

## **SOUTHILL 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.

**SOUTHILL APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H181**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Christine Muir	H181- More to the point, can the existing infrastructure support such a proposed influx of families? Yes, Broom has good motorway and rail links, but even now in rush hour some of the trains are standing room only at Biggleswade, access on/off the A1 is difficult, and the village road in Broom is busy with speeding motorists. Houses mean families! Local routes, schools, recreational amenities, parking areas, social infrastructure will all need an actionable plan to expand and improve facilities and services if the area is to sustain such a huge growth in housing. This must be looked at in conjunction with and alongside all the proposals for housing development.
Mrs J Hall	As this is near to existing development this could be used for low cost housing for the young people of the village also to provide sheltered housing for the elderly.
R Brown	To include village hall and play area.

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
Paul Scutchings	No regular bus service, with two cars per household it would double the amount of cars on these country roads.
A R Baines	This site is quite unsuitable for development.
Alan Eastham	There are not any local services, and we do not want the village spoilt by introducing any.
Alastair Cameron	Development here can only put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads (which will be negatively impacted by Broom South Quarry traffic in the future, anyway), heating oil delivery lorries and electricity supply (since there is no mains gas in the village to share the energy needs provision), water supply (which is already marginal on pressure) and telephone/broadband provision (also apparently stretched already). A new Village Hall as mooted would take this social facility out of the heart of the village to a less desirable location, risking reduced usage, and a recreation ground on the northern fringe is unlikely to draw children away from the traditional village green area (near most of their homes). A financial contribution to the Old Warden Conservation Management Plan would not be likely to do much, if anything, for Broom residents; a poor sop.
Alex Boswell	Broom has suffered significant inconvenience and upheaval with the agreed quarrying activities at the Tarmac Quarry, Broom. It is my understanding that agreement was granted for the quarry application (and subsequent extensions there of) but no dwelling or commercial properties would be granted. To now target Broom for further development, upheaval, upset and inconvenience would further destroy the fabric and culture of country life.

Submitted by	Comments
Alison Palmer	In Broom we do not have a shop or gas and only about two buses a day. If residents are to use new health facilities in Shefford, private transport is necessary - we cannot walk to Shefford. It is quicker to go to Biggleswade. We do not require a new village hall - our existing hall is fine where it is. Adding more houses will not benefit the village. In fact, can the sewer/drainage system accommodate more dwellings?
Allan Butcher	This is prime agricultural land, and with the Quarry works which we did not want but is forced upon us, taking away agricultural land this is not acceptable. There is not suitable road links nor any infrastructure to support these extra houses. Broom is being victimized, after having to live with the Quarry works for so many years Broom now needs to be allowed to exist as the village it is, and not be changed into a satellite of Biggleswade.
B M Twitchin	There is no need for further housing in this small village which has no facilities - no shop, no post office, no school! It needs to remain a small village and should not be spoilt by housing development. Site H185 would be totally unsuitable because of its existing use as farm. On the proposed site is also a contaminated area of the former sewage treatment plant, a stream that is prone to flooding, a large number of mature trees and extensive wildlife such as frogs and great crested newts.
Barbara Spencer	Broom is a small village and would be unsuitable as a site for further development, it has no existing social infrastructure and virtually no public transport links.
David and Alison Davies	The field in question has been given set-aside status to encourage wildlife. We have noticed an increase in owls, kestrels and bramblings to name but a few. Broom is a small scenic village which would be completely ruined by this level of development. There are no services/amenities and most householders need the use of a car due to limited bus service. This amount of housing would only increase the number of cars on the road - approx 60 cars plus with this number of housing.
David Yates	Development at this and other sites around Broom is completely unacceptable. We have suffered too much already at the hands of quarrying. Broom is a small village and should remain so. There are no facilities to support this plan. Even if a relief road is built, it would be out of keeping with the area. Broom is a small village which has suffered more than most with nearby quarrying. A further blight of our countryside is unacceptable.
Denise Clarke	Broom is a small village which is why people live here. There are no facilities, no school, shop, post office, gas, buses, taxis, recreation for kids, nothing really. There is also loads of land already owned by a building company inside the village boundary, this will be built on soon enough without all of these houses. Shuttleworth, who own all of this land also own loads of land in Southill, however the Directors of Shuttleworth live there so want no new houses. Only one house has been built there in the last thirty years. They should build houses in Southill if they want them, at least there is a shop and post office there.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Erica Wark	I strongly object to proposal H181: Broom is a small, quiet, and picturesque village. These plans would alter its character so entirely that the essence of the village would be lost. I notice that there aren't plans to build around the Whitbread estate and Shuttleworth... Frankly it smacks of them wanting to profit from this land, without consideration of the residents of Broom, so long as it does not affect them themselves! The term NIMBY comes to mind... Not In My Back Yard - If they aren't happy to have it in their back yards then what makes it plausible that we would want to tolerate it in ours? The proposed plans would be of detriment to our quality of life and the quality of the countryside. It was stated by Mid-Beds that this would be targeted at large villages, but Broom is a small village! We wish to remain a small village, the changes you have proposed do not take into consideration the desires of the community, nor are they in-keeping with the existing settlement.
Jill Boswell	There are no local services to support! Broom is a small village with no schools, shops, poor public transport links and no park/play areas for children. I cannot see how developing the village further will have any benefit. Furthermore, the land in question is rich with wildlife. There are numerous species of birds, moles, field mice, bats and lots more. The village is almost surrounded by quarrying and the possibility of further suffocation by new housing is most alarming. Its time Broom was left alone.
K Tuck	This is a lot of housing for Broom, which will have an affect on its character and status as a small village. Southill school is not large enough (and has no room for expansion) to accommodate many more children, it is not practical. This will increase traffic in the village especially due to the fact you HAVE to travel for all amenities.
M Tait	Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe.
M. Franey	I strongly oppose this development for environmental reasons, with the loss of valuable agricultural land and food production.
Martin Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mr & Mrs M Biishop	There is no shop in Broom, No paper deliveries, no school, (Children bussed out for education) No playing area for children... This has been talked about for 30 years. There are no amenities in this village How generous of the landowners to offer land for housing but not for something really useful like a playing field The bus service is infrequent. Anyone moving here would need to work elsewhere to afford it and that would mean more traffic. Expanding Broom by huge amounts is a totally brainless suggestion and shows how greedy people are.
Mr M Kingsbury	Broom is a small village which is why most people come here to live, we have had one quarry for the last 12 years and now face another 12 years to the south of the village. I do not believe this further development is required or necessary, and will certainly not enhance village life.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J A Reid	Proposed site is currently used for leisure walking. Building on this site would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and increase traffic.
Mrs J Ablett	I do not believe this development would assist the local community in any way. There is very little infrastructure in Broom to support a housing development of this magnitude. There are no local shops, no schools or local businesses that would benefit from this proposed development. The public transport links to nearby towns are extremely poor. The medical centres are filled to capacity and would require householders to be in possession of their own transport. The access roads in and out of the village would not be in a position to cope with the increased vehicle loads.
Mrs J Woodward	More agricultural land lost. Livelihoods lost. Sewer and electrical system not able to cope with extra housing thus upheaval to residents whilst work carried out to rectify.
Mrs J. Butcher	Broom has had quarry workings around it now and for many years to come. Additional housing will take away more important agricultural land and countryside which we have already lost due to the quarry. Also as the council have agreed to further quarry works east of Broom, surely building houses in this area so close to the quarry works is not acceptable. Traffic through and around Broom is bad enough now if more houses were built a by-pass or new road net work would have to be built.
Mrs. K Gordon	Local schools and infrastructure unable to support this development.
Mrs. Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core -strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mrs. J M Collins	48 dwellings are too many to be built in a small village. Mid Beds core strategy aims to focus development on larger settlements in the district Mid Beds also state they wish to allocate sites for 400 new homes to be built in villages in their area between now and 2026, and they wish to allocate these sites mainly in the larger villages. To be consistent with Mid Beds core strategy a fair share for Broom would be no more than 10 dwellings. This land is a Greenfield site on prime agricultural land, used to grow vegetables. Government policy is that such sites should only be used if brownfield sites can not be found. Developments in world food markets clearly show Britain should be keeping agricultural land for food production.
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Peter Twitchin	Broom is one of the few small beautiful villages in Bedfordshire which already has had some tasteful developments over the years and the sensitive small expansions have blended in with the original character. The proposals would totally demolish this. There is no infrastructure here to support this - no school, church, shop, post office. H185 has successful farm work vegetable crops. With the current political climate sensitive to wasted air miles and the imperative to buy local crops it would be a disaster to terminate this farmers work - his business is growing too! The stream is prone to flooding which would not be good for building in this area. There are still newts and frogs crowd in H185 and young deer regularly stray into the area.
R A Collins	This is an enormous number of house to put in the small village of Broom and contrary to Mid Beds core strategy. There appears to be no need to replace the existing village hall as suggested. This is a Greenfield site and its use would reduce agricultural production - likely to be needed in the future with world shortages of food and energy.
Sandra Giddings	48 dwellings will significantly increase the size of the village - extending into existing agricultural land outside the village boundary for building. Since there is limited public transport and no facilities in Broom - it is likely this will increase traffic by 1.5 cars per household on average. There is no employment in eth village and no safe walking or cycle routes to Biggleswade or other towns. Additional land is suggested for a new village hall - removing it from the centre of the village and probably increasing traffic within the village boundary. The suggestion that a contribution be made to the old warden conservation management plan should be irrelevant to this application - since Broom is not included in this area - what is its purpose for Broom residents?
The Taylor Family	This site is totally inappropriate and any development would destroy the existing community and environment.
W Scutchings	This is a small, quiet hamlet which would be completely spoilt if there was a large development. I moved from a small but "expanding" village a few years ago because of an increase in muggings, crime and vandalism. We never see a police car here at the moment. We would with all those bored teenagers wandering round with nothing to do. There was recently a quarry here, the grounds need to settle much longer before any building is done.
Wendy Field	With the proposed new Quarry which has been approved against the wishes of the people living locally this will just add to the traffic problems which are going to arise anyway.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H183**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Christine Muir	H183 - See my comments for H181 which equally apply here. There are reasons why people choose to live in a small village and whilst we accept that some housing is necessary to help develop a community this is a huge number of proposed dwellings that will have an unwanted impact on the existing community - new village hall, playing fields, shops, small businesses - it will become an extension of Biggleswade instead of remaining a small village in its own right. It is interesting to note that no housing has been proposed around Southill village, (which has a church, school, pub, post office and shop)and desperately needs to enlarge its community in order sustain these facilities. Broom (which only has two pubs) has been targeted for major housing development which is clearly secondary to Southills needs. Why is this?
Mrs J Hall	This village needs housing for elderly and young, sheltered and low cost. I was born in the village and have seen so many of my friends move out of the village because there is nowhere for them to live because they cant afford the high cost of houses in the village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
No name given	There are still one or two people still registered at Shefford medical practice but as they die or leave area no new patients are able to register, Broom is no longer in the catchment area.
A R Baines	The council owned land at the end of Kings Rd should be developed first for low cost rented and shared ownership housing. There is a need for this type of housing.  This site is quite unsuitable for development.
Alan Eastham	Proposed development is far too big and would irrevocably distort the nature of Broom.
Alastair Cameron	Development here can only put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads, heating oil and electricity supply (no mains gas in village), water supply (already marginal on pressure) and phone/broadband provision (apparently stretched now). Building a large HOUSING ESTATE on this GOOD AGRICULTURAL LAND would be a COMPLETE FOLLY - adding about ONE THIRD AGAIN to the number of DWELLINGS in the village, and a LARGER proportion of INHABITANTS, it would DISRUPT the EXISTING sense of COMMUNITY and SECURITY. The SITE itself is IMPRACTICAL, because the only possible vehicular access would create a FLOOD RISK for properties alongside the residual low part of the site. A CAR PARK (however small, not currently needed) in this vicinity would only EXACERBATE SUCH PROBLEMS, also further OBLITERATING the remaining RURAL aspect of this area, currently seen from existing dwellings of essentially local character, and their associated strips of land along the north edge of the site.

