

Appendix G - Pre-Submission Consultation comments from residents, statutory consultees and interested parties (2020)

Comments	Response	Action
<p>Resident since 1960's Harrold enjoys a unique topography, sunlight and night skies Harrold needs protection of its 'lost history' combined with thriving shops/enterprises/patches of social intercourse - it's past is its future</p>	<p>Policies NDP4 (Harrold Design Statement), NDP5 (Heritage Assets), NDP9 (New Community and Retail Facilities), NDP 10 (New Business Uses) seek to secure these assets for the village.</p>	<p>No changes recommended</p>
<p>There has already been considerable development in Harrold in recent years and it was disappointing to read your proposals that ultimately will destroy what is left of the tranquillity that Harrold has to offer. Apart from the problems arising from increased traffic congestions and demands on schools and other amenities there is the loss in value to any private dwellings adjacent to these proposed sites. I do you hope these people will be adequately compensated and that the owners of the land that is about to be destroyed are not being too handsomely rewarded.</p>	<p>Harrold village is obliged to provide a minimum of 25 new dwellings in the parish as Bedford Borough Local plan policy 4S refers. Loss of property value is not a material planning consideration as it is not a public matter. New developments will have to pay Community Infrastructure Levy which can be used to address any local infrastructure impacts.</p>	<p>No changes recommended</p>
<p>I disagree with any development of additional houses/buildings in Orchard Lane due to the lack of safe pedestrian access along the lower part of the lane, from the High Street to just past the Dolls House. The proposed houses/buildings will create additional vehicles traversing the length of the lane, creating additional hazard to pedestrians, cyclists and other drivers, making the proposal in breach of the consultations key objective (2): "To promote infrastructure improvements (such as improved traffic management, car parking, pedestrian walking and cycle routes) needed</p>	<p>Comments noted. A footway and dropped kerb crossing point to join the footway on the western side of the site will be required as part of the development of this site. These improvements are considered necessary by Bedford Borough Highways Unit.</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to include highway improvements for pedestrians.</p>

<p>to support new development and to encourage safe and accessible movement for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and public transport." This objective seems to have been considered for the other two proposed sites, yet omitted for the proposed Orchard Lane site. Anyone who regularly walks, cycles or drives along Orchard Lane will know of the hazards and danger along the lower part of the lane.</p>		
<p>More effort needed to encourage safe and accessible movement for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists and public transport within the village. Countering speeding and therefore promoting the ability to come to a stop safely to avoid injury or fatality is essential.</p>	<p>Comments noted. This is a Non-Policy Action and will be addressed as an ongoing issue by the parish</p>	<p>No changes recommended</p>
<p>Strong pressure must be put on developers - a) to fulfil the wordings and promises of their planning application and b) not apply for variations to their existing proposals post acceptance.</p>	<p>The policies set out the minimum requirements for the development of each housing site. These cannot be amended by developers. However, the planning system cannot prevent planning applications from being made to Bedford Borough Council. Each application is assessed on its merits having regard to all material planning considerations including planning policies.</p>	<p>No changes recommended</p>
<p>Six new dwellings on Orchard Lane could add another 12+ cars to a street that already has very narrow access at the mouth of the lane for only one car. Orchard Lane is a no through road and already there is congestion when two cars meet. Adding additional residential properties in this road will undoubtedly lead to added congestion. At present at certain times of the day it would be very difficult for a fire engine to access Orchard Lane & increased</p>	<p>The site has been assessed by the Borough Council's Highways Unit has considered the highway impacts from the proposed development of the site and some improvements to the existing road are required. Parking for the new properties must be in accordance with the Borough Council's standards. Additional noise from associated new dwellings is not likely to cause statutory nuisance. This</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to include details of highway improvements required.</p>

