

List of Reg 14 Consultees

Statutory Consultees list provided by BBC Planning:

| Agency | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Anglian Water | Historic England (previously English Heritage) |
| Coal authority | Marine Management Organisation |
| Environment Agency | Natural England |
| Homes and Communities (HCA) | Network Rail |
| Highways England | Primary Care Trust – Bedfordshire CCG |

Landowners & Representing Agents:

| Agent | | |
|----------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Axiom | Lone Star Land | Bench/Hacking |
| Cerda | Optimis | 1 Grosvenor Holdings Ltd |
| DevComms | Pegasus | Smith Jenkins |
| DLP | PPS | |

Great Barford Amenities, Businesses & Organisations

| Amenities & Organisations | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Great Barford Primary Academy | Methodist Church | Golden Cross PH |
| Great Barford GP Surgery | Plymouth Brethren | Bowls Club |
| All Saints Church | The Anchor PH | |
| | | |
| Businesses | | |
| Affordable Cars | Bedford Storage | |
| Star Cars | THX | |

Local Authority

| Surrounding Parishes | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Renhold PC | Willington PC | Blunham PC (Central Beds) |
| Roxton PC | Wyboston PC | Moggerhanger PC (Central Beds) |
| Wilden PC | | |
| | | |
| Bedford Borough Council | | |
| Bedford Planning Policy Team | | |

Table of Redacted Representations made using Online Response Form

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| None: | 3 | I am supportive of the plan and the allocated area of development. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 1.1 | 10 | We object to the development of this green belt land for housing. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 10 | Building on less desirable land |
| Other | 10 | building at this side of the village has already been relentless |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 4.1 | 2 | <p>The assessment of site 125 (Table 4.1(a)) states 'no risk of flooding'. During our occupancy of 41 Green End Road, this land has flooded seriously twice - in 2006 and 2012. In July 2012 the fire brigade placed 'sandbags' against the doors and patio windows at the back of the house and pumped the water out of our gardens back and front. The fire brigade were already in the area assisting other flooded properties. Manned pumps were on site for several hours. We were told water would have entered our house within minutes without help. Houses in 'The Brambles,' a new estate were flooded, and the householders collectively paid for a 'bung' to be constructed to avoid this disaster recurring. We contacted both the Environment Agency and the Bedfordshire and River Ivel Drainage Board in February 2014 after further problems. They are aware of the situation.</p> <p>We would like to point out that one of the oak trees on Site 125 is 'protected'.</p> |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 2 | If site 125 is chosen for development, the risk of flooding must be dealt with. |
| Other: | 2 | If site 125 were to be developed, we would object if the houses were built one at a time. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 9.0 | <p>Vision very good, especially "maintain its rural character offering high quality housing".</p> <p>Objectives: 1 & 4. I'm not convinced that the new Roxton Rd development under construction would meet this objective (had it been required) as it appears to be relatively high density with small gardens and bordering very close to the main road. In contrast, the GtB West site is large enough for the creation of an enviable and spaced estate with plenty of green spaces and would be much enhanced by incorporating in the development tree-lined avenues and wildlife</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | <p>corridors.</p> <p>6 & 8. Important and excellent.</p> <p>9. Developers should be required to incorporate some commercial property as this would improve sustainability by including space and constructions of properties to encourage new businesses to provide services/facilities that don't currently exist in the village, thus also reducing the need for people to travel outside GtB for such services.</p> |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 9.0 | Included in the above |
| Other | 9.0 | Excellent Plan. Ref 1.2: Minor point – I assume there is now no requirement for EU compatibility. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 6.4 | 5 | I don't feel that 500 houses can be deemed as "an appropriate scale" to the existing village. According to the 2011 census, there were 2003 residents. The addition of 500 houses would as increase the population of the parish by over 50% (based on two people per household). |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 5 | Limit the number of households to an appropriate scale. In my opinion, a 10% increase in residents would be an "appropriate scale" to ensure that existing infrastructure could cope with the increased demand. In terms of numbers, I would suggest a maximum of 100 houses. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.1 | 1 | 'The policy places a short timescale upon the Neighbourhood Plan, it must be submitted by the 15th January 2021 or Bedford Borough Council will ' But this is BEFORE the closing date of this consultation |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 1 | Change the date!! |
| Other: | 1 | Very comprehensive and well supported with the site allocated thoroughly justified. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.1 | 12.0 | An allocation of 500 houses onto a village of around 1000 is proportionally a massive development but unfortunately not a matter the community can challenge. I accept that the chosen site might lessen the traffic impacts in the village, but allocation to other locations could have been accompanied by traffic measures to address this, whether by managing the flow or creating new road links. |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Suggested Mitigation: | 12.0 | At a personal level, I would have much preferred to see a number of smaller sites implemented, to achieve a more organic development. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.13 | 9.1 | 8.13 and 8.4 are both excellent. I feel that making extra care housing a requirement for supporting development would ensure this is incorporated and worthy of incorporation. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 9.1 | Incorporated above. |
| Other | 9.1 | Note - 8.1 states requirement to submit by 15Jan21 - hopefully this has been extended. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 12.5 | 11.0 | You have not mentioned that the new development could provide an opportunity to REDUCE congestion, about which residents (including myself) are concerned. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 11.0 | <p>Given the size of the new development - in area and inhabitants - it can and should contribute to the road network. Concrete measures need to be proposed (imposed) to alleviate the effect of 500-1000 additional cars clogging up the village.</p> <p>I believe the plan should propose a through road from the Bedford Rd. to Green End Road. This would provide the new residents with two exits, and enable traffic to & from Wilden to bypass the dangerous and congested junction at the Golden Cross. I would propose that this should be a proper road for through traffic, which would constitute a much needed improvement.</p> <p>BUT - if this is objected to, even a smaller more residential, unsignposted road would reduce pressure on the existing network due to 500-1000 new cars. In that case, traffic calming, bends, etc. could ensure that through traffic did not prefer to use it.</p> |
| Other | 11.0 | Thank you for doing this thorough job. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 12.9 | 8 | Bedford Rd is already heavily and increasingly used by non local traffic. The Black Cat roundabout developments will make this significantly worse in the relative short term. The new 500 house development should not be started at least until after the Black Cat roundabout improvements have been made. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 8 | Hold off starting the works until after the Black Cat works are completed. |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Other | 8 | I have a right of way over a track that runs parallel to our plot. Plan does not acknowledge this? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 12.19 | 12.2 | Wherever the new development is to be built, the allocation/s should specifically seek to improve the cycle network from the village into Bedford. The town is within cycling distance but there is currently no access route available without in part travelling alongside vehicles going at the national speed limit of 60 mph. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 12.2 | The plan currently fails to address this issue as it contains no specific policy to promote the cycle network. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 15.2 | 7 | I would like to see a commitment to clarify and rationalise the GI Aspirations listed in 15.2, mainly relating to footpaths, leading to the creation of a plan to dramatically improve the footpath and cycle way network around the village and especially to the south-west of the village. This will involve a lot of work with landowners, developers, and extraction contractors as well as the Environment Agency, neighbouring local authorities and other interested parties, and the sooner it begins the better. There is evidence that this issue is important to many residents. |
| Other | 7 | The amount of development allocated to Great Barford is clearly far too high. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 15.2 | 9.3 | Aspirations are excellent (although as the plans are not in high definition some of the locations referred to are unclear). As I attended some of the meetings I have a good idea. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 9.3 | For clarity, perhaps publish online a higher definition plan containing the references to which the Aspirations List refers. |
| Other | 9.3 | 16.5 & Appdx 3 refer to EU rules I presume no longer apply. NP is excellent & has our full support. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy CF1 | 4 | Building of 500 houses |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 4 | Not to build on a beautiful little village and go build somewhere else |
| Other: | 4 | We love the small village. 500 houses are only going to cause more traffic, more problems |
| Section | Submission | Comment |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Policy D1 | 12.4 | The integration of this scale of new development into the village will be heavily dependent upon the success of the design and layout of the project. Please ensure that the outer edges of the development are fully respectful of the local area – no overwhelming gable walls against the main road as we are presented with at the corner of Hare Meadow. Good, naturalised green frontages to the main road, and the development of different character areas internally, but taking on board the important characteristics of the village. This new site must become an interesting part of the village in its own right and there is no reason why this cannot extend to contemporary architecture too. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 9.2 | Very good policy indeed. Well done. A few comments:- 3rd bullet point: make extra care housing required or it may well not happen and would be beneficial. 8th & 12th bullet points: Planting & landscaping required. Excellent to specify a "definite edge" - preferably a green edge! 11th bullet point: Excellent to ensure a new medical facility is incorporated. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 9.2 | Incorporated above |
| Other | 9.2 | 9 - Natural Environment - all excellent, as is NE 1 and NE 2. Likewise CF 1. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 12.1 | The chosen site conflicts totally with the aims elsewhere in the plan to preserve the nature of a “village nestled in the valley”. It is on high ground, and will be very prominent on approaching the village from the west as well as in countryside views from all around the village eg from Wilden Road. It is essential that the development creates a soft frontage to Bedford Road – to this end the relevant criterion should read “Buffer planting and landscaping to assimilate the development into the surrounding landscape, to include greenspace, indigenous hedgerows and soft landscaping to the Bedford Road frontage” |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 12.1 | The significant landscape impacts on higher ground of the chosen site are no better than those of site 532/128, yet the latter would have fitted better within the existing confines of the village. Roxton Road would offer a far less dominating development, still of a single site (which could be argued to be more effective in bringing forward added benefits and planning gain). |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy TT3 | 12.3 | The footpath network around the village is currently very limited. It is a pleasing to see that the GI Plan seeks to extend this network. How can this be achieved alongside the development of land at Bedford Road, where the ability to build can be used as a lever with reluctant landowners? |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 12.3 | Alternatively can the new development perhaps be required to fund a project led by the PC to work with landowners and thus to create new linkages. |