Submitted by	Comments
Alison Palmer	The proposed allocated area for 78 dwellings takes up about a quarter of the village. This is not a sustainable area for building. In Broom we do not have a shop or gas and only about two buses a day. If residents are to use new health facilities in Shefford, private transport is necessary - we cannot walk to Shefford. It is quicker to go to Biggleswade. We do not require a reallocated village hall - our existing hall is fine where it is. Adding more houses will not benefit the village. In fact, can the sewer/drainage system accommodate more dwellings?
B M Twitchin	There is no need for further housing in this small village which has no facilities - no shop, no post office, no school! It needs to remain a small village and should not be spoilt by housing development. Site H185 would be totally unsuitable because of its existing use as farm. On the proposed site is also a contaminated area of the former sewage treatment plant, a stream that is prone to flooding, a large number of mature trees and extensive wildlife such as frogs and great crested newts.
Barbara Spencer	Broom is a small village and would be unsuitable as a site for further development, it has no existing social infrastructure and virtually no public transport links.
Brent Fielder	Wish to object to sites: Site H181 - 48 Dwellings East of Manor Farm. Site H183 - 78 Dwellings - North of Bancroft Avenue Site H184 - 25 Dwellings - South of Southill Road Site H185 - 10 Dwellings North of High Road Site H241 - Unspecified number of dwellings Site H294 - Unspecified number of dwellings - Site E52 - Business/storage or distribution/hotels/residential colleges/college/cycle shop/boat repair/tourism - SIG objects to all of these proposals. My reasons for objecting to H181, H183, H184, h185, h241 and H294 are that Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infra-structure. People here wish to remain a small village. The core -strategy of Mid-Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so. Thank you.
Clifford Fyson	I have further comments about: 1. vehicular access not being adequate; 2. environmental considerations; 3. the detriment to local culture; 4. residents of Broom having suffered enough. These are on an attached sheet.
David and Alison Davies	Believe this number of houses would be extremely detrimental to the village of Broom. We have no existing services, the school would struggle to cope with this number of children. Roads would become more congested. Wildlife and natural surroundings would be changed forever.
David Yates	Broom is a small village completely unsuitable for such development. The infrastructure does not exist to take this capacity. We are not even allowed to have street lights in the village high street to be safe at night, yet 400 odd houses- no problem. I note with interest that messrs Whitbreads do not wish to build any houses near the family seat at Southill or Cardington. Enough said.
Daxa Fyson	I have further comments about 1. Vehicular access being inadequate 2. Environmental considerations 3. Residents of broom having suffered enough 4. The detriment to local culture.

