



## Bedford Borough Council – Local Plan 2035 Consultation Paper Response Form

Please use this form to respond to the questions raised in the Local Plan 2035 Consultation Paper. It should be read alongside the consultation paper and technical documents referred to; copies of the documents are available to view on the Council's website at [www.bedford.gov.uk/localplan2035](http://www.bedford.gov.uk/localplan2035) or in hardcopy at our Customer Service Centre (at 2 Horne Lane, Bedford MK40 1RA) and all libraries in the borough during normal opening hours. Documents are also available at Rushden, St Neots, Biggleswade and Flitwick libraries outside of the borough.

Please send your response electronically if possible or as a WORD document via email to [planningforthefuture@bedford.gov.uk](mailto:planningforthefuture@bedford.gov.uk).

Alternatively responses can be sent by post. Please attach a stamp and send to:  
Bedford Borough Council,  
Local Plan 2035 consultation,  
Planning Policy Team,  
Borough Hall,  
Bedford, MK42 9AP

**PLEASE DO NOT SUBMIT COMMENTS IN MORE THAN ONE FORMAT OR SEND TO MORE THAN ONE EMAIL ADDRESS.** If you have submitted comments electronically you do not need to print and post them.

All responses (electronic and paper) must be received by 5pm on Friday 9 June 2017.

Your contact information will be kept on the Planning Policy database so that we can keep you up to date about this and other planning policy documents. We do not share contact details with other parts of the Council or other organisations. If you do not want your details to be retained (which would mean no further updates from us about the Local Plan 2035) please let us know by sending an email to [planningpolicy@bedford.gov.uk](mailto:planningpolicy@bedford.gov.uk).

All responses will be made public.

### CONTACT DETAILS

#### Personal details

Title	Mrs
Name	Alison
Job title (if applicable)	Clerk
Organisation (if applicable)	Bletsoe Parish Council
Address	77 Curlew Crescent, Brickhill, Bedford
Postcode	MK41 7HY
Telephone Number	01234 406099
Email	<a href="mailto:parishclerk@bletsoe.org.uk">parishclerk@bletsoe.org.uk</a>

## AGENT DETAILS (if applicable)

Title \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Job title (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Organisation (if applicable) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Postcode \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number \_\_\_\_\_

Email \_\_\_\_\_

**If you are using an agent, who would you prefer any correspondence to go to?**

(Please mark X one box only)

Contact agent       Contact client       Contact both

**Your interest** (Please mark X one box only)

Land owner       Resident       Consultant       Agent       Other

**Please specify 'Other'** (please write in)

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## QUESTIONS

**1a) Do you agree or disagree that one or more of the four new settlement proposals should form part of the development strategy?** (Please mark X one box only)

Agree       Disagree

**1b) If you disagree, the 2,200 dwellings identified for new settlement(s) as part of the preferred strategy will need to be provided elsewhere: where should the development go instead?** (Please write in)

Disagree with one or more, only one should go ahead which would provide sufficient houses. Wyboston should be the preferred option – there is infrastructure already in place and better employment opportunities more easily accessible ie Cambridge, Peterborough, Huntingdon, St Neots, London and Sandy.

We question why we need this number of houses and Bletsoe PC fully support the comments made by CPRE regarding the number of houses required during the time frame of the Local Plan – see CPRE response

<http://www.cprebeds.org.uk/news/current-events-2/item/2315-bedford-borough-local-plan-2015-our-initial-comments>

**2a) Do you agree or disagree that the brownfield site opportunity at Stewartby brickworks should form part of the preferred development strategy?** (Please mark X one box only)

Agree

Disagree

**2b) If not, the 1,000 dwellings proposed at Stewartby Brickworks as part of the preferred strategy will need to be provided elsewhere: where should the development go instead?**

(Please write in)

This site could accommodate more than the 1,000 houses allocated.