<p>cars coming & going would add to this. Noise levels will be increased from this additional traffic & households, which will have a negative impact on the environment and existing residents. There is also no doubt that if the six new dwellings goes ahead this will lead to further dwellings on that site being built in the future adding to these problems. The current site is an area of natural beauty not to mention home to many species of wildlife. This would have a certain detrimental impact on the environment. Furthermore the only access through the village is through the High Street. Building more dwellings on this side of the village will increase the bottleneck problem which Harrold already has.</p>	<p>and the other housing site have no formal designation or protection other than as open countryside. There are no known protected wildlife species on the site as confirmed by the parish council's site assessments. Local plan policy 43 requires biodiversity enhancement on all new development sites.</p>	
<p>Have any of the parish councillors ever driven down Orchard Lane? If they ever have, they would have noticed how difficult it is to drive down Orchard Lane, how congested Orchard Lane is now, and getting worse. Have any of the parish councillors ever seen the difficulty the grain lorries have getting through Orchard Lane? The answers to these questions must be that the parish councillors have never spent any time in Orchard Lane, because if they had they would never have proposed adding a building development in Wood Road!! At the beginning and end of school time, a number of school children walk and cycle down Orchard Lane. How dangerous will these narrow congested roads become with added building lorries? There is simply no space in Orchard Lane to cater for the additional traffic that this proposed development will create. Under these circumstances, how do the parish</p>	<p>Members of the Parish Council Steering Group are aware of the traffic issues in Orchard Lane and through the wider village. The Borough Council's Highways Unit has considered the highway impacts from the proposed development of the site and some improvements to the existing road are required. Parking for the new properties must be in accordance with the Borough Council's standards.</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to include details of highway improvements required.</p>

<p>councillors justify a plan to put 6 more houses in Wood Road? We completely agree that there should never have been a proposal to put 90 houses on the Odell Road site. But surely it makes more sense to put the 30 houses that we need to build on the Odell Road site where there is sensible access to the site. In the neighbouring village of Lavendon, they have built new houses successfully it seems to us, on the edge of the village. We feel the same approach needs to be taken in Harrold. We would be interested in a response to the above questions.</p>		
<p>NDP3 - On the condition that NO MORE THAN six new dwellings are agreed with the developer. In my opinion, this is a fair and realistic neighborhood plan for Harrold. While I realize that the site NDP3 at the top of Orchard Lane is in theory a sensible choice for development, I am very concerned at the potential for disruption, traffic increase and danger due to the fact Orchard Lane is narrow, has no pavements and was never constructed with extra housing development and building in mind. On street parking and traffic accessing the houses already built emphasizes the struggling infrastructure as it is. If it is decided that NDP3 will be developed, then it is imperative to limit the number of houses on that site to SIX.</p>	<p>Due to late withdrawal of the proposed housing site at Priory Farm (see 3.16 and 3.17 of Consultation Statement), this site will now be developed for 8 units.</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to allow a total of 8 new dwellings.</p>
<p>Any form of housing is always needed, I support fully of any developments in or around Harrold, there is always a shortage of housing, we need more housing for people, I don't see the problem with any of this plan/plans.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>NPA1 - Speed camera on NPA2 - The High St NPA3 - One way system - New road on boundary NPA4 - Church Walk brook needs maintaining as could be beautiful Traffic speeds through High Street! People race through to avoid waiting for oncoming traffic. Speed camera required (Carlton have one for far less traffic). The Brook in Church Walk is left overgrown as nobody claiming ownership. It could be a beautiful area leading to the Church. The wall needs re pointing also. Housing scattered throughout the Village - including affordable shared ownership - is essential and may allow locals to remain in the Village should they wish.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Speeding and traffic safety issues are an ongoing issue monitored by the parish council. The issues about the brook and wall are noted although the parish council have no powers to control these issues. The Odell Road housing site will deliver some affordable housing for local people.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>I am concerned that NDP10 & NDP11, if taken too far, will redefine Harrold as a more significant (key?) service centre, thus attracting a higher allocation of housing. I'm pleased that an extension to ribbon development has been avoided thus far. Thank you, and thanks again for all the work that's gone into this.</p>	<p>These policies are included as these issues were raised by local residents in previous consultations. Local Plan policy 4S requires the village to allocate land for between 25 and 50 new dwellings within Harrold. It is highly unlikely that Harrold will be redesignated a key service centre as a result of this growth.