to the infrastructure and whether the town can support any more growth. The schools are approaching capacity, there are frequent power cuts, there is nothing for teenagers to do, a lot of the land is on flood plains and it is irresponsible to plan any new building that is liable to floods, especially as incidents such as the floods of summer 2007, are set to rise and some roads in the town are practically impassable because of the amount of cars parked on them. Shefford is a lovely place to live and ideal size please do not spoil it.
N Martin	There is area for redevelopment within the centre of the town where services would be better served.
PAUL FJ MACKIN	<p>The development of this site would cause a considerable increase in traffic Any structures on this site would appear to be a strident feature at the entry point to the community.</p> <p>Shefford's medical facilities are completely overwhelmed at present.</p> <p>The Middle and Lower schools are full now.</p> <p>The sewage disposal system that serves Shefford is insufficient for it present needs.</p> <p>Public transport to the area is minimal.</p>
Pauline Cocevar	<p>PLEASE build on infill sites, derelict and brownfield sites before paving over acres of green farmland!</p> <p>Local employment is no doubt a good thing, but there are already vacant premises both on the industrial site and the high street in Shefford, not to mention numerous empty office and small-scale industrial units advertised "to let" around the Shefford/Stotfold area. If business owners do not want these, why would they want some of the new B1 units build on Sheffords green fields?</p>
Pr.Welch	Why site employment facilities on this development when shefford already has an industrial area which at the present time is under occupied.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Samuel Beadie (Investments) LTD	This site was considered by the previous local plan inspector who notes his concern regarding the sites development potential at paragraph 13.75.15 Development was not favoured due to the adverse potential visual impact.

SHEFFORD APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Ray Dart	Shefford	<p>I believe that the plans envisage a potential 980 additional dwellings, and by extension, an increase in the population of over 3000 people. Are there plans to improve local amenities or increase retail outlets? The village is already badly served (in all senses of the word) by a single grocery shop, although there is a very good butcher. How about roads? New Road is already effectively a single track road (with no passing places) at its Northern End as people who have no off-road parking leave their cars there. Bad parking on the main road between the pond and the shop frequently causes congestion, particularly as there is a bus stop opposite. It is safe to assume that these problems will get much worse after an expansion of the village without some major attention to the roads. If we have to have yellow lines, where will these people be able to park? There have been 5 power cuts in Clifton in the past year, three of them quite long lasting. (One was at least 6 hours in length.) Most of us think this indicates a fundamental problem with power supply to a village that has already grown too big. Are there plans for improving utilities to go along with any housing developments? A lot of questions (that I appreciate may not yet have any answers). About 20 years ago I went along to a planning meeting held in the local school - it was part of the consultation process that led eventually to the bypass being built. At that time I believe that the plans for growth in Clifton envisaged "Less than 20" new dwellings (I cannot remember over what period that was, but I believe it was fairly long). Of course, since then we have had very many more than that built. I have to say I am very much against an expansion of the village by anything as much as this. I also appreciate that I may be talking to the wrong individual, if that is the case; perhaps you will re-direct this letter to whoever is the right person. Many thanks.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Colin Smith	Shefford	<p>On Thursday evening I attended the consultation in the Shefford Community Hall. I was impressed with the amount of information and the people running the 'show' who helped a great deal in clarifying matters. I would like to express my opinion on the proposed sites in Shefford. First and foremost I have to say that most people including me are extremely concerned at the current infrastructure supporting the town of Shefford and whether it can cope with any further major developments. Since late November 2007 there has been at least one ongoing excavation in North Bridge St, South Bridge St or Clifton Road. This has usually been an electricity problem following numerous power cuts affecting the town or in one case when Clifton Road was closed for weeks I understood to be concerned with the water supply. Furthermore, residents are continually complaining about the sewage system which from time to time has given problems resulting in raw sewage surfacing giving rise to potential health risks. All these problems in addition to bad workmanship in the past has resulted in the roads already mentioned being in a dreadful state with potholes and areas of sinkage providing a hazardous situation for disabled people, cyclists and motorists. Commenting on the submitted developments it is very clear that the site allocation for new homes in Shefford could be resolved without building on flood plain. The increased seriousness of environmental factors should be taken into consideration when making the decisions. With developments already ongoing or in the planning stage it will clearly result in increased run off into drainage ditches and rivers in the town which potentially could give rise to serious localised flooding. As someone who regularly walks the footpaths adjoining the rivers in the town it is clear that the flooding of the paths has increased over the last 15 years that I have lived in the town. Only this last weekend of 15/16th March the footpath adjacent to the proposed new development on Shefford Business Park (currently under demolition) was flooded when the river came over its' banks. On a personal note the land at the rear of 5 Mayfields (Site Ref. H213) (adjacent to my property) is proposed for site development. This land is flood plain and to that effect was partially flooded on 3rd Jan 2003. There are other proposed sites of similar nature which if built on would reduce the amount of necessary floodplain in the area. Some of the general points made on the submissions are also of concern. For example they all state that the schools have the capacity to sustain these and the currently ongoing developments. This is not what I am hearing from people involved in the running of these schools. Similarly, the proposed new heath centre.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Colin Smith [continued]	Shefford	Yes, I agree that there will be increased capacity on the patient roll but will it be able to deal with the increase resulting from the proposed developments in Clifton, Meppershall and Shefford. If these developments go ahead then the new Heath Centre would probably be over capacity within a few years of being built. I believe it is necessary to provide new homes but critically it is important to consider the infrastructure, environmental factors and the overall quality of life offered by the town of Shefford. At the moment it is a nice place to live with a good 'feel' factor but nevertheless on a 'knife edge'. The situation could go downhill very quickly if the wrong decisions are taken.