Submitted by	Comments
Denise Clarke	Broom is a small village which is why people live here. There are no facilities, no school, shop, post office, gas, buses, taxis, recreation for kids, nothing really. There is also loads of land already owned by a building company inside the village boundary, this will be built on soon enough without all of these houses. Shuttleworth, who own all of this land also own loads of land in Southill, however the Directors of Shuttleworth live there so want no new houses. Only one house has been built there in the last thirty years. they should build houses in Southill if they want them, at least there is a shop and post office there.
Erica Wark	I strongly object to proposal H183: Broom is a small, quiet, and picturesque village. These plans would alter its character so entirely that the essence of the village would be lost. I notice that there aren't plans to build around the Whitbread estate and Shuttleworth... Frankly it smacks of them wanting to profit from this land, without consideration of the residents of Broom, so long as it does not affect them themselves! The term NIMBY comes to mind... Not In My Back Yard - If they aren't happy to have it in their back yards then what makes it plausible that we would want to tolerate it in ours? The proposed plans would be of detriment to our quality of life and the quality of the countryside. It was stated by Mid-Beds that this would be targeted at large villages, but Broom is a small village! We wish to remain a small village, the changes you have proposed do not take into consideration the desires of the community, nor are they in-keeping with the existing settlement.
Gary Field	Broom, strictly speaking is a hamlet, - not even a small village! It has just three roads to it & one main thoroughfare, no mains gas, no shop, no children's playing areas, negligible public transport. Hardly ideal to think about many new homes or commercial premises, especially with the expansion of the gravel pits increasing heavy traffic. The damage that many new homes or commercial premises would cause to this rural community would be irreversible. I was born and raised in Broom, I hope that the identity of the village is not destroyed before my children grow up.
James Sharp	78 houses would mean a huge percentage increase in the population of a village that would not be able to handle a development of this size. It does not fit in with what the council say are its preferred sites and any plans to build here should be disregarded. Broom cannot be deemed even a minor service centre as there are no services at all. The route in and out will go onto High Street (that won't be able to cope with the extra traffic) and will go past houses whose only outlook is onto the field resulting in an invasion of privacy, a possible reduction in light and an increase in pollution (traffic noise and fumes). The land is prone to flooding and development will only increase the likelihood of flooding proving detrimental to current residents. This agricultural land is experiencing an increase in wildlife now that the quarry to the west of Gypsy Lane is eventually coming to the end of its working life. This position will be reversed if this development goes ahead.
K Tuck	This is a very large development for the size of the village and will take away its status of being a small village. The local school cannot cope with many more pupils and has no room for expansion. Traffic in the village will certainly increase as there are no amenities in the village, which is what most of the villagers prefer, it makes it special and unique. This development will destroy the character of the village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kirk Mallett	We are a small community and any further development of our village will have a vastly negative impact on the locality, countryside and our quality of life. This is not about addressing the need for more affordable housing, but a nice new profit centre for the landowners. No one is fooled.
M Tait	Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe.
M. Franey	I strongly oppose this development for environmental reasons, with the loss of valuable agricultural land and food production
Mr & Mrs I Kermath	Broom is a small village with no local services other than two public houses. There is no infrastructure to support any further development on this scale. Local public transport links are minimal. The village shop was closed some years ago and the nearest shop is now a Tea Room. Everyday shopping requires the use of a car. The nearest lower school is small and located a bus ride away. Large scale development would destroy its tranquil and rural ambience.
Mr & Mrs M Bishop	There is no shop in Broom, No paper deliveries, no school, (Children bussed out for education) No playing area for children... This has been talked about for 30 years. There are no amenities in this village How generous of the landowners to offer land for housing but not for something really useful like a playing field The bus service is infrequent. Anyone moving here would need to work elsewhere to afford it and that would mean more traffic. Expanding Broom by huge amounts is a totally brainless suggestion and shows how greedy people are.
Mr D Rhoden	Under the current Government policy, it is anticipated that all new development sites are to be contained within existing brown field sites and are to be sustainable, along with access to good existing public transport. This site goes against all of the principles listed above. Broom has suffered as a result of the 2 quarries around the village and any proposals will have a significant impact on the whole community. Larger planned sites around Bedfordshire have sufficient capacity to meet the government's housing needs without the further need to destroy the rural countryside.
Mr M Kingsbury	Broom is a small village which is why most people come here to live, we have had one quarry for the last 12 years and now face another 12 years to the south of the village. I do not believe this further development is required or necessary, and will certainly not enhance village life.
Mrs J A Reid	Proposed site is currently used for leisure walking. Building on this site would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and increase traffic.
Mrs J Ablett	I do not think this development would assist the community at all. There is no infrastructure in Broom; there are no local shops or schools and the medical facilities are a bus or car ride away. The public transport links are poor. The access roads in and out of the village are narrow, winding lanes unsuitable for heavy volumes of traffic. The visual impact of this particular development would be detrimental to many villagers and is extremely unwelcome. Broom is a small village and does not have the required infrastructure to support developments of this magnitude.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Boswell	Broom is a small village with a large community spirit. The villagers have been living under the shadow of constant quarrying for years with lots more to come and now consideration is being given to choking us even further with new housing. Give Broom a break ! The proposed site is a wealth of wildlife and it would be disastrous to develop it.
Mrs J Woodward	Good agricultural land lost. People losing jobs. Electricity not able to take extra housing. Sewers not able to take extra housing. Broom village not in Shefford medical centre area.
Mrs K Gordon	Local schools unable to take more pupils and no local facilities for this size development. Any houses would need own transport which is against government wanting people to use local transport.
Mrs R.Anderson	In order for the village to accommodate more houses local amenities need to be greatly improved, i.e. very poor public transport, no local shops, over subscribed GP surgeries, clogged roads at peak times. Broom as a village has already given much more than the surrounding villages when it comes to supporting new houses. It has had 3 estates built and had the quarries, other villages have remained virtually unchanged. What will happen to the well used footpaths that cross most of these sites? Do not agree with such large green areas being used for so many houses and thoroughly disagree with site 7 being used for industrial use.
Mrs Susan Mitchell	I feel that the building of the suggested new housing in this area of Broom will change the whole nature of what is currently a very small village. Existing residents have chosen Broom as a place to live because of its size and quiet location and to impose the proposed building of 78 properties on this site would have a huge negative impact. I strongly object to this proposal.
Mrs. Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mrs.J M Collins	All 78 houses would have to exit Broom via the High Street. 78 dwellings are too many to be built in a small village. Mid Beds core strategy aims to focus development on larger settlements in the district Mid Beds also state they wish to allocate sites for 400 new homes to be built in villages in their area between now and 2026, and they wish to allocate these sites mainly in the larger villages. To be consistent with Mid Beds core strategy a fair share for Broom would be no more than 10 dwellings. This land is a Greenfield site on prime agricultural land, used to grow vegetables. Government policy is that such sites should only be used if brownfield sites can not be found. Developments in world food markets clearly show Britain should be keeping agricultural land for food production.
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.
Paul Scutchings	No regular bus service. So much would have to change to accommodate the amount of houses. It would no longer be a hamlet.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Peter Twitchin	Broom is one of the few small beautiful villages in Bedfordshire which already has had some tasteful developments over the years and the sensitive small expansions have blended in with the original character. The proposals would totally demolish this. There is no infrastructure here to support this - no school, church, shop, post office. H185 has successful farm work vegetable crops. With the current political climate sensitive to wasted air miles and the imperative to buy local crops it would be a disaster to terminate this farmers work - his business is growing too! The stream is prone to flooding which would not be good for building in this area. There are still newts and frogs crowd in H185 and young deer regularly stray into the area.
R A Collins	This is an enormous number of house to put in the small village of Broom and contrary to Mid Beds core strategy. There appears to be no need to replace the existing village hall as suggested. This is a Greenfield site and its use would reduce agricultural production - likely to be needed in the future with world shortages of food and energy.
R Brown	This site will burst the middle of the village - Road will not take traffic.
Sandra Giddings	78 dwellings is almost a third of the size of Broom and will have a significant impact on the village. The village has no local services, the local clinics are already under pressure to cope with Biggleswade and Shefford residents. A new centre in Shefford will still have to cope with the developments planned in its own area. With very limited local transport this development will significantly increase traffic in the village, often at a time when the school children are gathering for the special busses and could pose more danger to them. The village has already lost much of the agricultural surrounding with the ongoing quarry developments and we should preserve and encourage the continued provision of the remaining agricultural land. The financial contribution is meaningless to Broom residents.
The Taylor Family	This site is totally inappropriate and any development would destroy the existing community and environment.
W Scutchings	There is nothing in Broom, no shop, no post office, no school, you need to get in your car to travel anywhere. Very few buses here most families have 2 or 3 cars. It is a very quiet village, most people choose here to live because of the peace and quiet, expanding the village would push many people into moving. Quarry works must settle before anything is done to this land.
Wendy Field	Due to the proposed new Quarry which has been approved despite the objections of the people of Broom this will add to anticipated problems with traffic flow in the vicinity.
Wendy Scutchings	This site has been quarried recently so houses built will sink! Bus services are virtually non existent so there will be more cars on the road. In a quiet village area there will definitely be a lot more noise.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H184**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Egar	The site provides fro a village bypass with no access for new traffic to access the centres of the village which will bring tremendous benefits to the village which with other benefits is a sustainable benefit Parish Council agree with the principle of bypass but not the too many house but as by pass developer funded great benefit to the district and local community.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A R Baines	I would agree with this development conditional on a southern bypass.
M. Franey	Whilst I strongly oppose all the other sites listed for development in Broom, this site will have least detrimental impact on the character of the village.
Mrs J Hall	I think any of these small sites should be used for housing.
R Brown	This area maybe small businesses.

