

STOTFOLD 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.

STOTFOLD APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

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

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
Mr Steven Barker on behalf of Residents of Waters End, Stotfold, Herts.	Barker Parry Town Planning Ltd	H330, H361

Ref Number: H027

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.

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
F Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The lvel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>
Glenn Rickwood	<p>Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on "Land South of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold Town FC's Roker Park site has not been taken into account as part of this site allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services - local roads, local school and doctor's surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision - are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sited to such development. Stotfold cannot easily support further residential development and, thus, such development would not be sustainable. As such, this submission should be rejected.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kenton Moore	<p>I don't think that with the recent mass local development that is being forced upon us, Fairfield site and land between the Co-op site and the bypass, that there is any requirement for more housing to be built, furthermore with at least 2 local commercial sites that I can think of that already have buildings on them which look as if they are no longer used i.e. old Motorola site Taylors Road and the Pig Development site Hitchin Road that could easily be developed for industrial/commercial property I don't see the need to develop what is at the moment a green field site used for growing crops, after all, all these new houses do have people living in them that need to eat. As you can see by my address I do have a vested interest in that my house would back onto any proposed development, but I think the points I have raised are still valid.</p>
Lee Butler	<p>I acknowledge the requirement to provide between 50-250 extra homes by 2026. My principal objections to this site are: * Loss of green belt, which should be protected. This is favoured green space for walkers, provides pleasant environment and home for wildlife. * Access via Common Road will cause significant congestion and be potentially dangerous. The Regent Street junction with Common Road has poor visibility and can be hazardous. Increased volume of traffic using the proposed site will affect this. Common Road between Regent Street and the proposed new site provides essential residential parking, making available road space single track. The likely no. of additional cars will make this worse. Along with danger to cars, children playing along Common Road may also be affected. Planning Guidance now permits a reduced number of car parking spaces per dwelling and consequently there may be overflow parking from the site that will significantly increase existing congestion.</p>
Miss Wendy Scarr	<p>I strongly object to the use of another green space for development purposes. There are alternative brownfield sites within Stotfold which could be used for such development, with better access and proximity to local facilities. The site has poor access along Common Road which is already restricted due to residential on road parking. The site is also further away from local amenities than others.</p>
Mr & Mrs Moore	<p>Mixed usage over perfectly good agricultural land would bring more traffic to already busy roads. Private vehicles and larger industrial trucks making their way through Stotfold. Existing industrial areas already on opposite side of town to major roads.</p>
Mr P Claret	<p>This site would simply encourage further westward spread of Stotfold into the open countryside.</p>
Mrs Brenda Haskell	<p>Our Doctors surgery cannot cope with the present population. Stotfold's over development of back fill / garden areas has already created traffic congestion and had an adverse effect on the countryside and environment. A walk through a housing estate is no compensation for a walk along a river bank or through fields being able to observe the local wildlife. This proposal will take away yet another natural nature walk from Stotfold residents. We must not recreate the mistakes of the 1960s and 1970s, high density building that resulted in slum areas, higher crime figures and a miserable population who tried to mass migrate to the countryside. We need to sustain a country feel in our environment and live side by side with the indigenous species if we are to leave a sustainable planet for our grandchildren and their future offspring.</p>

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

Submitted by	Comments
R Hook	Many units currently void (empty). What are the proposed employment details - i.e. employers?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H049

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 B A Farman	But not 600, 250 maximum. 600 more houses would severely impact on the local roads, schools, surgery shops. It is too many.

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
H J Pickering	This site alone would satisfy more than the target building requirements for Stotfold. NB: Care should be exercised in building a large number of extra dwellings, noting that Stotfold has already grown by more than 50% during the past 5 years and there has not been an equivalent growth in the employment possibilities, causing more commuting to obtain jobs.
Howard Mitchell	I think building 600 houses on this site may be too great in proportion to the existing town size. Otherwise with easy access to the north to the 507, traffic disturbance may be better than that of other proposed sites.
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Kenneth Gardner	Concerned at impact on local roads. Bypass is already a high casualty route according to the sign just off J10 of the A1, and we still have to have hundreds of houses built off the first roundabout [land south of Stotfold] to say nothing of the Fairfield development.
Andrew Harding	This site proposed is an outrageous abuse of the council's position. The council have already forced through the provision of a half baked leisure facility that will only cater for a minority, to then propose some 600 dwellings is an outlandish disregard for the uniqueness of Stotfold as a large village/small town. Its position is already eroded with the substantial developments of Fairfield and the land to the south of Stotfold, turning Stotfold into a small town which is then an excuse for greater development. The strain that such substantial development will have on existing services, health, transport, sewerage, utility is very obvious and unacceptable. The impact on the visual amenity and wildlife will be massive.
Bryony Plumpton	This site is already being developed which will take away the green feeling of the area.
C Plumpton	The proposed leisure centre is enough for this site. Any more and the countryside/fields will be spoiled.
Fay Reid	On average there are 2 cars per household in this area. This will mean that CO2 emissions will have considerable impact.

Submitted by	Comments
Fiona Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The level valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>
Graham Russell	<p>As an employee working Stotfold agree with creating more employment before considering the consideration of 1050 houses, smaller businesses and local shops appear to struggle in Stotfold as well as increasing possibility of more housing.</p>
John Plumpton	<p>Use Brownfield sites only.</p>
K Irving & N Hall	<p>This area has already been identified for the new football ground and sports leisure centre. This we fully support however we do not support any more housing on this proposed site.</p>
Lee Butler	<p>Strongly object.</p> <p>Exceptional loss of green belt land, which should be protected where possible.</p> <p>Significant increase in size of town, irrevocably altering its character and affecting local amenity - insufficient infrastructure to support such a development.</p> <p>Proposal significantly exceeds government requirement for area (max 250 dwellings) and this should be avoided, particularly so as to prevent precedent. Housing targets should be amicably spread across mid beds to minimise impact on particular communities. I fear significant impact on traffic flows and potential congestion where overflow car parking may arise from developments that, whilst falling within planning guidance, cannot cater for the likely number of cars that will be present. Traffic issues may affect safety at Etonbury School, for pedestrians and cars dropping off children.</p> <p>I would support provision of accommodation for elderly persons at an appropriate site.</p>
Maggiolini	<p>I believe the leisure facility is a good idea and much needed facility in Stotfold - I do not feel we need more houses as we have had so many built in the area the schools and doctors are already stretched to breaking point</p>
Mrs B Dickinson	<p>Although this site has been designated already to house the Stotfold football and leisure facilities I do not think it is appropriate to build houses on green field land.</p> <p>Larksfield surgery is already struggling and you cannot book an appointment for the following week unless it is an emergency.</p> <p>I live directly opposite the site and have now found out that not only is there to be development in front of my house but now directly behind it (H260)It is totally unacceptable to change Stotfold from being a rural environment to a built up town with total disregard for the current residents.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs N Walker	This area is already under development with the planned sports centre which will destroy part of the countryside. This forms part of Stotfold's unique semi-rural character - one of the many reasons people choose to live here.
S J Barber	Site is disproportionately large for the projected growth of the town. Single access from Arlesey Rd restrictive for emergency services. Additional access (via Common Rd?) difficult due to current vehicle parking in Common Rd. Large impact on environment and green space.
Sarah Passey	<p>You say that Stotfold has been identified as needing to provide 50-250 new dwellings by 2026. This proposed development provides 600 and is therefore much too large and would have a significant effect on the community and facilities (schools, health provision, shops, policing, transport).</p> <p>I agree that Stotfold needs facilities like a leisure centre, but it also needs more shops, investment in the local schools, better transport links etc. Stotfold doesn't even have its own police station.</p> <p>Before granting permission for such a large housing development, please look first at attracting more shops to the town. Think about our children and the extra school places that will be needed; do not be reactive but be proactive and find the extra places now rather than several years later.</p> <p>Also please consider how important our green spaces are. Such a large development would destroy forever a large and beautiful nature area which many people enjoy walking through.</p>
Stuart Owen	<p>Stotfold is bounded by main roads which make it extremely difficult to exit or enter the village at times of peak road congestion. There are very limited public transport facilities. As this proposed site is close to a middle school and a junction with the A507 road I believe that it is inappropriate to add more traffic congestion in this area. This is also one of the few areas of Stotfold still with open countryside.</p> <p>What amenities that are left, such as open countryside with footpaths that can be walked on, are rapidly disappearing. Stotfold could soon have the housing density of a large town or city without any of the amenities, such as shopping areas, parks, cinema and public transport. Therefore, I do not believe that this site is suitable for further development</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H056

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
John Chapman	Taking into consideration that the football club are relocating and that some 55 houses are planned next to that site, next is Manor Farm site Malthouse Lane also owned by the County Council, this in my opinion would round off the area very well.
P. J. Patmore	The proposed site lies between a main village road and attractive riverside meadows and through Kingfisher Way public footpath. Any development should be kept away from the ruler edge to keep a rural buffer zone for the benefit of recreational users. The site is convenient for school and shops and is central to the village, so above comments are important for many 120 proposed dwelling possible too many. Proposed new village green welcomed.

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
Lee Butler	In favour of this development are: *Its position within the existing boundary of the town, if we must lose green belt to meet housing targets. *Should hopefully have adequate and safe access/egress. *Meets 50% of the housing target in one development. Against are: *Potential traffic congestion, from travelling cars or parking overspill, in conflict with traffic from the school *Location in a location with risk of flooding, according to Environment Agency records.
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Kenneth Gardner	An appalling proposal - Malthouse Lane and Mill Lane should be left alone as should the surrounding fields as all are a valuable amenity for many in the town to say nothing of the wildlife - rook tree lane is already a hazard because of parked vehicles particularly near the school.
Andrew Harding	The location is a jewel in Stotfold's ever eroding countryside amenity. This area is outstanding as an original village feature and to propose development of this land is vandalism by any other name. It should be left for the many people of Stotfold who regularly walk/cycle through this area enjoying the green and open aspect of this location. Why do Mid Beds aim to destroy our countryside that envelopes and is intrinsic within Stotfold, why?

Submitted by	Comments
Christian Glew	The meadow is a significant part of the Ivel Valley wildlife area and is used continuously by the community. Once this land is built on there is no going back and a community facility and wildlife preserve will be lost forever. In addition to the loss of this leisure facility the proposed infrastructure will not lend itself to the surrounding highways and further congestion to the routes through the town will occur. Rook Tree Lane / Regent Street etc. are already at breaking point. The additional traffic will be dangerous to the community and in particular the children. This site should be preserved in order to retain the characteristics of the town. The flood plane nature of part of the site will have future environmental consequences to the surrounding areas and wildlife.
Cllr Mrs Mary Cooper	H056 site is adjacent to the Millennium Green in Stotfold - currently owned by the Town Council. The council wish to further enhance the amount of land available for informal public recreational use in this area adjacent to the River Ivel, which takes the Kingfisher Way (long distance Beds footpath) into its area. The nearby Mill Meadows are being made into a nature reserve area, adjacent to refurbished Stotfold Mill. Land to the east of this is also sought to provide woodland walks, possible tree memorial/ash scattering area for Stotfold cemetery use due to burgeoning population of the area. Long term vision of the town council is to lease or better still, purchase these areas between Mill Lane/Malthouse Lane/Millennium Green to accommodate all these possible uses. Purchased land would be placed as a "Field in Trust" with the open spaces organisation.
Dr Smon Wathen	Please leave land around the Ivel alone - it is the last green space for Stotfold residents to enjoy. We have seen Otters, Kingfishers, voles and all manner of songbirds. Do not destroy this with housing - this destroys the aquatic habitats and will further erode the countryside around Stotfold. In addition, more traffic on the Stotfold roads will pose both environmental and safety issues for the community. Access to this part of Stotfold is poor and you should not rely on existing infrastructure. Access all the way from the A507 will increase the traffic burden to the town. Stotfold is not simply a means of meeting your government targets.
Edward Hyde	No more housing or planning.
Gale Boucher	When I moved into Rook Tree Lane, I admit the view to the rear of the house was what sold it to me. But over the years that I've lived here I've realised it's not the view that I love; it's the people who use the field. Every time I look out of the window - no matter what type of weather, just so long as there is a smidgen of daylight - there will be people walking their dogs, flying a kite, watching the world go by. They talk to each other, they discuss local issues, they get some fresh air. A man made village green is all well and good - but it's usually off limits to most people. The place we have now is extremely well used and it would be a travesty to loose it. And where would the new additions to the town go to school? What about doctors? What about the extra traffic. Not to mention the impact on the River Ivel.

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	<p>Submission H056 Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold', and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended development of Stotfold Town FC's Roker Park site has not been taken into account as part of this site allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services – local roads, local schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision – are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Stotfold cannot easily support further residential development and, therefore, such development would not be sustainable. This proposal is of particular concern because it is on a meadow that borders the River Ivel, partly lying within its flood plain, and if part of the Ivel Balley, which is much valued by local residents of all ages as an area of open countryside (taking in Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields) within walking distance of central Stotfold, where they can relax and find some tranquillity; during this Site Allocations consultation period hundreds of Stotfold residents, plus their friends and family visiting from nearby towns, have signed a petition (which will be presented to members of Mid Beds District Council) opposing this proposal and seeking to conserve the open countryside surrounding the Ivel Valley in Stotfold. The submission H056 site is a particular favourite of those persons wishing to walk with their dogs and should thus be conserved for its significant public amenity value. Furthermore, Malthouse Lane is a narrow lane that is unsuitable for providing access to the proposed residential development (of 120 dwellings), which would be likely to have at least two cars per household. Stotfold Town Council is also currently seeking to have full statutory status restored to the footpath that crosses this field between the Kingfisher Way and the old Baptist Chapel on Rook Tree Lane. In light of the above points, this proposal should be unequivocally rejected.</p>
J Fox	Totally inappropriate for housing.
J Musselwhite	This site already supports activities i.e. dog walking, single walkers (they feel safe in this area) children play in a natural area. The only natural countryside left in Stotfold, it is very much used by the community.
Jane Hyde	The whole of the river Ivel valley should be free of development. The residents of Stotfold have had enough development and need open spaces for leisure. This site is in the River Ivel Valley and as such it should not be developed. At the moment we as the tenant farmers, are leaving it open for public access and that is how it should stay. It is always in use and is appreciated by the residents of Stotfold who need open spaces for informal recreation. There is a tremendous benefit to the wildlife. We have a barn owl and other birds of prey hunting over the field.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Janet Hawkins	There is no Appropriate infrastructure from Malthouse Lane. There is already a very dangerous hazard nearby when the articulated lorries from Aztec Transport try and get round the Green by the Baptist Church. Stotfold now has enough new housing and it is getting very difficult to get out of Stotfold particularly at Rush Hours without further development. This is without the housing being built at present. If further housing is to be built will you provide proper Policing of the town?
Joan Barratt	Insufficient infrastructure: lack of transport, schools, utilities not able to cope, local roads already difficult at rush/school hours, doctors not able to cope with the people/housing already planned
Joanna Hartwell	I feel that whilst development of the area represents progress it is important that the green areas of Stotfold remain so. The area around the river should not be excessively developed and should be left to be as natural as possible. I accept that whilst I would prefer Stotfold to remain at its current size expansion is inevitable, but I believe that every effort should be made to keep the area to the East of the town as free from expansion as possible to ensure that the river and its surroundings are unaffected and remain a place of peace and quiet that all residents can enjoy.
Joanne Sams	Stotfold already has a huge amount of housing being created already
John Davies	The Ivel Valley should be kept for recreational use and open space to be enjoyed by the local residents.
John Haskell	This is an area of natural beauty and provides many people with walks and recreational areas. I have lived in Stotfold for 50 years and seen many developments eroding the county side and green areas within the village. This is now the last area in the village where you can experience the natural beauty of the county side. I can see this area from my house and it is in constant use come rain or shine by dog walkers. The loss of this area will only serve to cause even more dog poo on our pavements
John Morrison	This site is an important amenity for Stotfold in respect of the number of people who use it for walking along the river and their dogs. Without this amenity many people would have to drive to get their exercise which is contrary to all government policies. Malthouse Lane is very narrow and having the playing field opposite would increase the danger to children who use it. There would also be significant impact on the countryside and environment.
K Cooper	The proposed site (H056) is totally unsuitable for housing. Given the amount of growth in town at the present this small field is one of the only pleasant areas left for walkers etc and to lose it would upset a great many local people.
K Irving & N Hall	Utilising the current football Roker park ground once it is relocated to its new position to the existing health centre. This area will be used to build new housing and should be limited in this vicinity.
L.Ward	Ancient meadow supporting wide variety of abundant wildlife and leisure facilities/ dog walking/ bird watching, fishing etc. To loose this would undermine the bedrock of what Stotfold has to offer in a rural location. major impact on properties during the school run.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Lara Morrison	Although you state this site as unused which is true with regards to housing/business, it is heavily used by the local community as a lovely green area. People, including myself, use this site DAILY to walk the dog along. It so also heavily used by horse riders and walkers. It would cause a lot of problems if this site was built on including all the extra traffic as we just don't have the right infrastructure in this area.
Michelle Wathen	Wholly inappropriate for any type of development. This is one of the few places left in Stotfold where there is peace and quiet to walk and look at the wildlife around. The access roads are narrow and near a lower school. It is beyond belief that this site is proposed.
Mrs B A Farman	It is risible to suggest a village green to be sited here. We have the Riverside Park and Kingfisher Way. Access over a beautiful old bridge and narrow roads. Leave This Area Alone for us to enjoy.
Mrs Brenda Haskell	This is a beautiful natural area where wildlife is in abundance, toads, frogs, butterflies at certain times of the year and fox, rabbits, many wild bird species including a pure white pheasant. If this area were to be built on we would be destroying an area that is currently enjoyed by many residents for a local nature walk. Malt house lane is our last quiet country lane.
Mrs F Barone	I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place! The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The Ivel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and its just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!
Mrs J E Hyde	This ought to be left as a green site - no more concrete.
Mrs L W Lewin	This site is part of the unique green space along the river to the east of the town and needs to be preserved from any possible development now or in the future.
Mrs N Walker	This area is an important nature site & many people go to enjoy the countryside. At a time when we should be protecting the environment it is unthinkable to destroy it There would be no benefit in building here for the people of Stotfold. Malthouse Lane often floods as it is very close to the River Ivel - houses here would be at risk or even contribute to flooding. The roads in the surrounding area are very narrow and often congested with school traffic, and could not support development. A serious accident would be very likely as many children walk to and from school or arrive by bus or car. This could be both from development traffic and then increased traffic due to extra housing. Where would any children from a development here go to school? The closest school is already over-subscribed and the next one is due to move further away. Development here would be disastrous - both environmentally and socially.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Nora Beale	<p>I strongly object to the proposed development in Malthouse Lane. The proposed housing area is well walked with paths criss-crossing and is next to the River Ivel. It is all very well building on certain fields and Brownfield sites, but quite another building along the kingfisher way and surrounding areas. There will be nowhere for people to walk soon and the pleasure of walking by the river will be gone, plus the detrimental affect on wildlife (so much for the poor kingfishers).</p> <p>We have suffered the mill view development taking away a much loved walk and are now supposed to accept another strip of the kingfisher way being spoilt. This field should be left as it is - an open space to be enjoyed.</p>
Mrs R Fernley-Hughes	<p>This is a flood plain - to build on here would be madness and lay the council open to future problems if insurers refuse to offer home insurance on homes built on flood plains which they have warned central government they may do in future. This area of land is one of a precious two in Stotfold where people can walk their dogs and enjoy the outdoors. Using this space would have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of Stotfold residents and spoil the environment</p>
Mrs V.Balderstone	<p>The area off Malthouse Lane would make an ideal country park. It has the Kingfisher Way walk going through it and would make a wildlife corridor running along the River Ivel from Radwell all the way along the river. Stotfold needs green spaces not more houses.</p>
Ms Sue Steptoe	<p>This site is part of one of the few remaining green spaces of Stotfold, and should remain so. It is used by local residents for recreational use, mainly walking and enjoying the countryside - a much needed facility in a growing village. Housing development here would ruin the rural nature of this part of Stotfold, and especially the adjoining Millennium Green. (NB: the new Mill View development has ruined a pleasant countryside walk from Mill Lane to Baldock Road).</p> <p>Access to the site is via narrow lanes, especially Malthouse Lane, and inappropriate for 120 dwelling; housing would create additional traffic, congestion and safety hazards which this corner of Stotfold cannot support. The site borders the river and may even be part of the local flood plain. It is also a haven for wildlife, especially birds, which would be displaced by any development. There are more suitable sites in Stotfold for housing. Please leave this area as green space for quiet enjoyment.</p>
Paul Clifton	<p>The area under consideration is one of the very few remaining publicly accessible green areas within Stotfold and is used extensively by the Stotfold residents for walking their dogs. Loss of this area to housing would seriously impact local environment since there would be no other areas remaining to walk dogs without incurring fouling of public areas and disruption to other non-dog owning residents. The area also borders the Kingfisher Way and the development and subsequent increase in noise pollution would drive the kingfishers away from this area of natural beauty. Malthouse Lane is a small narrow lane and does not offer the access required for further housing; access to A1 would only be for Northbound traffic, other traffic being forced through the centre of Stotfold along Rooktree Lane or Mill Lane. Heavy rain in this area can also cause flooding in the field and proximity to the river will raise building insurance concerns for prospective owners.</p>
Pete Maggiolini	<p>Stotfold has had an huge influx of housing already</p>
Philip Hare	<p>We have had too much development in Stotfold in recent years and especially in the east where our country walks are fast disappearing. Please preserve our rural heritage</p>
R Hook	<p>Infrastructure, where is it??</p>