Cllr Lewis Brit	Shefford	Shefford District Councillors have made their views known most strongly at both District and Town planning meetings, that there should be no further development within Shefford until there is the appropriate upgrading of all services to accommodate it. This includes: schools, health facilities, electricity supplies and distribution, sewage system throughout the town, roads. Our views are supported by the Town Council. MBDC Councillor Lewis Brit.

Name	Subject	Comment
Ginny & Nigel Morris	Shefford	<p>Further to our email sent last night, I would like to add that we feel very strongly that this little market town of Shefford has already taken on enough housing. It has more than doubled in size in the last 15 years or so, with the Bellcote Meadows Estate, the Churchill Way estate off Ivel Road, the Football ground soon to be developed (what happened to the alternative provision for the football club by the way, that land must have gone for millions?), the Priory Gate development, Oliver's Court now in progress, the old Eldon Rubbermaid Industrial park soon to be redeveloped and many other small infill plots. The Lower and Middle schools will not be able to cope with all the additional children, nor will the surgery. There has been no associated help for the town apart from the questionable 'enhancement' of the Town Centre which has killed off the street market, and the millennium green kissing gate, a target for vandals, as is the new play equipment near Somerfield and on the Memorial Playing Fields, nobody much goes up that corner of the field unless they are up to no good. One of the many planning documents on the MBDC website refers to important countryside gaps (e.g. between Clifton/Shefford, Clifton/Henlow), we consider that the farmland around Queen Elizabeth Close is the only remaining countryside gap between us and the bypass, and is really important. Also, the Appraisal document regarding H162 refers to bus routes and nearest train station, one of the main things about Shefford is that the public transport is not that good, everyone needs a car to get to Arlesey station and the only people who use the buses have no alternative, particularly as routes are being withdrawn all the time. Having said all the above, if the worst comes to the worst and the H162 development is approved, then it should be a main criteria that the design is re-planned to avoid the demolition of No.19. Why should the design of our close be sacrificed, along with the quiet aspect we have all enjoyed by the choice of living in this cul-de-sac on the edge of green land, when the design of any new development can be altered to avoid this?</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Michael Hill	Shefford	<p>After reading the PPS appraisal document relating to Site 162, I should like to add our comments. Shefford has doubled in size in less than twenty years. The infrastructure supporting the town's current population is already at it's fullest capacity (esp. schools, dental healthcare, doctor's surgeries). For the 5000+ people who already live in Shefford, a planned development of 250 more houses will only mean extra, unwanted competition for local facilities (where they exist at all). Under such questionable circumstances, we do not believe an expansion of our town could be called 'sustainable development' Any development that is not sustainable is unacceptable. Any idea that this exponential increase in Shefford's size has not seriously eroded its small, market town appeal is hopelessly misguided. Enough is enough! The town has endured two enormous housing sprawls and several other large housing estates in the last decade and a half, I do not believe these have added to Shefford's prosperity significantly, nor to the existing inhabitants quality of life. Specifically to Application H162/H019: The houses bordering this development on it's northern boundary (i.e. Queen Elizabeth Close) will have their quiet, rural outlook taken away; the major reason why they moved into this close for many of it's occupants. The proposed footpath access to this estate is deemed to run to Ivel Road via Queen Elizabeth Close, it is not possible for this