

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment
	Historic England	33	DH 1	Pleased to note the inclusion of robust policy (DH1) to achieve positive design including for the public realm, whilst retaining and enhancing local distinctiveness
	Historic England	34	DH 2	Notes this section refers to "Grade 1 and Grade 11" buildings and recommend that this is altered to "Grade II" to reflect the way in which the grades are written in national policy and to avoid "Grade Eleven" buildings, for example. We would also suggest that the requirements for policy DH2 could be backed up by the production of an Historic Area Assessment that includes characterisation analysis incorporating a discussion around local materials and form. This can then be included as an appendix to your plan, and referenced in your policy
	Historic England		Assets of Community Value	Suggests that NDP could also incorporate the designation of Assets of Community Value as well. This can include local community assets such as public houses, libraries, and others. This can help protect them from being lost to redevelopment or - from the point of view of the community - undesirable adaptation. More information on this process and its benefits can be found on the Locality website. They note the inclusion of a map and a list of 'Village Assets', some of which appear from their descriptions to be good candidates for this process. They suggest also that some - for example the War Memorial, if it is not already designated - could be included on a list of 'Village Heritage Assets' that are assessed against a set of suitable criteria and then afforded the same protection as non-designated heritage assets are given in Policy DH3. See Historic England website for guidance.
	Bedfordia	22	BE 1	Supports the recognition of the importance of local businesses and employment in the village of Oakley but considers the policy should see a minor revision to recognise the opportunity for sensitive expansion of Highfield Park. Please refer to the letter submitted with these representations for further information.
	EMC Designs		All Policies	Strongly agrees which is why I believe the site opposite the Bedford Arms goes against everything you have taken great pains to consult over and plan for.
	Oakley AFC		All Policies	Agree
	Clapham PC		All Policies	Agree. The principles of good practice in providing a plan have been completed and the Oakley plan is based on a methodical approach by the people of Oakley to support actively sustainable development. It identifies the future needs for Oakley, to ensure that the plan supports the growth of the village in a way that protects the landscape around Oakley village, and ensures key services and infrastructure are not overstretched.
	Bedford BC		Policies - general	The Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of maps that illustrate how and where specific policies apply. It would be helpful if these could be combined to produce a single Policies Map.
	Bedford BC	20	HG 2	The reference to "evidence of local housing need" pre-supposes that an objective assessment of local need is being kept up-to-date, against which the developer's justification can be judged. Who will be responsible for this? The text reference to space standards should be included in the policy (and reference made to your supporting evidence) that justifies use of this standard.
	Bedford BC	22	BE 1	A map would be useful to show the extent of the business parks.
	Bedford BC	22	BE 2	You should define what is meant by "the existing centre of Oakley" so that the Council will know how to apply the policy.

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment
	Bedford BC	24	BE 4	As written, the policy sets a very high bar which may not be achievable in all situations. The word “must” should be changed to “should wherever reasonably possible”. The requirement to “not impact negatively on the functionality of the existing telecommunications infrastructure” is unlikely to be capable of assessment by the Council. Further explanation is needed or it should be deleted. The supporting text refers to a requirement for a “connectivity statement” to be submitted with planning applications. This would require an amendment to the Council’s Local Validation List for Planning Applications. I am not aware that you have reached any agreement with the Council that such a change can be made and until that has been agreed the requirement in the Neighbourhood Plan could not be enforced.
	Bedford BC	28	LE 1	The policy heading refers to “Sensitive Landscapes” although the policy and supporting map refers to “significant landscape areas”. A consistent term should be used to make the policy clear. The policy refers to the supporting map for the boundaries of “significant landscape areas”, however it is not clear from the map which these are (the map includes a number of colour shaded areas, none of which is defined in a legend). The supporting map shows “Local Gap” and “Important Landscape Views”, however these are not defined in the text or referred to in the policy. The policy refers to “the setting of significant landscape area” without defining what is meant. This could be difficult to interpret when considering planning applications.
	Bedford BC	30	LE 3	The supporting map suggests that you intend the policy to apply to surrounding parishes. However, the policies in your Neighbourhood Plan cannot apply outside of your Neighbourhood Area. The supporting map should therefore be changed.
	Bedford BC	35	DH 2	The requirement to use “authentic” materials is unlikely to be considered reasonable except for listed buildings or in conservation areas. It is also not entirely clear what it means and therefore the term should be deleted.
	Natural England		All Policies	No comment but refer NDP Group to document Neighbourhood Planning and the Natural Environment: information, issues and opportunities
	Environment Agency		All Policies	No longer able to provide bespoke advice but suggest consider document - Planning Advice Guidance.
	Lincroft Academy	29	LE2	Has no specific comments to make. Comments on Policy ONP LE2: Local Green Space are considered specifically against the third question on green space detailed further below with particular reference to the school’s sports pitch and playing field provision at the southern end of Station Road.
	Oakley Business	19	HG1	The development of site 171 does not protect the rural nature of the village surrounding the area. It will cause traffic and transport issues.