Submitted by	Comments
S J Barber	Immense impact on open green space adjacent to River Ivel. Additional pressure on already overcrowded St Marys School. Poor vehicle access from Malthouse Lane
Samantha Duffy	All these houses are not needed. We do not need all these new homes built. What we need is our government to care about the important things. Funding our Military properly, environmental issues. If we don't deal with these things especially environment issues then we won't have a planet left to build on!! I also think you haven't put into consideration that having these areas that you wish to build are part of some of the scenery in Bedfordshire. I personally like to take a walk and look out to the lovely fields on a summer's day and see rabbits. Overall, I come back to the phrase you have used. The government have said we need new homes. Correction, we do not need it. Maybe our government should spend more money on building houses and schools in 3rd world countries and places for homeless people to stay. I know for a fact this is just all a money making scheme and you do not think about anything else. Spend your money on something more important, and don't ruin my scenery!
Sarah Passey	The area near this proposed development is very congested and parking is a serious problem during the day. Pedestrians and wheelchair users have to walk in the road to negotiate parked cars around Kings Baptist Church so to increase traffic in this area with a housing development is not a good idea. Please consider the safety of children who walk to and from school and nursery, especially if big lorries would be coming and going all day. Schools in the area are already close to capacity. If St Marys and Etonbury schools could be extended and extra places created for children then perhaps this development could have great potential to support the community. Finally, please consider our local environment. The development will destroy a beautiful meadow, country lane, historic hedgerows, and habitats for wildlife.
Siarl Siviyer Dixon	The main objections are road safety as the roads are thin, there will be a risk to children using the green and access to the A1 is not suitable to increased traffic when it is busy. In addition local services need time to catch up with current and near future demand.
W C Hyde	Area is an important amenity field which has been left open for public access. It is a popular place for children to play and for people to walk. It is down by the river and in the Ivel valley which should be preserved.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H128

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

Submitted by	Comments
S J Barber	Good access from A507 and Hitchin Rd. Should blend well with the "South of Stotfold development. Easy access to new facilities being provided on Fairfield site.

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
Andrew Harding	I think some limited development could be considered as this location is more heavily developed, however the potential is then there to join up at a later date with any development South of Arlesey Road. Overdevelopment in this area will not be welcome and will not be benefit to any infrastructure or service as all services and infrastructures are at capacity.
Maggiolini	We have a lot of houses already in Stotfold that are being built but if there is a need for more this is an acceptable site - it would again put strain on schools and facilities.
Mrs B A Farman	It would increase congestion at peaks times on roundabout/roads to gain access onto bypass (A507) conflict between one of the access roads and cycle underpass.
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.

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
F Barone	I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place! The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The lvel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!
Fay Reid	Schools are overstretched.

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Stotfold cannot easily support further development and thus such development would not be sustainable, As such, this submission should be rejected.
Graham Russell	As an employee working Stotfold agree with creating more employment before considering the consideration of 1050 houses, smaller businesses and local shops appear to struggle in Stotfold as well as increasing possibility of more housing.
H J Pickering	NB: Care should be exercised in building a large number of extra dwellings, noting that Stotfold has already grown by more then 50% during the past 5 years and there has not been an equivalent growth in the employment possibilities, causing more commuting to obtain jobs. Moreover, Hitchin Road is already very busy and will be more so one the Land S. of Stotfold development is complete. Finally, it should be noted that a large part of the area is low-lying and often boggy, which would complicate life for those moving into this part of town.
Howard Mitchell	This development will use farmland and land that has been used for the stabling of specialist horses. I think your description of the site should make this clear. Shawmer Farm is correctly described in several references as ARAB Racing Association of Britain, Shawmer Farm, 122 Hitchin Road, Stotfold, Hitchin, Hertfordshire. This, if to close should be reserved for general stabling of horses or as an equestrian centre that would provide both employment opportunities and recreational facilities much in demand in our locality. The site provides an important sanctuary for wildlife such as woodpeckers and bats. Any proposal to demolish and redevelop Shawmer Farm should be strongly resisted.
J Brown	Hitchin Road already has a problem with too much traffic. With this extra housing will come even more problems. We have lived on Hitchin Road for 11 years and we have found there has been a great increase in traffic. I feel we will be unable to support an even greater amount.
L Ward	Displacement of ground nesting birds in the fields. Overdevelopment of land that currently provides a designated nature wolk. Infringement of specially created Etonbury Wood. Over stretching of existing resource-doctors, schools, traffic. Too much building in the village. No work in the village, shops are too small and few.
Mr & Mrs Moore	Accesses onto Hitchin Road would cause more congestion a) On a rear bypass round-about will mean vehicles having to enter queuing traffic trying to access by-pass especially with new road on opposite side of Hitchin Road. Also cycle-track crosses Hitchin Road at this point! b) Access road entering Hitchin Road from Shouthern Farm directly opposite entrance to Two Browels PH and adjacent to Pix Road - sight lines for traffic approaching from high street direction are often obscured. Bends in Hitchin Road are very deceptive and dangerous

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Alan Cooper	Both sites are outside of the existing development by a large amount. The visual impact of both when approaching Stotfold would be major. H128 area comes far too close to the bypass with no barrier to noise or other pollution afforded to residents, road/transport links to the town would be tenuous. H159 has no natural links to existing development unless considering only the frontage to Arlesey Road.
Mrs Anne Petch	I am horrified that more land is being used for housing. Stotfold is being developed beyond control. All amenities are threatened as development has become so rapid. The welfare of our children and animals who enjoy the country walks would be destroyed. The pollution is increased by more vehicles. Our health service is going to be badly affected as appointments are already difficult to book. The location of our property means my family will be directly affected. Our views, noise etc. When is this over development going to stop?
Mrs C Turnbull	The exits from Stotfold onto the A507 are already severely congested - surely another development so close to the road is only going to make this even worse?
Mrs M.A. Ephgrave	Traffic in Hitchin Road increased, the by-pass was built to reduce traffic in the area- the road is quite narrow so there will be traffic congestion. Bus services stop at 7pm and there is only 1 bus per hour, meaning more cars and congestion. Stotfold already increasing too fast, there is only 1 supermarket and not enough facilities in town, 1 doctor's surgery. Using too much green belt land.
Mrs N Walker	There is already a large development underway the other side of Hitchin road - a further development here would place too much traffic on an already busy road. More valuable countryside would be lost for the sake of profit for the landowner and developer.
Mrs V. Balderstone	Why?? Build a woodland area that joins up with Etonbury Wood. Give Stotfold a breathing space between towns. This area has Pix Brook running along in a beautiful valley. This is a forward planning idea that could be something to be proud of NOT just urban sprawl that takes and gives nothing back. We need green spaces not just more houses.
Peter J. R. Brown	<p>Sites access at 122 Hitchin Road will cause additional road congestion due being immediately opposite the busy Two Brewers pub car park entrance</p> <p>It is already difficult to get vehicles out of private dwellings onto Hitchin Road for those who have off road parking, and this will add 259 (H128 & H129 one per household), in a concentrated area is going to make the volume of traffic worse. This congestion would be increased by the services and delivery vehicles that are needed to support these households.</p> <p>Hitchin Road is already very congested with on road parking, both on and off the paths where vehicle owners do not have off road parking</p> <p>I am also very concerned about the wildlife that uses this area. They are all going to lose their natural habitat. The hedgerows dug up, the soil of the arable land turned to concrete and tarmac. A specific area bounded by H128 was left to grow wild and Miss Aldridge was always proud to say that this was her contribution to the countryside's wildlife</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H129

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.
S J Barber	Small site, but reasonable use of "infill".

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
F Barone	I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place! The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The Ivel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and its just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!
Glenn Rickwood	Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Stotfold cannot easily support further development and thus such development would not be sustainable, As such, this submission should be rejected.

Submitted by	Comments
Howard Mitchell	This development will use land and facilities that has been used for the stabling of specialist horses. I think your description of the site should make this clear. Shawmer Farm is correctly described in several references as ARAB Racing Association of Britain, Shawmer Farm, 122 Hitchin Road, Stotfold, Hitchin, Hertfordshire. This, if to close should be reserved for general stabling of horses or as an equestrian centre that would provide both employment opportunities and recreational facilities much in demand in our locality. The site provides an important sanctuary for wildlife such as woodpeckers and bats. Any proposal to demolish and redevelop Shawmer Farm should be strongly resisted.
Mr & Mrs Moore	Accesses onto Hitchin Road would cause more congestion a) On a rear bypass round-about will mean vehicles having to enter queuing traffic trying to access by-pass especially with new road on opposite side of Hitchin Road. Also cycle-track crosses Hitchin Road at this point! b) Access road entering Hitchin Road from Shouthern Farm directly opposite entrance to Two Browels PH and adjacent to Pix Road - sight lines for traffic approaching from high street direction are often obscured. Bends in Hitchin Road are very deceptive and dangerous
Mrs M.A. Epherave	Too much traffic on Hitchen Road, not a good enough public transport system, buses are 1 per hour and finish at 7pm. not enough shops, most are in Stotfold. Our estate agents, takeaways and hairdressers are still just for a village, now too many houses.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H145

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.

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
C Plumpton	Leisure centre already proposed is taking more than enough of the green fields in this area.
Glenn Rickwood	Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Stotfold cannot easily support further development and thus such development would not be sustainable, As such, this submission should be rejected.
John Plumpton	Use Brownfield sites only.
Lee Butler	I acknowledge the requirement to provide between 50-250 extra homes by 2026. My principal objections to this site are: * Loss of green belt, which should be protected and an important home for wildlife. * Access via Common Road (CR) will cause significant congestion and be potentially dangerous. The Regent Street junction with CR has poor visibility and can be hazardous. Increased volume of traffic using the proposed site will affect this. CR between Regent Street and the proposed new site provides essential residential parking, making available road space single track. The likely no. of additional cars will make this worse. Along with danger to cars, children playing along CR may also be affected. Planning Guidance now permits a reduced number of car parking spaces per dwelling and consequently there may be overflow parking from the site that will significantly increase existing congestion. * I do favour provision of allotment space at an appropriate development in the town.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Brenda Haskell	Currently you have Danes Close, Saxon Avenue, Vaughan Road, Ivel Way, Priory Gardens, Castle Close and Netherstones traffic converging onto Common Road, any further building programmes within this area will result in an unacceptable traffic grid lock, at certain times of the day, trying to get out of Common Road onto Regent Street. It already is a problem partly due to the older type properties in Common Road not having any parking areas thereby reducing the road to a single track, add the fact that all of the local driving schools use common road to teach various manoeuvres, it would be even more dangerous. The proposed area is currently used by local walkers and is rich in indigenous wildlife, Stotfold is a rural Town please let's not take out the Rural. To have a long term sustainable lifestyle in Stotfold we need to keep the balance between ourselves and nature. Stotfold Residents deserve a decent quality of life and that cannot be attained by over development of our very few open areas currently enjoyed by so many.
Philip Hare	This is an important area for the local people to walk. We have had too much development in Stotfold in recent years and our country walks are fast disappearing. Please preserve our rural heritage.
S J Barber	Poor access through Common Rd. Spoils opens view of countryside to the west of Stotfold. Impacts the allotments and the fundraising by the "Eleemosynary Charity of William Field".
Wendy Scarr	I strongly object to the use of another green space for development purposes. There are alternative brownfield sites within Stotfold which could be used, particularly in this use the inclusion of the allotments which benefit local residents and have a positive environmental impact. The site has poor access along Common Road, due to on road residential parking and has poor access to existing local amenities - post office etc.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H159

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
H J Pickering	This site would contribute handsomely to the target building requirements for Stotfold. NB: However, care should be exercised in building a large number of extra dwellings, noting that Stotfold has already grown by more than 50% during the past 5 years and there has not been an equivalent growth in the employment possibilities, causing more commuting to obtain jobs.
Mrs. S. F. Millard	There are fields along Arlesy Road which are right for development. One is opposite where the leisure centre will be and many people think it a better site for the new Hallworth House. Further along next to the Launderers site are two more fields which are no longer cropped and are for sale. Both are about 2 and a half acres each. Stotfold is in need of retirement bungalows, these sites would be ideal. Further on is a field already marked in red, H159 owners are Green King. Properties in these three sites would bring a lot of revenue to the leisure centre. The health clinic would have room to extend instead of building a new one.
David Russell Associates	This site is comfortably in scale with predicted level of growth fro Stotfold. The site has good potential for supporting local services given its proximity to local services. The half hourly 97/97A bus service from Stotfold to Hitchin and Letchworth runs along Arlesey Road. The site is not affected by any existing Local Plan constraints and is not within a floodplain zone. Development on this site would take advantage of its orientation maximising the use of available daylight and sunlight to create an energy efficient development. The site's proposals include a natural play space area for children and adults. This would extend the emerging wooded landscape, ameliorating any impact on the surrounding countryside. Development of the site, together with other land just to the east, would meet Stotfold's future housing needs and integrate the currently isolated Etonbury Middle School with the rest of the village.

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

Submitted by	Comments
S J Barber	Access from Arlesey Rd should be OK. Proposal is environmentally sensitive around Pix Brook. Development is of reasonable scale.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Harding	The proposed location will impact massively on the visual amenity of the area and is not an appropriate location for additional housing. It will encourage the conurbation of Stotfold and Arlesey as one town and will only exacerbate problems. It is not in a significant location that the residents would necessarily support the individual businesses in the area in particular the small food retailers. The lack of a good bus service along this area will encourage more car use.

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	<p>Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Stotfold cannot easily support further development and thus such development would not be sustainable, As such, this submission should be rejected.</p>
Mr Alan Cooper	<p>Both sites are outside of the existing development by a large amount. The visual impact of both when approaching Stotfold would be major. H128 area comes far too close to the bypass with no barrier to noise or other pollution afforded to residents, road/transport links to the town would be tenuous. H159 has no natural links to existing development unless considering only the frontage to Arlesey Road.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H200

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
Jane Hyde	This site would be improved by a nice housing development.
Joanne Sams	This is brownfield land which has huge hangar like employment buildings. Housing and more a more sympathetic employment building would be an improvement.
S J Barber	Small development on brownfield site which is welcomed. Minimal impact on green space due to existing adjacent buildings. No public transport.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H S Russell	I do think that we require more jobs in the area to go with the houses.
Pete Maggiolini	The area could benefit from having housing rather than hangar like employment buildings in this rural 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
Glenn Rickwood	Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotford residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Such development would not be sustainable. However this is a Brownfield site and should not therefore be preferred to Greenfields sites for development for employment usage , which would be much greater benefit to the wider local community, with the provision that this should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of sustainable, high-quality, carbon-neutral design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. Nay property considered, environmentally sound, proposal that led to the demolition to the monstrous, hanger-like construction at the centre of the existing site, and the removal of haulage operation that operates out of it at present causing so many problems on local roads, would be deemed to be highly positive development by most Stotfold residents.
Janet Hawkins	Surely there is a great danger to traffic here with the site of Aztec Logistics only a short distance away which is already very dangerous along the Astwick Road, by the Crown Public House, round the Green and along Rook Tree Lane.

Submitted by	Comments
Lee Butler	I acknowledge the requirement to provide between 50-250 extra homes by 2026. My principal objections to this site are: * Loss of existing 'brownfield' employment land which could be regenerated to help achieve employment increase targets and thus contribute to avoiding 'greenfield' employment developments proposed.
Mrs V.Balderstone	Every Spring there is a toad migration along Taylors Road towards Taylors Mill. I have been organising a toad patrol for the last 22 years and have seen the numbers of toads, frogs and newts declining year on year. This is due largely to the increased use of Taylors Road by cars/lorries exiting onto the A1M. If this development goes ahead more traffic will use the road and will spell the end of this colony.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H247

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
Bryony Plumpton	Brownfield site. Not many existing properties surrounding site. Good size development for position.
C Plumpton	Brownfield site so more suitable. Not many surrounding houses already so less people to upset. Can take all required housing in Stotfold (200-250) so would negate the need to use any existing green field sites in other areas of Stotfold.
Cllr Mrs Mary Cooper	Site already has limited housing on it, replacement development would be beneficial as a small number of extra units to our town total. Development of site for employment use is seen as "extra" employment for the town over and above the safeguarded employment area in Taylors Road at present. Although the Taylors Road site has poor access at present, through narrow residential roads which are used for on-street parking by residents whose properties open onto or are close to the actual pavement/footway. This site adjacent to A507 so safer/better access here.
Jane Hyde	This is already a brownfield site with good access to the A507 and a school on the Fairfield site.
John Plumpton	Brownfield site.
Lee Butler	I am in favour of this development proposal (incl E25) for the following reasons: *Brownfield site capable of meeting Stotfold's full target of 250 dwellings by 2026 as well as providing jobs for the employment target. The one development could prevent any other locations being required. *Minimised effect on visual aspect on grounds that development already exists. *Minimal effect on infrastructure of main town, with capacity to install additional infrastructure with minimal disruption. *Minimised environmental impact - no loss of green belt. Access to site will need to be considered carefully to prevent congestion.
Matt Robson	Good to develop on Brownfield sites as opposed to Greenfield sites. The development would cause less disruption in this area.
N Walker	Of all sites proposed this is the most preferable as it is on an unsightly brownfield site, would not impact too much on the countryside, and the road has already been developed for Fairfield park. It would also not cause Stotfold to feel too overcrowded as it is becoming now.
S J Barber	Cuts into green space between Stotfold and Fairfield, but may work to bind the two communities. Large development satisfying projected growth. Good vehicle access. Second best option, with H128 being best.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Kenneth Gardner	If even more building is to be imposed on us then i suppose this brownfield site is preferable to losing even more of the greenfield ones.
Joanne Sams	While Stotfold has had a lot of development in the last couple of years if employment sites are needed (there seem to be a large number employment units standing empty in the area) then the only benefit of this one is that it is already brownfield land and close to the new Fairfield development for people needing work spaces
Mrs H S Russell	I do think that we require more jobs in the area to go with the houses.
Sarah Passey	Since this site is brownfield then it would be suitable for development (in preference to greenfield sites proposed around Stotfold). What worries me most about such a large development is that Stotfold does not have the facilities to cope with the extra people. The doctors surgery is already very busy, the dentist isn't taking new patients, we only have one supermarket, there is no police station, the two schools we have are at capacity (bearing in mind the proposed expansion of Roecroft), and the roads are getting much busier. You really should think again about targeting Stotfold for such housing growth before implementation of extra facilities. Having lived previously in London, I have seen firsthand the problems created when housing developments are approved with no facilities already in place.