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Annex 1 | 6 | OBJECT to the housing policy. Creation of a massive housing estate outside the village is contrary to the proposal of the expert consultants. AECOM identified proposals to integrate the 500 houses on separate sites which all related well to the existing villages, not just creating another new out-of-village estate, like all other new development at the moment. If you ask villagers where they want the 500 houses, they will answer with "get it all done in 1 site, somewhere away from me!!!, but a greenfield estate with potential for upto 2000 houses may be great for the land owner, but is not the best or most sustainable option to preserve the characteristics of the village. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 6 | Read the AECOM housing report and consider just those proposals. A local 'opinion' survey gets dominated by the most vocal residents, or groups of residents, some of whom may also be influenced by the land owner. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Annex 1 | 11.1 | The key views |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 11.1 | The view from the Bedford Road should also look towards the village. The view as marked ignores the new development, and the tragedy is it cannot be ignored. I greatly appreciate the references in the plan on preserving aspect, but by enlarging the view indicator on policy map 3 to also look towards the village, you would be giving a clear signal that the developers must treat this issue with the greatest respect. |
| Other | 11.1 | Thank you very much for your efforts, and for including concerns regarding aspect in your plan |

Promoter Leaflet Drop

At this point, on Thursday 14 January 2021, the promoter representing the northern part of the small Site 123/526, conducted a hand delivered distribution of a 3 page leaflet to houses in the village. This was considered to be an attempt to provoke responses, during consultation, to be in favour of their interests.

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|------------|---|
| None | 22.4 | A highly credible Neighbourhood Plan with realistic policies to safeguard the future development and sustainability of Great Barford. I fully support it. Well done. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| None | 42 | We moved to Great Barford because it is a lovely country village. We are against the ongoing building of new houses. The facilities such as the doctors, shops and post office are already extremely busy and could not accommodate extra people. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 1.1 | 29.C | <p><i>These are the comments of Wilden Parish Council</i></p> <p>Unable to open Draft Plan to provide paragraph or policy number despite repeated attempts over several days so, comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construction Traffic – There will be a great deal of construction traffic during the building of so many houses. We would like an assurance that these lorries and vans will not be allowed to travel through Wilden's tiny lanes and streets and will only enter or leave Great Barford via Bedford Road, Roxton Road and St. Neots road. Any rat-runs through Chawston crossroads via Colesden or from the B660 via Shrubbery Lane or Ravensden to be barred to all contractors and sub-contractors. 2. GP Surgery – We support the building of a new large surgery with sufficient parking for patients on the new housing estate. The present surgery is over-run and has very little parking and is opposite the school which is problematic during term-time. |
| Other | 29.C | These are the comments of Wilden Parish Council |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 1.3 | 40.0 | Make sure every household is notified as before with the original document in 2016. DO NOT rely on people attending an event. This does not engage everyone and does not get a true reflection of village opinion |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 3.11 | 40.1 | You mention GB lies in a shallow bowl within the landscape and go on to mention the level topography means that tall structures and large scale buildings are highly visible. How is building 500+ house in one site on the main road into the village going to keep the village nicely nestled in the countryside? |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.1 | Infill within the village would mean all new development would have to fall in line with the existing properties nearby and we would not end up with a jungle of 3 storey houses blighting the landscape |
| Section | Submission | Comment |

| 3.15 | 40.2 | The loss of a significant amount of grade 1 agricultural land in a time when we will be called upon to produce more of our own food is ludicrous. The gentle rise of the land heading towards Bedford would also mean any development would be above the height of the existing village and spoil the rolling views of the countryside surrounding the village. One of the main features of the village is that it is nestled in a shallow bowl and any development past the current edge of the village heading towards Bedford will lose this important characteristic. |
|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.2 | Limit development to within the village and the site known as 127 |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 4.1 | 21 | 500+ houses is a considerable project that needs detailed analyses of the infrastructure prior to any detailed approvals to the scheme are granted. Firstly the concentration of the new build to one large site would be far beneficial than a selection of smaller developments . It would also be the least disruptive to the village as ALL of the new infrastructure can be located to the WEST of the village thus avoiding major disruption . to the existing village and its residents. With multiple sites this would be both a nightmare. Please consider; 1/ Surface Water Run-off : The run off from 500 houses will inundate the existing systems thus the existing system cannot be considered as being a practical option.New outfalls would be needed to be laid from the new development directly to the River Ouse ,West of the Village. 2/ Estate Road. Clearly an opportunity to build a new route to the north of the village for HGV's thus avoiding any further build up at the Village Crossroads.. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 21 | Will the site be developed to a Rural Density or an Urban design. The Nightingale site is clearly too dense for a Rural setting ! SECTION 106 conditions. This would be an opportunity to get new facilities for the Village such as new medical / minor injuries clinic, Re landscaping the playing field to make it serviceable with new Pavilion for for Soccer and Cricket ! GENERALLY; Fundamentally there is no real alternative to this large site being dealt with as an a new and seperate part of the existing Village. It is a one off that needs to be serviced seperately and the upgrading of foul drains,sewerage works, water system, Electrics ,Telephones etc should be carried with the least disruption to the rest of the village. This may actually result in new feeders and an upgrading of several of the systems. This might prove to be a difficult process as the it will be a considerable cost burden to the Utility companies. |
| Other. | 21 | The Drainage infrastructure is inadequate for the existing Village thus taking an extra 500+ ?? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 4.1 | 37.2 | I refer to Table 4.1(a) : High level review of key criteria (as listed in page 2 and 3 of GBNP AECOM. Site assessment support criteria Flood Risk. Plot 125 |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | <p>The said area is currently standing in water as is the bottom of my garden which is adjacent to Plot 125. Water is running off the neighbouring farmland into a small ditch then on to plot 125 to a depth of 6 inches deep. Run off from hard landscaped surfaces will flood the area.</p> <p>Refer to Table 4.1 (a) River and Surface water States in the above there is no risk of Surface water flooding. Most misleading and not an accurate assessment.</p> |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 37.2 | Build at another site or reduce the number of dwellings and hardstanding. Use all of plots 125 and part of plots , 127 and 126 to create suitable environmental barriers to allow natural drainage between the larger building area and current local housing. Again photographs will be sent to the parish council of said standing water. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 4.1 | 44 | In Para 4.1(a) The AECOM report is misleading and states that the plot designated 125 is NOT subject to surface flooding when in fact since 1988 it has had surface flooding most winters and is currently flooded. I know and grew boundary hedge deliberately to try and alleviate surface flooding in my adjacent garden. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 44 | Reduce construction and hard surfaces to a minimum to prevent run off and leave a natural barrier to absorb drainage. |
| Other | 44 | The Great Barford west development estate could almost double the population and as the village is in the Ouse valley bowl would be visible from the river view, low lying community and its surrounding area. A blot on the landscape. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 24.3 | Objective 1 states any development should be of an appropriate scale so as not to overwhelm its position or surroundings: a development of 500 houses on one site is not of an appropriate scale and it will of course overwhelm its surroundings - currently wide open green space. What is being proposed is similar to the large developments seen off Tyne Crescent in Putnoe - eg Ashmead Road, Margil Road & Crispin Drive. The Ashmead Road development completely overwhelms its surroundings. The proposed Grt B development is also very similar to the development seen along Baden-Powell Way on the outskirts of Biggleswade which again has completely overwhelmed that area of the town being built on what was previously open countryside. A large development of 500 houses in this one location will be clearly visible as people enter the village from the Bedford end and will detract from the visual aspect of this approach. Objective 4 states that any new housing development will.....integrate as fully as possible with the existing village. With respect how does building all 500 houses on one site on the outside of the village and calling it Great Barford West, in any way integrate the site into the existing village? What is currently proposed does the complete opposite - it is the construction of almost a separate "satellite" village. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.3 | The 500 houses need to be spread across the several locations across the village. It will be easier for newcomers to integrate into the village community if they feel "part" of it as oppose to all newbies being grouped together in a complete new and physically separate development. |

