

Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Statement

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	3
2. Background	4
3. Details of consultations and events	5
4. Consultees List	7
5. Comments received from 6 week consultation and Changes Implemented	8
6. Topics covered across all consultations	8
7. Conclusion	9
Appendices	
Appendix A - Results of Initial Launch Consultation	10
Appendix B – Results of responses to Initial Questionnaire June/July 2015	12
Appendix C – Feedback from event May 2016	22
Appendix D – Results from Issues and Options Questionnaire Nov/Dec 2016	23
Appendix E- Comments and responses from Pre Submission consultation June 2019	27

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal requirements of Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 as amended. Throughout the process of producing Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan the Parish Council have endeavored to ensure that full and proper consultation occurred with the local community and other organisations with an interest in the Plan. The aims of the consultation process were:
 - a. To ensure that all stakeholders and residents were aware of and had input into the process;
 - b. To ensure that the views of residents could be taken into consideration and residents feel that the process has been open and transparent;
 - c. To engage with as broad a cross section of the community as possible and utilise a variety of methods of consultation to enable as many people as possible to be included;
 - d. To ensure initial consultation results were used to inform wider consultations at subsequent stages of the Neighbourhood Planning process;
 - e. To ensure that hard to reach and marginalised groups are consulted.
- 1.2 The policies contained in the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan are as a result of the extensive consultation with the residents and stakeholders of the parish. Views and interactions from this process including further information from an extensive evidence base lead to the Vision and Objectives, and subsequently therefore form the basis for the key policies set out in the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 1.3 This statement provides a record of the consultations undertaken during the Plan's development, to whom they were addressed, publicity undertaken and consultation methods used.

2. Background

- 2.1 The Parish of Thurleigh was formally designated as a Neighbourhood Area through an application made by Thurleigh Parish Council under Part 2, Section 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Neighbourhood Plan area was officially approved by Bedford Borough Council on 1 July 2013, following a 6 week period of public consultation (which ended 13 May 2013) as required within Part 2, Section 6 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.2 Results of consultations are shown in a series of appendices, with links to relevant web pages where further information can be found.
- 2.3 Consultation was undertaken by Thurleigh Parish Council with some independent professional support from Beds Rural Communities Charity, independent town planning consultants and a habitat ecologist.
- 2.4 Issues raised during an initial consultation with a focus group of active parish residents, along with recurring issues raised through Parish Council meetings, were used to help to inform further consultations and the topics to be covered by the Plan.
- 2.5 The programme of consultation completed is detailed in table 1 below.

Table 1

Date	Activity	Method
1 st December 2014	Launch Event	Exhibition held at Village hall to engage with the community.
14.5.2015	Drop in session at Scald End Tea room for businesses	Informal session
June/July 2015	Initial Survey	Every property visited by working group to gain thoughts
25.5.2016	Event relating for further call for sites	Exhibition held at the Village Hall to engage with the community
Nov Dec 2016	Survey- Issues and options	Questionnaire delivered to every property
June 2019	Regulation 14 consultation	Event at Village Hall, questionnaire delivered to every property

2.6 The delay between the Issues and Options stage and completion of the Pre-Submission version of the neighbourhood plan was due to the desire to include reference to the most up to date local plan policies and the delay in the adoption of the new Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (adopted in January 2020).

2.7 Residents were kept informed throughout the process with updates on feedback from the various events and questionnaires available on the Neighbourhood Development website at www.thurleighndp.com

2.8 At the bi monthly meeting of the Parish Council regular updates on the progress of the plan were given. These minutes are published onto the local Parish Council noticeboard and are available on the Parish Council website at <https://thurleigh-pc.gov.uk/parish-council-minutes/>

3. Details of consultations and events

3.1 Neighbourhood Plan launch event held 1st December 2014

3.1.1. This was a Stakeholder Consultation event held at Thurleigh Village Hall, with both a lunchtime and evening session to ensure that it was an open and accessible event to all members of the Parish. The event was well attended.

3.1.2 The event was advertised using Flyers delivered to each property in the Parish and posters placed at strategic places around the village

3.1.3 Invitees included –

Representatives of Community Groups, local businesses, Thurleigh Village Hall Committee, Playing Fields Trustees, parents and governors of Thurleigh Lower School and all residents of the Parish.

A total of 102 people attended the launch event and a large amount of useful information was gathered.