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
F Barone	I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place! The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The lvel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Submission H247 Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold', and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold Town FC's Roker Park site has not been taken into account as part of this site allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services – local roads, local schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision – are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. As Stotfold cannot easily support further residential development, such development would not be sustainable. However, this is a 'brownfield' site and should therefore be preferred to 'greenfield' sites for development for employment usage, which would be of much greater benefit to the wider local community; with the proviso that this should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of a sustainable, high-quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. It is also served by a bus link between Hitchin and Stotfold, via Letchworth (although the frequency has been halved recently), and well-positioned in terms of the road network, its position close to the A507 being likely to ensure that extra traffic from outside the local area would not need to pass through the central Stotfold.
Graham Russell	As an employee working Stotfold agree with creating more employment before considering the consideration of 1050 houses, smaller businesses and local shops appear to struggle in Stotfold as well as increasing possibility of more housing.
Janet Hawkins	If this site were used it looks to me as if Stotfold would practically be part of Letchworth.
John Clench	Hitchin Road will be a major outlet for the sites already being developed and for those to which planning permission has been agreed. To implement further development upon a highway that is already busy would be a folly. In addition the A1, a fragmented 2 or 3 lane dangerous highway would need to be upgraded to 3 lanes from South Mimms to Junction 10 prior to any increased housing.
Mrs BA Farman	The development sites ought to be integrated into the town- not as a separate parcel.
Mrs V.Balderstone	The pig testing units would make an ideal area for industrial use. The area is close to the bypass and already being used as a work area. I think this would be a good use for this land.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H260

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

Submitted by	Comments
H J Pickering	This site would contribute very well to the target building requirements for Stotfold. NB: However, care should be exercised in building a large number of extra dwellings, noting that Stotfold has already grown by more than 50% during the past 5 years and there has not been an equivalent growth in the employment possibilities, causing more commuting to obtain jobs.
S J Barber	Good use of land filling between The Gardens and the Saunders Yard. Good access from Arlesey Rd. Little environmental impact.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Submissions H260 Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold', and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold Town FC's Roker Park site has not been taken into account as part this site allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services – local roads, local schools. Doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision – are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such a development. Stotfold cannot easily support further residential development and thus such development would not be sustainable. As such, this submission should be rejected. However, this is partly a 'brownfield' site that should therefore be preferred to 'greenfield' sites for development for employment usage, with the proviso that such development should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of a sustainable, high-quality, carbon-neutral design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. It is also towards Arlesey, which might encourage employees from outside the area to walk to the site from Arlesey railway station, thus reducing the number of private motorized vehicles on congested local roads.
Mrs J Smith	Residential potential only, due to proximity of school and the safety of children passing the site daily. Commercial development would exacerbate an existing problem. Land at west of site for commercial purposes could encourage the expansion of an already contentious site. Existing infrastructure is stretched. However the land could be used for bungalows for retired people. This would also be in keeping with neighbouring properties and there is a distinct lack of this type of property on the market in Stotfold. Easy access to local facilities such as the doctor's surgery would be an added benefit. I can see no reason for a walkway from the site to The Gardens. What would be the purpose of this? The only means of exit would be back onto Arlesey Road.

Submitted by	Comments
N Walker	<p>Limited housing may be possible here but this seems an unsuitable site for business use - the road is already very busy with the School, surgery and proposed sports centre. It is already close to houses on both sides.</p>
Rob Smith	<p>The site is more suited to residential development than commercial development:- “Support Local Services & Infrastructure”: • Commercial development would be out of place in this rural-residential area. • Inclusion of commercial development would spoil the “Victorian character” of the proposed residential development. “Without creating traffic congestion”: • Lorries and larger vans from a commercial development should be avoided as there are traffic congestion problems along Arlesey Rd during school pick-up times. “Without significant impact on countryside or local environment” • Potential to build single story properties so as not to be overpowering to similar properties in the adjacent properties in The Gardens • Opportunity to provide a green/wooded area on eastern boundary, as per Stotfold Town Council’s recommendation.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Harding	To propose a mixed use site let alone housing is ridiculous. This is agricultural land and should remain so, the land South of Arlesey Road provides a natural green belt protection to over development. The option of B1 office use is nonsensical. It is a totally isolated location for office/small businesses to set up and the fact Saunders garage is there is not an aid to making a decision. In fact Saunders garage is often noisy and their vehicles routinely speed along Arlesey Road and through Stotfold causing unnecessary traffic. The visual impact will be detrimental and the wildlife will suffer badly. The houses will be isolated from the centre and this will encourage further use of cars.
F Barone	I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place! The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The Ivel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We dont want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and its just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit! We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!
Mrs B Dickinson	This site is directly behind my property. I moved to Stotfold because of its rural environment. The site to the front of my house has already been approved for the Stotfold Football club and leisure facilities and now I will have the greenfield site behind my house developed as well. This is totally unacceptable. Expanding and building all these new homes and not having the facilities to support them is crazy. Building on open countryside all around Stotfold will turn in into an urban nightmare. That is not why we live here. Where will all the wildlife go The doctors' surgery and schools cannot cope with this influx.
Mrs V.Balderstone	This development would be perhaps the most appalling rape of the countryside yet proposed. The field in question lies at the top of the small River Pix valley next to Etonbury school. Why not continue the tree planting at Etonbury down the river to Hitchin Road this area would then be an area to be proud of not just another urban sprawl almost joining up with Arlesey. This area would make Stotfold a thing of beauty and something that all the new residents of our overcrowded Town could be proud of.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H262

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

Submitted by	Comments
Jane Hyde	Light industrial/managed workspace would be suitable for this space.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Such development would not be sustainable. However this is a Brownfield site and should not therefore be preferred to Greenfields sites for development for employment usage , which would be much greater benefit to the wider local community, with the provision that this should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of sustainable, high-quality, carbon-neutral design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. Nay property considered, environmentally sound, proposal that led to the demolition to the monstrous, hanger-like construction at the centre of the existing site, and the removal of haulage operation that operates out of it at present causing so many problems on local roads, would be deemed to be highly positive development by most Stotfold residents.
Joanne Sams	This area has been developed badly in the past it was pretty countryside no hangar-like employment sites landscaping would improve it
Mrs H S Russell	I do think that we require more jobs in the area to go with the houses.
S J Barber	Access may be a problem, but would be an improvement on existing industrial unit. New employment use should be "light", similar to units in Mill Lane.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
F Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The lvel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit!</p> <p>We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>
Hall	<p>The road structure within Stotfold if already stretched beyond the ideal. Anything built on the east side of Stotfold H262 would be a disaster for the road network and a danger for access via the A1. The roads are simply not built to cope with this and there is no sensible way of solving this issue.</p>
K Irving & N Hall	<p>Consider utilising the land in current use by Roecroft Lower School, which is to be relocated to the current planned development for land south of Stotfold. This area can be built on for housing only.</p>
Lee Butler	<p>I acknowledge the requirement to provide between 50-250 extra homes by 2026.</p> <p>My principal objections to this site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Loss of existing 'brownfield' employment land which could be regenerated to help achieve employment increase targets and thus contributes to avoiding 'greenfield' employment developments proposed.
Mr Alan Cooper	<p>This is the only protected employment area within Stotfold, more local employment is desperately needed. Housing on the narrow Taylors Road would give rise to many hundreds of traffic movements each week towards either a dangerous A1 junction or to an equally dangerous junction at Astwick Road and the green (crown corner). Improved A1 access for HGVs and promotion of the site for employment is surely the way to go.</p>
N Walker	<p>Access to this area is difficult as it would mean driving all the way through Stotfold to the south, causing congestion, and using small rural roads with only limited access to the A1 to the north</p>
R Hook	<p>Many units currently void (empty). What are the proposed employment details - i.e. employers?</p>
Siarl Siviyer Dixon	<p>The main objections are road safety as the roads already busy with HGVs from Aztek Logistics from 0700 - 1800 and Saunders Garage at all times, there will be a risk to children using the green and access to the A1 is not suitable to industrial traffic when it is busy.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H277

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr. R. J. Patimore	With the proposed relief road from the centre of the village to Stotfold Road to the north, all sites between the railway and the high street are opened up to access without making the already very busy high street any worse. Good opportunity exists for recreational access to the west with perhaps a new footbridge over the railway and enhanced river walks. Many people are dissuaded in crossing a four track mainline railway on a flat crossing

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

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	Arlesey is an unusually linear settlement with all existing development close to its main arterial road (church lane/High Street/ Hitchin Road). It has not been subject to any significant level of development in the recent past, unlike its near neighbour, Stotfold, which is currently closely linked with at county council level- once the 1300 houses agreed for construction on 'Land South of Stotfold' and Fairfield park have been completed. Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of 5 years and its transport infrastructure, public services and utility services are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them. As such, Arlesey is incomparably more able than Stotfold to help meet the outstanding quota of housing mid Bedfordshire must provide up to 2026. Obviously, all criteria relating to the positive promotion of sustainable development must be fully considered, so that 'brown field' sites are preferred to 'greenfield' sites and development is directed away from flood plains and locations that clearly lack the requisite transport and service infrastructure. The location of this submission site some distance outside the existing 'settlement envelope' (according to the map of Arlesey published as part of this consultation) might therefore count against it relative to the above criteria.

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
Charles Planning Associates Limited	This site is remote from the village and outside its boundaries. The land lies in the countryside and adjacent to the major development taking place at the Fairfield Park site. Development on this site would serve only to extend the Fairfield Park development into the open countryside where National planning policies seek to protect the countryside for its own sake. Development on this site would contribute nothing to the services and facilities of Arlesey. Development should not be allowed on this site.
G Rosa	Already enough houses built on Fairfield park without spilling onto the countryside.
K Irving & N Hall	Ludicrous!

Submitted by	Comments
Pauline Brotherton	Opposed to major redevelopment in Arlesey which will result in loss of green field - agricultural land - pastures - meadows and the like and result in increased emissions - more cars on already overburdened roads. However - the land is vacant and not used for crops - and is within reasonable distance of the High Street and amenities.
S J Barber	Vehicle access not easy. Strongly affects green space between Stotfold (Fairfield) and Arlesey. Very poor public transport.
V Hitchin	How will the town cope with traffic? Trains are already full.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H330

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 Peter John Hawkins	Limit the numbers of houses; Stotfold has enough now.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Steve Barber	Is small scale and might not have impact on views to countryside. Might link into proposal H260 with access to Arlesey Road
Mrs E Gibbs	Shouldn't be built here as on a flood plain and could cause flooding here and elsewhere.

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 David Colin Pipe	This proposed development would make Waters End a very busy road, the junction with the Hitchin road would become even more dangerous than it is now and the Hitchin road itself even more of a race track. I object most strongly to more green fields being lost to a policy that is out of date, out of touch with local peoples needs and creating houses that in the present climate aren't wanted or needed I moved to Stotfold to get away from urban sprawl, mad planners, and a government that has totally lost the plot.
Mr Donald Pearson	This development adds nothing to Stotfold in terms of amenities, facilities or infrastructure. It adds traffic to an already congested system that is trying to cope with the rapid addition of 2 huge housing projects. The disruption and extra load on the road system is already markedly felt and we are still only halfway the developments currently underway, never mind adding more. This development takes a valuable play/recreation area (end of Waters End) way from local children. It also destroys green space with the consequent impact on wildlife and residents "quality of life".

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood	<p>Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on “Land South of Stotfold”, and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold Town FC’s Roker Park site has not been taken into account as part of this Site Allocations process. The town’s transport infrastructure, public services and utility services, local roads, local school, doctors’ surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision – are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow and larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more ‘greenfield’ sites to such development; escalating concerns about rising food prices and the need to control our nation’s long-term ‘food security’ – relative to the rising fuel costs associated with ‘food miles’ – should certainly lead both central government and local authorities to seek to protect land that has an agricultural use, as does this submission site. Furthermore, as the District Council’s initial comments note, “this site is [entirely within the floodplain [and] in general, development should avoid the floodplain.” Stotfold cannot easily support further residential development and, thus, such development would not be sustainable. This submission should therefore be rejected. NB – given that the unexpected ‘second phase’ of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date), it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so ‘latecomer’ submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.</p>
Mr John Alderton	<p>This site would impact hugely on the local environment and countryside and take away a lot of the natural wildlife that currently exists. If the access is via Waters End it is too narrow to accommodate the number of vehicles for the new site and the construction vehicles during the build. The junction at Hitchin Road is right on a sharp bend that is very fast making this a very dangerous place to bring more vehicles out onto, it is already bad enough with Heron Way and Waters End, let alone another estate. If the access were to be via Waters End I assume that this would mean cutting a road through the play area at the bottom where my children play and which was listed on the Bovis diagrams when we bought the property. I feel that other sites offer more in the way of scope for future development and safer access for traffic and people.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Lee Butler	Object. Whilst developments on H159 and H260 could be potentially acceptable and sustainable so that housing targets can be met, this additional site extends too far into green belt, which should be avoided if possible. There appears to be sufficient available brownfield land in Stotfold that could meet Stotfold's 50-250 housing requirements by 2026. Traffic from an additional 160 homes to that already proposed by H159 and H260 may result in significant parking overflows, even though provision of spaces may fall within planning guidance limits. Traffic issues may arise from the extra volume emerging onto Arlesey Road, which may have safety implications, especially given the proximity to Etonbury School. Housing targets should be amicably spread across mid beds to minimise impact on particular communities. I object to the idea of building on the floodplain. Whilst this may meet 'targets', consideration should be given to future occupants and the effect on them and the town of issues arising from flooding.
Mr Michael Haskell	Housing should only be allowed outside of floodplains
Mr Paul Clifton	My main concern is mostly with the impact on the infrastructure and environment. Further developments such as this do not seem to be supported by similar adjustments in current infrastructure provision and the burden will increase the pressure on already stretched local resources traffic and services. Secondly, and just as important (if not more so) is the impact on our natural environment by continuing erosion of our green spaces; much of our wildlife will be severely impacted by usage of existing fields and open green space. Why do we not make more use of existing Brown land spaces and derelict commercial areas around the country?!
Mr Peter Brown	If this site was allowed to be developed you would be restricting the availability of rural areas for recreation and dog walking. this would be purely financial greed without any consideration on the environment

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Steven Barker	<p>A large proportion of this site lies within the floodplain as depicted on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map and this (centred on Pix Brook) separates the site from Arlesey Road which, it is noted, could be the point of access (via March 2008 Proposed Allocation H260 it is assumed). To the east, H330 adjoins suggested allocation H316 (see separate comments) which is wholly within the floodplain and which presumably is an alternative route to an existing highway (Waters End – Hitchin Road). The liability to flood is a major constraint and whilst mitigation can always be provided at a cost this should not be until better alternatives have been explored. There are clearly alternative sites around the settlement which do not suffer similarly so this site should be discounted for this reason alone. On a not unrelated matter, local people are conscious of the fact that the sewerage infrastructure in Stotfold has long been an issue. Certainly, in this part of the village it is understood to be near or at capacity and any additional residential development and the discharge there from would need to be accompanied by improved facilities. This would need exploring and satisfying were the principle of development to be accepted. On the matter of access, the site in isolation is landlocked and does not adjoin any existing roads or built development. Indeed, its northern boundary is formed by the above-mentioned watercourse (Pix Brook). Its allocation would only make sense in conjunction with adjacent land to the north and east (which incidentally would make a large total site in the context of Stotfold). We have no comment to make on the possibility of accessing the site from Arlesey Road other than it is the former east/west main road through the village and, although now bypassed, it remains a main road in and out of the village. Access from the east via suggested site H361 and Waters End is not discounted, however, and notwithstanding the floodplain issue (above) it does require comment (see also separate objection to H361). Waters End is currently a cul-de-sac of 18 dwellings off which, and closer to its junction with Hitchin Road, is a further cul-de-sac (Heron Way) of 45 dwellings. The combined addition of 185 houses (25 and 160) even if it were technically possible (and this would need to be demonstrated) is quite unacceptable in terms of the amenity of existing residents in Waters End were it to be extended in this fashion. If H361 is allocated and if H330 is to be allocated then certainly the latter must be conditional upon H330 (other than for pedestrians/cyclists) not having a road link with H361 and Waters End and its vehicular access being in an alternative location, presumably to Arlesey Road.</p>
Mr Trevor Watler	<p>I feel that with the present traffic levels on the existing by pass and the town roads coupled with the poor bus service and over subscribed local rail links (Arlesey and Letchworth are already over capacity at peak times) further development in this area of Stotfold will simply add to the existing travelling difficulties. The sewage system is also already at capacity for Stotfold.</p>
Mr Vikram Sahota	<p>The proposed site would create no benefits to the existing residents in the surrounding area, as no or little improvements in the form of local services or amenities would be created for existing residents. Much of the proposed site is located of flood plains, whilst housing may be in demand, building new homes on existing flood plains will possibly create major problems within the near future. The building on flood plains also increases the possible risk of flooding not only to newly planned builds, but also to existing parts to Stotfold.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Brenda Haskell	This appears to be over the top development, it is once again on part of the flood plain lets hope common sense prevails this time and the proposal is rejected.
Mrs Claire Chouffont	I am irritated to discover that after attending the exhibition at the Roecroft earlier this year and being told development sites were finite. Now there are more.
Mrs E Jane Hyde	There are enough sites already identified for housing. This area is on a flood plain and is not suitable for development.
Mrs Helen Winder	To increase the number of houses will cause significant increase in through traffic which will have an added impact of the safety to our children, increase in traffic noise which at present is very very low, the increase to pollution, significant impact on wildlife (we have a number of rare species which visit our garden on a regular basis), light pollution by adding more street lighting. This list goes on! How much more of our green land needs to be lost to development? How much wildlife does the town wish to drive out? How much more added traffic needs to be added, to already a very busy road, Arlesey Road? How many children's safety do you want to put at risk? Do you want to become a mini Stevenage? You already have a development taking place behind the Co-Op and building work has stopped due to houses not being sold! I could go on with many more points but i think this gives you a taster of how I, personally am feeling!
Mrs Judy Dear	Not advisable to build on flood plain as could then cause flooding in the other known areas of the flood plain.
Mrs Marilyn Radford	This would take away a lot of the country side. We bought this house because it was in a quiet area looking out at open fields.
Mrs Rosie King	This proposal will affect the traffic on the exit to Hitchin Road, on a potentially lethal bend. Do we really need to build on green belt land, and lose all the nature
Mrs Sallie Munden	Problems with traffic, enough houses already.
Mrs Teresa Ann Nichols	Part of this site would be built on a floodplain. Access would be from Arlesey road. The bypass was built to reduce traffic along Arlesey road, making school access safer. The new site would increase traffic again. School bus service was originally provided due to danger of walking with volume of traffic and taken away when bypass built. Therefore insufficient services and facilities available for this amount of housing. Enough green fields have been lost to housing and there are plenty of brown sites available to accommodate enough housing required by 2026.
Mrs Valerie Balderstone	This area is a small breathing space between Fairfield and Stotfold. I strongly feel that we need some areas in Stotfold that are NOT built on. We do not need any more houses.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ms Leona Ellis	Taking into consideration the overall need for extra housing in the future I really feel this site is entirely inappropriate. Access whether from Arlesey Road or potentially Waters End (Hitchin Road) will have a significant negative impact on existing housing, the roads are adequate to serve these cul-de-sacs but to make them main through roads would be extremely hazardous. I am also perplexed that any of these proposals have been put forward with the large new Green Acres development very close by. Very few of the houses are getting sold and I understand that building is to order only at present. This site is supposed to include suitable infrastructure, although when it actually gets built remains to be seen. I also feel there is still scope for developing existing areas rather than destroying more green fields; yes we do need to accommodate everyone however it should be driven by necessity rather than greed.
Penny Gregory	Waters End is already a busy road, as the only access to Heron Way. More housing in this area will make the Hitchin road junction a dangerous hazard. Also the people who brought houses in Waters End when it was first developed, were told that there was to be no more houses in the area earmarked.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Patrick Clarey	An unnecessary encroachment of the village west ward. The number of housing units required can be without this.
Ms Joanne Sams	Stotfold will have grown 50% in the next few years and does not have enough local amenities to support more development. The land is greenfield and also on the floodplain