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| 5.1 | 25.1 | The Vision and Objectives of this Neighbourhood Plan have been clearly developed and refined to reflect the priorities of our community and will help in the future development of the village. |
| Other | 25.1 | An excellent document |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 28.2 | <p>[These comments also apply to Para. 7.3.] The 1st objective is key and I strongly believe that the size and scale of a 500 home single development that could dominate the views into and out of a rural Conservation Area at Green End contradicts that objective to “maintain and enhance the essential rural ambience of the village.....be of an appropriate scale so as not to overwhelm its position or surroundings and should not detract from the visual aspect when entering the village”.</p> <p>The 5th and 6th objectives state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The landscape, wildlife and habitats will be protected and enhanced. Existing green spaces will be protected, enhanced where appropriate and new spaces will be provided • The historic environment will be conserved and enhanced with new development respecting the characteristics and appearance of the old” <p>Green End has a striking collection of statuesque trees that dominate views along the approaches from Wilden Road, Birchfield Road and across the Allocated Land from Bedford Road. From the large row of ancient Oaks to the intermixing of 100ft Pines and deciduous Walnut, Chestnut, Sycamore and Ash they are landmarks themselves and are host to a wide variety of birds and insects.</p> |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 28.2 | A more modest scale development still on the Allocated Land but primarily extending along the Bedford Road south westwards. Additional housing pockets can be spread more evenly around other sites in the village so as to balance the impacts, spread the benefits and enable a more considered sequencing of development over the many years of construction. Any development must maintain a clear distinction and separation not only with open undeveloped space but also require planned buffering with existing hedgerows and trees protected and new hedgerows and trees planted. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 28.4 | [Comments also apply to Para. 7.] The 4th objective which states that “New housing development will be visually attractive in design and landscaping and integrate as fully as possible with the existing village” is of critical importance. One only has to read the litany of negative comments from local residents on the community Facebook pages regarding the new development on Roxton Road to understand how strongly people feel about the aesthetics and how housing blends into or otherwise the environment around it. Quite frankly that new estate looks like a self contained block of densely packed properties with no flow into the landscape on its northern and eastern boundaries in particular. Should something similar be permitted on the Allocated Land would be a disgrace and would emphasise |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | the two village split which is a risk with such a sizeable development on only one extremity of the existing village. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 28.4 | Blend housing into the existing look and feel of the village along Bedford Road, well spaced and with open gaps and a variety of styles to complement the existing housing stock in the village. Avoid the look of a dense estate block penetrating deeply into the rising landscape (as per Roxton Road!). |
| Other | 28.4 | I am concerned that the proposed development is so large in comparison to the existing village that it will; a) mean that all residents will be subject to a building site for many years as housing stock is dripped onto the markets, and b) will change the village out of all proportion. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 37.0 | Vision and objectives are not met regarding integration with the existing village, the site sits on the edge which will by nature deter local integration. Smaller sites around and through the village will encourage integration. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 37.0 | Smaller sites around and through the village will encourage integration. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 37.1 | Sustainable Development Principles 6.4 Ensuring that there is no increase in the risk of flooding. From 47 Green End Road the proposed plots 125 127 116 predominantly slope down to all the properties along the north edge of the planned area for development. Contrary to the site assessment report AECOM Page 12 Plot 125 stands in water after sustained and heavy rainfall. Water currently drains and collects at this site as a result of slow natural drainage from surrounding agricultural land and because a bund installed by residents of the Brambles restricts its natural run off potentially flooding their homes. I have recently taken photographs proving standing water and flood danger is ever present. The local plan will only increase the potential for increased risk. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 37,1 | Much consideration needs to be given to the risk of flooding to Green End Road homes. Hard surfaces will produce much faster run off building to a point of mass overflow. Containment could be a consideration however at some point it would become full and overloaded. Some form of environmental barrier could be developed on site 125 mitigating the flood potential. The Brook running along Green End Road already floods on the corner of Birchfield Road. The brook running from Davidsons Farm as an open water-course with culverts giving access dotted along its length until half way along Green End Road where it is piped underground. Any increase in water flow as a result of development will increase the potential for flooding on a grand scale, any blockages at a culvert will make matters even worse. Please consider all possibilities that could introduce new criteria or element likely to increase flooding potential. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 5.1 | 38.C | Representations on behalf of Old Road Securities PLC at Land off Roxton Road (Willoughby Park) |