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
Alastair Cameron	Development here, even with a desirable bypass route, could put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads (which will be negatively impacted by Broom South Quarry traffic in the future, anyway), heating oil delivery lorries and electricity supply (since there is no mains gas in the village to share the energy needs provision), water supply (which is already marginal on pressure) and telephone/broadband provision (also apparently stretched already). A new Village Hall as mooted would take this social facility out of the heart of the village to a less desirable location, risking reduced usage, and a recreation ground on the northern fringe is unlikely to draw children away from the traditional village green area (near most of their homes). A financial contribution to the Old Warden Conservation Management Plan would not be likely to do much, if anything, for Broom residents; a poor sop.
Alison Palmer	In Broom we do not have a shop or gas and only about two buses a day. If residents are to use new health facilities in Shefford, private transport is necessary - we cannot walk to Shefford. It is quicker to go to Biggleswade. We do not require a new village hall - our existing hall is fine where it is. Adding more houses will not benefit the village. In fact, can the sewer/drainage system accommodate more dwellings?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
B M Twitchin	There is no need for further housing in this small village which has no facilities - no shop, no post office, no school! It needs to remain a small village and should not be spoilt by housing development. Site H185 would be totally unsuitable because of its existing use as farm. On the proposed site is also a contaminated area of the former sewage treatment plant, a stream that is prone to flooding, a large number of mature trees and extensive wildlife such as frogs and great crested newts.
Barbara Spencer	Broom is a small village and would be unsuitable as a site for further development, it has no existing social infrastructure and virtually no public transport links.
David and Alison Davies	Feel the village will be changed altogether. Currently no services. School is a bus trip away and would need to be extended - again lack of space to do so. Congestion would increase due to the number of houses being proposed. Wildlife and natural look of village would be changed forever.
Denise Clarke	Broom is a small village which is why people live here. There are no facilities, no school, shop, post office, gas, buses, taxis, recreation for kids, nothing really. There is also loads of land already owned by a building company inside the village boundary, this will be built on soon enough without all of these houses. Shuttleworth, who own all of this land also own loads of land in Southill, however the Directors of Shuttleworth live there so want no new houses. Only one house has been built there in the last thirty years. They should build houses in Southill if they want them, at least there is a shop and post office there. The bypass would be okay if Shuttleworth, who have made £250 million out of the gravel taken from Broom would pay for it themselves but no, they demand payment in the form of houses to make yet more profit from our little village.
Erica Wark	I strongly object to proposal H184: Broom is a small, quiet, and picturesque village. These plans would alter its character so entirely that the essence of the village would be lost. I notice that there aren't plans to build around the Whitbread estate and Shuttleworth... Frankly it smacks of them wanting to profit from this land, without consideration of the residents of Broom, so long as it does not affect them themselves! The term NIMBY comes to mind... Not In My Back Yard - If they aren't happy to have it in their back yards then what makes it plausible that we would want to tolerate it in ours? The proposed plans would be of detriment to our quality of life and the quality of the countryside. It was stated by Mid-Beds that this would be targeted at large villages, but Broom is a small village! We wish to remain a small village, the changes you have proposed do not take into consideration the desires of the community, nor are they in-keeping with the existing settlement.
K Tuck	This a rural part of the village and any building will destroy the landscape as it is now. I feel the proposed bypass/relief road will not easily resolve the traffic and dangers this development will cause.
M Dempsey	This proposal along with H294 and H241 were rejected by the village many years ago. When the Whitbread estate had plans drawn. As there are now no facilities such as a shop or school the proposal to double the size of the village was seen as unacceptable to the residents of Broom

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
M Tait	Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe.
Martin Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mr & Mrs M Bishop	There is no shop in Broom, No paper deliveries, no school, (Children bussed out for education) No playing area for children... This has been talked about for 30 years. There are no amenities in this village How generous of the landowners to offer land for housing but not for something really useful like a playing field The bus service is infrequent. Anyone moving here would need to work elsewhere to afford it and that would mean more traffic. Expanding Broom by huge amounts is a totally brainless suggestion and shows how greedy people are.
Mr M Kingsbury	Broom is a small village which is why most people come here to live, we have had one quarry for the last 12 years and now face another 12 years to the south of the village. I do not believe this further development is required or necessary, and will certainly not enhance village life.
Mr S Ablett	This development would not enhance or assist the community of Broom in any way, shape or form. The offer of a bypass is merely a sweetener as there are concerns regarding speeding through the village, which could be addressed by a lower speed limit in the village. The promise of a bypass would not be possible on the building of just 25 houses, and would require considerably more (100+) to make it financially viable to the developer. It is too high a price to pay. Broom is a small village and a development of this magnitude is unnecessary and not conducive to the environment. If Broom householders wanted to live in a town they'd have bought a property there and not in a picturesque country village!
Mrs K Gordon	This is a small village the pastures provide local residents with grazing without having to travel long distances.
Mrs. Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mrs. J M Collins	This site has clearly been proposed in collaboration with site H241. Together the 2 sites would provide space for far more houses than it is reasonable to build in a small village. Mid Beds core strategy aims to focus development on larger settlements in the district Mid Beds also state they wish to allocate sites for 400 new homes to be built in villages in their area between now and 2026, and they wish to allocate these sites mainly in the larger villages. To be consistent with Mid Beds core strategy a fair share for Broom would be no more than 10 dwellings. I would not object to 5 or 6 dwellings on this site close to the existing Southill road. This land is a Greenfield site on prime agricultural land, used to grow vegetables. Government policy is that such sites should only be used if brownfield sites can not be found. Developments in world food markets clearly show Britain should be keeping agricultural land for food production.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.
Paul Scutchings	Not enough infrastructure to accommodate all these families
Peter Twitchin	Broom is one of the few small beautiful villages in Bedfordshire which already has had some tasteful developments over the years and the sensitive small expansions have blended in with the original character. The proposals would totally demolish this. There is no infrastructure here to support this - no school, church, shop, post office. H185 has successful farm work vegetable crops. With the current political climate sensitive to wasted air miles and the imperative to buy local crops it would be a disaster to terminate this farmers work - his business is growing too! The stream is prone to flooding which would not be good for building in this area. There are still newts and frogs crowd in H185 and young deer regularly stray into the area.
R A Collins	This is a major extension of Broom village to the south and a large number of house to put in the small village of Broom, hence contrary to Mid Beds core strategy. This is a Greenfield site and its use would reduce agricultural production - likely to be needed in the future with world shortages of food and energy.
Sandra Giddings	The benefit of a southern by-pass is dubious since it is likely still to require traffic to cross the lvel at Jordans Mill, therefore increased traffic will cause additional problems here and at whatever junction is used to access the Shefford Road. The addition of 25 homes to the village of Broom will have an adverse impact and add to the traffic issues increasing cars and pollution, since Broom has no facilities and only limited public transport. The land is existing agricultural land and should remain so, especially given eth proposed quarry south of this area.
The Taylor Family	This site is totally inappropriate for development and would destroy the existing community and environment.

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
Alastair Cameron	Development here, even with a desirable bypass route, could put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads (which will be negatively impacted by Broom South Quarry traffic in the future, anyway), heating oil delivery lorries and electricity supply (since there is no mains gas in the village to share the energy needs provision), water supply (which is already marginal on pressure) and telephone/broadband provision (also apparently stretched already). A new Village Hall as mooted would take this social facility out of the heart of the village to a less desirable location, risking reduced usage, and a recreation ground on the northern fringe is unlikely to draw children away from the traditional village green area (near most of their homes). A financial contribution to the Old Warden Conservation Management Plan would not be likely to do much, if anything, for Broom residents; a poor sop.
Mrs J A Reid	The only positive thing about development on these sites is the provision of a relief road if this means traffic bypasses the village centre. It should also be considered that Broom village will be being subjected to another big gravel quarry to the south if this site is developed.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H185**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Hall	These small sites could be used for the elderly or young people to mix the inhabitants of the village so they could look after each other.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A R Baines	I could accept this modest development.
Georgina Grummit	I cannot think that to put a new village hall at the north of the village away from the centre is a good idea. The centre of the village is where the green is and that's where it should stay. As for a few houses it is not a bad place for a very small development.