path to be the pedestrian route to the town centre for 800(+) people without destroying the peaceful quiet of the road. In addition, the safety of these pedestrians on the Close's narrow paths and carriageway must be very seriously in doubt - the road/footpath is proportioned for 40 dwellings, not the 360(?) total; this is madness! The increased foot-traffic into Ivel Road would be similarly beset with dangers; this is not a safe junction to attempt a road crossing, sitting on the blind-summit of Ivel Road. We love living in this road, the proposed development will ruin it. Should we (existing inhabitants) all suffer when a developer drops this plan here? In the PPS appraisal, the housing plan is reported to 'have no significant impact on its neighbours' and suffer 'no loss of outlook or privacy' (pg13 par. 3.17). This is simply laughable. To suggest that a view of fields stretching to the horizon is not infinitely preferable to a housing estate is a total nonsense. The report makes much of re-using land that is currently occupied by light-industry, but this land is less than 10 percent of the proposed development, and could be reoccupied by another business entity without the need for building 320 houses on it. The appraisal proposes a roundabout on the Hitchin Road approach to Shefford, (to allow access to this new estate) is similarly described in praiseworthy terms as an aid to slowing traffic and improving road safety, clearly road safety is important, but</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Michael Hill [continued]	Shefford	does it require a large housing estate and roundabout to be built, when a simple speed camera (or traffic pinch-point) will do??? Both these planning justifications are mere trivia when compared to the loss of 10 hectares of Shefford's green boundary. We very strongly believe this planning application should be rejected. I hope my letter is not too late for consideration. Regards The Hill Family
Nicola Brixney	Shefford	Please find below comments on the Appraisal Document (Mar 2007) supplied by PPS supporting the development of Site H162 in Shefford. I appreciate that your deadline was Friday, but when I spoke to one of your colleagues last week, I was told that as long as I submitted by comments to you this weekend, my views should be taken into consideration. I hope this is the case. In general terms, I object to the development of Site H162 because of the scale of the proposed building. Shefford is in danger of changing from a compact community with soul and character to a faceless urban sprawl. Developments of the size proposed (320 houses) will cut into the countryside, put even more pressure on already swamped resources such as schools and doctors and add to existing congestion and speed problems on the roads. As a case in point, the middle school, which I believe is already the largest middle school in the country, is heavily oversubscribed and last year had to turn down several applicants. It has an outstanding reputation and is a credit to Shefford. How easy will it be to maintain the results, discipline and caring attitude when it is flooded with children from the new estates? When we moved from London 9 years ago, the community spirit, the slower pace of life and the rural aspects were what drew us to Shefford. Surely this is something to be proud of and to nurture rather than to destroy by allowing outside developers to grow rich at our expense? The quota of 50-250 new houses can easily be met by building on infill sites which have previously been developed e.g. the industrial site next to the river, or the old football site on Ivel Road. There is absolutely no need to allow the building of huge estates. More specifically, I object to Site H162 for two further reasons. Firstly, the houses on the edge of the site will lose uninterrupted views of countryside and the peace and quiet which comes with them. Secondly, the proposal to demolish a perfectly good family house in order to provide access to the new estate is almost beyond comprehension. How can permission be given for a quiet residential close (i.e. a cul-de-sac) to be turned into a thoroughfare for possibly upwards of 900 people?