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>I think this plan is mis-leading as there's a definite threat of 90 houses at least proposed to be built up Odell Road, and it now in the 2nd Appeal stages, and there's people that do not understand that these houses are on top of this 11 that the neighbourhood plan proposes . plus there's already been put through within the developers proposal Arch of 700 houses starting from Odell Road over to Orchard Lane. hence I disagree with any houses put forward by the Neighbourhood Plan to be built in Odell Road or Orchard Lane/Wood Road as its just giving a foothold to the Developers to</p>	<p>The Odell Road appeal for 90 new houses has now been withdrawn. The policy for this site (NDP2) will allow a maximum of 17 new dwellings to be built. Local Plan policy 4S requires the parish to allocate land for between 25 and 50 new dwellings within Harrold. If the parish council do not allocate the sites through the neighbourhood plan then the responsibility falls on to the Borough Council. Community Infrastructure Levy monies can be spent on a variety of local</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>pursue there proposal even more, especially a the NHP ones in Odell Road have an unfinished road in them leading down into the field ready to be extended on for more houses. Also these Developers have put a proposal into you the council to take over the lake in the field, this I can see would be a big advantage to the council as then they wouldn't have to keep on pushing the present owners to maintain the lake and ground/fencing around it, plus there would more likely be other advantages to the council and local authorities if the Developer took over the lake. But the Developers would be planning on taking over the lake just for 90 house, they must defiantly be thinking and planning on getting there bigger plan through and I for one do not want this. I have left some of your questions un-answered as under the above circumstances they could be things the Developers could play on to put thereselves to an advantage, although some of them would be an asset to the village and its residents.</p>	<p>improvement projects identified by the Parish Council.</p>	
<p>Support and improve bus services should be incorporated in the plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The housing growth for Harrold would not justify infrastructure improvements to public transport according to the Borough Council's Highways Unit. Community Infrastructure Levy monies can be spent on a variety of local improvement projects identified by the parish council. This is a Non- Policy Issue which can be considered further outside of the Harrold NDP.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>My reason for disagreeing with DP4 is because this consistuates the largest number of proposed new dwellings, resulting in major</p>	<p>The housing site at Priory Farm has been withdrawn (see 3.16 and 3.17 of Consultation Statement). This site will no</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>distruption, pollution and congestion. New Road is narrow + would struggle to accommodate an increase in traffic, particularly given that it is currently used mostly by the fem/farming in Priory Farm Would suggest 1) Reduce the number of housing by at least half 2) Planting row of evergreen trees between existing housing plots and new development to block noise/pollution/view + ensure privacy on both sides. 3) Not going ahead with it (my preferred option). Thank you</p>	<p>longer be developed for housing as part of this plan.</p>	
<p>I would prefer that the Parish did not waste money printing high quality documents like this. A simple photocopy document in the same format would achieve the same objective at lower cost.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>85A High Street is a contemporary example of this which should be noted - GOOD DESIGN is preferable to the bland poor post modern design which is the current fallback response to 'in keeping with existing character of the village'. 85A in Conservation Area. NDP4 - Improved junction and access arrangements - VITAL NDP5 - improve the character - See previous comments about 85A High Street. We can't pretend to be living forever in the 19 or earlier. NDP6 - Imaginative re-use - Enhance can mean improve 21 style. NDP8 - Safety on the bridge must be considered - now dangerous to walk because of speed of + increase traffic. NPA2 - ie. on the bridge. NPA4 - Not sure about this - NPA5 - This needs to be more than tip-service</p>	<p>Comments noted. Good design is encouraged and all new housing development will need to conform with policies NDP2, NDP3 and NDP4 (previously NDP5). The housing site at Priory Farm has been withdrawn (see 3.16 and 3.17 of Consultation Statement). Improvements to the bridge would need to be addressed as a Non-Policy Issue and will be considered as an ongoing issue by the parish.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>NDP4 - Access?? This will cause chaos trying to get out onto Harrold Road NDP10 - No</p>	<p>The housing site at Priory Farm has been withdrawn (see 3.16 and 3.17 of</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>need, we already have enough provisions for a small village. NDP11 - Already have enough local business uses and options without extra being built. Speed through the Village? - other villages are having speed calming/lowering measures eg averages cameras. Why are we not? Especially near the school/Co-op. Investment in youth - Clubs in village (cricket, tennis) need to be kept alive.</p>	<p>Consultation Statement). This site will no longer be developed for housing as part of this plan. The issues identified in policy NDP11 are included as these issues were raised in previous consultation responses by residents.</p>	