3.1.4 The event consisted of 19 posters providing details of what a Neighbourhood Plan is and the stages and timelines involved, and key questions were posed such as

- What do we need to retain a viable community in Thurleigh?
- What do we need to make Thurleigh an even better place to Live?
- What do we value and what do we want to preserve?
- What is Thurleigh missing?
- What do you think should be changed or improved?

Details of the posters can be found at <https://thurleighndp.com/results-from-the-npd-launch/>.

3.1.5 Members of the Parish Council and Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development working group were in attendance to answer any questions, and attendees were encouraged to put thoughts onto post it notes which were later collated and used to help formulate the plan and inform the content of further consultation with the residents. A summary of the feedback from the event can be found in Appendix A and at <https://thurleighndp.com/results-from-the-npd-launch/>.

3.2 Informal session for Local Businesses May 2015

3.2.1 To ensure that business and those working from home were aware of the NDP, and to engage with them and get their thoughts an informal drop in session was arranged for May 2015 at Scald End Tea Rooms, Mill Rd, Bedford MK44 2DP

3.2.2 To publicise the event a flyer was delivered to every property in the village.

3.3 Initial Questionnaire June/July 2015

3.3.1 Following the launch event the working group compiled a number of questions to help them formulate the plan and seek clarity on the resident's thoughts for the future of the village.

3.3.2 There were 173 questionnaires completed either online or as hard copies (representing a 38% return rate based upon the number of questionnaires issued and 57% based upon the number of properties in the village). 99.4% had Thurleigh as their main residence.

3.3.3 The initial Neighbourhood questionnaire sought views, in particular, on the extent and location of new housing development in the village and outlined the sites that had been submitted to Bedford Borough Council for potential consideration as part of a "call for sites" process in 2014. This resulted in the submission of two sites for residential development in Thurleigh, at The Beeches, High Street and Hayle Field, High Street.

3.3.4 Responses received then helped formulate the plan, and a summary can be found at Appendix B.

3.4 Questionnaire following identification of further possible sites for Housing via Bedford Borough Call for site May 2016

3.4.1 In September 2015 Bedford Borough undertook a further call for sites. This resulted in a further nine sites being put forward by landowners/agents in Thurleigh Parish, including a proposed sustainable new settlement of up to 1,000 homes on the Thurleigh Airfield Business Park.

3.4.2 Given the significant impact of the second "call for sites", a supplementary questionnaire was prepared and was issued in May 2016. Further views were vital as part of the process of determining the most appropriate locations for growth in the village. This was particularly important so that the Neighbourhood Plan was developed in a well-informed, community led manner. In order to ensure that all sites within Thurleigh were considered an event was undertaken on 25th May 2016 at Thurleigh Village Hall at which maps showing the new sites were displayed. The event was publicised via a flyer to every property, as well as on the Parish Council noticeboard and NDP website.

3.4.3 A questionnaire was published and delivered to every household. Results of the questionnaire have been summarised and can be found at Appendix C.

3.5 Issues and Options November/December 2016

3.5.1 An issues and options questionnaire was undertaken in November/December 2016. This was delivered to each property in the village.

3.5.2 A number of issues were raised that have been used to determine options that have been subject to consultation and which have helped shape the content of the draft Neighbourhood Plan with general support for the overarching objectives in relation to the following eight topic areas shown :

- Housing
- Infrastructure needs
- Green Spaces
- Village facilities
- Business and employment
- Young people
- Local Distinctiveness
- Heritage Assets

3.5.3 A summary of responses can be found at Appendix D.

3.6 Regulation 14 Pre-submission Plan

3.6.1 An event was held at the Village Hall at the start of the commencement of the formal six week consultation in June 2019. Exhibition stands were manned by members of the Working Group who talked visitors through the plan to date.

3.6.2 The event was publicised by posters and on Facebook, and approximately 60 people attended.

3.6.3 Following the event a questionnaire was delivered to every property in the Parish seeking feedback, in addition to statutory consultees. 70 responses were received from residents, and 6 from other consultees. Comments made by all consultees can be found at Appendix E.

4. Consultees

4.1 Set out below is a list of all the local service providers, statutory consultees, consultees and other interested parties who have been consulted during the development of the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan.