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
Alastair Cameron	Development here can only put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads (which will be negatively impacted by Broom South Quarry traffic in the future, anyway), heating oil delivery lorries and electricity supply (since there is no mains gas in the village to share the energy needs provision), water supply (which is already marginal on pressure) and telephone/broadband provision (also apparently stretched already). A new Village Hall as mooted would take this social facility out of the heart of the village to a less desirable location, risking reduced usage, and a recreation ground on the northern fringe is unlikely to draw children away from the traditional village green area (near most of their homes). A financial contribution to the Old Warden Conservation Management Plan would not be likely to do much, if anything, for Broom residents; a poor sop.
Allan Butcher	This is a small farm, building works would destroy valuable land used for growing necessary crops.
B M Twitchin	There is no need for further housing in this small village which has no facilities - no shop, no post office, no school! It needs to remain a small village and should not be spoilt by housing development. Site H185 would be totally unsuitable because of its existing use as farm. On the proposed site is also a contaminated area of the former sewage treatment plant, a stream that is prone to flooding, a large number of mature trees and extensive wildlife such as frogs and great crested newts.
Barbara Spencer	Broom is a small village and would be unsuitable as a site for further development, it has no existing social infrastructure and virtually no public transport links.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Brigitte Twitchin	This site should not be developed as it would mean the closure of the existing farm. There are a great number of trees on the site which should not be cut down. The site is prone to flooding and contains also an old contaminated site. Apart from that a number of Great Crested Newts have been spotted in the area.
Claire Littlechild	A beautiful village .after already being aggravated buy recent quarry works I feel that we do not need the extra facilities in broom and that this site or any other in broom is not appropriate. People have chosen to live in this village because of the size of it and how it stands today.
David Yates	Talk of a recreation area here is ludicrous. The land to the north of the village is far too near the quarry workings to be considered safe for children.
Denise Clarke	Broom is a small village which is why people live here. There are no facilities, no school, shop, post office, gas, buses, taxis, recreation for kids, nothing really. There is also loads of land already owned by a building company inside the village boundary, this will be built on soon enough without all of these houses. Shuttleworth, who own all of this land also own loads of land in Southill, however the Directors of Shuttleworth live there so want no new houses. Only one house has been built there in the last thirty years. They should build houses in Southill if they want them, at least there is a shop and post office there. Also the loss of yet more agricultural land.
Erica Wark	I strongly object to proposal H185: Broom is a small, quiet, and picturesque village. These plans would alter its character so entirely that the essence of the village would be lost. I notice that there aren't plans to build around the Whitbread estate and Shuttleworth... Frankly it smacks of them wanting to profit from this land, without consideration of the residents of Broom, so long as it does not affect them themselves! The term NIMBY comes to mind... Not In My Back Yard - If they aren't happy to have it in their back yards then what makes it plausible that we would want to tolerate it in ours? The proposed plans would be of detriment to our quality of life and the quality of the countryside. It was stated by Mid-Beds that this would be targeted at large villages, but Broom is a small village! We wish to remain a small village, the changes you have proposed do not take into consideration the desires of the community, nor are they in-keeping with the existing settlement.
M Franey	I strongly oppose this development for environmental reasons, with the loss of valuable agricultural land and food production.
M Tait	Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe.
Martin Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Miss K Gilbert	Group business growing high quality vegetables in family for 3 generations Contains sewage pumping station and previous system Stream floods in times of heavy rain

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr E.G. Davies	This site is totally unsuitable for the following reasons a) It contains the current Broom sewage pumping station. b) It contains the contaminated site of the previous sprinkler system and drying beds. c) It is traversed by the Broom Village stream which drains the fields and road all the way from Stanford then through High Street. This is prone to flooding. d) It devours sections of a Public Bridleway and a Public Footpath. e) It is the business centre of the Jordan family vegetable growing and packing business who have cropped this land for over 80 years. f) It is the staging post and environmental Nature Reserve for wild animals numerous species of birds and amphibians (toads, frogs and newts) some of which are protected under EU LAW! It has to compensate for all the field hedges destroyed by the quarrying. The Council own unused development land at the end of Kings Road which can accommodate Broom's future housing needs.
Mr M Kingsbury	Broom is a small village which is why most people come here to live, we have had one quarry for the last 12 years and now face another 12 years to the south of the village. I do not believe this further development is required or necessary, and will certainly not enhance village life.
Mr Paul Burns	Broom is a small village with no shops Etc. to support significant extra housing. There is an area already owned by council at the end of Kings Road which would allow about 10 houses within the existing village lines. The number of houses identified would change the village outlook, add significant traffic to the three main roads to the village. Site 4 behind us is currently a small farm track with natural woods and a stream that runs to the quarry being turned into a nature area. The houses would mean the removal of the woods and stream and also close the farm which has been farmed by the same family for some three generations.
Mr Rondel	This site is a contaminated site. It is a business centre for the Jordon family who have farmed this area for many years. It's also a nature reserve containing wild animals, i.e. deer, fox, squirrels etc and numerous species of birds, toads, frogs and great crested newts protected by law.
Mr, & Mrs. Rondel	There are other areas in Broom for housing that will not interfere with the residents of Broom. The kings Road is Ideal for further housing, and has all the facilities. water, electricity, and sewage pipes. I strongly object to houses being built at the rear of my property, as it would deny me of the view of the country side from my windows. I moved here from the City of London to escape the pollution, because I have a heart condition, and am receiving medical treatment. I am sure that if building were to commence behind my house, it would make my condition worse.
Mrs Beth Burns	Broom is a small village with no shops Etc. to support significant extra housing. There is an area already owned by council at the end of Kings Road which would allow about 10 houses within the existing village lines. The number of houses identified would change the village outlook, add significant traffic to the three main roads to the village. Site 4 behind us is currently a small farm track with natural woods and a stream that runs to the quarry being turned into a nature area. The houses would mean the removal of the woods and stream and also close the farm which has been farmed by the same family for some three generations. Poor bus service not able to cope with influx of people.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs C M Cernik	Broom village has very little lighting, no gas, no shop, no school or church. We have no local services. This site is totally inappropriate for housing development. Too many children would have to be bussed into schools when we should be encouraging people/pupils to walk to school.
Mrs I Munro	The council owns development land at the end of Kings Road which is adequate for Brooms need.
Mrs J A Reid	Proposed site is currently used for leisure walking. Building on this site would have a detrimental effect on the local environment and increase traffic.
Mrs J Ablett	Quite simply, Broom does not need any more houses, and certainly not developments of this magnitude. It does not have the infrastructure and public transport facilities to cope with vast amounts of new houses.
Mrs J M Collins	The benefits mentioned in this submission will only be provided if much larger proposals in Broom by the same landowner are accepted. This small site will contribute little to such benefits. If this site is used for housing, the Shuttleworth agricultural tenant who has farmed in this area for two generations will be left with land ideal for growing vegetables, but nowhere to store tractors or wash the crops before sending them to market. He says he will be unable to pay the cost of replacing the barn which is on the proposed building site. This proposal is likely to result in the adjacent land being lost to agricultural production and agricultural employment being lost. I feel this is against the government policy that agricultural land should not be used for housing until brownfield sites in the area have been used.
Mrs K M Davies	Site includes: Broom pumping station. Contaminated site of previous sewage sprinkler system and drying beds. Broom village drainage stream which floods at least 4 gardens summer and winter after heavy rain. Contains 4 agricultural buildings - one a very large cleaning and packing shed and is the hub of the Jordan family business. It is also an environmental nature reserve with amphibians some of which are protected by the law!
Mrs. D. Weston	The area includes 1. A highly productive vegetable enterprise; 2. Broom Sewage works and the demolished old sprinkler system and drying beds recorded as a contaminated site; 3. The main Broom drainage stream which floods; 4. A public bridle path; 5. It is an Environmental Nature Reserve full of amphibious, wild animals and numerous species of birds; 6. The council own land in Kings Road which should be very adequate for Brooms future housing needs.
Mrs. Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Peter Twitchin	Broom is one of the few small beautiful villages in Bedfordshire which already has had some tasteful developments over the years and the sensitive small expansions have blended in with the original character. The proposals would totally demolish this. There is no infrastructure here to support this - no school, church, shop, post office. H185 has successful farm work vegetable crops. With the current political climate sensitive to wasted air miles and the imperative to buy local crops it would be a disaster to terminate this farmers work - his business is growing too! The stream is prone to flooding which would not be good for building in this area. There are still newts and frogs crowd in H185 and young deer regularly stray into the area.
R A Collins	Broom is a small village and 10 dwellings is too many to add without changing the character. It is disproportionate to the total number needed in small villages, and contrary to Mid Beds core strategy. There has previously been a sewage works on this site so it is likely to be contaminated. This is an agricultural site and would eliminate the farm buildings of the current tenant farmer, destroying his livelihood and stopping market gardening production over a larger area than the site alone.
R Brown	Village hall out of village, will be vandalised. Recreation area to near lake.
The Taylor Family	This site is totally inappropriate for development and would destroy the existing community and environment.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H241**