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H331

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
E Dear	Why build on flood plains, will it cause problems elsewhere? Too many houses.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Nicola Phang	The site is located on a flood plain, next to the River Ivel. With climate change and unpredictable weather, we should avoid doing so. It would have an adverse effect on the countryside and environment. Would it not be possible to build on the Motorola site on Taylors Lane instead of a new green site? A smaller project would have less impact on existing community resources. I have concerns about local facilities such as the GP surgery. Can it support the ever increasing population of Stotfold? The map available on the site does not show enough detail. How will the traffic access the main part of the town? The road towards Taylors Lane is already congested with residents cars parked outside their houses.
Mr D Heath	This is very good agricultural land at present. Surely with food prices going up, and the shortages, we should be aiming to save any farm land from being used for home/industry. There have been a few previous applications for change of land use (this particular field) which have been turned down.
Mr David Colin Pipe	My comments for the survey on H330 apply to this application plus Waters End , Heron Way is a small estate one road in the same road out, no shops schools , nothing , that's how we like it
Mr David Garratt	This site has for many years been subject to applications for houses and factories, the site is grade 2 arable land and should be retained for farming, the present development in Stotfold, the possible development of the football ground make this proposed development which is clearly outside the Stotfold envelope not required.
Mr David Pelter	Road congestion within the surrounding area will restrict any new use on this site. Significant investment is required if the existing overloaded infrastructure is required to support further vehicle movements. Access from Taylors Road onto the A1 is a major risk/danger.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood</p>	<p>Outside the existing 'settlement envelope', the submission site is agricultural land of good quality that has been farmed for many years. Escalating concerns about rising food prices and the need to control our nation's long-term 'food security' - relative to the rising fuel costs associated with 'food miles' - should lead both central government and local authorities to seek to protect such prime agricultural land. The desire to prevent the loss of such land is entirely consistent with policies in Med Bedfordshire's adopted Local Plan and its emerging Core Strategy. Further to this, the Bedfordshire-based president of the National Farmers Union, Peter Kendall, had recently issued statements making a strong case for ensuring that Bedfordshire is part of a vigorous, successful farming sector; these statements are far more positive and pragmatic than Roger Tym & Partners' passive observation within the Mid Beds Core Strategy consultation document that agriculture within Mid Beds, as an employment sector, is in decline. Put bluntly, we can easily survive without the consumer products or services that office units proposed for this site might provide (as part of submission E77), but none of us can do without food! There is certainly no great need for this 'greenfield' site to be developed for housing provision . Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on "Land South of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years, Furthermore, the impending residential development of Stotfold Town FC's Roker Park site (as planned by Stotfold Town Council) has not been taken into account as part of this Site Allocation process; the Roker Park proposal is set to far exceed the minimum target of fifty houses set for Stotfold by the District Council, and given this Council's close involvement with the project linked to the relocation of the football club, its officers should have knowledge of the relevant figures. Relative to the above, it should be noted that concerns have already been raised locally - at 'minuted' meetings of Stotfold Town Council's Town Enhancement Committee, for example - about the strain that submissions H262 (for 100-135 dwellings) and H200 (for 18 dwellings) might place on adjacent roads and utility services here. As a result of its recent growth, the town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services - local roads, local schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision - are already struggling to cope with existing demands placed upon them. Both of these submissions, H331 and E77, would have a markedly adverse effect on this situation. As regards the provision of employment in Stotfold, the redevelopment of the 'brownfield' site E25 should be preferred, with the proviso that any proposal should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of a high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. However, no amount of landscaping or attempted mitigation of the appearance of a business (or leisure) park on this submission site could significantly reduce the irreversible, destructive effects it would have on the Ivel Valley here.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood (continued)</p>	<p>In connection with employment issues linked to Stotfold it is also important to note that the town's year-on-year unemployment levels remain at less than 1% (0.8% according to recent figures published by the Department for Works and Pensions), while there exists a considerable number of vacant commercial units across Mid Bedfordshire and even close to the submission site (in Fen End and at the Bury Business Park on Mill Lane, for example). Furthermore, the provision of new employment sites within a particular area does not necessarily mean that local residents have the skills to secure any new jobs created. As such, persons from outside the area will fill these jobs while the 'out-commuting' of these locals would continue. Consequently, the 'problem' of 'out-commuting' will not have been solved and the only major change locally – particularly in locations not served by effective public transport, such as submission site E77 – will be a far greater volume of private motorised vehicles on local roads. In terms of accommodating employees travelling from outside the immediate area to large employment site locally, the most sustainable option would be to redevelop areas of 'brownfield' land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station. With regards to the "leisure use" aspect of Submission E77, it should be noted that the new large-scale sports and leisure facility currently under construction on land off Arlesey Road, and the proposed new community building on "Land South of Stotfold", will provide the town with a comprehensive range to recreational facilities. The location of the submission site prevents it from offering other leisure facilities on a meaningful scale, or functioning as a sustainable employment site, because the transport infrastructure required to cope with a large number of visitors is clearly lacking. Moreover, the fact it is not served by a public transport network makes this proposal entirely contrary to the aims of PPG13, which seeks a modal shift that would reduce reliance on the private motorised vehicle. Further to this, its location would necessitate that almost all visiting cars and delivery vehicles would have to pass through the already congested streets of central Stotfold, given that Taylors Road (from which it would have been accessed) and the other country lanes east of Stotfold (Astwick Road and Wrayfields) – as well as being too narrow to cope with increased levels of traffic – are effectively a 'one-way system', requiring those travelling south to make a six mile round trip via the Langford bypass. In these impatient days, with many drivers assisted by 'sat-nav' equipment, that is not likely to happen. ...But if it did, then the increased traffic would make the lanes far less safe for the pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians who use them (their rural character being such that they have neither pavements or street lights), as well as local drivers. The open countryside east of Stotfold, almost entirely unchanged throughout the 20th century, is a much valued and much enjoyed public amenity, being the only such area within walking distance of the town (the countryside east of the A1 and south of the A507 is inaccessible to pedestrians from Stotfold due to the volume of fast-moving traffic on these major trunk roads), and this submission site, so close to the River Ivel, is an important part of the landscape.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood (continued)</p>	<p>And if the hangar-like ex-Motorola building on Taylors Road does disappear in connection with Submissions H262, or a prior planning application (the adjoining two-storey office block has already been demolished since the 'first phase' of this consultation), then the appearance of area immediately northwest of this site is even set to be much improved. Therefore, any development of this agricultural land – particularly with the establishment of offices or other commercial premises that would be significant alien features so close to the lvel – will only diminish the area's historic character and appeal for the many people who appreciate the rural views as they walk, jog, cycle or ride horses along Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields, or traverse the Kingfisher Way, the Three Mills Walk or other footpaths nearby. In fact, during the 'first phase' of this Site Allocations consultation hundreds of Stotfold residents, plus their friends and family visiting from nearby towns, signed a petition (presented to MBDC's Forward Planning department and Vision Twentyone in April) opposing submissions promoting the development of the open countryside surrounding the lvel Valley in Stotfold. Had submissions H331 and E77 been included in the original phase of this consultation – and it must be remembered that no indication was given that additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date – then that petition would definitely have made reference to them alongside submissions E06 and H056. Of further concern would be the potential noise pollution, especially from vehicle movements, and nocturnal light pollution that any development here – particularly commercial development – might generate. At present, the open countryside east of Stotfold is still very much a quiet, tranquil area, with the sound of traffic on the A1 and A507 being carried away from it on all but the rare occasions when strong winds prevail from the east. It is also very dark at night, due to the lack of street lights, so that the constellations of stars are clearly visible. Any development of this site and the effects of any resultant commercial operations, might also be detrimental to the public amenity value of the Riverside Recreation Ground, directly adjacent to it, which is classified as an "important open space". As the submission site is right beside the River lvel, large areas of it, towards the east and south-east, might become waterlogged in the winter months, and recent dramatic increases in levels of rainfall throughout the entire year (almost certainly caused by climate change linked to increases in man-made carbon emissions), have meant that lowest-lying areas of the open countryside east of Stotfold, and irrigation ditches/gullies bordering them, now struggle to contain the amount of surface water on the ground in the Spring and Autumn, and occasionally during the Summer too. As the District Council's initial comments note, "approximately 50% of this site is within the floodplain [and] in general, development should avoid the floodplain." Thus, any large-scale 'hard-coursing' of the submission site would significantly increase the risk of flooding in this area. In light of the above points, and at a time when, both locally and nationally, public authorities – including Mid Beds District Council – are seeking to recognise and consolidate a Green Infrastructure network that strengthens the public amenity links that exist between 'greenfield' facilities (such as the Riverside Recreation Ground) and areas of open countryside (such as the adjacent submission site), both of these submissions, H331 and E77 should be firmly rejected.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood (continued)	Hopefully, the creation of a Landscape Character Assessment procedure within Mid Beds, relative to policies CS5 and CS22 of the emerging Core Strategy, will ensure that the true agricultural and public amenity value of all such areas within Stotfold's Ivel Valley will be recognised – and afforded due weight – so that they are properly conserved. NB – given that the unexpected 'second phase' of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date), it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so 'latecomer' submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.
Mr Lee Butler	The site's position within the existing boundary of the town could be considered acceptable, if we MUST lose green belt to meet housing targets. It meets almost 100% of the housing target in one development. However, there appears to be sufficient available brownfield land in Stotfold that could meet Stotfold's 50-250 housing requirements by 2026. I am concerned about potential traffic congestion, from travelling cars or parking overspill. I object to the idea of building on the floodplain. Whilst this may meet 'targets', consideration should be given to future occupants and the effect on them and the town of issues arising from flooding. Housing targets should be amicably spread across mid beds to minimise impact on particular communities.
Mr Michael Haskell	No mixed use should be allowed in Stotfold except a town centre is critical and needed now.
Mr Paul Clifton	My main concern is mostly with the impact on the infrastructure and environment. Further developments such as this do not seem to be supported by similar adjustments in current infrastructure provision and the burden will increase the pressure on already stretched local resources, traffic and services. Secondly, and just as important (if not more so) is the impact on our natural environment by continuing erosion of our green spaces; much of our wildlife will be severely impacted by usage of existing fields and open green space. Why do we not make more use of existing Brown land spaces and derelict commercial areas around the country?!
Mr Peter John Hawkins	Wrong position of town.
Mr Steve Barber	A very large site satisfying the whole projection to 2026. Difficult vehicle access, a long way from schools, therefore a possible increase in traffic. Impact on environment largely dependant on outcome of H262 and E06.
Mr Victor John Gruncell	Already there are major housing developments in the Stotfold area putting pressure on the infrastructure, plus with the increase of traffic damaging the environment. Also this land, as stated in your site allocations leaflet, is floodplain; we hear enough on the needs about houses being built on floodplains and the problems that arise.
Mrs Brenda Haskell	Mixed use, i.e. housing and employment is a recipe for disaster it will lead to potential accident/health hazards, complaints about noise levels, traffic movement etc.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Ejane Hyde	The land within the immediate vicinity of the river lvel should be left open and not be developed. The road links are bad. The area floods, if the river rises which it does on occasions it provides a flood plain.
Mrs Isabelle Martineau	Will cause conflict with local traffic. There is already a lot of traffic in Stotfold, The roads can't cope with more Lorries especially around the green area. Aztek logistic has had to leave its premises in Stotfold for precisely these reasons. Link to A1 not appropriate for high traffic. It will be dangerous and will causes congestion problems on the A1. Causes problem with lvel way cycle route.
Mrs Janet Hawkins	No more housing is needed in Stotfold. It is already very difficult to get out of Stotfold at rush hour times. There is only a narrow lane leading from this site. The sewage problem is already bad in this area. The schools, particularly the lower schools are already overcrowded. The health centre is also overloaded.
Mrs Judy Dear	Why build on flood plains-therefore not suitable.
Mrs Linda Gruncell	Stotfold is, at the moment, having a lot of new houses built along the bypass A507 - local amenities would be unable to cope with a lot more housing. This area also has minor road access. The site in question is on a floodplain with potential flooding. Local schools are full and other amenities are stretched. Surely this land is Green Belt; we should protect it and its inhabitants.
Mrs Rebekah Hall	The road system in Stotfold is woefully inadequate to support any further development on the Silverbirch Avenue/Taylor's Road end of the town. The only routes to access the A1 Southbound, the town facilities and the A507, are already congested with parked cars lining each major road through Stotfold. I am referring in the main to The Green, Regent Street, Astwick Road, Vaughan Road, Rook Tree Lane and the High Street. You would have to agree with me that the current road layout was not designed with any expansion in mind and will be the means of frustration and pollution together with the added risk of accidents on these roads with an overwhelming increase in use. The wildlife that exists in this area will also be a cause for concern as will the beauty of the lvel Valley. These are important to the residents of Stotfold who take pride in the countryside that surrounds this small town.
Mrs Susan Pelter	Local roads already inadequate to carry extra traffic, roads congested with on-street parking. Access on/off A1 very dangerous at Taylor's Road junction. Floodplain - solution = wildlife park to replace other green areas in Stotfold that have been built on.
Mrs Valerie Balderstone	Every year for the last 22 years I have organised a toad lift along Taylor's road towards the lake at Astwick. If this development goes ahead this will spell the end of this already in trouble breeding group. In this area we have toads, frogs and newts. We do not need this development.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Patrick Clarey	Area lies across from the riverside play area to Taylors Road and lies on the kingfisher way walk. It should be retained as an open space boundary to the north of the town. Building should not take place along the river./

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H361

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
E Gibbs	Providing more houses on this site will not cause flooding for existing dwellings.
Mr Andy Owens	A well structured plan with good access and limited impact on surrounding area. The mix of residential and recreational space makes appropriate use proposed site.
Mrs Carolyn Owens	Compared to most sites in the village, this appears to be a sensible small development without imposing upon other residents. Good road access and close to village centre.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Paul Clifton	My main concern is mostly with the impact on the environment. Further developments such as this impact on our natural environment by continuing erosion of our green spaces; much of our wildlife will be severely impacted by usage of existing fields and open green space. Why do we not make more use of existing Brown land spaces and derelict commercial areas around the country?!
Mr Steve Barber	A small development probably only having an incremental effect on traffic and the countryside.
Mrs Judy Dear	Floodplain- why build there next to the river?

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
Homes in Waters End	This is a private road. I would like to see it remain that way.
Dr John Christopher	I strongly object to this site being developed for housing on several grounds: 1) The site is wholly within the floodplain; 2) The site is a Greenfield one, outside the current settlement envelope of Stotfold; 3) Access to the site will be poor, especially if it is intended for access to be via the already congested Waters End.
Mr David Cattley	This area is a flood plain for the Pix Brook, any development of this site would put properties on the opposite bank under threat of flooding as well as any properties built thereon.
Mr Donald Pearson	This development adds nothing to Stotfold in terms of amenities, facilities or infrastructure. It adds traffic to an already congested system that is trying to cope with the rapid addition of 2 huge housing projects. The disruption and extra load on the road system is already markedly felt and we are still only halfway the developments currently underway, never mind adding more. This development takes a valuable play/recreation area (end of Waters End) way from local children. It also destroys green space with the consequent impact on wildlife and residents "quality of life".

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood	<p>Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on “Land South of Stotfold”, and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold Town FC’s Roker Park site has not been taken into account as part of this Site Allocations process. The town’s transport infrastructure, public services and utility services, local roads, local school, doctors’ surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision – are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow and larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more ‘Greenfield’ sites to such development; escalating concerns about rising food prices and the need to control our nation’s long-term ‘food security’ – relative to the rising fuel costs associated with ‘food miles’ – should certainly lead both central government and local authorities to seek to protect land that has an agricultural use, as does this submission site. Furthermore, as the District Council’s initial comments note, “this site is [entirely within the floodplain [and] in general, development should avoid the floodplain.” Stotfold cannot easily support further residential development and, thus, such development would not be sustainable. This submission should therefore be rejected. NB – given that the unexpected ‘second phase’ of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date), it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so ‘latecomer’ submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.</p>
Mr Iain Nichols	<p>Traffic will access site through Hitchin Road which is already the busiest road in Stotfold. The site would be built on a floodplain. There are not enough facilities i.e. shops, leisure venues to warrant more housing in Stotfold. Stotfold has already nearly doubled in size over the last 5 years taking Fairfield into account. The new development on the bypass is not progressing in build or sales due to the economic down turn. The bus service to the station in Arlesey is woeful. There are plenty of brown field sites available without spoiling the green belt land in Stotfold. We wish to retain our natural habitat. We strongly disagree with the proposals for this site. Overall, the number of housing site proposals far exceed the number of houses required by 2026.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr John Alderton	I feel this site would be totally unacceptable due the access, which I assume is via Waters End itself. Waters End is too narrow to accommodate the number of vehicles for the new site and the construction vehicles during the build. The junction at Hitchin Road is right on a sharp bend that is very fast making this a very dangerous place to bring more vehicles out onto, it is already bad enough with Heron Way and Waters End, let alone another estate. The proposed site is on a flood plain which, in light of the current climate, I feel is a risky place to build houses when there are so many other sites available. If the access were to be via Waters End I assume that this would mean cutting a road through the play area at the bottom where my children play and which was listed on the Bovis diagrams when we bought the property. I feel that other sites offer more in the way of scope for future development and safer access for traffic and people.
Mr Lee Butler	As with developments H159 and H260, this could be potentially acceptable and sustainable so that housing targets can be met. It does not appear to significantly destroy green belt land, so if green field sites must be chosen, this may be a preferred location. That said, there appears to be sufficient available brownfield land in Stotfold that could meet Stotfold's 50-250 housing requirements by 2026. Housing targets should be amicably spread across mid beds to minimise impact on particular communities. My objection is on the basis of building on the floodplain. Whilst this may meet 'targets', consideration should be given to future occupants and the effect on them and the town of issues arising from flooding.
Mr Michael Haskell	Housing should only be allowed outside of floodplains.
Mr Robert James Thornley	Access to this site would be through a designated children's play area, which is in regular use. Access onto Hitchin Road would increase traffic near a blind bend in Hitchin Road. This is another example of encroachment into Green Field (greenbelt?) land within Stotfold. There would be many other more appropriate sites within the area that could sustain further development without using Greenfield sites. The town already has insufficient shops, schools, leisure facilities and transport infrastructure to cope with the current population. Residents have real fears that the current and foreseeable infrastructure could not possibly meet the demands of the proposed housing growth!