- Bletsoe Parish Council
- Riseley Parish Council

- Bolnhurst and Keysoe Parish Council
- Ravensden Parish Council
- Clapham Parish Council
- Milton Ernest Parish Council
- Central Bedfordshire Council
- Borough Council of Wellingborough
- Milton Keynes Borough Council
- East Northamptonshire Borough Council
- Huntingdonshire District Council
- Bedford Borough Council
- Coal Authority
- Homes and Community Agency
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- English Heritage
- Network Rail
- Highways Agency
- Marine Management Organisation
- BT Openreach
- Vodafone, O2,EE
- Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
- Western Power UK
- Cadent
- Anglian Water Authority
- Harvey Trust
- Franklyn Educational Trust
- Country Landowners Association
- NFU
- Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association (bpha)

5. Comments received from 6 week consultation and Plan Changes Implemented

5.1 Comments and subsequent changes to the plan can be found at Appendix E.

6. Topics covered across all Neighbourhood Plan Consultations

1. Traffic & transport
2. Housing needs
3. Sites put forward for development in connection with Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030 (call for sites)
4. Parish housing needs survey
5. Biodiversity
6. Open spaces

7. Conservation areas
8. Limits to development
9. Footpaths
10. Flooding
11. Facilities & Services
12. Energy & water
13. Renewables
14. Employment
15. Broadband
16. Listed Buildings and Heritage
17. Youth issues/ facilities

7. Conclusion

- 7.1 This consultation statement demonstrates that the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (on behalf of Thurleigh Parish Council) has prepared the Neighbourhood Plan in Accordance with the legal obligations as set out in the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012.
- 7.2 All statutory requirements have been met as well as additional consultation and engagement. The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group has made genuine and committed efforts to engage with all those who live, work or have a business interest in the parish and provided them with every opportunity to influence the content of the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan throughout its preparation.
- 7.3 This consultation statement and appendices have been produced to document the engagement process undertaken through the development of the Neighbourhood Plan and is considered to comply with Part 5, Section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012.

Appendix A- Results of initial Launch consultation

Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation Exercise: summary of responses

Each of the Post-it note responses has been recorded in a separate document. What follows is a summary of the key issues that were raised. These reflect very much the majority view since there will always be a minority of dissenters on most issues.

Housing

That there is a need for more affordable housing in the village which means for both young people and the elderly. This was very much aimed at existing residents rather than attracting incomers.

Suggestions as to location included: demolishing the flats in The Close and building bungalows, developing the Officers' Mess site, Hayle Field and Church field. As well as providing (affordable) accommodation for existing residents, there was also an acknowledgement that increasing the housing stock would help retain existing facilities (the pub?) and perhaps attract further facilities.

Many respondents were keen on a small shop being available in the centre of the village.

Coupled with the development of housing is the need to ensure sufficient/additional parking. This is a particular issue in The Close and Keysoe Road.

Traffic

Many concerns about the village being used as a thoroughfare for much traffic, both East-West and as an alternative to the A6. General feeling that there is a need for speed reduction schemes that might include average speed cameras, traffic calming (especially around school/Village Hall High Street area) and further speed limits.

Broadband

A very high number of respondents would welcome the introduction of high-speed broadband to the village, perhaps with a central facility where people might access it if unable to access through home.

Young People

There was a general feeling that there is a need for more opportunities/facilities for young people within the village.

Sense of Community

Many respondents highlighted the need for a greater sense of community, which could include developing more community facilities, better use of Village Hall for activities, develop Community Garden/allotments. Retaining school is a key part of developing the community and perhaps utilising its facilities. Look at the skills that residents can offer.

Access

Maintain safe footpaths and provide additional access e.g. footpath from village to Cross End. Coupled with this, the need for additional public transport.

Heritage

Make better use of the Church, perhaps illuminate it as a feature. Open up access to Bury Hill. Protect trees.

Environment

Plant more trees, have more pride in the village, promote footpaths and bridleways and consider wildlife area. Maintain the rural nature of the village.

Appendix B

THURLEIGH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOURHOOD QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The Thurleigh NDP questionnaire was circulated for responses during June/July 2015. There were 173 questionnaires completed either online or as hard copies (representing a 38% return rate based upon the number of questionnaires issued and 57% based upon the number of properties in the village). Of these:

- 26.3% had lived in the village for over 30 years.
- 99.4% had Thurleigh as their main residence.

OBJECTIVE 1 – HOUSING

73% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that provision should be made for the local housing needs by allocating a 'rural exception' site.

20.1% agreed that over 30 units/new homes should be built in the period to 2032 - over and above the number of new homes already established to meet the local need (this represented the largest proportion of respondents). There was support for small scale development with over 45% indicating a priority for more than 20 new dwellings.

Only 12% of respondents did not think that new housing was required.