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

Submitted by	Comments
M Egar	Strong need to support this development proposal because : Take traffic out of village with new road. Return village green to traditional safe and quiet area for recreation. Sustainable development. Land take is mainly not productive. Massive community benefits at no cost to the community or council. Will lead to improved local transport and facilities. Provide a shop ,none exits at present. Provide more support for exiting Village hall and pubs. Village has very good access to main road system and railways with short travel distance. Four land owners providing land and supporting proposals.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A R Baines	I could accept this development conditional on a southern bypass.
Alastair Cameron	Development here, even with a desirable bypass route, could only put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads (which will be negatively impacted by Broom South Quarry traffic in the future, anyway), heating oil delivery lorries and electricity supply (since there is no mains gas in the village to share the energy needs provision), water supply (which is already marginal on pressure) and telephone/broadband provision (also apparently stretched already). A new Village Hall as mooted would take this social facility out of the heart of the village to a less desirable location, risking reduced usage, and a recreation ground on the northern fringe is unlikely to draw children away from the traditional village green area (near most of their homes). A financial contribution to the Old Warden Conservation Management Plan would not be likely to do much, if anything, for Broom residents; a poor sop.
R Brown	This area maybe small businesses.

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
Barbara Spencer	Broom is a small village and would be unsuitable as a site for further development, it has no existing social infrastructure and virtually no public transport links.
Brent Fielder	My reasons for objecting are that Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infra-structure. People here wish to remain a small village. The core -strategy of Mid-Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Christine Muir	H 241 - To use the word by-pass is misleading. The only way to by-pass Broom would be to build a new road west to east from the B658 and take it right through to exit onto the Langford Road. If this relief road comes in or out of the new development anywhere else along Southill Road (as proposed) it will necessitate a proper junction and purpose built cycle paths and pavements for safe access and will still cause additional traffic to pass through the village (more danger/speed) on what is already a busy rush-hour cut-through to the A1. The by-pass should be described as an access road. If there are to be dwellings on the south side of Broom then this road should not become yet another dangerous rat run for speeding drivers.
David Yates	Talk of this development is out of keeping with the area. Broom has suffered more than most with local quarrying. Building a relief road would lead to even further housing plans. Before we know it we will not be a small village but a suburb of Biggleswade.
Denise Clarke	Broom is a small village which is why people live here. There are no facilities, no school, shop, post office, gas, buses, taxis, recreation for kids, nothing really. There is also loads of land already owned by a building company inside the village boundary, this will be built on soon enough without all of these houses. Shuttleworth, who own all of this land also own loads of land in Southill, however the Directors of Shuttleworth live there so want no new houses. Only one house has been built there in the last thirty years. They should build houses in Southill if they want them, at least there is a shop and post office there. The bypass would be okay if Shuttleworth, who have made £250 million out of the gravel taken from Broom would pay for it themselves but no, they demand payment in the form of houses to make yet more profit from our little village.
Erica Wark	I strongly object to proposal H241: Broom is a small, quiet, and picturesque village. These plans would alter its character so entirely that the essence of the village would be lost. I notice that there aren't plans to build around the Whitbread estate and Shuttleworth... Frankly it smacks of them wanting to profit from this land, without consideration of the residents of Broom, so long as it does not affect them themselves! The term NIMBY comes to mind... Not In My Back Yard - If they aren't happy to have it in their back yards then what makes it plausible that we would want to tolerate it in ours? The proposed plans would be of detriment to our quality of life and the quality of the countryside. It was stated by Mid-Beds that this would be targeted at large villages, but Broom is a small village! We wish to remain a small village, the changes you have proposed do not take into consideration the desires of the community, nor are they in-keeping with the existing settlement.
Georgina Grummitt	There are so few villages left unspoilt by too much new housing also too few villages with meadows that are still in use, also lost income for the farmers which will also lose out because of all the gravel working that are going on all around Broom.
John Barker	Living in Broom Fard Yard (Southill Road) we will be totally envelopped. I see nothing for Southill - Stanford Road has housing one side only - build on the other side.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Palmer	We do not need retail usage or a bypass road. No new dwellings means no need for bypass! In Broom we do not have a shop or gas and only about two buses a day. We do not require a new village hall - our existing hall is fine where it is. Adding more houses will not benefit the village. In fact, can the sewer/drainage system accommodate more dwellings?
K Tuck	This covers a large hectare of land and will inevitably be too large a development for such a small, rural village. The specification of a small employment usage will not have any positive impact on the village. The proposed bypass/relief road will not easily resolve the traffic problems and dangers this development will cause. The local school cannot cope with any further intake.
M Tait	Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe.
M. Franey	I thoroughly oppose this development on environmental grounds.
Martin Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mr & Mrs M Biishop	There is no shop in Broom, No paper deliveries, no school, (Children bused out for education). No playing area for children... This has been talked about for 30 years. There are no amenities in this village. How generous of the landowners to offer land for housing but not for something really useful like a playing field. The bus service is infrequent. Anyone moving here would need to work elsewhere to afford it and that would mean more traffic. Expanding Broom by huge amounts is a totally brainless suggestion and shows how greedy people are.
Mr M Kingsbury	Broom is a small village which is why most people come here to live, we have had one quarry for the last 12 years and now face another 12 years to the south of the village. I do not believe this further development is required or necessary, and will certainly not enhance village life.
Mrs J Woodward	Lack of sufficient electricity and sewer. Without considerable upheaval for the rest of the village - close proximity to proposed gravel extraction - both noise and dust blown in by prevailing wind (south-south west)
Mrs. Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs. J M Collins	This site, clearly proposed in collaboration with site H184, would provide far more housing than is reasonable to build in a small village. Mid Beds core strategy aims to focus development on larger settlements in the district Mid Beds wish to allocate sites for 400 new homes to be built in villages in their area between now and 2026, and to allocate these sites mainly in the larger villages. To be consistent with Mid Beds core strategy a fair share for Broom would be no more than 10 dwellings. The developer funded bypass promised in this proposal will only be needed if a large number of houses are built in Broom. The parents in the village have expressed doubts about the suitability and safety of a playing field in an area at the edge of the village. This land is a Greenfield site on prime agricultural land. Government policy is that such sites should only be used if brownfield sites can not be found. Britain needs agricultural land for food production.
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.
Paul Scutchings	Not enough infrastructure to accommodate all these families.
Peter Hitchin	Broom is one of the few small beautiful villages in Bedfordshire which already has had some tasteful developments over the years and the sensitive small expansions have blended in with the original character. The proposals would totally demolish this. There is no infrastructure here to support this - no school, church, shop, post office. H185 has successful farm work vegetable crops. With the current political climate sensitive to wasted air miles and the imperative to buy local crops it would be a disaster to terminate this farmers work - his business is growing too! The stream is prone to flooding which would not be good for building in this area. There are still newts and frogs crowd in H185 and young deer regularly stray into the area.
R Brown	This scheme has been tried before and was voted out and is still a rubbish idea. Road and houses NO.
Sandra Giddings	A bypass may cause additional problems as the river crosses the lvel at Jordans mill and may increase traffic along Gypsy lane. The proposed retail unit is unspecified, and may in itself create additional traffic issues and parking problems depending on its size. Too small and it will not survive (example Southill stores post office) and too big and it will create traffic issues. Broom is unlikely to be able to support an outlet regardless of its size without adversely affecting either Southill or Caldecot stores. Small employment use requires clarification - this may adversely affect the nature of this quiet residential village.
The Taylor Family	This site is totally inappropriate for development and would destroy the existing community and environment.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Allan Butcher	Broom is a small village this planned expansion would destroy it for ever. If this was specified as no more than 10 houses and the Barn converted into apartments than this would be acceptable.
Mrs J A Reid	The only positive thing about development on these sites is the provision of a relief road if this means traffic bypasses the village centre. It should also be considered that Broom village will be being subjected to another big gravel quarry to the south if this site is developed.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H294**