Name	Subject	Comment
Nicola Brixney [continued]	Shefford	<p>We have no wish to suffer the same fate as other 'access roads' in Shefford i.e. trees and gardens damaged, litter thrown down, large groups of young people creating noise during the early hours. People buy houses in cul-de-sacs because they want the security and peace that such a location offers... is it right to change the nature of a road to such a great extent in order to allow the developers to present their site in a more attractive way ? Even more specifically, I have the following comments about the appraisal document submitted by the developers. The numbers in the margin refer to page and paragraph no. as they appear in the document on the Mid Beds website. Pg 3, para 1.2 - Shefford does not have a 'busy shopping centre '. It contains small local shops, some of which still adhere to early Wednesday closing. The 'range of restaurants ' consists of pubs and 2 Indian restaurants. The dentist does not accept NHS patients. The 'clothing' shops consist of one charity shop and one second hand clothing shop. I am not sure where the ' computer shop ' is. The greatest percentage of shops in the High Street are estate agents. In short, Shefford town centre provides low level shopping and is certainly not as vibrant or wide ranging as is suggested. Pg 8, para 1.25 - it is simply not true to say that the land 'is no longer actively cultivated '. In the 9 years that we have lived here, the field abutting Queen Elizabeth Close has been planted with wheat and harvested every year. This year is no exception; the wheat was sown last autumn and is already well established. Pg 10, para 2.5 - there would apparently be a saving of 100m if the footpath through Queen Elizabeth Close was used to reach the bus stop. Is this worth knocking down a house for? Pg 13, para 3.14 - 'the removal of an unsafe and substandard commercial access' will not be necessary if ' it is likely that within the near future the Depot will become redundant' (Pg 8, para 1.25) Pg 13, para 3.17 - Given all the reasons outlined above, how can ' development of this site ...have no significant impact on its neighbours'? The statement that the properties overlooking the land will suffer 'no loss of outlook or privacy ' is frankly ridiculous. No developer, however philanthropic, would be able to construct houses that look and behave like a field of wheat. Pg 15, para 4.4 - This area of Bedfordshire is spread out , with most amenities only reachable by car. I do not know the figures, but I am sure that the large majority of the residents of Shefford rely on cars rather than buses or cycles/ walking. Indeed, a great many people from the Queen Elizabeth Close area even choose to drive their children to school. Most households nowadays own one or even two cars, and a large percentage of residents work outside the Shefford area.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Nicola Brixney [continued]	Shefford	As an illustration of this, at a weekend the estate to the back of the Esso garage is full of cars, both on driveways and in the road. To say that the proposed estate will ' help reduce the reliance on the private motor car' is ludicrous. To sum up, the siting of a large housing estate on the land to the back of Queen Elizabeth Close is inappropriate in terms of size, pressure on infrastructure, impact on the quality of existing residents' lifestyles and change of usage of a residential close. I am strongly opposed to it. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. Mrs Nicola Brixney.

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr & Mrs G A Andrew	Shefford	<p>Whilst I do appreciate this E Mail is past the deadline date I still wish you to convey the contents to the Mid Beds Senior District Planning Officer so that they are fully aware of our views and actions. You have received correspondence from many households in the close in regard to the developments around QE Close and many reasons for these developments not to proceed. We fully support all of these reasons and are in complete agreement with all the correspondence sent to you. Be in no doubt that we intend to stand against all these proposals/developments and will seek the advice and guidance of our local MP and if needed, legal representation. I will explain more fully why we are very strong on these issues. We live at No 11 QE Close directly opposite No19 the property you wish to take down. We purchased our house in the close some 21 years ago with the intention of living here through our middle and old age because of its peace and tranquillity, small development and quality of the housing. Our children grew up here in safety as do many children now, to remove these features in one foul swoop without any consultation with the residents astounds and horrifies us. It would seem from the Appraisals Document compiled on behalf of Samuel Beadle Investments Ltd the deal is nearly done? Not so, I would strongly advise Mid Beds Council to commence full discussions with a senior Planning Officer together with the residents from Queen Elizabeth Close ASAP at the Chicksands council offices within the next two weeks so that all the development points can be honestly and openly discussed. Unwittingly you have already devalued all the properties in Queen Elizabeth Close as all new searches from solicitors for new residents will now reveal the close is to apparently become a thoroughfare? Returning to my personal position we would be subjected to a large amount of foot and cycle traffic directly in front of our lounge window where once it was a peaceful view with little or no movements during the day or night. We purchased into a close which is a, quiet, secure, 40 houses only cul-de-sac with all the neighbours looking out for each other. It must be stressed that it is not us who have started this campaign, we have had no choice and therefore we intend to fight on all fronts to return our lives and the life of the close back to normal. As a valid and final point Mid Beds District Council are struggling to provide and maintain adequate services to the local community now ,should not these issues be addressed first before considering any future development. Can you please provide me with the name and email address of the Senior Planning Officer in Mid Beds so that I may copy this email to them. I await your reply. Mr and Mrs G A Andrew.