| | | Please see submitted representation report (listing comments on all relevant sections of the draft NDP) |
|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Suggested Mitigation: | 38.C | Please see submitted representation report (listing comments on all relevant sections of the draft NDP) |
| Other | 38.C | Please notify us at each subsequent stage of Neighbourhood Plan preparation. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 6.1 | 24.4 | Sustainable Development Principles are stated as meaning inter alia that development should be: At an appropriate scale and in locations where it would support the community - what is proposed is not at an appropriate scale (see my previous comment on 5.1). How will a large development centred in one location separate from the main village in any way support either the new community or the existing Grt B community? Ensuring that there is no increase in the risk of flooding - what is proposed will significantly increase the risk of flooding to the properties along Green End Road and the developments located off Green End Road (see my previous comments on 8.3 & Policy H1 - as advised I can provide evidence to support my arguments if required) Will meet contemporary construction, energy efficiency & water management standards - for reasons previously explained it is absolutely VITAL that if the proposed development goes ahead as currently suggested that the highest level of water management standards are adhered to & measures are put in place to ensure the proper upkeep and maintenance of any flood alleviation measures for many years to come. Will avoid the loss of or damage to hedgerows, trees and local wildlife habitats - the site currently allocated is currently a large green open space with hedgerows and trees. Yes it is agricultural pasture land but it is still habitat for birds and mammals and the hedgerows are vital "wildlife corridors". Will avoid overloading existing utilities and services (water, drainage, sewage and waste) - as previously commented on what is proposed will seriously overload the drainage currently available for surface water run off. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.4 | For all the reasons detailed above, to propose an development of 500 homes in one location is completely at odds with many of the Sustainable Development Principles. Wherever the development takes place it will have serious adverse impacts on the environment and wildlife but it would be easier to satisfy more of these Principles by spreading the development across a number of smaller sites. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 6.2 | 40.3 | Space for a new medical centre was allocated within the Hare Meadow development and remains untouched. Rumour has it the surgery cannot afford to move - how would this be any different with a new development? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 6.4 | 28.0 | The key views identified in Policy Map 3 ignore the important views approaching Great Barford from the high points on Bedford Road especially the density of very large old trees (deciduous and evergreen) in the Green End Conservation Area. The further that development extends westward away from the Bedford Road in the chosen area of allocated |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | land, the greater the obscuring of these views and encroachment on the otherwise rural and arboreal aspect of the Green End Conservation Area. A number of properties in Green End, some of which are listed, enjoy open and rural views towards the south and west. This open aspect is inherent in the character of this Conservation Area and the key amenity for residents. To encroach on Green End through development towards the northern end of the Allocated Land I believe would be in direct conflict with section 6.4 which states as follows: “The following adverse impacts must be avoided: • Avoidable intrusion into open countryside, and unacceptable impact on the landscape” • “Visual intrusion on the Conservation Areas and their settings...” • “A loss of amenity for existing residential properties...” |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 28.0 | Any development in the allocated site should be restricted to that land closest to the Bedford Road (along the southern end of the Allocated Land) and therefore creating a clear distinction and maintain an open line of site into and out of the Green End Conservation Area. In the knowledge that the c.65ha site is large enough for many more than 500 homes, that seems like a solution that minimises the loss of character of the Green End Conservation Area and maintains the existing linear settlement profile of Great Barford |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 6.4 | 28.3 | [Comments also apply to Policy H1.] The Sustainable Development Principles state: “Ensure that there is no increase in the risk of flooding.” According to the Ordnance Survey maps of the Allocated Land there is approximately a 15 metre drop from Brewers Hall Farm down to Green End Road (from 40m to 25m). Our property at 61 Green End Road (known previously as Greenfield) abuts the Allocated Land (currently under agriculture) where it slopes down from the aforementioned higher ground. Every Winter the run off from this farmed field floods at its lowest point along our boundary with that part of our garden often under a few inches of settled water. A large mediaeval pond in a neighbouring property and a smaller one on the other side completely fill. I understand that the main concern of planners will be of the most obvious risk of flooding from the Great Ouse itself but that cannot ignore the risk of flooding from other watercourses such as the brook that runs the length of Green End Road and other ditches, ponds and field run off systems. A number of properties in Green End have a history of flooding. Should development take place on the Allocated Land then as a result of the vastly increased hard surface run off there will undoubtedly be an increased flow of water downhill towards the properties along Green End Road. Having had an evacuation notice on Christmas Eve because of the risk of flooding and watching water levels rise dangerously high at both the front and rear of our property only last week this matter is of huge concern to me and my neighbours. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 28.3 | To protect these properties a comprehensive study and analysis must be undertaken and a specific system will be required to be put in place. Potentially a significant ditch running between these properties north west to south east and joining a watercourse to transport that water towards the Great Ouse. I would also expect these residents to have legal recourse to the council should their properties be flooded as a result of the proposed development. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| 7.1 | 19 | <p>As the Neighbourhood Plan wishes to reflect community opinion and aspirations and add a local dimension to the assessment of proposals for new housing. Good design is not just about appearance, but also functionality and the relationship to surroundings I suggest that the selected option for a single site reflects the above.</p> <p>Past styles have adopted the infill/dispersed approach which has the potential to overcrowd areas and lose the open village aspect and character of the village.</p> |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 19 | Not adopting the dispersed building approach. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 7.2 | 40.4 | 'Great Barford is a rural village set in a hollow, surrounded by open countryside and therefore hidden from distant view' 'the relationship to adjacent countryside is part of the village ...' as a key feature and characteristic of the village and Parish and therefore important attributes that should be respected when considering further development'. These statements come directly from 7.2 of your draft plan and yet all of these key characteristics and features will be lost if the chosen site goes ahead. How can you justify the choice of site when you believe the above? |
| Suggested Mitigation: | | Option 1a |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 7.3 | 24.0 | I am at a loss to understand how one development of 500 houses in one location can possibly fall within the description of being "of the density in keeping with its immediate area. Also in the proposed location it will directly encroach on the view of the village as people approach from the western side of the village. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.0 | For the houses to be built in dispersed locations around the village - there are areas of land along Roxton Road and also there would appear to be an opportunity to infill some of the area adjacent to Woodpecker Close along New Road. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 7.3 | 40.5 | As the proposed site for the new development stands alone does this allow for free reign on density as there is no immediate area for it to be in-keeping with? Again you mention it should not encroach upon surrounding landscape or spoil the views approaching the village. Another contradiction for the choice of site. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.5 | Option 1a |

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| 7.4 | 40.6 | Following the success and location of Woodpecker Close would it not be beneficial to extend it? |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.6 | Option 1a |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 7.5 | 32 | Developments to be of an appropriate size and scale does not match the plan to build in one large area. Smaller developments, such as Woodpecker close, would blend more naturally into the village. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 32 | Split the development into smaller areas within the current village such as off New Road or Addingtins |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.1 | 22.1 | According to the Local Authority, Great Barford is classed as a Key Service Centre, but it does not properly acknowledge the lack of current infrastructure and amenities, nor the spare capacity needed to support growth, only that growth will provide new homes AND services. Bedford Local Plan 2030 Policy 4S Amount and Distribution of Housing Development, allocates 500 homes to Great Barford. This is a disproportionately large growth for a parish that had just 881 dwellings recorded in the 2011 Census. Even taking intervening development in to account, the growth of 500 on current dwellings will be over 50% (similar for Sharnbrook), whereas for Clapham and Bromham, 500 homes is around 25% growth. All classed as Key Service Centres. Although the Neighbourhood Plan cannot change the allocation amount, the huge imposition needs noting. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 22.1 | The allocation quantity cannot be reduced, so the Neighbourhood Plan must ensure the new development provides good design and net gain in infrastructure and facilities for the benefit of all parishioners, without incurring a legacy of burden for future upkeep and maintenance. Offers of open parkland may seem an attractive leisure amenity proposition, but its future management and maintenance costs need to be taken into account. |
| Other. | 22.1 | There is an opportunity to work with developers to provide good net gains for current and future residents. We need to see an uptake of the aspirations for mutual benefit of the parish not just on site schemes. Don't waste the opportunity. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.2 | 40.9 | It would have been nice if the AECOM report/results had been made more public rather than having to find them on notification of this draft plan |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.2 | 40.24 | It is interesting that the findings from AECOM suggest that sites 123/526, 125 and 605 perform best against the NDPs objectives have been ignored. Yes it is evident these sites alone cannot fulfil the 500 houses required but they are included in option 1a - which AECOM have also commented that the allocation of smaller sites would |

