

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
	Historic England	47-49	All sites	Recommends taking a proactive approach to the design, layout etc for those sites. In particular, development on these locations should sustain and where possible enhance the significance of heritage assets and make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness. The general policies will be a useful aid to this process, but you may wish to explore the potential to develop site specific development briefs for those sites identified, to ensure that the development on them meets your aspirations. See website for guidance. For further advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate the Historic Environment Record at Bedford Borough Council.
	Bedfordia	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree in principle to the allocation at Station Road but consider the Neighbourhood Plan does not consider the full opportunities from this site in accordance with the proposals put forward in collaboration with the SAF for Lincroft Academy. Please refer to the letter submitted with these representations for further information.
	EMC Designs	48 - 49	Site 170 Site 171	In part agree with the proposal for houses off Station Road. However, do not agree with the 20 opposite the Bedford Arms. As someone who uses the high street every day for both commuting (I live locally) as well as visiting family on the street, choosing the narrowest entrance way and section of the road to facilitate 20 dwellings and all their vehicles seems like a crazy place. The High Street has been identified already as being a very narrow road and the road could not be widened much at this junction due to the pub literally hanging over the road already. The plan rightly identified that whole area as a site of historical importance and the Duke of Bedford Cottages that line the road would lose a lot of their rural heritage if a new housing development was put here.
	AFC Oakley	47-49	All sites	Agree
	Clapham PC	47-49	All sites	Agree
	Natural England	47 - 49	All sites	No comment
	Bedford BC	47 - 49	All sites	You should ensure that the relevant supporting documents are available on your website. In particular these should include: A consultation statement A statement setting out how the Plan meets the basic conditions i.e. it: has regard to relevant national policies and advice issued by the Secretary of State contributes to the achievement of sustainable development is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan is compatible with EU obligations is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010) A report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a determination that an environmental assessment is not required. You should include site specific policies for each development site being allocated. These should set out the requirements that any future planning applications should comply with. Offers to discuss the NDP and supporting documents and requests expected timetable for submission.

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
	Lincroft Academy	47 48 - 49	Site 152 Site 170 & 521	<p>Considers the two allocations as proposed will not resolve the existing challenges for the school. Feel they must express their disappointment with regard to some aspects of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of its relationship with the Academy, with regard to Site No. 152 – Oakley Academy Playing Field, Station Road, and Site 170 &amp; 521 – Station Road. You will appreciate the aspirations that the Academy has previously set out for the reorganisation of the land parcels on the eastern side of Station Road working with the landowner for Site 170 &amp; 152 for the enhancement of the school and its playing field provision as well as wider benefits for the village and community.</p> <p>We feel the draft Neighbourhood Plan has not listened to the concerns expressed by the school and the majority of the parental body and the approach it advocates represents a missed opportunity in not recognising these enhancements. It is fully recognised that the school’s operation has raised and continues to raise a number of issues particularly in terms of access/transportation and parking and the disturbance this causes. Also, the nature of the school campus layout and the separation of the main part of the school from the sports/recreation area causes a number of issues for the delivery of the school curriculum and also gives rise to potential safety issues.</p> <p>In effect the strategy advocated by the Neighbourhood Plan would seriously inhibit the school’s ability to address these issues. As the Parish Council is aware the aspiration for the Academy is for a self-contained campus for both Oakley Primary Academy and Lincroft Academy. This will allow for the further development of both schools and would overcome the above issues. This would include the addition of dedicated parking provision and circulation space on site as well as the creation of a new main access and driveway. The Academy considers that the proposals previously presented to the Parish Council provided an optimum opportunity to address all of the above matters, and also to bring into effect a series of traffic calming measures that include the closing off of Station Road as it currently is and its diversion onto a new access/distributor road. Traffic problems along Station Road are an ongoing issue and the plans previously presented to the Parish Council probably provide a once in a generation opportunity to address these. The reference to Site No. 152 on page 45 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan incorrectly references that the Academy Playing field is opposite the school. It is separated by some distance from our main site and for reasons already outlined and as previously established gives rise to both operational and safety issues.</p> <p>The proposals presented by the school and the land owners would achieve both the positioning of the playing fields opposite the school and the creation of a singular campus such that a range of school activities can be self-contained, and expansion accommodated. This would also benefit local residents and the community at large. The proposals would also allow for a significant upgrading of the existing facilities and would provide for the creation of a range of sports facilities to fully meet and enhance the requirements of both the school and the many community sports clubs that would use them.</p>