<p>This appears to be a very well thought out and well considered plan which brings together the thoughts of Harrolds' community. I am particularly pleased to see the way that the Parish Council sees it's role in maintaining and improving the essential community assets which enhance the lives of our villagers. The principle of small, dispersed developments will minimize the impact of future housing and is to be encouraged.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>Two points we would want to see: - All established trees (TPO or not) should be incorporated into development sites and have full protection (including full roots area) during the construction phase. New tree planting schemes around the sites would be a planning condition (and more widely in the village) - Where possible sustainability should exceed building regs eg. local materials, sustainable wood sourcing, max energy efficiency, solar and wind electricity generation where non-obtrusive</p>	<p>Comments noted. Sites which include trees are required to include appropriate assessment when a planning application is made. Proposals would be assessed by the Council's Arboricultural Unit. Local Plan policy 43 requires all new development sites to include biodiversity enhancement. Local Plan policies 53 - Development layout and accessibility and 54 – Energy efficiency are considered to already deal with these issues.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>NDP2 - As it's on the edge of village + accessed via main road I support this. Crossing point is important. NDP3 - How big are the dwellings (existing no of cars etc) size would impact on traffic down Orchard Lanes,</p>	<p>Comments noted. In relation to NDP2, the Borough Council's Highways Unit have confirmed that due to the size of the development a crossing point is not justified. This reference has therefore</p>	<p>NDP2 amended to exclude reference to crossing point.</p>

<p>which needs to be considered therefore based on info now, it's a no. NDP4 - Traffic can be problematic. Visibility on Main Road an issue, may add to problem with more cars. NPD10 - Important to explore facilities, especially for those who may find it difficult to travel. In addition, facilities can add to community spirit. NPA11 - Nature club at HCP? More clubs for children + adults Just an observation that this consultation doc. Is expensive paper printing. Is this a good use of funds?</p>	<p>been removed. NDP3 information is not yet known and will need to be the subject of a planning application. The Borough Council's Highways Unit have confirmed that some highway improvements will be necessary. Parking for the new properties must be in accordance with the Borough Council's standards. The housing site at Priory Farm has been withdrawn (see 3.16 and 3.17 of Consultation Statement). Activities at the Harrold and Odell Country park would be a Non-Policy Action and will be addressed as an ongoing issue by the parish.</p>	
<p>My family and I have lived on the High Street for 27 years. We have seen huge development since then and and have never previously obligated. We very strongly believe now however that development in this village has reached capacity particularly in terms of impact on the high street, increased traffic volunteers and noise as well as the impact on facilities. We realize how developments work and this may well be the start of a lot more..... There are many areas that are closer to main roads, motorways that would not negatively impact on villagers. Getting into Bedford in the mornings, and Milton Keynes can take 1 and a half hours!! This will get worse.</p>	<p>Local Plan policy 4S requires the parish to allocate land for between 25 and 50 new dwellings within Harrold. If the parish council do not allocate the sites through the neighbourhood plan then the responsibility falls on to the Borough Council.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>
<p>We are importing 50% of our food therefore we should not be building on green field sites.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Local Plan policy 4S requires the parish to allocate land for between 25 and 50 new dwellings within Harrold. If the parish council do not allocate the sites through the neighbourhood plan then the responsibility falls on to the Borough Council.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

	Agricultural land classification issues were considered in the site assessments that form part of the evidence base to the plan. If housing land is to be allocated as required by the Local Plan then the least valuable agricultural land needs to be used.	