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Tony and Jane Conneely	Shefford	<p>We would like to register our concerns with regards to the proposed Mid Beds housing development in Shefford. Our main concerns are will regards to H162 and H019.. With regards to H162, there is no mention on the website of proposed access to what would be the new estate. However we have heard that there may be plans to demolish existing house(s) in Queen Elizabeth Close to facilitate access. We are concerned that if true these proposals would have a detrimental effect on us, dramatically changing the character of the close that we live in, and turning it into a busy thoroughfare. The main attraction when purchasing our home five years ago was the fact that it was in a quiet close with little foot or vehicular traffic, and we are sure that this was a main attraction for many of the other residents too. We also cannot tell from the plans whether access to H019 will have an effect on our close.. Please note our concerns, while we acknowledge that development is inevitable and necessary, we believe everything should be done to avoid having a detrimental effect on existing residents. Regards Tony and Jane Conneely.</p>
Paul Welch	Shefford	<p>From P R. Welch with regards to the proposed developments H019 and H162. I strongly believe they will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of the residents of queen Elizabeth close. With such large developments the Shefford town infrastructure would be severely stretched. The developer has put forward that the site H162 will have little visual impact on the existing town because of the lie of the land. This infers that the site would be unattractive to the beholder. myself and others adjacent to the site would have this unattractive view as well as increased noise levels, light disturbance, air pollution i.e. car fumes and stench pipes, and vandalism. As for site H162, I have fears that our gardens will have flooding problems due to faster run off of surface water. At the moment I have the field drainage ditch running into a culvert under mine and no.23's garden. Who will maintain the ditch in future? Also will this culvert be sufficient size for the future? The lower parts of site H019 were flooded in the last downpour because nobody is maintaining the culverts under Ivel Rd. Ivel Rd were also flooded. As regards the proposed access via the proposed demolition of no.19 Queen Elizabeth Close, this will have a disastrous effect on the close through litter problems, use of motor bikes, late night revelling, and the effect of the close being a public footpath to hundreds of strangers. Thank you. P R Welch.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Richard and Elaine Fordham	Shefford H019 and H162	<p>We write to express our concern over the proposed access through Queen Elizabeth Close in Shefford to the adjacent new housing development labelled as H019 and H162 on Council development plans. Queen Elizabeth Close has only 40 houses and has a narrow road not intended as a thoroughfare. Should this access be provided, there will clearly be an enormous increase in vehicular traffic as well as pedestrians using Queen Elizabeth Close to reach schools, shops, and arterial routes. This, in turn, is likely to devalue all properties in the close since part of its charm is the quiet setting and low volume of traffic. We bought here in a small close as we did not wish to be part of a large estate with associated higher volume traffic conditions. The proposal to provide access to the new development through Queen Elizabeth Close will create a total change in the environmental living conditions for existing residents. This is unacceptable. Given these concerns, one solution would be to provide an access to the new development directly from Ivel Road, perhaps at the existing roundabout at Churchill Way. We would request that such a solution is considered by the Council. Further, we would strongly request that the Council work harder to engage existing residents in appropriate public involvement processes. It is unacceptable that we have had no formal notification from the Council for these plans. Please advise how the Council will work with residents to ensure future development plans respond to all parties' needs. We look forward to your response either by letter or electronic mail.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Gary Boyle	Shefford H162, H019, H171/E43, H163	<p>Dear Mr Duffy I am writing to you in connection with current development consultation on Housing Development within the Shefford area. I was aware that a high level strategy was underway in Mid Beds to assess the preferred options for development in the district. However, what I was unaware of, until a few days ago, was the extent of the planning applications, and in particular those targeted at the areas in and around Ivel Road and Queen Elizabeth Close. The remains of this email documents my thoughts on the Housing Development in general, and in particular four plans that have particular impact on the area in which I live. I accept that a level of housing development across Mid Beds, and in particular within Shefford, is inevitable. What is most concerning however is the scant disregard that many of these developers have for the local environment that exists and how the emphasis appears to be solely on building houses without providing commensurate facilities and infrastructure to support the additional people that purchase these dwellings. In my time in Shefford numerous large housing estates have been commissioned and completed by several well known national builders but there has been little if any increase in the facilities which exist within the town. Robert Bloomfield Middle School (which both of my children attends) is an excellent school, and has become the envy of much of the surrounding county thanks to the efforts of Mr Rogers (the Head) and