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
				<p>This would consolidate the breadth of sports/recreation available to students, but also the capacity of the facilities to the benefit of students and their health and well-being.</p> <p>Community use of the existing sports provision is good with the Football Federation recognising the potential of the site to provide first class facilities for local football clubs including the club within Oakley.</p> <p>In this regard the draft Neighbourhood Plan proposals would appear to be short-sighted, with the current strategy, if followed through, removing any opportunity to positively address the issues currently faced by the School and the community.</p>
	Hazel Kaye	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>Disagree. There will be danger to drivers and pedestrians at the proposed point of entry. Also there will be disruption to the High Street with the increase in traffic; it is already too congested. Therefore I strongly disagree to the proposal to develop site 171. Finally the field is too small to put 20 houses on it. Letter attached on traffic and safety.</p>
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>Disagree. I would like to object to the development of 20 houses opposite the Bedford Arms for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A development of this scale would have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of local residents, by reason of (among other factors) noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc.</li> <li>• Development would be of considerable loss to the local ecology, which both benefits and adds to the green village atmosphere to the village of Oakley.</li> <li>• The visual impact of the development would have a detrimental effect on the more scenic area of the village and significantly alter the character of the neighbourhood</li> <li>• The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners</li> <li>• The development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users. The entrance point to the site is already a natural pinch point for traffic due to the narrow carriage way. There is also no possible provision for a foot path on the public house side of the road, putting pedestrians at risk.</li> </ul>
	Anglian Water	47 - 49	All sites	<p>Consideration should be given to including a specific policy or policies for these sites which outline criteria relating to Anglian Water's existing water and water recycling infrastructure in the plan to be submitted to Bedford Borough Council. As the Development Plan is intended to be read as a whole any additional text should be considered in the context of the adopted and emerging Bedford Local Plan.</p>
	Optimis on behalf of site owners	47	Site 166	<p>Disagree. Conclusion - site 166 is in residential use and compatible to the historic residential uses and pattern of development along the High Street. The verdant tree boundary to the north-west sets a permanent and defensible boundary to the village and contains this site which is not visible from the countryside beyond. the site has suitable access, reinforced by a highway's expert, and is capable of serving the development to meet BBC highway standards. We have concerns relating to the assessment of sites undertaken by Urban Vision and have set out our response to these points. Earlier consultation with the public identified this site as the most favourable location. This public opinion has not been respected or included within the latest draft of the ONP.</p>

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. Station Road is already a daily nightmare for traffic due to the proximity of the school and several businesses. Any housing works carried out here would be potentially disastrous for existing residents.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. No strong disagreement but would suggest that allowing development of up to 50 homes on the one site on Station Road would limit the inevitable disruption caused by building traffic and other activity to one part of the village rather than two. Also the Station Road site lends itself to development but limited by the railway and Station Road but there will be inevitable pressure to extend this site at some stage in the future so why not do it now?
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. Station Road site is too close to existing housing and too many squeezed into top corner of a huge field.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>I have previously submitted a response to the Committee saying that although I was not happy with the proposed site 171, I understood the need for Oakley to accept the Borough Council's specified number of houses, and sites had to be found. However after further consideration I have now concluded for the reasons below, that site 171 is inappropriate.</p> <p>I have now been involved with Speedwatch for a few months and I am frankly staggered by the amount of traffic through Oakley already. Clearly we have to control the speed of the existing traffic from current housing but equally we have to be very careful where we place new housing to avoid creating new danger spots or increasing the danger at places where the risks are already high. I now consider the road near the Bedford Arms and the junction of the High Street and Church Lane to be such a spot. My reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Exiting traffic from site 171 will have a limited view of vehicles arriving from Church Lane and only a short period in which to react and then only a narrow road to exit onto.</li> <li>2. Buses already have difficulty in making the turn from the High Street into Church Lane and cannot do so if there is any traffic coming up from Church Lane. They are forced to wait and cause holdups for traffic behind. Any traffic from new housing on site 171 will experience this problem regularly.</li> <li>3. There is a bus stop near the Bedford Arms gardens which again would limit the view of exiting cars from new housing on site 171 and difficult though it is to believe, many drivers coming down the High Street overtake standing buses despite the fact they have no view of traffic approaching from Church Lane. Again increasing the risk to exiting vehicles from site 171.</li> <li>4. I have previously made representations to the Parish Council on speeding vehicles entering Westfield Road from both the High Street and Church Lane and the difficulty we and my immediate elderly neighbours have on exiting our drive especially on foot when my young grandchildren are with us. The problem has been exacerbated in the last few years by the increase in "white van men" making deliveries. As well as the narrowness of the road near the Bedford Arms and the junction, vehicles use the small island at the end of Westfield Road to do U-turns. New housing nearby will lead to an increase in vehicles and inevitably to more deliveries who will find a need to use this "facility".</li> </ol>