| | | have a smaller impact as the sites are spread across a wider area. I will also note at this point, as there doesn't seem to be anywhere else to note it, that the development of one large site would take up to 10 years to be completed, whereas smaller sites would be delivered in a much smaller time frame. |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.3 | 14 | I very much support the comments and conclusions of nominating the Great Barford West - Allocation being the preferred area for possible development. This will provide far less congestion within the village as opposed to multiple distribution of developments particularly the cross flow of vehicular traffic on the main road which is widely used in peak hours as access to and from the Black Cat Roundabout. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 14 | None. |
| Other | 14 | In all respects the issue of the volume of traffic through the village is a great concern. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.3 | 24.1 | While building all 500 houses in the one proposed location may well avoid the flood risk areas identified on government flood risk maps, by building all 500 properties on the allocated site, there is a real risk of increasing the flooding from surface water run off to houses located along the length of Green End Road. When I purchased my property in 2012 a number of properties in The Brambles were affected by water running off the "allocated site" - summer 2012 was extremely wet. Christmas 2020 - a large area of the allocated site was under water - it pools at its eastern edge of the site directly behind The Brambles (I have photographs which I can provide if required). I witnessed the landowner dig a channel to allow the water to drain from the field into the adjacent drainage ditch/culvert which runs under The Brambles and drains into the ditch which runs the length of Green End Road towards the river. This ditch was almost full. Fortunately we had a day or so where the weather remained allowing the Green End ditch water level to fall but if this had not been the case, there was a real danger of the ditch/culvert backing up and the water on the allocated site flooding into the properties on The Brambles. All the properties in The Brambles have large attenuation tanks under their rear gardens to collect rain water and allow it to drain away slowly. I am gravely concerned that a 500 house development with roads, driveways, patios etc will generate significantly more rain water run off than the current field which has soil and vegetation to slow down the rate of run off. Throughout the 2020 Christmas period, while everyone was focussed on the River Ouse and the flooding caused when it broke its banks, the Government website carried a warning of flooding from surface water run off which could affect Green End Road & The Brambles. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.1 | The 500 houses should be built in several locations across the village to alleviate the danger of significant flash flooding from surface water run off in Green End Road, Strawberry Fields & the Brambles. The ditch along the edge of Green End Road also has to cope with water running off the fields from the Birchfield Farm side of the village. If the |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | plan to build 500 homes on this one allocated site goes ahead then the drainage provision for the allocated site and along the length of Green End Road MUST be improved. |
| Other | 24.1 | My comments above are also relevant to Policy H1 |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.3 | 24.5 | Where is the evidence to support the stated assumption that "most traffic would travel towards Bedford?" This is a sweeping statement which is being used to justify locating all 500 homes on the allocated site. With the improvements which are to take place to the Black Cat and the dualling of the A428 to Cambridge, also the good access to the A1 which gives access to Peterborough going North & Letchworth, Stevenage, Hatfield and London going South, it is equally as likely that new residents would be travelling to these locations. Also with a Tesco Superstore, Aldi, Lidl and the small out of town retail park on the Wyboston side of St Neots and easily accessible from the A1 via the Wyboston exit, it is also equally as likely that new residents would chose to travel to St Neots for their shopping instead of travelling into Bedford. For the reasons expressed elsewhere in previous comments, building on the allocated site may well avoid the flood risk areas identified on the government food risk maps but it does nothing to avoid the risk of surface water flooding to the properties along Green End Road, Strawberry Fields & The Brambles. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.5 | The development should be spread across the available sites to both the east and west of the village. For the reasons explained above it is fair to say it is equally possible residents will be travelling out of the village to the east as it that they will be travelling to the west. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.3 | 27.C | <i>Renhold Parish Council response</i> 8.3. This links with Policy map (Annex 1). 8.3 states: '..... Residents were asked to fill in a form, which was then analysed. The outcome was that residents clearly preferred the option of one site providing all the development in one location, known as Great Barford West. On balance, this site would involve less direct impact on residents in terms of traffic flows (assuming the trend that most traffic would travel towards Bedford.....' Renhold Parish Council is concerned that this substantial development would have a significant impact on traffic on the Bedford Rd/St. Neots Rd as it enters Water End to access the A421/A428, and also the Water End Lane as it enters the main village. It also seems at odds with your own Development guidelines (p23) which state: development should retain separation of individual villages - avoid linear developments along roads merging settlements. The development of 500 dwellings on the proposed site in open countryside increases the future coalescence of Great Barford with Water End and the Renhold community by setting a precedent. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 27.C | The Parish Council do not feel this is a suitable locations, and feel if this site is taken forwards there needs to be increased mitigation measures put in place, including a cycle way provision be included on the main access road. |

| Other | 27.C | Response on behalf of Renhold Parish Council |
|---------|------------|--|
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.3 | 40.10 | The consultation in 2016 show 75% of the community preferred smaller sites within the village, with only 4% opting for one large site of up to 500 houses. The favoured area for development was to in-fill the North East between Roxton Rd and Addingtons Rd (sites named 123 & 526). The minutes from the Neighbourhood Planning Committee in June 2017 say 'good response on the exercise to establish which areas of potential development are preferred by the community. A clear favourite was the area of land between New Rd and Addingtons Rd'. 'During discussion it was noted that the listed potential capacities for the combined parcels of land between New Rd & Addingtons Rd have the capacity for more than 500 houses. So why have these opinions not been taken into consideration and one large site been submitted? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.3 | 40.11 | I question the validity of the results for the consultation held in late 2019. If the results were taken from only those that attended the event how is that a 'public' consultation and a fair representation of the community? Shouldn't a similar approach to that of the 2016 survey been followed? What were the reasons behind not contacting each household? This was pre-covid. There were no restrictions. I also question the decision to not contact each household for this consultation (Jan 2021). The assumption that most traffic would travel towards Bedford therefore this site would involve less direct impact on residents in terms of traffic flow is sweeping at best. The 2016 results show that most residents work in Bedford or Sandy. Therefore, there would still be an increase in the volume of traffic travelling through the village which is at present plagued with speeding vehicles on the Bedford/Roxton Rd. The improved link to Cambridge at the Black Cat would also mean more traffic travelling through the village. Increasing the wait times to cross the cross-roads in the centre of the village leading to more cars queuing down the High St and Green End Rd. Regarding flood risk, if Woodpecker Close was at little/no risk of flooding when built then sites 118 & 535 included in Option 1a should also not be affected, especially as they are further from the river than Woodpecker Close. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.4 | 40.12 | How will the new development link with the existing village if it is one large site isolated on the outskirts of the village? There is no existing pavements, or safe footpath links from the village to the proposed site. If the in-fill sites were used this infrastructure to the village amenities already exists |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.11 | 40.13 | I agree that a lot more bungalows need to be provided |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 8.13 | 40.14 | There is no need for two and a half storey properties. If the houses are built on a large enough plot two storeys is |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | sufficient. Looking at Hare Meadow, some of the houses in there are so tall it feels like they're falling in on you when you walk through. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.14 | one and two storey houses only |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 9.1 | 40.16 | A top priority identified by residents is the protection of the countryside. How is building 500+ houses protecting the countryside? |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.16 | Smaller in-fill developments would have much less impact on the aesthetics of the village |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 9.2 | 40.17 | How is this proposed development in keeping with Policy 37 of the Local Plan if it destroys the key feature of the village being hidden in a valley? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 9.4 | 24.6 | In 9.4 there is a reference to the Landscape Character Analysis which "supports an approach that requires development to be unobtrusive". What is currently proposed is anything but unobtrusive - it is going to be a huge development of 500 houses on what is currently green pasture land. In 9.5 The Development Guidelines state that any development should "retain the separation of individual villages - avoid linear development along roads merging settlements". One only has to look at the Loves Farm development on the outskirts of St Neots or the new developments along the B530/Amphill Road to see how one development rapidly expands. The draft plan states the proposed allocated site can support 1,000 dwellings. What measures are in place to ensure any development on the site will be limited to 500? It is only a matter of time before applications are received to expand the allocated site which in time this result in urban sprawl which will join up with Renhold and the outskirts of Bedford. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.6 | A better spread/allocation of the 500 houses across various sites in the village to spread the impact of the development and ensure an adherence to the stated guidelines. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 9.4 | 40.18 | How is 500+ houses in one site not going to be obtrusive? It will be a blot on the landscape and we will lose the rolling countryside that leads to the village, spoiling the characteristic features |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 9.6 | 40.21 | Excluding the key view located on Bedford Road facing the river, all of the other views will be ruined by the block of 500 houses proposed on this site. How has this not been taken into consideration? |