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

Submitted by	Comments
MS Egar	Relief road will return village to tranquil centre which will benefit the village and community . Last Parish council meeting supported principle of relief road but they did not agree on number of house for funding of bypass so objected. Will bring many benefits is sustainable and should be supported.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A R Baines	Would accept conditional on southern bypass.
Alastair Cameron	Development here, even with a desirable bypass route, could only put more strain on essential infrastructure - local rural roads (which will be negatively impacted by Broom South Quarry traffic in the future, anyway), heating oil delivery lorries and electricity supply (since there is no mains gas in the village to share the energy needs provision), water supply (which is already marginal on pressure) and telephone/broadband provision (also apparently stretched already). A new Village Hall as mooted would take this social facility out of the heart of the village to a much less desirable location, risking reduced usage, and a recreation ground on the northern fringe is unlikely to draw children away from the traditional village green area (near most of their homes). A financial contribution to the Old Warden Conservation Management Plan would not be likely to do much, if anything, for Broom residents; a poor sop.
Allan Butcher	This is the only possible site that I could see being of no huge negative affect on the Village.
K Tuck	This small area of land would not spoil the character and status of a small village.
R Brown	This area maybe small businesses.

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
B M Twitchin	There is no need for further housing in this small village which has no facilities - no shop, no post office, no school! It needs to remain a small village and should not be spoilt by housing development. Site H185 would be totally unsuitable because of its existing use as farm. On the proposed site is also a contaminated area of the former sewage treatment plant, a stream that is prone to flooding, a large number of mature trees and extensive wildlife such as frogs and great crested newts.
Barbara Spencer	Broom is a small village and would be unsuitable as a site for further development, it has no existing social infrastructure and virtually no public transport links.

Submitted by	Comments
Brent Fielder	My reasons for objecting are that Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infra-structure. People here wish to remain a small village. The core -strategy of Mid-Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Christine Muir	H 294 - Children in recreational areas need supervision and the proposed site is not overlooked by housing. Could this pose a danger to youngsters who will use these facilities? A pedestrian/cycle access (though welcome) will not stop traffic cutting through the village to reach the A1. The pub will be noisier & car parking for residents in Southill Road more difficult. This road has no street lights, no speed humps no traffic calmers and little noise and light pollution. If these have to be considered due to the enlargement of the population the whole ethos of the village will change. TARMAC has already earmarked a large site to the south of Broom for the continuation of gravel extraction - noise and dust, more lorries and mud on the roads and an eyesore for the community. Coupled with the housing and employment proposals please consider what the present residents of Broom will have to endure in the years to come.
David Yates	Broom is a small village, it has suffered enough. No no no no no.
Denise Clarke	Broom is a small village which is why people live here. There are no facilities, no school, shop, post office, gas, buses, taxis, recreation for kids, nothing really. There is also loads of land already owned by a building company inside the village boundary, this will be built on soon enough without all of these houses. Shuttleworth, who own all of this land also own loads of land in Southill, however the Directors of Shuttleworth live there so want no new houses. Only one house has been built there in the last thirty years. They should build houses in Southill if they want them, at least there is a shop and post office there. The bypass would be okay if Shuttleworth, who have made £250 million out of the gravel taken from Broom would pay for it themselves but no, they demand payment in the form of houses to make yet more profit from our little village.
Erica Wark	I strongly object to proposal H294: Broom is a small, quiet, and picturesque village. These plans would alter its character so entirely that the essence of the village would be lost. I notice that there aren't plans to build around the Whitbread estate and Shuttleworth... Frankly it smacks of them wanting to profit from this land, without consideration of the residents of Broom, so long as it does not affect them themselves! The term NIMBY comes to mind... Not In My Back Yard - If they aren't happy to have it in their back yards then what makes it plausible that we would want to tolerate it in ours? The proposed plans would be of detriment to our quality of life and the quality of the countryside. It was stated by Mid-Beds that this would be targeted at large villages, but Broom is a small village! We wish to remain a small village, the changes you have proposed do not take into consideration the desires of the community, nor are they in-keeping with the existing settlement.
John Palmer	We do not need a community centre - we have an adequate village hall where it is, in the centre of Broom. How does this relief road work with only pedestrian access to centre - will there be two half to the village? Adding more houses will not benefit the village. In fact, can the sewer/drainage system accommodate more dwellings?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
M Tait	Broom is a small village with no local services - shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas. Public transport is poor, and roads from the village towards Biggleswade (for existing facilities) are narrow, and considered by many residents as unsafe.
M. Franey	I thoroughly oppose this development on environmental grounds.
Martin Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.
Mr M Kingsbury	Broom is a small village which is why most people come here to live, we have had one quarry for the last 12 years and now face another 12 years to the south of the village. I do not believe this further development is required or necessary, and will certainly not enhance village life.
Mrs J Ablett	Small village, no infrastructure to support. No local school. No local shops. Poor public transport. The small village of Broom does not have the capacity to take a housing development of this magnitude, and the promise of a developer-funded bypass to alleviate traffic in the village is too high a price to pay for the size of the development planned. In order to make this financially viable the development would need to be some 100+ houses and this would substantially increase the local population. Public transport links to local towns are poor - 1 bus every 2 hours which is insufficient to support increased housing. This developer could have assisted in reducing the carbon footprint by offering land in Southill which has a shop and school.
Mrs J M Collins	This is part of site H241, and could not offer any of the benefits mentioned in this submission unless it is part of the larger site. This site, clearly proposed in collaboration with site H184, would provide far more housing than is reasonable to build in a small village. Mid Beds core strategy aims to focus development on larger settlements in the district Mid Beds wish to allocate sites for 400 new homes to be built in villages in their area between now and 2026, and to allocate these sites mainly in the larger villages. To be consistent with Mid Beds core strategy a fair share for Broom would be no more than 10 dwellings. The developer funded bypass promised in this proposal will only be needed if a large number of houses are built in Broom. The parents in the village have expressed doubts about the suitability and safety of a playing field in an area at the edge of the village.
Mrs J Woodward	Lack of sufficient electricity and sewer. Without considerable upheaval for the rest of the village - close proximity to proposed gravel extraction - both noise and dust blown in by prevailing wind (south-south west). Broom residents no longer able to register with Sheffort PCT, village out of catchment area. People are registered at the moment but doctors will not visit village and will not take on new patients.
Mrs. Filkins	Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infrastructure. Residents here wish Broom to remain a small village. The core strategy of Mid Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages, Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.
Paul Scutchings	Not enough infrastructure to accommodate all these families.
Peter Hitchin	Broom is one of the few small beautiful villages in Bedfordshire which already has had some tasteful developments over the years and the sensitive small expansions have blended in with the original character. The proposals would totally demolish this. There is no infrastructure here to support this - no school, church, shop, post office. H185 has successful farm work vegetable crops. With the current political climate sensitive to wasted air miles and the imperative to buy local crops it would be a disaster to terminate this farmers work - his business is growing too! The stream is prone to flooding which would not be good for building in this area. There are still newts and frogs crowd in H185 and young deer regularly stray into the area.
S P	The development proposed for Broom seems to go against the aims of the mid beds housing plan i.e. developing in the large village/town areas rather than spoiling the character of smaller villages. This level of development would change the character of Broom completely.
Sandra Giddings	Relies on a bypass being built which will create its own problems wherever it meets the Shefford road to the west and its junction on the East. Relies on additional development proposals to provide employment and it is unclear how they would impact traffic. The number of homes is unspecified - depending on the type of housing it could have an adverse effect on the village. There is no clear commitment on what would be developed.
The Taylor Family	This site is totally inappropriate for development and would destroy the existing community and environment.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J A Reid	The only positive thing about development on these sites is the provision of a relief road if this means traffic bypasses the village centre. It should also be considered that Broom village will be being subjected to another big gravel quarry to the south if this site is developed.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H349**

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 Alan Eastham	I have understood for some time that the applicants have outline approval for one new dwelling to the west side of 8 High Road. Is this new proposal substitutional or additional?