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Steven Barker	<p>This site is completely within the floodplain as depicted on the adopted Local Plan Proposals Map and as is confirmed by the promoter. Even if mitigation measures could, at a cost, be included as part of any development it should only be pursued if there is no alternative. Given the size, shape and physical characteristics of Stotfold there are plenty of better alternatives and this site should be discounted for this reason alone. On a not unrelated matter, local people are conscious of the fact that the sewerage infrastructure in Stotfold has long been an issue. Certainly, in this part of the village it is understood to be near or at capacity and any additional residential development and the discharge there from would need to be accompanied by improved facilities. This would need exploring and satisfying were the principle of development to be accepted. On the matter of access, Waters End is a cul-de-sac off which there is a further cul-de-sac (Heron Way) with, in all, 63 dwellings. A further 25 dwellings, assuming they are to be served as an extended cul-de-sac, would represent a 40% increase in houses and a consequent increase in traffic. Certainly, should the principle of development be accepted it is necessary to demonstrate that the existing cul-de-sac (the Waters End arm) and its junction with Hitchin Road are technically capable of taking this increase without prejudicing highway safety. Certainly, the residents are doubtful and would want satisfying on this point. Further, were the site to be linked through to suggested site H330 (see separate objection) for which it is noted, access only could be from Arlesey Road then that suggests that it could also be via this site and Waters End. Irrespective of any technical considerations the impact upon the amenity of existing residents in this cul-de-sac of 18 houses from 185 new dwellings would be quite unacceptable. If the larger site is to be developed then both it and, preferably, site H361 should be served off Arlesey Road rather than via an existing small cul-de-sac. This is related to the final area of concern. Presently, there is an area of public open space in the form of a play area which sits at the head of the cul-de-sac. It is not clear what is intended by the proposed "large area of open space" but the proposed access appears to bisect the existing space so whilst there may be replacement open space it seems likely to disrupt the existing play area which is conveniently located for existing residents and make it less safe.</p>
Mr Trevor Watler	<p>I feel that with the present traffic levels on the existing by pass and the town roads coupled with the poor bus service and over subscribed local rail links (Arlesey and Letchworth are already over capacity at peak times) further development in this area of Stotfold will simply add to the existing travelling difficulties. The sewage system is also already at capacity for Stotfold. Also, the additional traffic that would be travelling down what is at present a cul-de-sac would endanger local children in the area. In addition, the junctions of both Hitchin Road/Waters End and Waters End/Heron way are already very dangerous to negotiate without the extra turning traffic that this development would bring.</p>
Mr Vikram Sahota	<p>The proposed site would create no benefits to the existing residents in the surrounding area, as no or little improvements in the form of local services or amenities would be created for existing residents. The proposed location is already situated on a busy location, Hitchin Road, with the creation of new home only increasing the congestion problems.</p>
Mrs Brenda Haskell	<p>This appears to be over the top development, it is once again on part of their flood plain lets hope common sense prevails this time and the proposal is rejected.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Claire Chouffots	I'm very annoyed that after attending the roecroft exhibition earlier this year and being told that the potential development sites were a finite number, you have now added more.
Mrs E Jane Hyde	There are enough sites already identified for housing. This area is on flood plain and is not suitable for development.
Mrs Helen Winder	I think it is outrageous that you are considering this site for development. I have lived in Waters End for 12 years and one of the reason for living there is the beautiful open views that we can enjoy. The road in Waters End is not wide enough as it stands serving the current number of houses. To increase the number of houses will cause significant increase in through traffic which will have an added impact of the safety to our children, increase in traffic noise which at present is very very low, the increase to pollution, significant impact on wildlife (we have a number of rare species which visit our garden on a regular basis), light pollution by adding more street lighting. This list goes on! The triangle which is at the bottom of Water End was designated a safe play area and open ground for the residents of Waters End. By taking the road through this will remove this facility which is used and enjoyed by our children. How much more of our green land needs to be lost to development? How much wildlife does the town wish to drive out? How much more added traffic needs to be added, to already a very busy road, Hitchin Road? How many children's safety do you want to put at risk? Do you want to become a mini Stevenage? You already have a development taking place behind the Co-Op and building work has stopped due to houses not being sold! I could go on with many more points but i think this gives you a taster of how I, personally am feeling!
Mrs Linda Wilding	This site is identified as being part of the flood plain ,the Pix Brook takes the ever increasing road drainage in this area and the increase in volume is very evident to all who live in the vicinity and there is every likelihood that the vast expansion of buildings will only increase the flooding risk. The paper work speaks of this being a flat site and not affecting the residents of The Gardens but no mention is made of the fact that The Gardens rises away from the site giving a clear view the of area in question. The dwellings in the Gardens are bungalows and the development plans show large dwellings of at least two story's and experience tells us that buildings get larger not smaller and denser not further apart.
Mrs Marilyn Radford	I don't want houses there. But if it is going to happen the access should be from Arelesy Road or Hithcin Road, Not Waters End.We bought the house 5 years ago thinking it was a nice, quiet road, if these house have got the access through Waters Ends it would make the road very busy and the junction into Hitchin Road very busy and dangerous. Also the children feel safe playing out the front at the moment, if the access is through Waters End it would know longer be safe for them. How much more country side is going to be used for housing, All the lovely walks I used to go on when I was a child have now gone.
Mrs Rosie King	The housing here will affect green belt land, and increase traffic which will have to exit onto a potentially dangerous bend on the Hitchin Roadl object strongly to this proposal
Mrs Sallie Munden	Too many houses here already, too much traffic.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Valerie Balderstone	This is a small area next to the river. We have houses on the other side so this development would go against having a wildlife corridor for otters etc. This whole area would make an excellent park area with tree planting up to Etonbury Wood. Be a forward looking council and doing just go for houses. People need green spaces too.
Ms Joanne Sams	Stotfold has will have grown by 50% in the next few years the infrastructure will not be able to cope with even more development
Penny Gregory	This plot of land was meant to be a children's play area. To have more cars exiting from Waters End onto the Hitchin Road, right by the bend, would seem a dangerous hazard.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Patrick Clarey	It would appear a logical infill.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E05

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
Cllr Mrs Mary Cooper	Is adjacent to A1/A507. Safe ingress/egress to site would be paramount. A507 is very busy on this section as has picked up traffic from further west of the area. S106 money from this site could fund a safe pedestrian crossing of the A507 for the Kingfisher Way that is now cut in two just west of this site, before the roundabout with A507/Baldock Road/Norton Road in Stotfold. Options could be - underpass - following the original route towards/from Radwell. Bridge over road - probably far too expensive, or tortuous to use as extensive ramping of it would be necessary as steps only would not be permissible.
H J Pickering	This site would satisfy the need for a significant number of new jobs in Stotfold. NB: It should be noted that the population of Stotfold has grown by more than 50% during the past 5 years and there has not been an equivalent growth in the employment possibilities, thus causing more commuting to obtain jobs.
Jane Hyde	This would be an ideal site for employment as it has access to the A1 & A507 and Stotfold needs some more local jobs. It would not impact visually on the people of Stotfold And a site so near the A1 and roundabout has no amenity value. It would balance up the service station on the other side of the A1.
Paul Clifton	This area is outside the residential centre of Stotfold and has good access to the A1 both north and south via Junction 10. As long as the area was low noise and low pollution and was discretely landscaped, it would make an ideal location for development of employment. The area also has easy access to Baldock Xtra Services which are directly opposite which would provide for the needs of the employees. Consideration would have to be made however for the impact on already heavy traffic usage of the A507.
S J Barber	A good location for industrial and distribution, being close to the A1. Zero impact on local residential areas.
Sarah Passey	The area proposed for development is suitable for an employment centre. With the site bordering the A1 and the A507, access would be adequate, as long as big lorries would not be allowed to travel through Stotfold centre. However, the site would not benefit facilities in Stotfold because it is too far away for workers to get to them on foot (they would be more likely to go to Baldock services). An increase in traffic in the centre of Stotfold around the Co-op would be detrimental to the town. However, please do not allow this site to be developed if doing so would set a precedent for further development on the land bordering the A1/A507. A large industrial area would be detrimental to the area and the environment.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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
Graham Russell	Considering the location of employment it would not effect the present environment of Stotfold and would benefit the local people and no increase of population.
Mrs N Walker	Access to this area would have to be carefully considered in order not to impact too heavily on the town.

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
No name given	<p>I disagree with the above named site used for the identified purpose because-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The area is adjacent to wildlife sites and therefore development will affect the fauna and flora of the area. -The identified area is a flood plain. -Development is too near a residential area and would obstruct the landscape and any screening would take years to grow to fulfill its purpose. -Noise from the development would impact on the nearby housing. - Development would put a strain on the A507 which is already a high risk accident road. -A business park already exists in Biggleswade a few miles away therefore expansion should be considered in Biggleswade which already has the facilities to cope with such a development.
F Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The lvel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces.We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit!</p> <p>We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	<p>Submission E05 If Stotfold is to support new employment development then it must be brought forward in locations, and for uses, that are sustainable and will not be detrimental to the environment. The vast majority of Stotfold residents would not want the town to acquire more employment sites at the expense of its rural character and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to new development. This is the largest site submitted in the Stotfold area as part of this allocation process, yet due to the type of storage and distribution operation proposed here, in conjunction with a general industrial operation, the number of jobs that it would create it, at most, half that proposed by the same landowner, Bedfordshire County Council, for submission site E06 (unquestionably the least sustainable employment site promoted within Stotfold as part of this process); this disparity in terms of a 'land-developed-to-jobs-created' ratio is indicative of this Council's (and its agents') lack of a coherent, sustainable approach to the provision of employment in the Stotfold area. And it should be noted here that this Council, and, hence, its professed (and peculiar) obligations to realise the 'best value' for its land, will cease to exist in 2009. The development of this large 'greenfield' site far outside the town's defined settlement envelope - with particular regard to the large structured associated with this proposal, which would be significant alien features on this land - might well lead other local landowners to think that a precedent had been set for the possible development of adjacent agricultural land, thus encouraging them to submit further proposals that could threaten the future of the important area of open countryside east and south-east of Stotfold towards the Ivel Valley. Such an outcome must not be permitted because the rural tranquillity of this area of open countryside is much valued by local residents as a public amenity within walking distance of central Stotfold. This is especially so given that the countryside east of the A1 and south of the A507 is inaccessible to pedestrians from Stotfold due to the volume of fast-moving traffic on these major trunk roads. Furthermore, the loss of prime agricultural land should be avoided in accordance with the directives of the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy. Submission site E05 is far from any form of public transport and its location adjacent to the A507 and Junction 10 of the A1M, would not be accessible to prospective employees by foot or by bicycle, certainly not without considerable risk to their safety in such heavy, fast moving traffic. As such, this proposal is entirely contrary to the aims of PPG13, which seeks a modal shift in transport use that would reduce reliance on the private motorised vehicle. Furthermore, the movements of a significant number of vehicles, especially large haulage vehicles, attempting to access an employment site in this location could cause major problems in terms of safety and congestion along this very busy stretch of the A507, also impacting on traffic attempting to join the A1. Relative to this proposal, it would be prudent for a thorough assessment of local utility services (drainage/sewerage/electricity/gas/water) to be conducted, as the appropriate infrastructure does not exist at the submission site, and might not be easily, or viably, introduced, to support such a large development in this location. Of further concern is the likelihood that the industrial or storage units on the proposed site would be visible on the horizon to the south from Wrayfields, Mill Lane and Malthouse Lane, which would have a significant detrimental effect on the character of this area of open countryside east of Stotfold.. In addition to the above,</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Glen Rickwood [continued]	the potential light pollution from by the proposed site at night would have a negative effect on the character of this area, particularly as viewed from Wrayfields, Mill Lane or Malthouse Lane. At present, this is a quiet, tranquil area, which is very dark at night, due to the lack of street lights, so that (when there is no cloud cover), the constellations of stars overhead are clearly visible. Light pollution from a site of such prominence on the horizon would reduce local residents' enjoyment of the beauty and clarity of the night sky. Consequently, in terms of the provision of employment in Stotfold, the redevelopment of 'brownfield' sites such as E25 and H262 should be preferred, with the proviso that such development should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of a high-quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. The future of the submission E05 site should be as farmed agricultural land, thus helping to meet requirements or local and national food sufficiency, also contributing towards the UK's targets for reductions in carbon emissions by helping to reduce 'food miles' travelled within this country or abroad. Relative to these objectives, the Bedfordshire-based president of the National Farmers Union, Peter Kendall, has recently issues statements making a strong case for ensuring that Bedfordshire is part of a vigorous, successful farming sector. In view of the above points, submission E05 should be firmly rejected, while it should be noted that, in terms of accommodating potential employees travelling from outside the immediate area, the most sustainable options for employment sites locally would be areas of 'brownfield' land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station.
Joanne Sams	This is greenfield land also no close to any public transport. However it is close to major roads and will not impact as much traffic-wise on the town of Stotfold.
K Irving & N Hall	Access to A507/A1(M) would be wrong and adding to the already high volume of traffic. The A1M cannot currently support the volume of cars used daily.
Lee Butler	I acknowledge the requirement to provide additional employment space by 2026. My principal objections to this site are: * Significant loss of green belt and consequent environmental impact * Significant damage to visual aspect * Concern over ability of Stotfold's infrastructure to support such a development * Concern on impact of increase in traffic (congestion, safety, noise, parking, pollution) resulting from proposed 450-500 staff. * Likely to be significantly over and above the target for the area; employment targets should be borne across the district to prevent major impact on any one community. * Existing, underused 'brownfield' employment sites should be considered first.
Mark Ellis	Stotfold has done enough! It must have doubled in size in the last 4 years, it is ridiculous!! Stop building our little town up into a nasty city!!

Submitted by	Comments
No name given	The development is not appropriate for services - there are services in the centre of Stotfold and also at the motorway services on the other side of the A1 junction. The Existing facilities question is misleading - if it means are there existing developments that can be used instead of this development, then yes - Biggleswade is just up the A1, and that area should be used, and there are Motorway services just on the other side of the A. There are no good public transport links. The development would increase traffic over the A507 as well as the A1. The A507 is already very busy and subject to issues with traffic accidents. The area would impact badly on the local fauna because of the proximity (or presence in) the floodplain and wildlife area nearby. The additional waste, position and wind-blown rubbish from an industrial area would badly affect the area.
Mrs L W Lewin	There are empty brownfield sites and spare storage/warehouse/unit capacity at Biggleswade, Letchworth and Stevenage. Taking green space is immoral while other sites very close to the A1 are under used. There is insufficient access without causing traffic problems. This site would potentially be used to argue infill of further development on the green space east of Stotfold from the river valley to the A1 and along the A507. This site is too close to the border of Stotfold to be viable for storage and distribution. Also, storage and Distribution is potentially noisy with heavy vehicles and low employment per allocated space and is not the best type of employment for the area. The green space is farmland and provides a green corridor essential to the Stotfold community.
Philip Hare	We have had too much development in Stotfold in recent years and especially in the east where our country walks are fast disappearing. Please preserve our rural heritage

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E06

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
Howard Mitchell	The traffic created by 1000 jobs would have a significant impact on the town unless a new road linking to the 507 was provided, perhaps in conjunction with E 05.
Mrs H S Russell	I think this would be a bad site for jobs as we would be cutting down on our countryside again and the road around this area are very narrow for busy lorries to be driving around.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Kenneth Gardner	A dreadful proposal which means the destruction of some of the last remaining relatively quiet lanes in the area. access to the A1 from these lanes is not all that safe and i would expect more traffic coming through the town via Mill Lane [totally unsuitable for the sort of traffic likely to result] and up queen street which is already a hazard at the top end and that's even without taking into account the yet to be completed development off queen street. Can we please have some natural open spaces left in and around this town?
Christian Glew	This is a totally inappropriate location for this proposed development. It will have a significant and detrimental impact on the local wildlife in the Ivel Valley and will be dangerous to the local community (adjacent play fields) and the users of the A1. The domestic scale of the A1 exit to Wrayfields is over the crest of the hill & even with significant alterations to the junction, large scale vehicles & volumes of traffic will not be able to leave the A1 safely. Also Wrayfields/Mill Lane/Mhse Lane are not highways designed for heavy usage by both the volume and type of vehicles expected. The central facilities within Stotfold do not lend to significant developments such as this (1000+ cars); Queen St/Rook Tree Ln/Regent St are already congested with parked cars either side creating a pull in and pass journey on these routes. This development will undo the easing of traffic created by the by-pass and conflicts the councils policy on safety to pedestrians throughout the town.
D.M.Garratt	Why do we need this type of development on a non brownfield site when we are at the same time getting rid of land classed as key employment site i.e. the two old Motorola sites and putting houses and a few offices on the site, the Beta Engineering site next to it is also proposed for redevelopment, this area in conjunction with Fen End provided a source of employment for Stotfold, it needs modernising not moving.
Dr Simon Wathen	1000 cars coming through Stotfold? Does not seem to really help the community, if you can guarantee the jobs for Stotfold people then fine - you cannot - this is of no benefit to the people of Stotfold whatsoever. You will destroy the town with the extra traffic and ruin a picturesque part of the town with an industrial estate.

Submitted by	Comments
F Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The level valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and its just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit!</p> <p>We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	<p>We wish to object to Bedfordshire County Council’s proposals to develop the above 10 hectare site as a business park in the strongest possible terms, as it does not in any way represent sustainable development and would be a significant alien feature in the surrounding rural environment. We are also concerned that this the activities pursuant to this business park submission would have a significant detrimental effect on our family’s quality of life/residential amenity and that of our neighbors in Wrayfields.</p> <p>Far from any form of public transport, and far outside the defined ‘settlement envelope’, this is agricultural land of good quality that is currently worked by a Wrayfields farmer, as it has been for many years. The western boundary of the site borders the River Ivel and, according to information supplied by the Peterborough office of the Environment Agency, a significant amount of this land lies within its floodplain, though at present the risk of flooding is described as low, given the absence of any hard-coursed surfaces.</p> <p>It is proposed that the access to the envisaged business park would be at the junction of Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields, which would require drastic modifications so that the characterful (grassed and tree-planted) triangular piece of land dividing the roads here would be destroyed. These are narrow country lanes, barely wide enough in places for two cars to pass, and the notion that they could cope with many hundreds of vehicles that would travel to and from a business park intended for 1000 employees is as ludicrous as it would be dangerous for both traffic and pedestrians. Any attempt to mitigate the effects of such an ‘explosion’ in the volume of vehicular traffic travelling along these roads – modifications to this junction, widening of the roads or the introduction of pavements or street lights – would have a detrimental effect on their rural character, though this would, of course, be marginal compared to the large-scale destruction of the area’s rural character by the business park itself. Furthermore, the lanes that meet the A1 north of Junction 10 – i.e. Wrayfields, Taylors Road and Astwick Road – are effectively a ‘one-way system’ that would see vehicles either approaching or exiting the proposed site via central Stotfold, rather than make a six mile round trip via the Langford bypass in order to travel south; thus potentially placing an extra 1000 cars, plus delivery vehicles, on local roads that are ill-equipped to cope with such traffic.</p> <p>It should also be noted that not only would this proposal increase the safety risks to the residents of Wrayfields, where the national speed limit currently applies, but the hazardous blind bends on both Mill Lane and Malthouse Lane towards central Stotfold, and the ford bridge on Malthouse Lane, which rises so as to prevent drivers from seeing oncoming traffic, would surely contribute to the occurrence of serious accidents if the number of vehicles, especially large vehicles, using these lanes were ever to be significantly increased. As such, we wonder how the County Council’s policy to increase the number of “quiet lanes” networks within Bedfordshire’s rural areas sits relative to this proposal, especially given that at last month’s meeting of Stotfold Town Council (the full council meeting held on Friday March 7) it was agreed that this council will investigate how it might apply for “quiet lanes” status for the roads adjacent to the proposal site. It is certainly appropriate for the</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood [continued]	<p>Stotfold cemetery, on Mill Lane, to be part of such a “quiet lanes” network. Of similar concern is the ridiculous assertion within the County Council’s own submission report for this proposal (Appraisal Statement, Section 4, item 4.7) that the “most obvious route” from the proposal site to the A507 would be to direct all vehicles via Malthouse Lane, The Green and Rook Tree Lane – and, hence, past St Mary’s Lower School and Poppies Nursery, an area bustling with school children (and younger children) between 8.30am and 9.00am on weekdays – towards Queen Street and the southern end of Stotfold High Street. This is just one example of the lack of familiarity with, or understanding of, the Stotfold area and its existing infrastructure apparent throughout this submission by the County Council’s property consultants and agents (Mouchel Parkman and Woods Hardwick Planning Ltd.), fully illustrating the lack of thought and foresight that has gone into this opportunistic proposal. Other glaring inaccuracies within this document concern assertions made about the provision of public transport relative to the proposed site. Firstly, (relative to Section 4, item 4.3) the Arriva-operated 97/97A bus service between Hitchin and Stotfold terminates at The Green, Stotfold, more than a kilometer away from the proposed entrance to the site. Secondly, it is now and even less frequent service than it was at the time that this submission was prepared and (as of April 2008) there is only one bus running every 60 minutes on this route; therefore, given that the journey time from Hitchin to Stotfold is between 43 to 57 minutes, only a tiny proportion of the envisaged 1000 employees would be able to reach the proposal site during the morning rush hour without the use of private motorised vehicle. Thirdly, the AGS, taxibus service (as mentioned in Section 4) is a solitary minibus with eight passenger seats operating between Arlesey and Stotfold at intervals of 30 to 45 minutes at peak times; as such, only a miniscule number of the proposed site’s work-force could benefit from this service. Finally (relative to Section 4, item 4.7), the distance from the junction of Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields (i.e. the proposed point of access to the site) to Arlesey railway station is not two miles as stated but approximately two and three-quarter miles (by road or on foot), much too far for any prospective employees to walk to work, and a distance that few would consider cycling. As such, this proposal is entirely contrary to the aims of PPG13, which seeks a modal shift in transport use that would reduce reliance on the private motorised vehicle. During this Site Allocations consultation period hundreds of Stotfold residents, plus their friends and family visiting from nearby towns, have signed a petition (which will be presented to members of Mid Beds District Council) opposing this proposal and seeking to conserve the open countryside surrounding the Ivel Valley in Stotfold. The abiding view-point of these persons is that the open countryside east of Stotfold, almost entirely unchanged throughout the 20th century, is a much valued and much enjoyed public amenity, being the only such area within walking distance of the town; the countryside east of the A1 and the south of the A507 is inaccessible to pedestrians from Stotfold due to the volume of fast-moving traffic on these major trunk roads. Any</p>