Cars parked on main street make passing during busy times challenging. Could you consider insisting all cars park on outside of road and including some double yellow line sections to be used as 'passing point' during busy times.	Comments noted. This is an existing issue which can be addressed as a Non-Policy Action and will be considered as an ongoing issue by the parish.	No changes recommended.
No more street furniture please to limit the urbanisation of a rural isolation.	Comments noted.	No changes recommended.
I think it's very important to create sufficient affordable housing in the village for young families. I know of one family who are expecting a third child, and are having to look for a home away from Harrold because their affordable home is too small to accommodate a third child, and they cannot afford to buy a larger house in the village. They work in/around Harrold and their children attend school in Harrold. It is very sad that they may be driven out by the cost of housing.	The new housing development proposed at Odell Road will deliver some affordable housing provision.	No changes recommended.
1) When new developments are sanctioned + planned I really feel that development of new public paths should be created or extended where possible to promote access to further reaches of our rural surroundings. These could be off-road paths located on development sites themselves preferably Bridleways to be inclusive to as many users as possible. It is a unique opportunity to do this, and would help to maintain a rural feel to the village in the face	New development proposals need to take account of existing footpaths. Public path improvements are limited to land within the control of land owners or applicants. Speed limits on Harrold Bridge would be a Non-Policy Action and will be considered as an ongoing issue by the parish.	No changes recommended.

<p>of increased building, loss of green space/countryside, increased rural road traffic. 2) Harrold Bridge in my view for safety reasons should be 20mph NOT 30mph - as the village population rises more pedestrians + cyclists using bridge.</p>		
<p>Whilst in principal we agree with the PC in building 30 new dwellings we would not be happy with NPD2+3 as we fear the Great Catesby plans would potentially open up the opportunity to develop the area in between.</p>	<p>The Odell Road appeal for 90 new houses has now been withdrawn. The policy for this site (HNPD2) will allow a maximum of 17 new dwellings to be built. Local Plan policy 4S requires the parish to allocate land for between 25 and 50 new dwellings within Harrold.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>I do not agree with the proposal to develop more dwellings at Odell Road, Little Odell than at Orchard Lane Harrold. The proposal also seems to conflict with policies NDP8 and NPA1. The site at Odell Road, Little Odell is remote from the village centre of Harrold and from all of its facilities. Access to Harrold for pedestrians from the site is via two crossings of a busy road junction and then along an unlit and perilously narrow single-file footpath along the side of the busy Odell Road. The walk is unpleasant and unsafe and the residents of a new development are therefore more likely to drive into Harrold rather than walk. On the other hand, the site at Orchard Lane, Harrold is much closer and adjacent to the established residential heart of Harrold. It is connected to the village centre via a much shorter and safer footpath network through residential areas. New residents are much more likely to walk into the village centre than drive. I do agree that development in Harrold should take place on smaller sites but feel that sites nearer to the</p>	<p>Comments noted. The suitability of all sites put forward as part of the call for sites process were assessed (see site assessment report in evidence base). This considered all site constraints and issues and graded each site accordingly. The Odell Road site assessment identified the lack of pedestrian access to the village. The housing site at Priory Farm now withdrawn (see 3.16 and 3.17 of Consultation Statement) and the late need to progress the plan in accordance with Local Plan policy 4S - <i>Amount and distribution of housing development</i>. Given this timescale, the need to reconcile the delivery of land for at least 25 new dwellings within the parish with, the limited number of suitable sites identified and with less support for the Orchard Lane site due existing highway and access issues, the parish council is left with little option but to make the Odell Road site the main housing site for growth.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>village centre should be used to accommodate greater numbers and a mix of affordable housing in preference to those that are more remote. Developing six dwellings at Odell Road, Little Odell and 11 (7 market and 4 affordable) at Orchard Lane, Harrold would therefore be more logical and agreeable and more in accordance with policies NDP8 (provision of safe cycling and walking opportunities) and NPA1 (encourage safe and accessible movement for pedestrians...).</p>		