Over 60% supported new housing provision and, in response to the style of housing, villagers responded as follows:

- Houses with 3 more bedrooms (40.6% agreed/16.1% strongly agreed).
- Semidetached/terraced (57.3% agreed/16.7% strongly agreed).
- Bungalows (50% agreed/22.7% strongly agreed).
- Retirement housing (46.1% agreed/17.8% strongly agreed).
- Affordable homes for sale/rent (43.8% agreed/22.2% strongly agreed).
- Elderly sheltered homes (35.8% agreed/14.6% strongly agreed).
- Eco-friendly homes (33.8% agreed/25.7% strongly agreed).
- The respondents felt strongly that flats/apartments and three storey housing should not be provided as part of new developments.

40.6% were neutral on the provision of either large or small gardens in new homes.

There was a strong view that houses should complement the village style and that any new development must have adequate parking.

Villagers agreed with the two Call for Sites identified:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beeches (33.1% agreed and 13.6% strongly agreed). • Hayle Field (46.1% agreed and 22.7% strongly agreed).
<p>Concerns about more housing related to traffic volume/speed, parking, current infrastructure, access to both sites, drainage, current sewage system.</p>
<p>Other locations that were identified for potential consideration were (i) Field behind the school, (ii) extending Glebe Close, (iii) the existing Village Hall site, (iv) existing Garage site at The Close, and (v) behind the Post Office.</p>
<p>There was a mixed reaction to residential development on the former Officers Mess site.</p>
<p>Housing density for future development: There was robust feedback from the survey for low density development (less than 20 dwellings per hectare) - with 56.8% of respondents supporting low density development) and an emphasis for a few medium sized (62.4% of respondents) or several small developments (63.3% of respondents). The support for individual plots, including gardens of existing houses, was less obvious with 46.7% agreeing to individual building plots in the gardens of existing houses. Key responses were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 56.8% agreed to less than 20 per hectare • Only 24.5% supported medium density development (30-40 per hectare) • Only 2.9% supported high density development (over 50 per hectare) • 66.7% agreed to being similar to neighbouring area • Only 24.5% supported one large development of more than 20 houses • Villagers expressed a preference for a few medium sized developments (62.4% agreed) or several small developments (63.3% agreed). • 46.7% agreed to individual plots including building in gardens of existing houses, 40.8% did not support such provision.
<p>Development was also considered appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • next to existing housing 33.3%. • on brownfield sites 37.6%.
<p>Respondents did not feel it was appropriate that there should be development on greenfield sites (61.8%) or on greenfield sites if no brownfield sites available (41.9%).</p>
<p>44.9% agreed that the existing village boundary should be maintained, whilst 73.1% responded that the existing boundary should not be significantly extended. 58.1%, however, supported, an extension of the existing boundary to enable fringe development (adjacent to existing boundaries). Only 34.3% supported an extension of the existing boundary to enable small developments (43.4% did not).</p>
<p>Respondents considered that any housing development should support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people to stay in the village, with 74.2% regarding this as important or very important. • Local businesses/community groups and facilities, with 70.4% regarding this as important or very important. • Improved infrastructure (roads/amenities), with 60.6% regarding this as important or very important. • The meeting of housing needs, with 63.3% regarding this as important/very important.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increase in vibrancy of the village, with 59.3% regarding this as important or very important. • Enhancement of village culture and social mix, with 46.8% regarding this as important or very important.
<p>Concerns relating to any development in Thurleigh were identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on environment (36.2% concerned/34.4% very concerned). • The impact on view of the entrances and exits to and from Thurleigh (34% concerned and also 34% very concerned). • Increased parking need (35.8% concerned/48.1% very concerned). • The access problems due to increased traffic and congestion (32.7% concerned/49.7% very concerned). • Having adequate infrastructure (35.8% concerned/43.2% very concerned). • The pressure on school places (29.6% concerned/28.4% very concerned).
<p>In considering any new development, the follow were seen as important or very important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses that are energy efficient and have low environmental impact (84.9%). • Houses that are low cost to buy/rent (61.3%). • Houses with gardens (77.9%). • Houses with off street parking (98.7%). • Houses that respect the existing character of the village (94.5%).
<p>42.1% of villagers agreed and 34.6% strongly agreed that a Village Design Statement should be developed.</p>
<p>53.1% strongly agreed (and a further 39.5% agreed) that there should be car parking space standards set.</p>
<p>49.4% agreed and 29% strongly agreed that there should be an amenity space standard set.</p>
<p>57.7% strongly agreed and 31.7% agreed that there should be a height standard set.</p>
<p>50.9% strongly agreed and 31.7% agreed that there should be a massing standard set.</p>
<p>51.6% strongly agreed and a further 34.2% agreed that there should be an external finish standard set.</p>
<p>63.6% strongly agreed and 32.1% agreed that that there should be a highway access standard set.</p>
<p>54.5% strongly agreed that trees and hedges should be protected.</p>