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Glenn Rickwood [continued]</p>	<p>form of new development in this rural area would significantly diminish its historic character and appeal for the many people who walk, jog, cycle or ride horses along Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields. One party of approximately two-dozen members to visit the area recently for recreational purposes was the Stevenage “Leisure 50” group, seen rambling along Wrayfields on Tuesday, 15 January of this year.</p> <p>Relative to these points it should be noted that the public footpath running along the eastern/south-eastern boundary of the submission site – which is regularly used by members of the public, not least by ourselves, our neighbours and our friends and family – would be negatively affected by this proposal.</p> <p>Whereas employees of the County Council have told us that it is obliged to seek “best value” for the land it owns (allegedly to wither reduce levels of council tax or invest in public services) by submitting proposals such as this, it is the firm opinion of Stotfold residents that “best value” relative to this area of open countryside is for its ‘Greenfield’ and agricultural lands to remain undeveloped so that we can continue to enjoy them. Again, it is hard to reconcile this Council’s management of its property portfolio with the contents of the Spring 2008 issue of its “Get Out! (and enjoy Bedfordshire’s Countryside)” magazine, which unrelentingly extols the benefits of rural areas: “Did you know recent medical evidence shows that access to the natural environment improves health and wellbeing? So what are you waiting for?” [page 6 of this magazine]. It is important here to bear in mind that Bedfordshire County Council, and, hence, its professed (and bizarre) obligations, will cease to exist in 2009.</p> <p>However, the proposed site not only contributes to this rural area in terms of its value as a public amenity, as it is of great importance as a productive expanse of agricultural land, which the tenant farmer would wish to continue to work. Policies within the adopted Local Plan and the emerging Core Strategy seek to prevent the loss of prime agricultural land such as this, especially when other sites of lesser quality (in terms of soil composition), and particularly ‘Brownfield’ sites, are available. This is certainly the case in Stotfold, with submissions H262 and E25, for example, having been put forward as part of this site allocations consultation.</p> <p>It is important that submission site E06’s future is that it should continue to be properly worked as agricultural land, this helping to meet local and national requirements for food sufficiency and contributing towards the UK’s targets for reduction in carbon emissions by helping to reduce ‘food miles’ travelled within this country or abroad. Relative to these objectives, the Bedfordshire-based president of the National Farmers Union, Peter Kendall, has recently issued statements making a strong case for ensuring that Bedfordshire is part of a vigorous, successful farming sector; these statements are far more positive and pragmatic than Roger Tym & Partners’ passive observation within the Mid Beds Core Strategy consultation document that agriculture within Mid Beds, as an employment sector, is in decline. In simple terms, we can easily survive without the consumer products or services that a</p>

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Glenn Rickwood [continued]</p>	<p>business park on this site might provide, but none of us can do without food!</p> <p>Although we do understand that this site allocation process relates to quotas laid down within the East of England Plan, it should be noted that there are already a considerable number of vacant commercial units across Mid Bedfordshire and bear to, even within, Stotfold. Not including sites put forward as part of this consultation, these currently include units in Fen End and two at the Bury Business Park in Mill Lane, Stotfold, as well as three in the Arleseay Business Park, large units in the Stratton Buisness Park in Biggleswade and a dozen or so more in the industrial area around Blackhouse Road in Letchworth. Given Stotfold's close links to Hertfordshire (post code, telephone dialing code, hospital provision etc.), the availability of premises and employment opportunities in Letchworth, Baldock, Hitchin and Stevenage should figure prominently in any consideration of the town's employment needs. Furthermore, Mid Beds District Council's online Lane and Property Register indicates that it has at least 92 commercial units currently available to let or buy.</p> <p>Relative to employment issues concerning Stotfold it is also important to note that year-on-year unemployment levels here have remained at less than 1% (0.8% according to the most recent figures published by the Department for Works and Pensions) and that the provision of employment sites within a particular area does not necessarily mean that local residents have the skills to secure any new jobs created and, if not, then persons from outside the area will fill these jobs while the 'out-commuting' of these locals would continue. Consequently, the 'problem' of 'out-commuting' will not have been solved and the only major change locally, particularly in locations as remote from public transport as submission site E06, will be a far greater volume of private motorised vehicles on local roads.</p> <p>With regards to the "existing employment site in close proximity to the land being promoted here to the north west", as mentioned in the County Council's own submission (Appraisal Statement, Section 4, item 4.2), this piece of 'Brownfield' land (within the defined 'settlement envelope', is several hundred metres away, beyond the considerable expanse of agricultural land on the opposite bank of the River Ivel, which is protected by its designation as an "important open space".</p> <p>Of further concern, especially to the residents of Wrayfields, would be the potential noise pollution, especially from vehicle movements, and nocturnal light pollution that the proposals for submission site E06 would generate. At present, this (the area of open countryside where Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields meet) is very much a quiet, tranquil area, with the sound of traffic on the A1 and A507 being carried away from it on all but the rare occasions when strong winds prevail from the east. It is also very dark at night, due to the lack of street lights, so that the constellations of stars overhead are clearly visible.</p> <p>In addition to the above, no amount of landscaping or attempted mitigation of the appearance of the proposed business park could</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood [continued]	<p>significantly reduce the irreversible, destructive effects it would have on this area of open countryside. Our residential amenity would be significantly reduced by its presence, particularly if large, tall or noisy units were to be positioned near to our home, and the area's public amenity value would be wholly diminished at a time when, both locally and nationally, public authorities, including Mid Beds District Council, are seeking to recognise and consolidate a Green Infrastructure network; certainly the creation of a Landscape Character Assessment procedure within Mid Beds, relative to policies CS5 and CS22 of the emerging Core Strategy, would suggest that the true agricultural and public amenity value of areas such as the Ivel Valley in Stotfold will be afforded due weight.</p> <p>We also trust that, in the course of the LDF site allocations team's deliberations, the apparent inconsistency in the perception of flood risk associated with submission E06 and submission H003/E27 in Arlesey will be addressed, for while the consultation description of the former bears no reference to this issue, the description for the latter reads as follows: "A small part of this site is within the floodplain. In general, development should avoid the floodplain. This issue will need further consideration." Hopefully this evaluation process will recognise that a significant part of site E06 is, as conferred by the Environment Agency, within the floodplain of the River Ivel. Furthermore, due to recent dramatic increases in levels of rainfall (almost certainly caused by climate change linked to increases in man-made carbon emissions), areas of the proposal site, and the irrigation ditches/gullies bordering it, are now struggling to cope with the amount of water on the ground.</p> <p>Relative to this proposal, we are similarly concerned that a thorough assessment of local utility services (drainage/sewerage/electricity/water/gas (the nearest point of gas supply, for example, is close to 1km away from the proposed site, near the old Baptist Chapel on Rook Tree Lane)) should be conducted, as it is our belief, and that of many other residents, that the appropriate infrastructure does not exist, and could not be easily, or viable, introduced, to support a development in this location.</p> <p>In conclusion, we would ask the LDF site allocations team to recognise that submission E06 is not a sustainable proposal for the good many material reasons discussed here and that Bedfordshire County Council, and the new unitary authority that will replace it, should ensure that its future as valued agricultural land, part of a valued landscape of open countryside, is safeguarded. As such, this submission should be unequivocally rejected.</p> <p>It is our opinion that, in terms of accommodating potential employees travelling from outside the immediate area, the most sustainable options for employment sites locally would be areas of 'Brownfield' land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station.</p>
Graham Russell	In consideration of this proposed site would have an effect of destruction of local environment. Considering the closeness of local population it would not be effective for the locals.
J Brown	We have already lost part of our countryside to housing and feel that to lose any more will be a shame. There will be an increase of noise and traffic to a quiet and pleasant area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
J Hook	Too much for Stotfold to handle. Don't want to lose green spaces & countryside!
Jane Hyde	This is a rural area providing an area of open between Stotfold and the A1. It is in the Ivel valley and should be left.
Joan Barratt	Insufficient infrastructure. Road links by Ford Bridge too narrow. All roads within vicinity narrow and overcrowded.
Joanna Hartwell	I believe that the area surrounding the river should be left as free from development as possible.
Joanne Sams	This site would be in the only area left for Stotfold residents to visit the countryside. People walk there dogs, cycle and enjoy the pleasant surroundings. There are no utilities here plus there is a risk of flooding. It is greenfield land that is still being farmed so a brownfield site would be more appropriate. As the area is so rural there are no street lights or pavements causing problems for pedestrians if a 1000 cars are motoring back and forward. These small roads couldn't cope with the extra traffic (there is no public transport to this area), it would also mean a lot more traffic going through the middle of Stotfold close to the local primary school.
John Davies	This site is on the Ivel Valley flood plain and would increase the risk of flooding to homes close to the river. Not a risk worth taking!
John Morrison	The local roads around this site are very narrow and would not be able to support the type and volume of traffic envisaged. It is also close to the playing fields and would increase the risk to children there. There would be a major impact on the surrounding countryside and environment. As the buildings, however landscaped, would still intrude on the scenery.
Lara Morrison	The site proposed has very poor infrastructure and in no way would be suitable for the volume of traffic you propose. If this infrastructure was improved it would significantly destroy the local area and cause major congestion problems not to mention completely ruining one of the few green spaces left in Stotfold, an area greatly used by locals and enjoyed. It would be devastating if this site was developed.
Lee Butler	<p>I acknowledge the requirement to provide additional employment space by 2026.</p> <p>My principal objections to this site are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Significant loss of green belt and consequent environmental impact * Concern over ability of Stotfold's infrastructure to support such a development * Concern on impact of increase in traffic (congestion, safety, noise, parking, pollution) resulting from proposed 1000 staff. * Likely to be significantly over and above the target for the area; employment targets should be borne across the district to prevent major impact on any one community. * Appears to be an area of flood risk according to Environment Agency records. * Existing, underused 'brownfield' employment sites should be considered first.
Michelle Wateen	This site is on the Ivel valley, it would erode valuable habitats. There are very few areas left in Stotfold where we can walk and appreciate the wildlife. This area is one of the few left, Stotfold has had enough development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Alan Cooper	Access to this site is severely restricted by narrow roads, also a hump-back bridge from within Stotfold. Access from the A1 is via a very dangerous T junction with poor visibility. The area is open countryside on a gently sloping hillside with major visual impact when viewed from many parts of the town.
Mr P Clarey	Totally inappropriate. Access would require traffic to come through the town, which already has significant traffic problems, as A1 access is only to and from north bound carriageway. It would also mean destruction of a environmentally sensitive and important area along the bank of the River Ivel.
Mrs B A Farman	Totally unsuitable site for development of employment (or anything to do with buildings). It will destroy a very beautiful environmentally rich area.
Mrs Brenda Haskell	If it were a cast iron guarantee that the 1000 jobs were for Stotfold residents only this proposal could look attractive , but the reality is very different, this would result in a potential 1000 extra cars passing through Stotfold? We have already negated the by pass, by infill building on some of our better open areas, now there is a proposal to put at least 2000 car movements through our already vehicle choked town every day, 1000 people potentially will create 1000 cars coming and going to work = 2000 car movements if they don't go out on business or out to lunch or if they have no visitors, as a business I cant envisage that can you? If we are to have employment opportunities such as these in Stotfold then let them be sensibly thought out put them all where they have direct access off of the A1 and back onto the A1 and make it impossible to use Stotfold as a rat run ,which is the current trend with the likes of Aztec lorries.
Mrs L W Lewin	This site is within the green space of the Ivel valley, which must be preserved as open space for the community of Stotfold. There should be no development at all East of Stotfold to the A1 or along the 507. We have already lost huge amounts of green space and seen the vast expansion of the last five years, and still continuing. There should be no more development in or close to Stotfold until the community has had at least 10 years to absorb and repair the current growth.
Ms Sue Steptoe	This site is totally inappropriate for employment. It is in a quiet rural corner of Stotfold, and borders narrow country lanes which could not cope with the influx of traffic that employment (i.e. 1000 jobs) would create. Even a new junction would not solve the potential traffic and access issues. People use these lanes for walking and enjoying the countryside, and to remove that facility for the sake of jobs would be a great tragedy. Access from the A1 road may be feasible but at great expense, and there is another more suitable site adjacent to the A1 for employment (ref. E05). Any new employment in Stotfold should avoid additional vehicles travelling through residential areas. Public transport in this area is non-existent, and the lanes leading to the site are too narrow for a bus service. Structurally, the narrow hump-backed Ford Bridge in Malthouse Lane could not cope with extra traffic. This rural corner of Stotfold is unsuitable for employment purposes.
N Beale	Too much traffic will be created near the ford bridge and I am concerned that the bridge would have to be knocked down and a new one built which would spoil the area.

Submitted by	Comments
N Walker	It is unthinkable to propose such large business development in such a small rural area. The roads here in this part of Stotfold are completely unsuitable to support such an increase in traffic - accidents would be extremely likely, in an area near to a lower school and a children's play area (the Green. Access to the A1 is virtually one-way which would cause more traffic through the town. There is often flooding along Malthouse Lane. The ford bridge is too small and would have to be destroyed, when it should be preserved. The people of Stotfold do not want this development.
Paul Clifton	The area under consideration has poor access. People requiring access to the site from the A1 North will be forced to access through the centre of Stotfold and via Mill Lane (or less likely Rook Tree Lane). Mill Lane is a quiet residential area with a large concentration of young families. The increase in traffic using Mill Lane would prove a danger to children. Mill Lane is also the site of the recently restored Stotfold Randalls Mill which is a site of important historical interest. The increase in traffic directly past this mill will be detrimental to its preservation. Mill Lane would only be reachable via Queens Street which is now already burdened by increased traffic from the recent development to the south east of Queen Street. Unless the Wrayfields junction with the A1 can be made both North and South access, I suggest this site will only incur additional unwanted traffic in the town itself.
Pete Maggiolini	This is greenfield land in a rural area. Not suitable for large amounts of traffic no pavements, streetlights or public transport and most traffic would have to go through the centre of Stotfold to access this site.
Philip Hare	We have had too much development in Stotfold in recent years and especially in the east where our country walks are fast disappearing. Please preserve our rural heritage
S J Barber	Site is much too large for a town the size of Stotfold. Access, even with new road junction would be poor. Huge negative impact on the green space to the east of Stotfold. Not a good location.
Sarah Passey	I really think this proposal is a bad idea, for many reasons, but mainly environmental. The place suggested is a lovely greenfield area, the lanes are beautiful and full of wildlife and historic hedgerows, it is adjacent to the country park, and the area is very peaceful. To create a busy junction amidst all this would be detrimental to the environment and to the wellbeing of residents and our children. We need to preserve our green spaces, which are being gradually eroded by small pockets of housing springing up. The access from the A1 is also not safe for such a large amount of traffic, it is a very tight turning and narrow lane, and I dont think you should create a new junction and destroy the character of the crossroads at Wrayfields, Malthouse Lane, and Mill Lane. A development such as this would be better placed off the A507.
Siarl Siviyer Dixon	The main objections are road safety as the roads are thin, there will be a risk to children using the green and access to the A1 is not suitable to industrial traffic when it is busy.

Submitted by	Comments
Valerie Balderstone	Why? This is an area of outstanding beauty, it is a quiet well used area of Stotfold that could be left as a breathing space from the noise of the A1. The Malthouse Lane Bridge would not take lorries and it is a pretty reminder of more peaceful times. Extend the Riverside Park across the river to make an area up to Taylors Road on one side and up to the greenhouses on the other. Build a small visitor centre and marked walks to encourage people to exercise. Have the foresight to see that creating just another urban sprawl is something that an over crowded Stotfold just does not want.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E25

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

Submitted by	Comments
Cllr Mrs Mary Cooper	Site already has limited housing on it, replacement development would be beneficial as a small number of extra units to our town total. Development of site for employment use is seen as "extra" employment for the town over and above the safeguarded employment area in Taylors Road at present. Although the Taylors Road site has poor access at present, through narrow residential roads which are used for on-street parking by residents whose properties open onto or are close to the actual pavement/footway. This site adjacent to A507 so safer/better access here.
Glenn Rickwood	If Stotfold is to support new development then it must be brought forward in locations and for uses that are sustainable. The vast majority of Stotfold residents would not want the town to acquire more employment sites at the expense of its rural character and do not want to lose more green fields sites to new development. The redevelopment of Brownfield site should not be a preferred option for employment within Stotfold area. Use of this site would benefit the community than submission H247. Although the public transport links serving this area of moderate usefulness now that the bus service connections Stotfold with Letchworth and Hitchin has been reduced to one per hour. The site is positioned in terms of the road network, close proximity to the A507. Being likely to ensure that extra traffic from outside the local area would not pass through the central Stotfold. It is easy walking distance of Fairfield park, so that potentially its employees might come from this residential development which still has some 650 houses yet to build., So therefore the development should be rejected-!! In terms of accommodating potential employees travelling from outside the area, the most sustainable options for employment sites would be brownfield land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station.
Jane Hyde	Brownfield site with good access to the A507. Stotfold/Fairfield roads some local employment.
Lee Butler	I am in favour of this development proposal (incl H247) for the following reasons: *Brownfield site capable of meeting Stotfold's full target of 250 dwellings by 2026 as well as providing jobs for the employment target. The one development could prevent any other locations being required. *Minimised effect on visual aspect on grounds that development already exists. *Minimal effect on infrastructure of main town, with capacity to install additional infrastructure with minimal disruption. *Minimised environmental impact - no loss of green belt. Access to site will need to be considered carefully to prevent congestion.
S J Barber	Good access, and replacing one "industrial" use with another meaning little overall change to the town but creating a reasonable number of jobs. Business/R&D should fit alongside the proposed residential development also in E25, and have little impact on the Fairfield site.

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Carly Hooton	The access and traffic flow along the A507 is already a problem due to the amount of new homes on Fairfield Park so to add B1 or B8 which could potentially bring increased lorries and traffic would not be acceptable. Housing may not cause such an issue with noise levels etc but residents nearby will be concerned if planning consent is granted for industrial units/employment.
H J Pickering	This site would offer a useful number of jobs in the Stotfold area. NB: It should be noted that the population of Stotfold has grown by more than 50% during the past 5 years and there has not been an equivalent growth in the employment possibilities, causing more commuting to obtain jobs.
Mrs H S Russell	I do think that we require more jobs in the area to go with the houses.

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

Submitted by	Comments
F Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The Ivel valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and it's just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit!</p> <p>We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>
G Rosa	The main road is already very busy this development will only add to any congestion. This proposal may have a detrimental effect on the environment.

Ref Number: E66

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs H S Russell	I believe that if you build on all the site that are on this proposal we will have no green areas left. Children need to see the countryside to know what wildlife is all about.