<p>Thank you Harrold Parish Council for an excellent, easy to understand, "Public Consultation survey document".</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>I entirely agree with the concerns in relation to NPA3, where congestion and parking is a major concern in key areas such as the Green, High Street and Meadway at the Junction of Peaches Close. This is compounded by the parking of motor vehicles owned by a 'commercial' business, which prevents local residents from accessing parking near their homes and / or causes congestion on the High Street. These vehicles also prevent short term visitors to the Medical Centre from utilising the road for parking when the Medical Centre car park is full.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Existing traffic and parking concerns can be addressed as Non-Policy Action by the parish.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>No immediate issues with proposed plans for housing to west and north east of Harrold because there appears to be good access. Orchard Lane has a pinch point half way down so I believe access, traffic flow would be an issue. Even more so because once building starts in that location, flood gate open for expanding across northern edge of Harrold towards Odell. Same could be said from</p>	<p>The Borough Council's Highways Unit has considered the highway impacts from the proposed development of the Orchard Lane site and some improvements to the existing road are required. Both housing policy sites set a maximum amount of housing that can be built. Land outside the identified sites is considered open countryside and is afforded protection</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to include details of highway improvements required.</p>

<p>proposed development on Odell Road in reverse. Housing creeping back over northern boundary to Orchard Road.</p>	<p>under the normal national and local rural restraint policies.</p>	
<p>I agree with all the clauses in this consultation and trust that the precautionary elements in each will be given serious weight; in particular those aspects which are referenced in Harrold's Village Design Statement. These include sensitivity around our "Heritage Assets" and "Important Views and Landmarks." It is important that we retain the character of the built form of the village and seek to protect the views by accommodating (or controlling) the increased parking associated with visitors who have recently discovered Harrold's allure.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>The reason I am not in favour of the orchard lane proposal is due to the increased traffic and, hence, congestion it would bring to the centre of the village. The junction with the High Street is awkward and cannot be remodelled due to the proximity of buildings on both sides of Orchard Lane to the current junction</p>	<p>The Borough Council's Highways Unit has considered the highway impacts from the proposed development of the Orchard Lane site and some improvements to the existing road are required. Both housing policy sites set a maximum amount of housing that can be built.</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to include details of highway improvements required.</p>
<p>NPA4 consider paths/verges to be managed by 1 authority NPA9 ? consider a green burial site try to improve mobile phone signal</p>	<p>The housing site at Priory Farm has been withdrawn (see 3.16 and 3.17 of Consultation Statement). This site will no longer be developed for housing as part of this plan. A green burial site would be a Non-Policy Action which can be explored further by the parish council. Mobile phone infrastructure is a matter for the licensed mobile phone operators to address.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>As a resident of Wood Road, I would like to address the issue of the 6 proposed properties with access to this housing estate directly opposite my home. I currently have three</p>	<p>Each proposed housing site has been subject to a careful assessment (see neighbourhood plan evidence base). The Orchard Lane site has no statutory</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>trees opposite, and take great pleasure watching many families walk along wood road and up to the fields to enjoy the beautiful countryside. I would like to ask if the profit to be obtained by the parish council, Bedford Borough, the developers and the land seller is a fair exchange for the irreplaceable beauty the village residents benefit from today and for generations to come. Directly opposite my home are three magnificent trees which serve as not only functional parts of the eco system but also as things of beauty for us humans to enjoy. The natural assets we are proposing to destroy are contributors to human well-being today and for hundreds of years to come, for as long as the trees exist naturally. An incremental sustainable approach to construction is being driven and imposed upon the industry's professionals, contractors and developers. This raises significant questions as to whether the parish council has indeed considered the the eco-system when considering the housing proposals or has the prospect of financial gain overruled this point. We can not replace beautiful areas once they have been developed in, there is no going back. There are issues that need to be confronted when considering developments, especially when the prospect of removing trees are being considered. Nature is the life support of humans, this mindset should be at the forefront of our minds for us and generations to come.</p>	<p>designations or protection. The impact a development has on trees is a material planning consideration and can be considered at the planning application stage. In the event that affected trees are considered worthy of retention they can be protected by a tree preservation order. New development proposals will also be required to provide new landscaping including trees. Local Plan policy 43 also requires new development to deliver biodiversity improvements.</p>	