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|------------|---|
| 9.13 | 24.7 | The construction of 500 houses will have an adverse impact on our local wildlife habitats & biodiversity. The reference in 9.13 to the need to incorporating "bat boxes" is welcome but there is much more which should be done. Please read pages 87 to 90 of Back to Nature by Chris Packham & Megan McCubbin - as Chris says on page 90 it should be mandatory for builders of new build projects to incorporate bat bricks, bee bricks, starling & house sparrow bricks as well as swift bricks. Chris refers on page 89 to a number of Barratt's building projects built with nature in mind which included "orchards, hedgehog highways, newt ponds, bat and owl boxes". To quote Chris "If we want our communities to be better places for us to live, then we need to ensure we share them with nature. We need a better grasp on how community conservation can be effectively performed, we need to actively encourage the people who manage and shape these physical spaces to understand how to do so to maximise their biodiversity and to take advantage of new solutions when they become available. With East West Rail likely to cut across the area to the north of Grt B & the possible rerouting of the A1 to bring it closer to the east of Grt B our local countryside is under ever increasing pressure. The allocated site is a wide green space with hedgerows & trees providing valuable habitat for many animals & birds. I regularly hear owls at night. The hedgerows are vital wildlife corridors. To build 500 houses on this beautiful unspoilt piece of wide open space is environmental vandalism. Too often the mitigation measures of the kind referred to in the draft report - eg swathes of green space, hedges, native planting fall far short of what is needed to preserve at least some of the existing biodiversity. Visit any of the new developments I have referred to in other comments & see how areas of landscaping become nothing more than a few scraggly neglected bushes full of litter. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.7 | For development to be spread across several sites to spread the impact. To quote Chris P "what would pay dividends in so many cases is a partnership between the community with all its local knowledge & traditional commitment to the place & some up-to-date scientific knowledge & practical experience. In my experience this is far more productive in terms of increasing both biodiversity & the long term care of any protected area". For protecting the wildlife & the natural environment in a real and meaningful way to be a condition of any planning permissions. It needs to be far more than requiring some "native planting" on development boundaries - these soon become neglected & ineffective. The countryside is disappearing at an alarming rate & anybody that cares about the environment, who has children or grandchildren must do everything possible to ensure the protection & enhancement of what remains. |
| Other | 24.7 | The provision of wildflower meadows planted with native species is also vital to attract insects which in turn will provide food for birds and small animals. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 10.3 | 40.20 | You mention that the 'heart of the village' is where the bowls club is situated. If this is the case how is the proposed development going to engage with the facilities or even the village if it's located at the furthest point away?!! |
| Section | Submission | Comment |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| 12.25 | 40.22 | New links for pedestrians etc - Footpaths are essential. There are no footpaths past the first bend in Hare Meadow yet there is the footpath that links up to Silver St. This is a popular route for parents with children to walk to the school from Bedford Rd and without footpaths it's not 100% safe. I would like to see footpaths wherever the new development takes place, not just a change in tarmac colour! |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 13.6 | 40.23 | There was land allocated within the Hare Meadow development, if it's a matter of urgency why does it still remain unused? As previously commented if they cannot afford to move because of existing mortgages etc then even a new developments promise to include a site for the surgery would still go unused. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| 16.2 | 22.3 | The Bedford Local Plan 2030 did not take account of major east-west road and rail development within this region. The Local Plan Policy 1 dictates the Local Plan has to be reviewed within one year, and submitted for examination to update within three years. How does this impact the Great Barford Neighbourhood Plan? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy CON1 | 28.1 | This policy states that "The impact of development on views into and out of the Conservation Areas" must be addressed in a Design and Access Statement and /or Heritage Statement. The Great Barford Conservation Areas establishment document (Oct 1989) is the primary reference document in consideration of development proposals that could have a negative impact on the Conservation Areas. It states as follows: "Policy 3 Open areas, or their inter relationship with buildings and trees, may be part of the shape and form which make a conservation area a pleasant place. The open space itself can therefore be a key feature. The Local Planning Authority will not permit the development of areas which it considers make a significant contribution to the conservation area, even if the area meets the criteria of other development policies..." For Green End, the following extracts in this respect are key: "...the predominant effect is still that of open countryside – of an open area rather than a settlement" "It is important to retain the rural sense of the area and to resist the introduction of any urban features and dense development" "The Conservation Area boundary has been drawn to distinguish Green End from the recent expansion of Great Barford village itself. Where there is still opportunity for this distinction to remain, on the east side, it should be perpetuated and any further development prevented" "Policy 4 Development will not be permitted on any open space which the Borough Council believes contributes to the inherent character of the Conservation Area" It is the separate nature, openness and rural aspect of Green End that comprise its inherent character. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 28.1 | This leads to a natural conclusion that, in order to comply with the policies and principles of the Conservation Area, any development in the allocated site should be restricted to that land closest to the Bedford Road (along the southern end of the Allocated Land) and thus furthest from the east side of the Conservation Area itself. In the knowledge that the site is large enough for many more than 500 homes, that seems like a solution that minimises the loss of |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | character of the Green End Conservation Area and maintains the existing linear settlement profile of Great Barford. To ignore these policies and principles would be a dereliction of duty of the planners and council officials to respect foundation documents and what they are set out to protect. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy D1 | 40.7 | 'be of an appropriate scale' - the proposed site housing all 500+ new houses is not of an appropriate scale. If you merged the current village into one space it would fit in the proposed development site. How is that an appropriate scale? 'take advantage of views into/from the site to enable easy access and navigation ...' the entrance to the proposed site is on a stretch of road that has hidden dips and despite efforts to mitigate the fast flow of traffic would still pose dangers |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 40.7 | Option 1a |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy D1 | 40.8 | 'be well integrated with surroundings' - one large site will essentially become a village in itself. Therefore it will not integrate with the existing village. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy D2 | 13 | I think that by having one large housing estate will be detrimental to the village which should be kept as a village. If we have to accommodate an additional 500 homes, I think several smaller sites should be identified |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 13 | Several smaller sites distributed around the village would be better conjection and traffic build up |
| Other | 13 | Housing to be attractive and consideration needs to be made on the style of houses |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy D2 | 23 | I am in full agreement with the allocated land. This choice in my opinion will cause the least disruption to the village, and is away from the area's that are liable to flooding. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 15 | I am Against One Total Area of New House Buildings of 65Ha - Far to large an area for one housing site - Major facilities would be necessary with this scale of building area ? The adjacent main road would certainly become congested at times & major accidents are likely to occur - if this area is to be allocated for building it could be set out in sections One area in next 10 years & allocate further developments over a 20 years period |
| Suggested | 15 | Spread New House Building area throughout the village - there are certain to be other area on most of the Village |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Mitigation: | | borders |
| Other | 15 | I am strongly against Building on this Large scale in One Area there MUST be other alternatives |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 16 | I am in favour of the development being located as is suggested in the current NP plan currently proposed, Great Barford West. I am against the development being split and located in various areas of the village as I think this will change the village more and will be more disruptive. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 17 | I support the proposed development of 500 dwellings on a single large site as identified. My rationale reflects much of what has already been documented in various documents that I have reviewed. However, I wish to provide my comments nonetheless; The advantages of concentrating growth include it being easier to secure the delivery of necessary infrastructure, greater potential to provide affordable housing and greater potential for the delivery of community benefits, such as open space, which tend to be more lacking within this area of the village. The Parish Council sustainable development principles suggest that certain adverse impacts should be avoided. One such adverse impact is the overloading of existing sewage treatment facilities in Great Barford should a dispersed development approach be adopted. the existing sewage facilities are already managing a demand which is in excess of their capabilities. There is limited infrastructure along New Road to facilitate pedestrian movemen |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 18 | I do not think another large housing estate in the village is appropriate and will just be another blot on the landscape when entering the village. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 18 | Having studied the three plans available, in my opinion Option 1A would seem much more appropriate for the village. The new housing would not be in one big plot, but distributed and integrated into the village, which would mean different designs of houses, much more pleasing to the eye than the selected option and it surely makes more sense to fill in the plots as in Option 1A suggests, and much more in keeping with a country village. |
| Other | 18 | a number of other people in the village, there seems to be agreement with my comments |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 22.0 | You will be aware by now that a propaganda leaflet from Lone Star has been distributed around the village. This seems to try to impress their point of view on the local residents, that a “dispersed approach” for a distribution of small sites (presumably to include their interest) is better than putting all your “eggs in one basket”. They only present “advantages” for a dispersed approach, and “disadvantages” for the NP proposal. This is not a balanced argument. It |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| | | <p>is a disgraceful act, with obvious intention to sway residents' responses in favour of including the small plot of land they control "on Roxton Road". They don't actually indicate whether this is number 128, 123/526 or 605. My interpretation of the Neighbourhood Plan has not been influenced by this. In the early stages of the Neighbourhood Plan, I did think several small sites spread around the village outskirts may be better, but I've since come to realise the traffic chaos this would cause on the High Street as new residents take a short cut to Bedford through the village centre. The Christmas flood highlighted the risk to any development along the New Road/Addingtons Road area.</p> <p>I fully support the Draft Neighbourhood Plan and the single allocation site of Great Barford West. The advantages of that are obvious; it feeds on to the old A421 Bedford Road, so can carry an increase in traffic without disruption to the rest of the village. The previous "master plan" presented at the general exhibition for developers at the school in 2019 gave a good idea of what can be achieved, with plenty of open space and low density housing. Wide landscaped buffer zones will create a pleasant appearance. These are all aspects that could not be provided by adopting several small disjointed sites, the developers of which will only want to maximise their quick profit and move on. Great Barford West offers by far the best compromise if the village has to provide 500 houses demanded by Bedford Borough Council.</p> |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 22.0 | None. |
| Other | 22.0 | It's a pity developers seem to only consider their own (profit) interests, and don't respect any adverse impact they may create that others have to suffer later. We need good sustainable design. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 22.2 | The recent Christmas 2020 flood reached a level of approximately 19.0m AOD at Great Barford, with evacuation warnings given to many households along the High Street and Maltings Way area of the village. The water level was not far short of a similar event at Easter 1998 that was a little higher at circa 19.5m AOD. "Modern" records show a worse event in March 1947, when water reached approximately 20m AOD. However, three significant flood events in less than 75 years emphasises the potential vulnerability of land to the south and east of the main village. Recent river flood defences may better control flow, but have not eliminated flood possibility and can clearly be overwhelmed. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 22.2 | It is imperative that no future housing development should be considered to the east of the village. Development anywhere must be designed to mitigate any potential adverse impacts to both surface water runoff, and also effects on groundwater levels. Flood risk, on and off site, must be reduced through good design to safeguard both new developments and existing properties throughout the village. Remember the Brook as well as the River when considering flood risk. This drains the majority of land up to the bypass to the north and around Green End. |
| Other. | 22.2 | The 15th Century bridge and causeway across the river and floodplain has 17 arches, demonstrating that flooding has previously occurred, been of significant concern for a long time, and is not a recent phenomena. Historic knowledge |