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
F Barone	<p>I strongly disagree with any kind of further development of Stotfold. The village has been expanded enough. Houses are in the process of being built already up the A507 bypass which, in my opinion contradicts the purpose for which the bypass was built in the first place!</p> <p>The character of the village will be lost forever if more housing and more offices are built. We are fortunate to have such a mixture of landscapes around us. The level valley, the fields, the country feel to the area as well as a certain urban-ness really set our village apart and make it such a pleasant place to live in! We don't want to lose our open natural spaces. We love walking in fields, our children love to discover nature that way and its just at our doorstep! No need to use a car to go for a walk and to keep fit!</p> <p>We are a close knit community who care deeply about everyone's individual identity and therefore social problems here are swiftly dealt with. Adding yet more population will spoil this kind of nurturing!</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Glenn Rickwood	<p>Once the 650 houses agreed for consideration on "Land south of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield park, have been completed, Stotfold would have grown by some 50% over a period of five years. Furthermore, the intended residential development of Stotfold town FC's Roker park site has not been taken into accounts part of the allocation process. The town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services-local roads, schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision-are already struggling to cope with the existing demands placed upon them and the effects of the above developments are yet to be felt. Also, the vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any larger and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to such development. Such development would not be sustainable. However this is a Brownfield site and should not therefore be preferred to Greenfields sites for development for employment usage , which would be much greater benefit to the wider local community, with the provision that this should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of sustainable, high-quality, carbon-neutral design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. The transport infrastructure does not exist to cope with another employment site in the location promoted by submission E66 and it has no viable transport links, especially now that the bus service connecting Stotfold with Lethworth and Hitchin has been reduced to one bus per hour. So therefore the development should be rejected-!! In terms of accommodating potential employees travelling from outside the area, the most sustainable options for employment sites would be brownfield land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station.</p>
K Irving & N Hall	<p>Mill House Lane cannot support an increased volume of traffic especially passing the Mill.</p>
Lee Butler	<p>I acknowledge the requirement to provide between 50-250 extra homes and employment by 2026. My principal objections to this site are: * Loss of green belt. This is favoured green space for walkers, provides pleasant environment and home for wildlife. * Access via Common Road (CR) will cause significant congestion and be potentially dangerous. The Regent Street junction with CR has poor visibility and can be hazardous. Increased traffic using proposed site will affect this. CR between Regent Street and proposed new site provides essential residential parking, making available road space single track. The likely no. of extra cars will make this worse. Along with danger to cars, children playing along CR may also be affected. Planning Guidance now permits a reduced number of car parking spaces per development & there may be overflow parking from the site that will significantly increase congestion. *Existing, underused 'brownfield' employment sites should be considered first.</p>
Miss Wendy Scarr	<p>I strongly object to the use of another green space for development purposes. There are alternative brown field sites within Stotfold which could be used for such developments, with better access and proximity to local amenities. The site has poor access along Common Road which is already restricted due to residential on road parking. The site is also further away from local amenities eg. shops, post office etc.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs Moore	Mixed usage over perfectly good agricultural land would bring more traffic to already busy roads. Private vehicles and larger industrial trucks making their way through Stotfold. Existing industrial area already on opposite side of town to major roads.
Mrs Brenda Haskell	The volume of traffic in this area is already compromised by the fact that all the local streets converge onto Common road .It would be unwise and unsafe to exacerbate the problem by inviting " unknown " quantities of traffic movement along either Vaughan Road or Common Road, as due to the lack of parking in these areas, the streets are usually down to a single track. The mix of residential and employment building is usually a recipe for disaster as their needs are in opposition. For example, residential requires peace and quiet, aesthetically pleasant surroundings and outlooks. Whereby the very nature of employment areas means that heavier traffic movement is inevitable, creating dust, mud noise etc.
N Walker	Common Road is too small to cope with increased traffic. This is a residential area & not suitable for business use.
S J Barber	Large impact on the countryside to the west of Stotfold, expanding the settlement envelope. Poor access via Common Rd, not suitable for vehicles much larger than a "Transit Van". Not a good site for industrial development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E05a

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
Mr Michael Haskell	All future employment sites for Stotfold should be positioned with access from the A1 and removed from the town centre.
Mr Peter John Hawkins	Stotfold needs industry.
Mr Steve Barber	A good location for industry, with excellent links to A507 and A1/A1(M), but the suggested expansion westwards does start to encroach onto the greenspace around the River Ivel. Site is too large. Proposal E05 probably OK, E05a too big.
Mrs Brenda Haskell	This site would be ideal due to location, direct link to the A1 and A507 bypass as long as traffic calming measures are placed with Stotfold to prevent drivers using the town as a rat run.
Mrs Sallie Munden	We desperately need employment in the area to bring life and prosperity.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Howard Mitchell	This site has the obvious benefit of direct access to the A1M thus avoiding a further increase in commercial traffic within the town of Stotfold.
Mr Paul Clifton	The proximity to the A1(M) makes this site an obvious choice for commercial development. My main concern is with the infrastructure and impact on the environment. The A1(M) and A507 trunk routes are already very heavily utilised and in peak hours can become completely congested, with queueing on the A1(M) from Junction 6 all the way back to Junction 10; the additional commercial traffic introduced by this proposal will only add to this problem. Secondly, the scale of this proposal consumes a lot of green space which will impact severely on local wildlife. If this proposal is pursued there should be heavy emphasis placed on integration with existing infrastructure, environment and visual aesthetics of the area.

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
Dr Wathen Simon	Please leave the Ivel valley alone. Develop brown field sites first (e.g Taylors Road), not pristine countryside. Queen Street development spoilt a nice part of Stotfold along the Kingfisher Way. Further erosion of our countryside should not be an option - please consider the residents of Stotfold and the requirements for natural open spaces without the blight of industrial development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood	<p>The additional information submitted with this proposal states that “the site boundary has been amended to [from?] that previously submitted under reference E05 due to recommendations from a Landscape and Visual Appraisal undertaken by the agent”. Perhaps, this amendment relates to concerns that the industrial or storage units on the proposed site would be visible on the horizon to the south from Wrayfields, Mill Lane and Malthouse Lane, which, exacerbated by light pollution from the proposed site at night, would have had a significant detrimental effect on the character of the area of open countryside east of Stotfold. But whatever has prompted such a course of action, this submission must therefore supersede submission E05 and amounts to an admission (by the landowners and the agent) that E05 is flawed and should be refused. Submission site E05a is the largest proposal received for Stotfold area as part of this allocation process. No figures have been submitted for the number of jobs that would be created by this amended proposal, yet due to the inclusion of a storage and distribution operation, this figure is unlikely to be substantial, relative to the large expanse of land required. It cannot justify the loss of such a large area of agricultural land in this location, which, for a number of reasons, does not represent sustainable development. The site is far removed from any form of public transport and its location adjacent to the A507 and Junction 10 of the A1M, would not be accessible to prospective employees by foot or by bicycle, certainly not without considerable risk to their safety in such heavy, fast-moving traffic. As such, this proposal is entirely contrary to the aims of PPG13, which seeks a modal shift in transport use that would reduce reliance on the private motorised vehicle. Furthermore, the movements of a significant number of vehicles, especially large haulage vehicles, attempting to access an employment site in this location could cause major problems in terms of safety and congestion along this very busy stretch of the A507, also impacting in traffic attempting to join the A1. It would also be prudent for a thorough assessment of local utility services (drainage/sewerage/electricity/gas/water) to be conducted, as the appropriate infrastructure does not exist at the submission site, and might not be easily, or viably, introduced, to support such a large development in this location; particularly as, with regards to drainage, the amended proposal now extends unacceptably close to the River Ivel, just north of New Bridge, and must be even closer to its floodplain. E05a’s large industrial structures would be significant alien features on this large ‘greenfield’ site outside Stotfold’s existing settlement envelope, and such development could encourage the owners of adjacent agricultural land to submit planning applications that would further threaten the area of open countryside along the Ivel Valley and east of the town. Such an outcome must not be allowed because the rural tranquillity of this area is much valued by local residents as a public amenity within walking distance of central Stotfold; this is especially so given that the countryside east of the A1 and south of the A507 is inaccessible to pedestrians from Stotfold due to the volume of fast-moving traffic on these major trunk roads. Public enjoyment of the tracks and paths (including those that are part of the Kingfisher Way and the Three Mills Walk) close to the submission site would surely be diminished by the realisation of this proposal.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood (continued)</p>	<p>Consequently, in terms of the provision of employment for Stotfold, the redevelopment of the 'brownfield' site E25 should be preferred, with the proviso that any proposal should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of a high-quality, 'carbon-neutral' design, sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. Relative to employment issues concerning Stotfold it is also important to note that year-on-year unemployment levels here remain at less than 1% (0.8% according to recent figures published by the Department for Works and Pensions) and that the provision of new employment sites within a particular area does not necessarily mean that local residents have the skills to secure any new jobs created. As such, persons from outside the area will fill these jobs while the 'out-commuting' of these locals would continue. Consequently, the 'problem' of 'out-commuting' will not have been solved and the only major change locally, particularly in locations as remote from public transport as submission site E05a, will be a far greater volume of private motorised vehicles on local roads. Escalating concerns about rising food prices and the need to control our nation's long-term 'food security' - relative to the rising fuel costs associated with 'food miles' - should lead both central government and local authorities to seek to protect such prime agricultural land. The desire to prevent the loss of such land is entirely consistent with policies in Med Bedfordshire's adopted Local Plan and its emerging Core Strategy. Further to this, the Bedfordshire-based president of the National Farmers Union, Peter Kendall, had recently issued statements making a strong case for ensuring that Bedfordshire is part of a vigorous, successful farming sector; these statements are far more positive and pragmatic than Roger Tym & Partners' passive observation within the Mid Beds Core Strategy consultation document that agriculture within Mid Beds, as an employment sector, is in decline. Put bluntly, we can easily survive without the consumer products or services that office units proposed for this site might provide (as part of submission E77), but none of us can do without food! If Stotfold is to support new employment development then it must be brought forward in locations, and for uses, that are sustainable and will not be detrimental to the environment. The vast majority of Stotfold residents do not want the town to acquire more employment sites at the expense of its rural character and particularly do not want to lose yet more 'greenfield' sites to new development. As such, and in view of the other points stated above, submission E05a should be rejected, while it should be noted that, in terms of accommodating employees travelling from outside the immediate area to large employment sites locally, the most sustainable option would be to redevelop areas of 'brownfield' land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station. NB - given that the unexpected 'second phase' of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date), it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so 'latecomer' submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr James Godfrey	I would strongly object to the conversion of this Greenfield site to industrial usage. With the recent large housing developments, excessive strains are already being placed on the A507. The new Norton roundabout has done little to ease the congestion, something which will only get worse with the increase number of HGVs that would be using the road to access both the M1 and A1 as a result of industrial development. Stotfold does not have a wide enough transport infrastructure to support extra workers coming in to the town other than by road, again placing strain on the local road network. More suitable locations could be found around Arlesey, so utilising the existing rail network and making use of brownfield sites, rather than removing precious Greenfield sites. Stotfold residents do not want the town to grow any further, there are still strong feelings against the ongoing housing developments. The over-riding feeling is that any further developments would be to the detriment of the towns rural character. This would certainly be the case with this proposed development, effectively merging the town with the A1, and losing its current distinct green barrier that maintains the towns individuality. Stotfold residents would prefer to maintain the towns rural charm at the expense of further employment opportunities.
Mr Lee Butler	I acknowledge the requirement to provide additional employment space by 2026. However, I STRONGLY object to this proposal on the following grounds, (in line with my comments on the original submission for E05)* Significant loss of green belt and consequent environmental impact* Significant damage to visual aspect* Concern over ability of Stotfold's infrastructure to support such a development* Concern on impact of increase in traffic (congestion, safety, noise, parking, pollution) resulting from potentially hundreds (or thousands given site size and unstated proposed number in this new submission?) of staff that will use the site.* Likely to be significantly over and above the target for the area; employment targets should be borne across the district to prevent major impact on any one community. Danger of setting a precedent – it is not in anyone's interest to exceed government requirements.* Existing, underused 'brownfield' employment sites should be considered first – including potentially unused business locations in neighbouring towns such as Shefford, Biggleswade and Baldock.
Mrs Alison Godfrey	This site is wholly unsuitable for employment development. It would involve merging Stotfold with the A1 so losing the towns identity and individual rural charm. It is vital that Stotfold maintains this green corridor to enable the town to be distinct from other areas. The transport links in Stotfold are insufficient to support the existing ongoing housing developments, let alone further developments that would lead to a large increase in the number of HGVs using our already straining road network. A more sensible solution would be to utilise the existing rail network around Arlesey station and to develop brownfield sites here, rather than creating new sites on existing Greenfield sites. Stotfold does not need further employment opportunities. It is much more important for us to maintain our rural town than to develop in to a large industrial estate on the A1.
Mrs Jane Hyde	I supported the previous submission because we need more employment sites. However this is bigger and comes too near to the river, Local people have done a lot to improve the environment down by the mill and river, and an industrial area this close to an area that floods is not good.
Mrs Judy Dear	Surely this is already flood plain area?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Valerie Balderstone	The 507 into Stotfold is at the moment a short breathing space between the busy A1 and Stotfold. The Mill Meadows would be enhanced greatly by expanding into this proposed site. Green space V ugly business units I Know what I would like. If the land could be brought under the Mill control we could carry on the mills efforts in educating the future generations as to the food cycle etc. wildlife area with hedge laying, pond dipping, nesting birds etc for school visits
No name given	This site should not be developed for the following reasons- 1 The site is too close to a residential/activity buildings resulting in increase levels of noise and pollution from heavy traffic.2 The A507 is already a high accident zone. To allow more traffic on the road will result in even more accidents.3 The height of the buildings will obstruct local residents view and impinge on ones human right for privacy.4 Nature walks that involve crossing the A507 from Stotfold to Radwell will be affected by the development because of the increased level of traffic on the A507resulting in more accidents.4 Birds and wildlife that live/use the river lvel and surrounding countryside will become extinct in the area. Black squirrels, pheasants and otters are already decreasing in numbers as a consequence of the development off Queen Street. 5 The roads in Stotfold would not be able to tolerate traffic to and from the development which will happen despite any planning to avoid this issue. As a resident of Baldock Road, heavy traffic travelling to the A1 frequently have to reverse up the road because drivers think Baldock Road is a short cut to the A1 despite the A507 bypass being open for over 11 years. 6 Biggleswade has a similar site that is under used therefore Stotfold is very unlikely to benefit from the development.7 Baldock Road will be used for parking, increasing the possibility of accidents to children who use the nursery/scouting/guide buildings in Baldock Road.
Ms Jessica Taylor	I oppose developing this site. This site will either be accessed via the stopped-up Baldock road or via a link from the A507 or A1MBoth the A1M and A507 roads are heavily congested at peak times, and developing this site will only add to this congestion, with increased lorry and traffic movements. Access via Baldock road will increase the traffic going through Stotfold and also past residential areas. It is highly undesirable to have more traffic flowing through the town and on the surrounding roads, especially as the increased housing being built at the present time will already increase the traffic movements in this area. The site is a Greenfield site and should not be considered for development. Industrial units already located in Stotfold (e.g. off Taylors road) have struggled to attract businesses and many have remained empty and are an eyesore for the town. I cannot see why this development should succeed where others like it have failed. Surrounding areas e.g. Letchworth and Baldock (on A505) have industrial units standing empty that could be used by businesses wanting to relocate to this area. We do not need to build over Greenfield land to have more to stand empty also. I do not see this development creating jobs for those living locally. The noise and disruption to nearby residents will be considerable.
Ms Joanne Sams	There are no public transport facilities to this site. It is Greenfield land used for farming. There are no facilities in this area and no utilities. This site has grown from the original and now extends right down to Stotfold and near the lvel valley

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Patrick Clarey	This site extends right up to the area proposed for development as a nature reserve/ conservation area. It will cause a very unsatisfactory impact on wild life and the environment. The previous submission in this area which did not extend as far west was much more preferable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E77

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
Mr David Garratt	This site has for many years been a source of local employment and as such should be retained for employment as no other substantial area has been defined within the Stotfold envelope
Mrs Sallie Munden	We need leisure facilities and employment desperately in the area. I think the area needs leisure facilities and housing for low cost housing without any impact on the countryside.

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
E Gibbs	Would appear to be best suited for leisure activities.
Mr Paul Clifton	Dependant on the proposed development, this proposed site does offer some advantages. The main concern is with supporting infrastructure and environmental disruption. The site, if co-joined with the existing leisure facilities at the MUGA and Football ground, could make for comprehensive leisure facilities much needed in Stotfold. My concern is with access to the proposed site and the traffic disruption which would be introduced to the area.

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
Mr D Heath	This is very good agricultural land at present. Surely with food prices going up, and the shortages, we should be aiming to save any farm land from being used for home/industry. There have been a few previous applications for change of land use (this particular field) which have been turned down.
Mr David Pelter	This site is accessed from a road infrastructure that is already overloaded and residential in nature. Whilst this site historically had significant numbers of vehicle movements, since this use ceased with the departure of Motorola (circa 10 years ago) the roads have become overloaded with vehicle movements from elsewhere.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood</p>	<p>Outside the existing 'settlement envelope', the submission site is agricultural land of good quality that has been farmed for many years. Escalating concerns about rising food prices and the need to control our nation's long-term 'food security' - relative to the rising fuel costs associated with 'food miles' - should lead both central government and local authorities to seek to protect such prime agricultural land. The desire to prevent the loss of such land is entirely consistent with policies in Med Bedfordshire's adopted Local Plan and its emerging Core Strategy. Further to this, the Bedfordshire-based president of the National Farmers Union, Peter Kendall, had recently issued statements making a strong case for ensuring that Bedfordshire is part of a vigorous, successful farming sector; these statements are far more positive and pragmatic than Roger Tym & Partners' passive observation within the Mid Beds Core Strategy consultation document that agriculture within Mid Beds, as an employment sector, is in decline. Put bluntly, we can easily survive without the consumer products or services that office units proposed for this site might provide (as part of submission E77), but none of us can do without food! There is certainly no great need for this 'Greenfield' site to be developed for housing provision . Once the 650 houses agreed for construction on "Land South of Stotfold", and the similar number outstanding for Fairfield Park, have been completed, Stotfold will have grown by some 50% over a period of five years, Furthermore, the impending residential development of Stotfold Town FC's Roker Park site (as planned by Stotfold Town Council) has not been taken into account as part of this Site Allocation process; the Roker Park proposal is set to far exceed the minimum target of fifty houses set for Stotfold by the District Council, and given this Council's close involvement with the project linked to the relocation of the football club, its officers should have knowledge of the relevant figures. Relative to the above, it should be noted that concerns have already been raised locally - at 'minuted' meetings of Stotfold Town Council's Town Enhancement Committee, for example - about the strain that submissions H262 (for 100-135 dwellings) and H200 (for 18 dwellings) might place on adjacent roads and utility services here. As a result of its recent growth, the town's transport infrastructure, public services and utility services - local roads, local schools, doctors' surgery and electricity/gas/water/drainage/sewerage provision - are already struggling to cope with existing demands placed upon them. Both of these submissions, H331 and E77, would have a markedly adverse effect on this situation. As regards the provision of employment in Stotfold, the redevelopment of the 'brownfield' site E25 should be preferred, with the proviso that any proposal should be restricted to offices or light industrial units that are of a high quality, 'carbon-neutral' design that is sympathetic in terms of scale and appearance to their surroundings. However, no amount of landscaping or attempted mitigation of the appearance of a business (or leisure) park on this submission site could significantly reduce the irreversible, destructive effects it would have on the Ivel Valley here. In connection with employment issues linked to Stotfold it is also important to note that the town's year-on-year unemployment levels remain at less than 1% (0.8% according to recent figures published by the Department for Works and Pensions), while there exists a considerable number of vacant</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood (Continued)</p>	<p>commercial units across Mid Bedfordshire and even close to the submission site (in Fen End and at the Bury Business Park on Mill Lane, for example). Furthermore, the provision of new employment sites within a particular area does not necessarily mean that local residents have the skills to secure any new jobs created. As such, persons from outside the area will fill these jobs while the ‘out-commuting’ of these locals would continue. Consequently, the ‘problem’ of ‘out-commuting’ will not have been solved and the only major change locally – particularly in locations not served by effective public transport, such as submission site E77 – will be a far greater volume of private motorised vehicles on local roads. In terms of accommodating employees travelling from outside the immediate area to large employment site locally, the most sustainable option would be to redevelop areas of ‘brownfield’ land within walking distance of Arlesey railway station. With regards to the “leisure use” aspect of Submission E77, it should be noted that the new large-scale sports and leisure facility currently under construction on land off Arlesey Road, and the proposed new community building on “Land South of Stotfold”, will provide the town with a comprehensive range to recreational facilities. The location of the submission site prevents it from offering other leisure facilities on a meaningful scale, or functioning as a sustainable employment site, because the transport infrastructure required to cope with a large number of visitors is clearly lacking. Moreover, the fact it is not served by a public transport network makes this proposal entirely contrary to the aims of PPG13, which seeks a modal shift that would reduce reliance on the private motorised vehicle. Further to this, its location would necessitate that almost all visiting cars and delivery vehicles would have to pass through the already congested streets of central Stotfold, given that Taylors Road (from which it would have been accessed) and the other country lanes east of Stotfold (Astwick Road and Wrayfields) – as well as being too narrow to cope with increased levels of traffic – are effectively a ‘one-way system’, requiring those travelling south to make a six mile round trip via the Langford bypass. In these impatient days, with many drivers assisted by ‘sat-nav’ equipment, that is not likely to happen. ...But if it did, then the increased traffic would make the lanes far less safe for the pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians who use them (their rural character being such that they have neither pavements or street lights), as well as local drivers. The open countryside east of Stotfold, almost entirely unchanged throughout the 20th century, is a much valued and much enjoyed public amenity, being the only such area within walking distance of the town (the countryside east of the A1 and south of the A507 is inaccessible to pedestrians from Stotfold due to the volume of fast-moving traffic on these major trunk roads), and this submission site, so close to the River Ivel, is an important part of the landscape. And if the hangar-like ex-Motorola building on Taylors Road does disappear in connection with Submissions H262, or a prior planning application (the adjoining two-storey office block has already been demolished since the ‘first phase’ of this consultation), then the appearance of area immediately northwest of this site is even set to be much improved. Therefore, any development of this agricultural land – particularly with the establishment of offices or other commercial premises that would be significant alien features so close to the Ivel – will only diminish the area’s historic character and appeal for the many people who</p>