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
				<p>Conclusion. I have heard the reasons why the NDC proposed limiting the number of new homes on site 170 and utilising the land at site 170. However I think in this world of difficult choices that sometimes the least worst option has to be selected. In my opinion, increasing the number of homes at site 170 to the fifty required by the Borough Council's directive would at least put traffic onto a wider road with easier access to exits from the village and shorter routes into the Oakley to this new housing for "white van men" doing deliveries. Due to its situation there is also more opportunity to make changes to the road, its borders and layout to reduce the risks than there would be near the narrow road from the High Street exit from site 171. I repeat, putting the required fifty houses all on site 170 is not the ideal solution but probably the least worst.</p>
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>Firstly, may I state that I fully support the need to provide more housing in the village, however, there are serious road safety concerns with the proposed site as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The road outside the building of the Bedford Arms is extremely narrow. There is a lot of traffic through the village during weekdays, and this road is on a main bus route. Currently, all buses and especially double decker buses have to manoeuvre into the middle of the road, as it is just not wide enough to accommodate them – especially when pedestrians are walking on the road due to the lack of a footpath. You can imagine the dangerous conditions this creates for both road users as well as pedestrians. The road quickly becomes backed up, and it's cumbersome and difficult to pass, causing difficulties all along the High Street. Personally speaking, even now, I have to take action to avoid colliding with large vehicles such as tractors, lorries and the aforementioned buses by pulling into the proposed access road for the new site for oncoming vehicles travelling south.</li> <li>2) There is already a serious safety hazard for pedestrians on the main road near the proposed access road as there is no footpath on the side of the Bedford Arms Public House.</li> <li>3) In addition, taking into consideration the narrowness of the road, may I ask how you propose to resolve the question of coming from the direction of The Post Office and then turning right on the High Street into the new access road? It wouldn't be possible to do this without backing up traffic along the High Street – once again, adding to an already hazardous and dangerous traffic situation. The road is simply not wide enough for the village's current traffic requirements.</li> <li>4) I would respectfully suggest that the proposed access road is far too near to the bend. It would be very difficult to join the main road from the Access Road, particularly to turn right towards the bend.</li> <li>5) Heavy traffic congestion on this narrow road already exists, therefore the addition of 20 houses would certainly contribute to worsening traffic conditions, and again, would lead to serious safety fears.</li> <li>6) Lastly, whilst I appreciate that this may not be your department, there is currently also a drainage problem with the field, and I would be interested in obtaining information as to how this will be resolved also.</li> </ol> <p>The other proposed site of Station Road would seem to be a much safer option, and indeed a more suitable site generally in terms of safety.</p>

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
	Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. Can't see the need for 50 houses. 20 - 30 would be plenty.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree. Think there should be fewer houses on plot 171 to minimise traffic and environmental impact. Maybe only 10 houses.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Agree. Prime agricultural land. Congestion on Station Road if houses built on Station Road.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Agree. Traffic on Station Road if these houses built. School times great congestion.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Agree. Concerned about traffic on Station Road particularly during school times. Huge congestion. Parking on Station Road, Lincroft, Reynes Drive when school on.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree. But plot 171 should be restricted to 10 houses to minimise the impact of traffic at a potential dangerous junction & minimise the environmental impact.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree. Only concern is access on High Street.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. Bedford Arms not suitable on a bend/High Street. What are we doing about new houses on Church Lane/Lovell Road? Do they count to the 50?
	Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. All the council want to do is put max houses in village in any spare space.
	Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. Insufficient infrastructure.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. Bedford Arms site most unsuitable and potentially dangerous. Station Road not ideal.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. Bedford Arms site most unsuitable and potentially dangerous. Station Road not ideal.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. To develop near the Bedford Arms will lead to road accidents.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. The 20 houses proposed will lead to road accidents & congestion. Poor decision not thought through.
	Tenant of site 171	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. Station Road will soon be full of houses in the future, so why not put all 50 houses there then all new infrastructure can be concentrated to support the 50. Station Road will eventually be full for the complete length with houses apart from a school playing field and hopefully the infrastructure will be put in place to support this density of houses. Therefore why put the 20 houses opposite the Bedford Arms with an entrance & exit in the narrowest part of any road in the village and also have to duplicate infrastructure and utilities just for 20 houses.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. We should not allow building on green spaces. Once built on it is gone forever. The building in the field opposite the school is crazy. So many people walk their dogs around there and the plants and animals are beautiful. Destroyed forever.
	Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. The housing should all go in Station Road as the field opposite the Bedford Arms has limited access and housing will change the character of this part of the village as all the trees opposite the pub will need to be felled. The site in Station Road can accommodate the entire 5 houses so it seems pointless to allow creeping urbanisation in two areas if it can be contained in one. It is also likely that if the 30 houses are allocated now that in the future more houses will be allocated to the Station Road site. Three species of bat are known to use the field opposite the pub for feeding. These are Soprano Pipistrelle, Long-eared and Noctule. It is also used for feeding and foraging by Great Crested Newts. All these species have some protection and would be adversely affected by development.

Reference	Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment
	Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. The Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire (November 2015) defined the scale of future development on the edge of the village as being: small sites (less than 10 homes), medium sites (10 – 20 homes) and larger sites (more than 20 homes).
	Residents x 48	47 - 49	All sites	Agree
	Residents x 69	48 - 49	Site 171	Strongly disagree to the proposal for site 171. Please see the attached letter. Letter expresses concerns about safety of road users, increased traffic congestion, damage to the ecology, impact on drainage & soil and loss of privacy/amenity/quality of life for neighbours.