<p>I do not agree with the development of the Odell Road Site. The current SPA has not protected this site from development and this</p>	<p>The planning system seeks to control development and does not prevent applications being made even if they</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>is likely to be the same going forward. Any houses on this site is opening the door for further mass development, supported by an aggressive developer and landowners who have already shown themselves to be untrustworthy. Containment, or a lack of it, is a serious concern for this particular site. Furthermore, I am staggered that the access to this site has not been rejected. It is practically on a blind bend where cars are often doing more than 30mph. In recent weeks there have been problems on Odell Road with school buses and cars and there are umpteen crashes and near misses at the junction (Odell Road / High Street Odell), most of which go unreported. The access is problematic whether you have eleven or ninety houses and the Transport Statement and associated data and splay calculations should be further scrutinised. It is shocking that they haven't been already. Has the Parish Council data analysing the traffic flow in Harrold? How many peak hour vehicles travel along the High street in the direction of Milton Keynes / Olney and how many in the opposite direction. Surely, this is a key question for development location, if it is to avoid adding to the issues that already exist with traffic and Harrold High Street.</p>	<p>contravene policies. The Odell Road appeal for 90 new houses has now been withdrawn. The policy for this site (HNDP2) will allow a maximum of 17 new dwellings to be built. The Borough Highways Unit have assessed the suitability of the site from a highway perspective and have no objection in principle. No objection was raised by the Highways Unit on highway safety grounds in respect of the 90 dwelling scheme.</p>	
<p>It would be helpful if the local bus service could link up with Lavendon which has services going to various places further afield, rather than having to go into Bedford to come back out again</p>	<p>Comments noted. These are existing issues which do not relate specifically to new development proposals for the village. They can however be considered further as a Non-Policy Action by the parish.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>The development in Little Odell seems to have the least impact on the village. The land there is currently not used or accessible by residents (the other two sites are both popular dog walking / walking fields). The site is also directly accessible off a main through road, resulting in less disruptive traffic levels than the other 2 sites. The Odell development is also well considered and creates a logical infill of linear properties along this stretch of road.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>Opening up the filed in Orchard lane is a disastrous idea. The lane will not be able to handle two-way traffic. Common sense needs to prevail. I fear once the land t Wood road has been opened up for planning, the whole back of Wood road and the filed there will be greenlit for all future development and the lane traffic will become overly congested and permanently damaged. I can't believe any logic has gone into this and I would urge the council to think with more clarity.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council's Highways Unit has considered the highway impacts from the proposed development of the Orchard Lane site and some improvements to the existing road are required. Both housing policy sites set a maximum amount of housing that can be built. Land outside the identified sites (detailed on the proposals map in the plan) is considered open countryside and is afforded protection under the normal national and local rural restraint policies.</p>	<p>NDP3 (Orchard Lane) to be amended to include details of highway improvements required.</p>
<p>Provision of more car parking near the village centre would be one of my main priorities. I am surprised about the comment on cemetery space. I would have thought we were well provided</p>	<p>Comments noted. These are existing issues which do not relate specifically to new development proposals for the village. They can however be considered further as a Non-Policy Action by the parish council.</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>further funding and encouragement towards the village cricket club should be a focus to encourage a sense of community.</p>	<p>Comments noted. These are existing issues which do not relate specifically to new development proposals for the village. They can however be considered further as a Non-Policy Action by the parish council</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>
<p>Can we have average speed cameras as Carlton does? The speed camera in the High</p>	<p>Comments noted. Speeding and traffic safety issues are an ongoing issue</p>	<p>No changes recommended.</p>