---

---

---

**3a) Do you agree or disagree with the principle that all suitable and available sites in and on the edge of the urban area should be allocated? Currently this amounts to 1,988 dwellings. (Please mark X one box only)**

Agree

Disagree

**3b) If you think that not all of this should be allocated for development where should the development go instead? (Please write in)**

This is a misleading question. Only 700 houses are in the urban area the rest are in what we consider the rural area. Both Stewartby and Wyboston are more suitable due to existing infrastructure already in place.

---

---

---

**4a) Do you agree or disagree with the proposed allocation of urban and edge of urban sites listed in table 1 and table 3? (Please mark X one box only)**

Agree

Disagree

**4b) Are there any sites which you think should not be allocated or any other sites which you think should be allocated and why? (Please write in)**

There is a risk of coalescence with urban and rural areas. Definition of edge of urban is misleading and should be rural.

---

---

---

**5a) Do you agree or disagree with the amount of development identified for the Group 1 villages as part of the preferred development strategy (2,600 dwellings)? (Please mark X one box only)**

Agree

Disagree

**5b) If not, should the amount be higher or lower, what should the number be and how should the strategy change as a result? (Please write in)**

Should be divided more evenly between all villages in groups 1 & 2. Should rely on village local plans and should allow villages to decide themselves.

---

---

---

**6a) Do you agree or disagree with the list of potential development sites in each Group 1 village (tables 4 – 8)? (Please mark X one box only)**

Agree

Disagree

**6b) Which sites in Group 1 villages would you prefer to see allocated and why? Which of the options do you prefer and why? Are there other combinations of sites? (Please write in)**

Amount of development should be assessed on a percentage based on the size of a village. The amount of development currently proposed for group 1 villages is excessive and will have an enormous impact on surrounding villages.

---

---

---

**7a) Do you agree or disagree with the amount of development identified for the Group 2 villages as part of the preferred development strategy (225 dwellings)?** (Please mark X one box only)

Agree  Disagree

**7b) If not, should the amount be higher or lower, what should the number be and how should the strategy change as a result?** (Please write in)

Amount of development should be assessed on a percentage based on the size of a village. Why has Sharnbrook been allocated 600 on top of other development when Stewartby has been allocated none on top of their other development. Has Willington been taken into consideration?

---

**8a) Do you agree or disagree with the shortlist of sites for each Group 2 village (tables 9 – 14)?** (Please mark X one box only)

Agree  Disagree

**8b) If not, which sites should be included or excluded from the list? Which sites do you think should be allocated in each village to meet the strategy requirement?** (Please write in)

Should be up to the individual parishes to decide.

---

**9a) Do you agree or disagree with the approach for Group 3 and Group 4 settlements in the preferred development strategy (that rather than having specific sites allocated in the local plan there should be a local plan policy to allow small amounts of development if supported by the local community)?** (Please mark X one box only)

Agree  Disagree

**9b) If not, how should Group 3 and Group 4 settlements be treated in the development strategy? Do you have any comments on the wording of the draft policy for Group 3 and Group 4 settlements?** (Please write in)

---

---

**10a) Do you agree or disagree with the selection of Local Green Spaces?** (Please mark X one box only)

Agree  Disagree

**10b) If not, and given the site assessment work that has already taken place, which sites do you think should be removed from or added to the list?** (Please write in)

---

---

**11) Do you have any comments on any of the updated or new evidence base?** (Please write in)

We have not made any comments on this question as it is not clear what this question requires.

---

**12) Specifically in relation to the new settlement proposals, do you have any comments on our initial appraisal of the sites that have been put forward, set out in the study “New Settlements Assessment Framework Methodology and Initial Site Assessment”?** Having read the initial appraisal do you have a preference for which settlement(s) the Council should investigate further with a view to allocation? (Please write in)

The Wyboston site is the most suitable site because of its access to existing infrastructure, easy access to St Neots, Peterborough and Cambridge. Also Sandy via the East -West rail link and the fact the A1 is going to be remodelled. Bletsoe PC fully support the CpRE report “Bedford Borough Council’s Local Plan 2035 consultation – our initial comments” dated 22 May 2017 see link:

<http://www.cprebeds.org.uk/news/current-events-2/item/2315-bedford-borough-local-plan-2015-our-initial-comments>