the first class team he has assembled. The downside to this is an oversubscribed school, with numerous portakabins, and every year more people wanting to access this school for their children. Furthermore the current medical centre is full, the single dental surgery doesn't offer NHS treatment, the facilities for teenagers are limited and consequently low level crime and anti-social behaviour is on the increase. This is at a time when Shefford has one Policeman (whom nobody ever sees) and a couple of community support officers. This is the situation at present, and the plans (as I understand them) are to build potentially up to another 2000 dwellings in Shefford. I would like to see upfront guarantees of additional schooling, medical centres, dental surgeries, youth clubs, community sports ground, increased policing, public transport, truly upgraded shopping facilities put ahead of housing development such that the infrastructure is available to support any modest development, and for these to be completed either before or at worst in parallel with any additional housing. I would also suggest that all brown field sites are exhausted within the local area, before any green-field sites are considered for development. As to the specific plans in and around Ivel Road (namely H019, H162, H171 and H163) these do not seem to take into account either current residents' views or pre-existing issues of traffic and access.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Gary Boyle [continued]	Shefford H162, H019, H171/E43, H163	<p>Indeed, given the extent of the building planned I am surprised that all residents in Ivel Road and any roads off here have not been specifically alerted to the extent of development which is likely, as this will have major implications on access to their existing homes, local pollution, noise levels, the local countryside and their quality of life. I have detailed further specific concerns below and also taken the time to complete the online surveys on each application on the Mid-Beds website.</p> <p>H019- Bridge Farm, Ivel Road. The level of housing (170 dwellings) and access proposal for this site is wholly inappropriate given the current traffic problems on Ivel Road, and the pre-existing infrastructure and housing.</p> <p>H162- Land west of Hitchin Road The level of housing (320 dwellings) seems excessive given the pre-existing infrastructure and housing. Although the plan describes access via Hitchin Road (impacting this road) it also discusses a footpath link via Queen Elizabeth Close, which presumably involves the demolition of a house at the end of the close, which is currently owned by a property developer. Initial concerns would be the increased foot traffic through a quiet, private estate of 40 houses, to access 320 dwellings, of potentially mixed usage. This would be wholly inappropriate and would seriously impact a small attractive estate that was never designed to be a thoroughfare. In addition it opens up the possibility that this (one day) could be made into vehicular access and would then seriously devastate the pre-existing housing, with impact on traffic levels within Ivel Road also.</p> <p>H171/E43 - a mixed use plan (residential /commercial) for Bridge Farm Assuming that access to this development is not via Hitchin or Ivel Road (neither of which is suitable as this would have a serious impact on existing housing) then it will be via the current bypass? This road is already extremely busy for long periods of the day and the extent of additional housing (267 dwelling and the prospect of light industrial usage) will only exacerbate local traffic. The siting of commercial and domestic within this area does not seem appropriate.</p> <p>H163 - Shefford football ground, Ivel Road. This level of development (i.e. 52 dwellings) is the type and amount of development which should be supported and is sustainable within Shefford and the surrounding area in the light of the desire to provide more housing within Mid-Beds. The problem with this site is that it is wholly inappropriate being on existing floodplain and requiring access via Ivel Road which cannot cope with the existing traffic which uses it. In addition, the covenant to provide a suitable football pitch alternative should be addressed and agreed before any development of this site is allowed.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Gary Boyle [continued]	Shefford H162, H019, H171/E43, H163	In summary, the extent of housing proposed within this area of Shefford seems wholly inappropriate and will seriously blight the local rural aspect and the quality of life of existing residents. I do not believe these plans represent the best interests of Shefford as a community or as a desirable place to live and work. I accept that a level of development is unavoidable and necessary but serious consideration of major upgrading of local infrastructure (at all levels) is required even for modest development. Yours sincerely Gary Boyle.
Tony and Jane Conneely	Shefford sites H162 & H019	Dear Sir, We would like to register our concerns with regards to the proposed Mid Beds housing development in Shefford. Our main concerns are will regards to H162 and H019..With regards to H162, there is no mention on the website of proposed access to what would be the new estate. However we have heard that there may be plans to demolish existing house(s) in Queen Elizabeth Close to facilitate access. We are concerned that if true these proposals would have a detrimental effect on us, dramatically changing the character of the close that we live in, and turning it into a busy thoroughfare. The main attraction when purchasing our home five years ago was the fact that it was in a quiet close with little foot or vehicular traffic, and we are sure that this was a main attraction for many of the other residents too. We also cannot tell from the plans whether access to H019 will have an effect on our close. Please note our concerns, while we acknowledge that development is inevitable and necessary, we believe everything should be done to avoid having a detrimental effect on existing residents. Regards Tony and Jane Conneely.