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 E G & Mrs K M Davies	This site is on the extreme edge of Broom - a very small village and outside the existing settlement envelope. Almost a third of the proposed area - that facing High Road is part of a continuous corridor of mature spectrum trees and falls within the Broom Hall Tree Preservation Order - not one of these environmentally necessary trees should be surrendered to a developer. The area therefore not involved with trees would only sensibly be suitable for one dwelling.
Mrs Alison Davies	Whilst the number of houses is low, reason being the number of trees in the vicinity. The area provides great screening for the field behind it. The trees have been there for many many years and we would lose a mature coppice/woodland environment. Whilst the quarry is planting trees, these will take years to mature and is it necessary to take down even more trees just to build 3 houses? I feel that these houses are just an infill, will not be part of the village feel as they will be quite isolated from the rest of village. The houses along that road already feel slightly disjointed from the main village.
Mrs Brigitte Twitchin	I strongly object to the development on this site as it would require the felling of a large number of mature trees in order to gain access to the site. This area houses a large variety of wildlife and should not be destroyed.
Mrs June Ablett	Having objected to the other sites originally put forward for Broom, I cannot accept that this proposal is any different. Permission has already been granted for this landowner to build a new house on his land and there was no mention of this new development when permission was sought. The village is not equipped to keep expanding in this way. This new piece of land was not in the original plans put forward by landowners in the first consultation process and is I feel therefore trying to sneak in the back door as many residents will be unaware of these new proposals.
Wendy Field	Why is all the proposed new housing concentrated on Broom which has already contributed greatly to the extra housing needed via previous expansion and have had to endure the gravel pits which contribute to the raw materials needed in the whole of the area. We have no shop, no Post Office, dreadful public transport etc. Why no proposals for Southill or the rest of the parish?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: E49**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs. J M Collins	Traffic has been quite heavy around this site on some weekends when the woods have been used for their present leisure activities. Nearly all users of the woods arrive by car as there is little public transport, possibly none on Sundays. I feel any development here needs to be quite small and the highways dept. needs to look carefully at the traffic implications. Local teenagers lack leisure facilities and I would like to see this site provide suitable affordable outdoor activities for local families and teenagers.
R A Collins	This site is already extensively used for leisure activities and the provision of formal car parking and toilets sound like a good idea, and could prevent current problems with parking on verges, etc.
Rob Gatward	If used to provide improved or additional leisure facilities in mid beds in sympathy with this wooded area then this would be a good idea.

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

Submitted by	Comments
A R Baines	This site is already causing some annoying problems to local residents.
Graham Bellamy	If done sensitively with good habitat creation and management for biodiversity this could work.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Barbara Spencer	If developed this site would alter the small village of Broom unrecognisably it would join the village of Upper Caldecote to Broom. There is no existing social infrastructure to support the development.
Deborah Smart	Seems crazy to make jobs in a wood. How about jobs in the local towns and villages? I take my dogs walking in the woods and don't want to see the local habitat and peace destroyed wilfully. One shop? Then what?
Elliot Smart	This is the countryside, full of wildlife. Seems inappropriate place to have employment opportunities, even if they are limited to cafeteria and shop - where will it all stop? No-one locally uses the bike tracks. Since they arrived we stop to play in the woods.
Jason Haines	This is a quiet, woodland site, used by cyclists and walkers. The downhill race tracks are disrupting legitimate walkers and cyclists in this otherwise quiet area. Walkers are being pushed out by more aggressive downhill cycling activity. This site ought to be used for quiet recreational walking and relaxation, as it was before the introduction of the downhill cycling tracks.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
M Forster	Development of this site would, in my opinion, worsen an already difficult situation with parking of vehicles on narrow roads and increasing traffic at a dangerous junction. Without major investment in the highway i.e. provision of a roundabout, further development will lead to fatalities. The woodland is already subject to overuse and littering at weekends in particular, devastating what was once a beautiful natural area.
M. Franey	I strongly oppose the destruction of this woodland site.
Megan Smart	It is a wood. Leave it as a wood please. Don't give any more reasons for people from all over the country to visit this place for riding a bike over dangerous jumps. They are polluting the atmosphere, generating rubbish and calling the ambulance service every weekend.
Mrs M Hall	Presently the hundreds of users do not bring added income to the area as they do not support the local shops/pubs etc. In my opinion only toilet facilities should be provided in the existing Sandy Lane car park near to where families picnic and advert type signs sited to direct users to the nearby local village amenities for food etc. This small woodland should not be made even smaller but adding "urban" facilities. Also Rowney Warren backs onto Haynes & Shefford so should not be only in the Southill parish consultation!
Patrick Spencer	These development sites would be entirely inappropriate within the context of the existing community and environment. This is an extremely rural settlement with only minimal basic facilities. Broom has no shop, post office, playing field and very poor public transport links and would be unable to support the development proposals. Broom is identified as a small village and should be protected as such.
Paul and Sally Cripsey	Whilst supporting outdoor activities for general health and wellbeing there needs to be a balance. Whilst living in the vicinity for 35 years Rowney Warren has always been a place for family recreation and walks; an essential ingredient of healthy family life; it has been enjoyed by people of all ages. The development of the Fat Trax cycle park has certainly meant young cyclists get fresh air and exercise but at the expense of families feeling they can walk safely in the woods. We feel areas should be designated and fenced for designated recreation. We are also concerned by the large numbers coming in cars to use the cycle facilities, using a great deal of carbon footprint and causing serious traffic hazards.
S Hartill	There are no local services to this site at the moment and development would destroy a pleasant woodland setting. Traffic congestion is dangerous already and should be reduced not increased.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: E52**

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

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

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

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

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

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

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

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

**SOUTHILL APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
D. H Emanuel	Broom	Thank you for sending me details of the proposals for developments in the village of Broom and Old Warden. Once again it appears that Broom continues to be blighted by these proposed developments. As you are aware the countryside to the north and south of the village is currently being devastated by large scale gravel extraction. The additional proposals H181, H183, H184, H185, H241 and H294 are inappropriate in a village that has no infrastructure such as shops, schools, no employment opportunities, no medical facilities and limited access. I must strongly object to these proposals as they are totally unsuited for a small village especially one in the emerging Core Strategy.
Dawn Walton	Broom (Quarry)	Can you please advise when full details of the above will be circulated to householders in the area, together with details of where the exhibitions are being held? I live at Broom Crossroads and am very interested to see what is being proposed, in particular with the Quarry which most local residents cannot believe has been granted permission. It really seems quite farcical that although people register their thoughts and views that they do not want another 10 years of quarrying, it still manages to get planning. I would be please to receive the above information at your earliest convenience.
Brent Fielder	Broom H181/ H183/ H184/ H185/ H241/ H294/ E52	My reasons for objecting to H181, H183, H184, H185, H241 and H294 are that Broom is a small village with no shop, post office, school, leisure facilities, mains gas, decent public transport or any other infra-structure. People here wish to remain a small village. The core -strategy of Mid-Beds states that allocations will mainly be made in large villages; Broom is a small village and wishes to remain so. I object to E52 as we were promised by the landowners, The Shuttleworth Trust, that after the fifteen years of gravel extraction that we have endured they would turn it all into sailing and fishing lakes and wildlife conservation. They now want to put industry and a massive college on our doorstep and renege on their promise. After all of the years of hassle and rubbish from this site (five years still to go) we deserve what we were promised, a natural restoration.
J.K.N. Dawson, Local Footpath Officer, Ramblers' Association	E52	This very large site is of very high present and potential recreational value. A worked out gravel quarry, it is crisscrossed with public footpaths and bridleways accessible on foot, horseback, or by cycle from Upper Caldecote, Broom , Southill and Old Warden villages, Ickwell and Biggleswade. Upper Caldecote in particular is a large village, likely to expand further, which has otherwise few facilities for informal outdoor recreation. The planned restoration of the site (by 2012) will further enhance its amenity value to the local communities, and not development should be contemplated which would threaten this. (Please see appendix three for cover letter)
	H184 H241.	Traversed by important amenity path Southill FP6. Use and amenity could be affected by development. (Please see appendix three for cover letter)
	H183 and H185	Traversed or flanked by important amenity paths - FPs29,30, and FP5 respectively. Use and amenity could be affected by development. (Please see appendix three for cover letter)