<p>Street frequently shows cars travelling over 20 mph, perhaps an average limit would influence more?</p>	<p>monitored by the parish council. The speed camera suggestion can however be considered further as a Non-Policy Action by the parish</p>	
<p>Catesby Estates plc Copy of letter can be found at Appendix H Summary of issues - Policy NDP1 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how and where is the need for 30 dwellings in the evidence base and having regard for character and constraints of the village? • Housing site assessment scoring is unclear • New site assessments should be undertaken • The Housing Needs Survey is now dated • Local Plan review required January 2023 and therefore Harrold NDP will date quickly • Housing types are overly prescriptive <p>Policy NDP2 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocation of 11 homes is not supported by up to date evidence, is not ambitious enough and fails to maximise potential benefits • Bedford Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment in 2017 identified the site for up to 40 dwellings so why is the allocation so low • Recommended that site is allocated for 31 homes • Bus shelters are not justified • Plan does not meet basic conditions 	<p>Comments noted. NDP1 - The need for 30 dwellings on a number of smaller sites was arrived at using the conclusions of both the Housing Needs Survey and the initial consultation exercises carried out during the preparation of the plan. Housing site assessments were undertaken in accordance with guidelines and form part of the evidence base. It is acknowledged that the Harrold NDP will need to be subject of review. Housing types are identified in the Housing Needs Survey. NDP2 – The allocation of 11 homes (now to be 17) is based on Housing Needs Survey and the Parish Council's site assessment the latter of which concluded that development at depth would be out of character with the locality. This view was supported by the Borough Council for the 90 dwelling scheme on the site. The development of a larger site for 31 units would be out of character with the locality. Bus shelters were considered to be reasonable improvements required if the site were to be developed. However, following advice from the Borough Council's Highways Unit bus shelters will no longer be required.</p>	<p>No changes recommended to NDP1. NDP2 to be amended to support the development of the site for a maximum of 17 new dwellings. The requirement for bus shelters to be deleted.</p>

<p>Anglian Water Policy NDP 2 - There is an existing foul sewer which crosses this site allocation and then continues along Odell Road (to the South) and it is important that Anglian Water can continue to access this asset for maintenance purposes. It is therefore proposed that Policy NDP 2 include the following wording in the policy and that additional text is also included in the supporting text: 'There is an existing foul sewer in Anglian Water's ownership within the boundary of the site and the site layout should be designed to take these into account. (Policy wording)'. 'This existing infrastructure is protected by easements and should not be built over or located in private gardens where access for maintenance and repair could be restricted. If this is not possible a formal application to divert Anglian Water's existing assets may be required. Policy NDP 3 - Anglian Water has no objection to the principle of residential development on the above site. Policy NDP 4 - Anglian Water has no objection to the principle of residential development on the above site. Policy NDP 7 - Anglian Water welcomes the reference to development proposals making adequate provision for both water supply and sewerage.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>Policy NDP2 amended in accordance with advice.</p>
<p>Historic England We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, which we are pleased to</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>	<p>NDP4 amended in accordance with</p>

<p>note includes references to the historic environment throughout, as well as an emphasis on consideration for heritage where it proposes to allocate sites for housing. We particularly welcome policy NDP6: Heritage Assets.</p> <p>We have no objections to any of the site allocations proposed, and support the plan's reference to the Village Design Statement as a guide to the character of new development. We would suggest that regard should be had to the advice in Historic England's Streets for All: Advice for Highway and Public Realm Works in Historic Places, which in rural locations aims to reduce the unnecessary impact of highways infrastructure such as overly large junction visibility splays, hard carriageway edges in place of grass verges, and intrusive signage. There is also guidance available on this topic in the government's guidance: Manual for Streets, and would also recommend reviewing the recently published 'National Design Guide' for its advice on design.</p> <p>Overall, we would recommend that your allocation policies could include a requirement to minimise the scale of any highways or public realm infrastructure, in order to avoid or minimise harm to the historic environment (particularly Harrold Conservation Area).</p> <p>Otherwise, we consider that this plan demonstrates a positive strategy towards the historic environment of Harrold, and would welcome its being Made in due course.</p>		advice and response.
---	--	----------------------