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment
	Optimis on behalf of site 166	19	HG1	Disagree. Conclusion - the purpose of this representation is to strengthen the Oakley NDP prior to its adoption. The site which is the subject of this representation has been favourably assessed by Bedford BC. A Highways consultant has confirmed the suitability of access in response to comments raised in both the Site Assessments 2017 and the ONP. The proposed development is flexible in terms of the number, design, positioning and size of dwellings so that it can be developed to accord with policies and aspirations set out in the plan. We are of the opinion that ONP HG1 is too restrictive in its wording to allow for appropriate development outside of the allocated development sites. We would also note that ONP HG1 does not comply with BBC policy 3S and as a result can be considered that in its current form the ONP is not in conformity with the development plan and is "unsound."
	Resident	15 - 20	Housing Policies	Oakley together with other small villages, should be producing a plan to show both local and national government bodies that urban housing through the conversion and use of existing structures and sites is a far better use of land which would result in less damage to countryside, devalue fewer rural properties and prevent the need for inconvenience and disruption that comes with building new properties. The plans submitted for Oakley are short-sighted, policy pleasing and in my opinion disgraceful.
	Resident	39	TR1/DH1	We agree with building of new houses but parking on Station Road and in Lincroft is a major issue which needs to be addressed. Parking in Lincroft is making it dangerous for traffic as people are parking on bends and across narrow driveways. This will only become worse.
	Resident	34 39	DH1 TR1	There is no reason why mediocre 1950s design should be perpetuated. There should be a one way traffic flow in Station Road & High Street
	Resident	39	TR1	Agree other than where business causes consequent indiscriminate parking including on pavement. Hazel Kaye.
	Resident	39	TR1	20 house site is bad because roads will be affected.
	Resident	39	TR1	How can causing a dangerous road situation comply. The Beds Arms is a listed building & has already been hit by traffic.
	Resident	39	TR1	What village? With all the building the "village" is finished. Already a lot of houses being built in Parrott's Yard. Traffic and transport will be a joy. Hundreds of extra traffic movements every day. The road under the railway bridge will be more fun than it is now.
	Resident	19	HG1	According to the Neighbourhood Plan policies (January 2017) the consultation evidence showed that there was a clear preference for development on small sites of less than 10 homes. However, the development policy then changed the site definitions to: small developments (less than 20 dwellings), medium developments (20 – 40 dwellings). It also stated that development should prioritise brownfield sites first. Neither of the allocated sites are small sites of less than 10 homes and both are on agricultural land. Furthermore, if the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that part of the agricultural land off Station Road is suitable for residential development of 30 dwellings, it will be difficult for the local planning authority to resist the Bedfordia Group's proposals for development of the whole of the land east of Station Road and that company has every incentive and sufficient financial resources to take a full planning application for that scheme through all the necessary appeal processes.

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment
	Resident		All policies	I agree but do the money men?
	Residents x 69	35	DH2/TR1	Development of site 171 does not protect the rural nature of the village and will cause traffic and transport issues.
	Resident x 49		All Policies	Agree