Name	Subject	Comment
Joy & John Strutt	Shefford, Ref H162	<p>Ref H162 Land development at We bought our house in Queen Elizabeth Close 28 years ago because it was on a small development in a cul-de-sac which we thought would be a quiet crime free location. This has proven to be the case and we have enjoyed bringing up our family here. The proposed plan to create a cycle/walkway from a new estate located to the east will change this to the detriment. We have seen a step change in vandalism in Ivel Road since the development on Polehanger farm and know this would be replicated in Queen Elizabeth Close. The houses in Queen Elizabeth Close have open plan fronts and have not been designed with the necessary security in mind, for instance our house is only 2.2M from the pavement with the kitchen on the front of the house, the door being very accessible from the pavement. This will make Queen Elizabeth Close part of a large estate with all the social problems experienced on such developments. The appraisal statement "Land at Hitchin Road " paragraph 3.17 states "Development of this site would be no significant impact on its neighbourhood and then continues to address the impact on Hitchin Road and omits Queen Elizabeth Close where the land is lower and I suggest would have significant impact to the properties bounding the new development We would not feel so upset if there was not more sensible alternative to this problem. Ivel Road is narrow and is single file as a result of the residents parking, currently heavily used especially in the mornings by vehicles seeking access from the Clifton area to the A507 although over recent years the volume of traffic using this road has increase enormously at times it is a nightmare to negotiate. The addition of current new developments being built and proposed in the area will add to this problem so it makes sense to keep pedestrians such as school children off Ivel Road if possible. We also know that school children will take the shortest route, so I suggest that the footpath/cycle track be routed from the south-westerly corner of the new proposed development directly to the roundabout in Ivel Road through the proposed development H171/E43 Gudgins Farm. The result would be that the route to school and to the town is shorter, children would not have to walk along the potentially dangerous Ivel Road and that the character Queen Elizabeth Close would remain. I believe the demolishing of a superior house and the devastation that will result in Queen Elizabeth Close should not be part of the agenda. The character of Shefford and the living conditions of its current residents should not be rejected in the interest of developer's profits. There is a better, safer route as I have explained.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Virginia & Nigel Morris	Shefford, site H162	<p>Dear Mr Duffy We are writing to express our absolute horror at the prospect of the proposals connected with the above developments of the farmland surrounding Queen Elizabeth Close, in particular H162, as we have seen a plan of the proposed development. When we bought our house 12 years ago, we chose the location very carefully and the main attractions of Queen Elizabeth Close were: * It is a quiet cul de sac, so we would have no through traffic* It was a small development of only 40 properties* It is well planned, all the houses complement each other* It is on the outer edge of Shefford* It is immediately surrounded on two sides by open countryside We have had many peaceful years at Queen Elizabeth Close, with wonderful neighbours and have enjoyed living here quietly. The fact that it is a cul-de-sac has been the main factor in this. We have now, however, had the opportunity to look at various documents, although looking at www.talktomidbeds.co.uk I have not seen the newsletter that was apparently distributed to all residents. In the document 'Land at Hitchin Road, Shefford, Beds, Appraisal Statement'(by Phillips Planning Services Ltd, on behalf of Samuel Beadle Investments Ltd), I quote paragraph 1.14: "Our clients also own a property within Queen Elizabeth Close which directly adjoins the north western boundary. This property would be demolished to enable a direct footpath/cycleway from the site to the town centre and shopping facilities." We are aware that this property is no. 19 and we have also seen it on a plan of the proposed development. * How can there possibly be the need to demolish this large family house just to put a footpath or cycleway through from the proposed development?</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Virginia & Nigel Morris continued	Shefford, site H162	<p>This is not necessary; there are clearly alternative routes that could be investigated. If a footpath is all that is needed, surely the Shefford Memorial Association would benefit from a large donation for improvements in their facilities, in return for allowing a footpath/cycleway along the playing field boundary with the proposed development adjacent to the top end of Queen Elizabeth Close, directly down to the existing gate at the end of Elm Road, convenient for the Ivel Road bus stop and the town centre.* This demolition will totally ruin the character of this delightfully quiet cul-de-sac and is a criminal waste of a beautiful home for a family.* The associated footfall/cycle traffic we will have from 300+ new houses when there is no need for it.* The impact of this will be hugely significant on all the residents of Queen Elizabeth Close if the demolition is allowed to happen, if there is cycle access lads with motorcycles inevitably end up using it and it will also just be a handy 'rat run' for any troublemakers in the vicinity.