| | | must not be ignored when planning for the future. |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 24.2 | Additional to my comment on paragraph 8.3 where I set out my concern about the increased risk of flooding caused by surface run off from the allocated site, in addition to the availability of photographs illustrating the pooling of water which currently occurs on the allocated site, I also have available a Flood Risk Report prepared by Michael Thomas Consultancy in March 2013. This report was commissioned & paid for by a number of the residents of The Brambles in connection with their negotiations with the site's developer requesting improved flood defences to be provided following the flooding experienced in the summer of 2012. I am happy to make this Report available to the Committee. It contains detailed calculations and concluded that in a 1 in 100 year flooding event that some 270 cubic meters would flow across the site (The Brambles) less any discharge to the existing land drainage system in the field to the rear of the site which has been taken as the Baseflow Discharge Volume of 59.69 cubic metres. The would mean that in a 1 in 100 year event an additional 210 cubic metres of storage needs to be available to reduce the risk of on site flooding. It also became clear as part of this Report that the developer had failed to comply with the drainage conditions of planning permission 07/01523/FUL - the drainage consultant commented "Provision was made in the original drainage details by Couch Consulting Engineers to pick up any overland flow as it entered the site and directed to the proposed surface water drainage system. However in the detailed design carried out by the developer this provision was deleted without any alternative being provided." |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 24.2 | For the 500 proposed homes to be spread between a number of locations around Grt B instead of being concentrated entirely on the allocated site so as to spread the flood risk posed to The Brambles & all the dwellings located along Green End Road; for flood alleviation works to Green End Road to be significantly upgraded to deal with the additional surface run off which any development on the allocated site will cause; for any developer to be required to install attenuation tanks and adequate attenuation pools & to be required to put in place a Management Company to ensure that attenuation tanks/pools in communal areas on the development are properly managed and maintained and for the relevant officials to carry out checks to ensure that all conditions imposed on planning permissions relating to improving drainage and reducing flood risk from surface water run off are complied with in full prior to any properties on the development being occupied. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 25.0 | A well thought out and considered plan. The Great Barford West location puts the development on the edge of the village in the direction that the majority of traffic will come, not only during building but also once occupied, reducing the impact on the village itself. The opportunity to negotiate extra benefits for residents, both present and future, will be easier if dealing with fewer developers. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 25.0 | None |
| Other | 25.0 | An excellent plan given the constraints |

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Policy H1 | 26 | If the sloping areas of the proposed site are developed, there is a risk of surface water flooding which could affect properties along the southern side of Green End Road unless sufficient sustainable drainage systems are created. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 26 | 1) To concentrate the proposed development on the level areas of the site adjacent to Bedford Road. 2) To ensure that any development has in place appropriate flood mitigation systems. |
| Other | 26 | 1) If possible, the present field hedges should be incorporated into the proposed new development as they provide valuable habitats for wildlife. 2) Please consider having a mini-roundabout at the crossroads to slow 'through' traffic and make the junction by The Golden Cross safer. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 30 | I am concerned about the flood potential at the bottom of the slope for the proposed development. If the fields are concreted and tarmacked over there will be no available absorption into the ground which currently exists for rain water. There is often a considerable pooling of water at the northern end of the site at the bottom of the field. I have taken some photographs today 28/01/2021 to illustrate this point. It has been considerably worse than this previously. Today is not a wet day. I have assessed the depth of the water at 45 cms in the area I could access. I can't add the photos here. Can you contact me to advise where I can send them along with a short video. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 30 | I suggest some sort of drainage system must be built into the project, otherwise the increased water runoff from the hard covering of water absorbing land will cause flooding to the existing houses on Green End Road. |
| Other | 30 | The crossroads in Great Barford is very difficult at times with the present population. It needs some sort of traffic solution. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 33.0 | I prefer the selected NP option of a single 500 dwelling site on Bedford Road. However, I am not happy that there are sufficient convenient pedestrian accesses to the rest of the village. I do not want a 'split village'. There must be advanced, planned accesses from the site to Bedford Road. The flow of vehicles from Bedford Road through the village must be controlled or accommodated without the traffic we saw when the A421 was being constructed. Similarly, construction traffic should not come through the village at all. There must be a significant road in the site called "Wöllstein Way", or an acceptable alternative, to honour our 40+ years of Twin Town Partnership with Wöllstein in Germany. They have had a "Great Barford Strasse" for many years. It is disgrace that we have not returned the complement. |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| Other | 33.0 | See above |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 34.C | <i>Agent for Lone Star Land, who have land interests on Roxton Road.</i> Please see representations on behalf of Lone Star Land submitted via email to clerk@greatbarford.org.uk on 29/01/2021. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 34.C | Please see representations on behalf of Lone Star Land submitted via email to clerk@greatbarford.org.uk on 29/01/2021. |
| Other | 34.C | Please see representations on behalf of Lone Star Land submitted via email to clerk@greatbarford.org.uk on 29/01/2021. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 35 | <i>Currently progressing purchase of a house in Great Barford. Hope to move to the village by Easter.</i> We support the policy for the new housing development on the Great Barford West site. From our perspective, as a family with young children, the point about minimising the traffic through the village by placing the housing to the west is important. In a referendum context, we would support housing development on Great Barford West, but we would oppose development nearer the river/village centre. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 36 | Policy H1 details at several points the necessity to assess and provide a site specific flood assessment as well as ensure this huge single development be positioned away from the area of greatest flood risk so I trust the Decision Makers and Planning Authorities will also be encouraged to re-visit the site in winter and additionally, review recent photographs of the substantial amount of water which annually accumulates within the fields at rear (ie, southerly side of Green End Road, also overlooked by Chapel Field residents), some of which floods into natural ponds and gardens etc. This year in particular, the excessive amount of water appears to have created further flooding onto the bend at Green End Road, (Wilden Road side of the junction with Birchfield Road), which is a known accident spot, in ice cold weather, and nearby properties being put at genuine flood risk, particularly when local ditches also reach their limits. This Plan needs to take critical account of the land which falls towards the rear gardens and homes of Green End Road residents, and one has to seriously question the suitability of a single site of this size at this location particularly when the AECOM Independent Report detailed other more suitable sites in it's Tier assessment. |
| Suggested | 36 | Critical consideration to a far smaller, more balanced development at this location, to prevent the increased risk of |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| Mitigation: | | flooding in the area as well as minimising the impact upon this local conservation area, wildlife habitation (great crested newts identified in local pond) and ultimately, to create a more balanced / enhanced village settlement in keeping with the independent AECOM Report. |
| Other | 36 | Several, more balanced developments, as opposed to a bolt-on would more sensitively achieve 500 homes within village boundary (AECOM Report) Village Plan can still require type/quota of housing to meet future needs from smaller Developers) Prolonged disruption larger development. Traffic concerns. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 39.0 | "generous proportion" is meaningless in planning terms, a % or number should be used. "should be considered" also almost meaningless. If Cat 2 housing required, it should be stated as an in site requirement. 3 points of the policy are about flood risk, this is completely obvious to planners, could be merged into 1 point. There isn't sufficient strength to public open space on site - this should be strategic level and a requirement to provide it on site, as a destination for the whole village. Play equipment to be provided for all ages. Vehicular links between green Ed Rd and Bedford Rd to be required. Bungalows should be required, and max storey height (2.5) |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 39.0 | Better wording. And greater emphasis on what the site can deliver over and above housing. |
| Other | 39.0 | I don't particularly like the allocation choice, however I have no strong feelings if this is the choice of the village. This will be a massive alteration to the village, and existing village residents need to have a reason to go to the site (shared facilities) to integrate it quickly. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 39.1 | "generous proportion" is meaningless, needs to be a number or percentage. "should be considered" also meaningless, if cat 2 housing a demonstrable need, it should form part of the allocation. 3 points on flooding is excessive, combine to make 1 point, also obvious in planning terms. No mention of POS on site, there should be a requirement for destination level POS, to draw existing village onto site for play/rest/health etc. All ages play to be catered for. Requirement for links between Green End Road and Bedford Road. Bungalows should be required. Also max storey height (2.5) |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 39.1 | As above. With more precise wording, and actually providing something more on site than just housing and planting. |