Submitted by	Comments
<p>Mr Glenn Rickwood (Continued)</p>	<p>appreciate the rural views as they walk, jog, cycle or ride horses along Malthouse Lane, Mill Lane and Wrayfields, or traverse the Kingfisher Way, the Three Mills Walk or other footpaths nearby. In fact, during the 'first phase' of this Site Allocations consultation hundreds of Stotfold residents, plus their friends and family visiting from nearby towns, signed a petition (presented to MBDC's Forward Planning department and Vision Twentyone in April) opposing submissions promoting the development of the open countryside surrounding the Ivel Valley in Stotfold. Had submissions H331 and E77 been included in the original phase of this consultation – and it must be remembered that no indication was given that additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date – then that petition would definitely have made reference to them alongside submissions E06 and H056. Of further concern would be the potential noise pollution, especially from vehicle movements, and nocturnal light pollution that any development here – particularly commercial development – might generate. At present, the open countryside east of Stotfold is still very much a quiet, tranquil area, with the sound of traffic on the A1 and A507 being carried away from it on all but the rare occasions when strong winds prevail from the east. It is also very dark at night, due to the lack of street lights, so that the constellations of stars are clearly visible. Any development of this site and the effects of any resultant commercial operations, might also be detrimental to the public amenity value of the Riverside Recreation Ground, directly adjacent to it, which is classified as an "important open space". As the submission site is right beside the River Ivel, large areas of it, towards the east and south-east, might become waterlogged in the winter months, and recent dramatic increases in levels of rainfall throughout the entire year (almost certainly caused by climate change linked to increases in man-made carbon emissions), have meant that lowest-lying areas of the open countryside east of Stotfold, and irrigation ditches/gullies bordering them, now struggle to contain the amount of surface water on the ground in the Spring and Autumn, and occasionally during the Summer too. As the District Council's initial comments note, "approximately 50% of this site is within the floodplain [and] in general, development should avoid the floodplain." Thus, any large-scale 'hard-coursing' of the submission site would significantly increase the risk of flooding in this area. In light of the above points, and at a time when, both locally and nationally, public authorities – including Mid Beds District Council – are seeking to recognise and consolidate a Green Infrastructure network that strengthens the public amenity links that exist between 'greenfield' facilities (such as the Riverside Recreation Ground) and areas of open countryside (such as the adjacent submission site), both of these submissions, H331 and E77 should be firmly rejected. Hopefully, the creation of a Landscape Character Assessment procedure within Mid Beds, relative to policies CS5 and CS22 of the emerging Core Strategy, will ensure that the true agricultural and public amenity value of all such areas within Stotfold's Ivel Valley will be recognised – and afforded due weight – so that they are properly conserved. NB – given that the unexpected 'second phase' of this Site Allocations consultation has had very little publicity compared to the original Talk to Mid Beds exercise (and, indeed, there was no indication given to the public in advance of/during the earlier period of consultation that any additional submissions could, or would, be considered at a later date),</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Glenn Rickwood (Continued)	it is to be hoped that this will be taken into account by those considering the 70 or so 'latecomer' submissions, as obviously, there will therefore be far fewer responses from local residents to this phase and fewer objections to these proposals received. By no means should such an outcome be interpreted as suggesting that the Mid Bedfordshire public is (more) favourably disposed to these submissions.
Mr Howard Mitchell	If this site is developed for commercial use it should be dependent on the provision of a direct vehicle access from the A507 or A1. it is unreasonable to plan a new commercial development that could bring a further increase in commercial traffic to the town of Stotfold.
Mr Lee Butler	The site's position within the existing boundary of the town could be considered acceptable if we MUST lose green belt to meet Employment targets. However, I object to this proposal on the following grounds:* Concern over ability of Stotfold's infrastructure to support such a development* Concern on impact of increase in traffic (congestion, safety, noise, parking, pollution) resulting from hundreds of staff?* Likely to be significantly over and above the target for the area; employment targets should be borne across the district to prevent major impact on any one community.* Existing, underused 'brownfield' employment sites should be considered first.*I object to the idea of building on the floodplain. Whilst this may meet 'targets', consideration should be given to businesses and the effect on them, their staff and the town of issues arising from flooding.
Mr Michael Heskell	No mixed use should be allowed in Stotfold except a town centre is critical and needed now.
Mr Peter John Hawkins	Wrong position of town.
Mr Steve Barber	Poor vehicle access. Impact on River Ivel. Cant go ahead unless H262 given approval, then access to Industrial area would be via a residential area - not desirable. Not a good place for employment to be planned.
Mr Victor John Gruncell	There are only minor roads adjoining this site which could cause a lot of traffic congestion in the surrounding areas, plus noise and emissions/pollution in otherwise open countryside which I assumed was Green Belt land. Plus the problems of building on floodplains.
Mrs Brenda Haskell	Mixed use, ie housing and employment is a recipe for disaster it will lead to potential accidents/ health hazards, complaints about noise levels, traffic movement etc.
Mrs Ejane Hyde	The land within the immediate vicinity of the river Ivel should be left open and not developed. Road links are bad. The area floods.
Mrs Isabelle Martineau	Problems with traffic. Junction with A1 not appropriate for high level of traffic. Road around that area of Stotfold not appropriate for higher level of traffic. Too far from centre of village, people will need their cars to get there or from there to centre which will increase traffic. More commuters travelling above speed limit in the green area.
Mrs Janet Hawkins	No more housing is needed in Stotfold. It is already very difficult to get out of Stotfold at rush hour times. There is only a narrow lane leading from this site. The sewage problem is already bad in this area. The schools, particularly the lower schools are already overcrowded. The health centre is also overloaded.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Linda Gruncell	The roads from this site are minor roads through the village and would cause a problem; they are not built for excessive traffic. There are other small factory unit sites with empty buildings more suitable for employment use. A lot this site in question is a floodplain which in turn could also cause a problem with potential flooding and ruining of wildlife habitats.
Mrs Susan Pelter	Existing units in Stotfold are empty. Access to and from the A1 is dangerous. Excessive congestion already exists in neighbouring roads due to on-street parking. Previous industrial planning applications turned down on highways grounds - nothing has changed. It is on the floodplain - solution = wildlife park to replace other green areas in Stotfold that are being built on.
Ms Joanne Sams	This is a greenfield site that has no utilities. It is on the flood plain. There are no links to public transport and the local roads are narrow country lanes that cannot cope with an increase in traffic. In order to get to this site cars would have to drive through the centre of Stotfold hence increasing more unwanted traffic. With the large development of the new leisure facilities on Arlesey Road more leisure facilities are not needed especially being so far out of the town.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Patrick Clarey	The area lies across from riverside play area and lies on the kingfisher way riverside walk. It is a natural and aesthetic boundary to the northern side of the village that should be retained as open space.
Mrs Judy Dear	Flood plain area, could cause congestion of traffic on existing roads.

STOTFOLD APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	H331 Silverbirch Field, Taylors Road (This site is identical to E77)	Stotfold FP7 runs along a small part of the southwest corner. It is noted that a large proportion of the site is within Flood Zones 2 & 3 and the proposed development would therefore be inappropriate.
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	E05a Land West of A1, North of A507 Stotfold	FP5 and FP26 touch the SW corner of the site and continue as FP3. Only very general indication of proposed use is provided (Types B2 and B8). If carried forward, screening would help reduce visual impact of resultant development to footpath users.
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	E77 Silverbirch Field, Taylors Road (This site is identical to H331) Stotfold	FP7 runs along a small part of the southwest corner of the site. The proposed use for leisure in conjunction with adjacent playing fields could be compatible with a large proportion of the site being within Flood Zones 2 & 3. The alternative proposed use for offices would be inappropriate.
Christine Walker	Stotfold	Please do not allow any further housing growth to happen in Stotfold. It would be criminal to build on the land behind St Mary's School and around Mill Lane. There are many different species of birds in the area, some quite unusual, including red wings and grey wagtails plus many others. It is an area of outstanding beauty which is appreciated by so many. We need to keep our surrounding countryside otherwise before we know what the A1 will be our High Street!! Please, please listen.
Brian Smith	Stotfold	According to the proposals "Mid Beds has to find the land for 4,400 new homes". Is there a particular reason why they all have to be built in Stotfold? I have no objection to controlled in fill building but Stotfold is rapidly becoming another Stevenage. We have seen so many new homes and current building works of late and it seems no one is considering the affect on Stotfold as a place to live. I would suggest that there are plenty of "brown field" land or small plots which could be used without spreading small towns and villages into green field sites. I have seen from experience that Stotfold is an easy target for developers as there are no Bedfordshire residents to the South to object. I feel the time has come to put people ahead of profits and put effort into making life more comfortable, let's try to keep what little countryside is left and stop merging villages and towns into giant ghettos. Once it's built on it will never be green again.

Name	Subject	Comment
Neil Gratton	Stotfold	<p>The plans to redevelop the land close to the A1(M) near Stotfold has to be a big mistake. Green belt land who needs it?. We do. There are many brownfield sites between Stotfold and Stevenage that could and should be used first. Arlesey, Baldock, Letchworth and Stevenage already have good access links(Railways) and Services (Water, Electricity etc).The employed people of Stotfold already travel to and from work, I myself travel to Hemel Hempstead on a daily basis and it is nice to come home to peace and quiet. Once wildlife and their habitats are destroyed you can't bring them back. We have already lost land to houses by the Stotfold by-pass and the impending issue of traveler sites close to Larksfield Surgery, where will it all end. On the subject of travelers it was stated in the letter sent by mid beds council that they are an ethnic group and we have sent in racist comments, does this apply to me as I am a Welsh person living in an English Town? Is the council going to treat me differently? Let's be serious we all want jobs but at what cost, use the resources at hand. People move from urban sprawls for many reasons, the main one is for a better standard of living - a move from the hustle and bustle of large towns. Councillors have to make some unpleasant decisions, but let them stand up for the people they are supposed to represent. Not everything in this life is black and white. Just think a wrong or bad move now could have serious implications at election time.</p>
Mrs R Fernley-Hughes	Stotfold, Malthouse Lane	<p>With regards to the Talk to Mid Beds website and the application for new homes to be built off Malthouse Lane Stotfold, I would like to urge the council not to accept such an application for this site for three reasons:- 1. This land is bordered by the river and it would be madness to allow homes to be built so close when everyday we are seeing more and more about the consequences of global warming. I also understand that central government was warned just a few months ago by the leading insurance agencies that in the future they may not be able to insure properties built on flood plains. Agreeing to such a site would lay the council open to claims from disgruntled homeowners if in the future they could not obtain insurance. 2. This area of green open space is one of only two where local residents can walk dogs and generally enjoy the countryside. If this area were to be built on and indeed the areas off Common Road, Stotfold Common which are also under discussion there would be nowhere for people to walk in Stotfold at all. 3. Stotfold is already expanding with the current building sites bordering the A507. I think the town has taken up enough of the required quota for new builds for now. I hope my comments can be taken on board via email however, if I must do this in written hard copy I would be happy to do so. Thank you for giving local residents the opportunity to have their say.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Name	Subject	Comment
John Chapman	Stotfold, site H056	Town Enhancement Minutes 27th February 2008 Stofold Town Council recommend as follows from the minutes "Recommended that we object to H056 Land South of Malthouse Lane, Stotfold on the grounds that access from Malthouse Lane is not suitable. Also we have always commented that the area of land by the river should be kept as informal amenity land." In part this is correct, but take into consideration that the County Council own both sides of that part of Malthouse Lane, the Manor Farm which is for the most part redundant. H056 site Malthouse Lane This field has been referred to as a meadow, it is arable farm land which the tenant has in permanent set a side (non production land). Most of the other proposed sites in Stotfold are in agricultural production.
J Musselwhite	Stotfold; site H056	Land South of Malthouse Lane Stotfold Ref H056 I strongly object to the development of the above. You state existing use of site as Unused. What a lot of rot. The site is used daily by people walking their dogs, after school children walk and play on the area, many people just walk. In the school holidays it is used by children and parents for picnics, playing in the water catching tidlers, tadpoles just generally having fun. You state that a new village green is proposed, We do not want a organised tidy designated place to have fun, this area is like a small part of the countryside - natural, not a this is where you will enjoy yourself area - We all make our own amusements, if it is all tarted up it will encourage the yobs that now hang out on the green. Any way how much ground do you see being left to make a "green" after you have squashed 120 houses on it? Will it be like the "country walk" along the side of the new Mill View development, a beautiful walk has been destroyed, for ugly cramped housing. You must not let this last patch of countryside be taken away from the people of Stotfold. The other site in Malthouse Lane . if you change the junction at Malthouse, Mill and Wrayfields you will create an unsafe route for the many people that walk from Ford Bridge up Malthouse Lane into Mill lane to go to The cemetery. and for just general circuit walkers, We do not need more house or industry, people surely move to Stotfold because they like it as it is, a small country town, yes build some housing but it seems it is being picked on to over develop. Please think of the people that live here now.

Name	Subject	Comment
Pamela Manfield	General, Stotfold	<p>I write to protest extremely strongly about the possibility of any further applications for development being approved for Stotfold.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There have been significant numbers of houses already approved for Stotfold. Those currently built are already putting pressure on roads, infrastructure and the environment and this will get worse, as the current building projects are completed. 2. Several of these existing sites are having problems in selling houses. The current credit crunch is not helping, but they were having problems before then. The strong implication is that there is saturation of housing in Stotfold. 3. There are brownfield sites available, which could be used for light industrial use or converted to housing use. (if vital necessity for development could be proved). There is no need to further vandalise the green areas in/surrounding the town, particularly those near the River Ivel. 4. The quality of life of the people of Stotfold and the quality of their environment would be significantly damaged if further development is approved. 5. Green areas with recreational possibilities for people of all ages are fast disappearing in this area. It is vital that the financial interests of developers are not allowed to despoil our existing countryside, to the detriment of the rest of the community. <p>In conclusion, there is no need for further planning developments to be approved and any further developments will increasingly damage the environment, infrastructure and quality of life of the people of Stotfold. I strongly urge the Planning Authority and all relevant bodies to refuse these applications. I have copied this to Stotfold Town Council and to our local Member of Parliament, with the request that they add their support to the request in this email. I would appreciate confirmation that this response has been received and is being acted on.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Sally Carter	General, Stotfold	<p>My comments on the proposed developments do not concern the situation of the developments but the density of them. My home town of Exmouth, Devon has been devastated by high density housing. The infrastructure cannot cope and there is frequent lowland flooding. Housing estates that on paper appear to have driveways/garages/garden allocations that are adequate but in reality end up in being new ghettos. Narrow roads, no trees and border areas with residents forced to pile up cars in their drives and along the roadside are common features in Exmouth. Low level crime escalated because of the tensions within the estates caused by people being in too close a proximity to one another. Developers pay only lip service to the ambience of the location and I can cite evidence of this already happening in Stotfold. The bottom of Hitchin Road Development starts with a nice brick house sympathetic to the local style and ends in close proximity red brick housing where I can see the main vista will end up being parked cars. I spent a long time choosing Stotfold has my location to settle as it reminded me of Devon how it used to be. I know things have to change but please include some landscaping and trees – take a look at Brayes Manor. Nice modern housing – plenty of parking – lots of lovely trees!</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
S Coles	H361, Stotfold	<p>I wish to raise concerns of the proposed development in Waters End Stotfold. I live at No 20 Waters End Stotfold SG54QA. To start with my main concern is the level of upheaval and disruption and stress the intended development will cause my family and I. Mainly due to the existing narrow road outside my house and the expected increase in traffic that will be the main route to the intended site, and the right I have to park my family's vehicle's outside or near my home, not only will there be many problems due to both the heavy daily traffic trying to get through to the site, the right to live and park outside my home or even in the turning of Waters End / due to most houses having drop down kerbs and no available spaces in the turning except at the top end of the road which will be limited for space, if our vehicles park there, meaning again large vehicles not being able to gain excess etc. Even if the new proposed development took place, again due to the narrow road and if I park outside my house in the road and my opposite neighbour did the same it would mean only very small vehicles would be able to slowly get through etc, meaning problems to us and other road users gaining access? The road and the amount of traffic from Heron Way plus the new development would mean the junction would be backed up of traffic trying to turn on to Hitchin Road / off which is a fast stretch of road with a blind spot for traffic that use the road close to the entrance of Waters End. Of which at this moment in time has the odd near miss or accident weekly? I am also concerned as to why the council can consider proposing prime Agriculture land for housing. I can not understand the lack of infer-structure that is lacking in Stotfold and is needed to deal with the present building programs already in progress in the village, such as Schools / Shops / facility's for children. We have many Electric Black outs some times weekly even in summer times and more in the winter. How much more will this affect us due to the extra housing and extra demand? On a serious concern I have noticed on regular occasions that the sewage pumping station opposite Waters End, (Based on Hitchin Road) needs regular mechanical support to help lower the high intake to the pumping station, of which it seems it is not able to handle on it's own. If this is the case how will the extra amount of sewage and surface water be dealt with if there is no upgrade to the system? When it rains heavily the top end of Waters End has a high level of flood surface water on the road surface, which seems to take a long time to discharge down the present surface water drainage system. This means that the overflow of water cascades down Waters End and some times back logs up, due to the surface drains not coping. I see by the plans of the intended plots has history of being within the Floodplain / are you sure the new house owners will be able to get House Insurance for there new homes?</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
S Coles (continued)	H361, Stotfold	The area in question is also the lowest lying area in the village. When I purchased my home I was informed that the green space next to my home is part of the required green space by law for the number of dwellings in Waters End. This is also used as a safe area for it's residents. It is used daily and at weekends by the children of the estate playing soft ball games etc. Will I be compensated for the disruption and my rights to live in an acceptable environment while this project takes place? Will I be compensated for the loss of the features that helped me choose my home which will be lost if this project takes place. As a foot note I will do every thing legally possible to stop this project and do not intend to assist the developers in anyway to gain access to the site while building work takes places.