* If the development itself goes ahead, it will also have the effect of exacerbating flooding problems when there is heavy rain. Our own garage has already been flooded on numerous occasions with runoff of water from the fields on H162 land during heavy rainstorms. This will only get worse if the land is developed for housing.* Even though our own property does not directly adjoin the land, we will just be part of a large estate - this is exactly what we came here to avoid and to enjoy living in the countryside. * The document referred to above refers again in paragraph 2.5 and 4.18 to a new footpath/footpath through Queen Elizabeth Close as though the demolition of No. 19 is already a foregone conclusion. In paragraph 2.5 it mentions that the nearest bus stop in Ivel Road would now be 600 metres away, rather than 700 metres in Clifton Road, we don't consider that 100metres is a material advantage of any kind, particularly when we are all supposed to be walking more.* Paragraph 3.17 states that development of this site would have no significant impact on its neighbours. This just not true at all, as we have stated above, it will completely change the whole nature of our cul-de-sac, and definitely to the detriment of our human right to enjoy a peaceful life. Please consider these points, as we are extremely concerned. Yours sincerely Virginia & Nigel Morris</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Ilan Rawet	Shefford	<p>The areas that I think the plans for Shefford should consider are: 1. Job creation as well as new homes. New homes in isolation will only generate commuter traffic that is road based when public transport is poor. 2. New developments should not be considered in isolation. All new developments should include the prospects of integration with adjacent new developments so as to integrate pathways and cycle tracks and alternative access for emergency vehicles. In the example that I have in mind H162, H163 and H171(H019) should all be planned to integrate their pathways, cycle tracks and emergency access road use. 3. The current traffic congestion on Ivel Road and the associated safety risks. Ivel Road, before the building of the bypass was a small country road providing access to Meppershall. A number of cottages were build alongside this road that preceded the current use of the car. As a result these homes have no off street parking and narrow footpaths. Ivel Road is now the main access from Clifton Road and South Bridge Street in Shefford to the bypass and the fuel retail site on the A600. The current use of Ivel Road north of the Churchill Way roundabout makes life a hazard either as a pedestrian, a cyclist or a motorist. Any development that increases the use of this road has the potential to precipitate a serious accident. I would like to see that all future development takes the problem into consideration. My casual observation indicates that a significant amount of the traffic on Ivel road comes from the north, the Sandy Road / Biggleswade area and from the east, Clifton etc. and for some reason avoids the by-pass. 4. I note that there a number of sites that propose the demolition of existing houses to provide access. Although I can understand to a certain extent such activity where the development plot is land locked I struggle with the concept when the site has open access to existing facilities by road, playing fields and other land that has the potential for development. As the whole principle of these plans is to provide the right mix of housing and jobs, demolition just to provide a path does not quite fit. 5. A number of the plans refer to the good public transport links. A trawl of the Stagecoach web site today for bus timetables only gives access to a few local villages as well as direct routes to Hitchin (for London main line train station at Arlesey) and Bedford. Access to other places requires a car. I am concerned that housing development only will cause even more commuting. This unfortunately can only at the moment be by car. A number of the plans refer to the closeness of a bus stop in Ivel Road. The main route bus stop in the Stagecoach timetable is in Clifton Road. The timetable identifier is Shefford, Ivel Road which is the junction of Clifton Rod and Ivel Road. Thank you for reading my missive and the opportunity to comment on the plans. Regards Ilan Rawet</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr Keith Dear	Flooding and development, Shefford	<p>On page 14 of Issue 6 of "We love Bedfordshire" the article opens with "Bedfordshire is susceptible to flooding due to the major rivers that pass through the county". This is a worry for many residents in Bedfordshire and particularly those living in Shefford who are living between two rivers. Is the likely effect that development would have on the potential increase in risk of flooding taken into consideration for all new developments? Are all new developments refused when the risk of increased flooding is confirmed? For the Council to be able to confirm potential increases to the risk of flooding is always given priority consideration in the planning process would be very welcome, not just by me, but by many residents of Shefford.</p>
Mr & Mrs Andrew		<p>I wish to register my concerns for the new proposal development of 70A Ivel Road although it only makes reference to 4 more houses the road is already congested and dangerous. It once formed part of a country lane going up to the village of Meppershall and is still the same size but with substantially increased speeding traffic. Children and pedestrian use the narrow footways to gain access to the school and shops and I believe no more traffic should be added to an already dangerous road.</p>