| Section | Submission | Comment |
|-----------------------|-------------------|---|
| Policy H1 | 40.15 | How is buffer planting and landscaping going to hide the houses built on a hill? |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 43 | Policy H1: Location for Future New Housing Development and the associated map in Annex 1 Policy Map 1: Map of Development Allocation Land West of Great Barford show an area of approximately 85 hectares measured from Google Maps. At a density of 40 houses per hectare this area could provide 3400 houses. At a low housing density of 25 houses per hectare, only 20 hectares of land would be necessary to meet Great Barford Parish's requirements to provide 500 houses under Bedford Borough Council's Local Plan 2030. The allocation of the proposed area under Great Barford Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan, exposes the village to significant urbanisation in future BBC Local Plans. The draft Neighbourhood Plan does not include any restriction on developments of the area apart from "a maximum of 500 houses" which will only apply until 2030. It is essential that the area proposed for housing development within this area is restricted. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 43 | Restriction of the housing development area to a line level with the existing Great Barford Village boundary sign would effectively halve the area for development and future proof village expansion. |
| Other | 43 | The initial survey of residents opinions favoured several smaller developments. A single large site will be developed by a large development company. who will resort to legal challenge to any of the elements of the Neighbourhood Plan they wish to ignore. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 45 | We support the single site option, at Great Barford West providing a capacity of 500 homes. A single site would bring forward greater benefits, and meet Great Barfords housing quota within the development plan. It would also bring forward greater wider community benefit such as a doctors surgery, open spaces and local parks. The land is allocated and a developer appears to be ready to move forward including important master planning work. Other less desirable sites could then be rejected by BBC as unsustainable development if development comes forward. It is also unknown whether the developers are ready to move forward on the smaller sites option, and these would not bring forward the same benefits would not exist. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 45 | See above |
| Other | 45 | Please see previous section |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 46 | I believe the single site chosen will be visually intrusive, breach policy DI by being an urban intrusion as with the incongruous Roxton Road development, and out of keeping with the village and not integrated with the village. I also |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | believe it will leave us vulnerable to further development once the principle of going so far beyond the SPA is established. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 46 | I believe that 3 or more smaller sites, perhaps including part of the chosen site would fit in better and use the natural infill sites which will otherwise remain vulnerable to speculative developers. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 47 | Having attended the various forums and reviewed the housing needs survey and other supporting documentation, I support the allocation of Land at Great Barford West for the siting of the required new homes; the character and nature of the existing village will be retained, which is imperative, traffic generated will naturally feed onto the main roads as opposed to the local roads etc. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 47 | A reduction in the number of new dwellings to be built. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy H1 | 48.C | WSP is the planning agent, responding on behalf of a land owner. |
| | | Please refer to the consultation response submitted via email on 01/02/2021 by WSP. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 48.C | Please refer to the consultation response submitted via email on 01/02/2021 by WSP. |
| Other | 48.C | Should you require a paper copy of our submission documents as emailed, please do let us know and we can issue to the Parish Council Offices. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Policy NE1 | 40.19 | Proposals in the Parish should recognise and seek to protect and enhance the historical and natural landscape and local character of the Parish including key views. The proposed development would ruin the natural landscape upon entering the village. As is mentioned throughout the document the village is built in a valley, any development to the West of the village will be built outside of this valley and be prominent |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Annex 1 | 20 | I do not feel the site allocated meets the stated objectives of the plan, apart from the fact that fewer residents objected to it. The chief objection is that it runs a very real risk of creating a separate village, relatively unconnected to Great Barford (similar to the situation in Biddenham with Great Denham). The new residents might well not use local services. The suggestion that a new medical centre might sited on the new development would create access problems for infirm patients who would have difficulty walking to such a centre. The proposed site does not meet the vision stated in the plan, since it would not be "nestling" in the main village, but |

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|
| | | be sitting on much higher ground, so much more visually intrusive. For that reason. I would also oppose buildings more than two storeys in height. The objectives also state that there should not be detriment to the view when entering the village, but a development in the proposed location must surely affect these views. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 20 | Over the years, the village has expanded by adding pockets of development within the existing confines of the village and that approach should be continued in order to provide the extra homes required and preserve the cohesion of the village. The proposed site is very large and there is the risk that even further housing could be added without difficulty in future reviews. A piecemeal approach avoids a large volume of traffic from the new site onto the C44, which may difficult to manage safely. Additional traffic on the C44 may well pose a threat to safe cycling. A piecemeal approach would also give better access to bus services. Using a range of developers would give a variety of building styles, more in keeping with the rest of the village. |
| Other. | 20 | I think either of the other options presented in consultation would be preferable to this proposal. |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Annex 1 | 31 | I do not believe that the wholesale development of Great Barford West meets the requirements of Item 4 in The Objectives which states that new housing development should be integrated with the existing village |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 31 | Other sites including 116 (part only),117,125,128 and 123/526 more appropriately meet the criteria of integration whereas Great Barford West will create an alternative village on the outskirts |
| Other | 31 | It is my view that any development should be undertaken within a current defensible village boundary and not creating a new and enlarged boundary |
| Section | Submission | Comment |
| Annex 1 | 41 | Having all future development concentrated in this one area will ruin the village of Great Barford. I believe this will create a 'new' Great Barford and an 'Old' Great Barford. Furthermore developments of this size are often soulless and would not be in-keeping with the rest of the village. As someone who has grown up in the village and moved to Hare Meadow from Chapel Field the appeal of this development is that if offered the chance to stay in the village in a new house whilst retaining the village feel of Great Barford rather than being on a soulless estate that could be anywhere in the country. |
| Suggested Mitigation: | 41 | Out of the options presented 1a seems to be the best fit with the village. The developments will be dispersed across the village spreading the impact of the developments on traffic etc. The view of the village when approaching from Bedford will also be protected to some degree and the issue of a 'new' and 'old' village will be avoided. Whilst i'm not entirely opposed to development within the village as I appreciate this has to happen I do believe the recommended option would be a mistake and could possibly ruin the village forever. |