OBJECTIVE 2 – INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

<p>The main transport issues were identified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42% were concerned and 31.5% were very concerned with pedestrian safety. • 37.3% were concerned and 27.3% were very concerned with local road congestion. • 30.9% were concerned and 20.4% were very concerned with the provision of safe cycle routes (31.5% were neutral).

- 40.1% were concerned and 33.3% were very concerned about frequency of the local bus services.
- 39.5% were concerned and 34.6% were very concerned with the safe walks to school.
- 30.5% were concerned and 58.5% were very concerned about the speed of traffic through the village.
- 32.7% were concerned and 46.9% were very concerned about parking in the village.
- Over 60% were very concerned about the road maintenance standards.
- 46.3% were concerned and 27.4% were very concerned about footpath provision.
- 44.4% were concerned and 22.8% were very concerned with footpath standards.
- 30.7% were concerned and 60.7% were very concerned with HGV traffic in the village.
- 33.3% were concerned and 51.5% were very concerned about through traffic.

The main mode of transport is 95.1% by car; 69.7% get about the village on foot.

There is an average of 3 cars per household.

Villagers travel between 0 - 160 miles to work each day.

In terms of the improvements most needed in response to transport issues:

- 81.8% strongly agree to the need for an improved bus service.
- 44.4% agree and 37.5% strongly agree to the need for more designated footpaths.
- 84.5% strongly agree to the need for traffic calming.
- 72.7% strongly agree to the need for average speed cameras.
- 44.9% strongly agree to the need for reduction in on-street parking.
- 59.9% strongly agree and a further 29.9% agree to the need for reduced speed limits.
- 48.1% strongly agree to the need for improved highways/footpath maintenance standards.
- A weight limit for the High Street was suggested.

Designated cycle lanes (43.2%) and pedestrian crossings (50%) were seen as neutral options.

In terms of footpaths:

- 45.1% agree to the need to upgrade and extend footpaths.
- Over 60% agree to the use of footpaths as cycle paths (but not for speed cycling).
- 42.9% agreed to the introduction of white lines along the side of the road to mark recommended places for pedestrians and cyclists.

A specific concern was the level of inconsiderate parking in the High Street, particularly associated with school drop off and collections.

There were no constructive solutions to improved parking in the village and, in particular, the concerns in The Close and Keysoe Road.

Digital Connectivity: a very strong reaction for improved broadband. Ideas included working in partnership with satellite internet provision, using fibre optic from the airfield, use the church tower to gain better connectivity.

OBJECTIVE 3 – GREEN SPACES

The following are important when considering the local environment:

- 57.4% regarded the protection of existing open space as very important, with 33.3% regarding this as important.
- 46% regarded the maintenance of groundwater quality as very important, with 42.9% regarding this as important.
- 41.3% considered that reducing the risk of flooding was important, with 38.1% regarding this as very important.
- 39.5% considered that reducing the carbon footprint was important, with 33.1% regarding this as very important.
- 50% considered that the need to maintain air quality was very important, whilst 38.1% regarding this as important.
- 50.3% considered that encouraging good housing design was very important, with 41.6% also regarding this as important.
- 53.8% considered that improving road safety was very important, with 38.1% also regarding this as important.
- 47.9% considered that ensuring safe pedestrian routes was very important, with 39.3% also regarding this as important.

There was a very good level of support for improvements to meet future village needs with:

- 41.8% supporting improvements to surface water drainage.
- 47.4% supporting improvements to the sewage system.
- 61.5% supporting the installation of gas in the village.
- 62.9% of respondents regarded improvements to recycling provision to be essential.

In terms of additional or improved facilities to be included in the parish:

- 69.2% supported additional or improved landscaping of public areas.
- 51% supported the provision of additional formal/informal green spaces.
- 56.4% supported additional or improved play areas for children.
- There is a good level of demand for the provision of allotments
- There was a mixed response to the need for more public seating and picnic areas

Concerns within the village are:

- 23.6% were very concerned and 23% were concerned about air pollution.
- 37.8% were concerned and 26.8% were very concerned about fly tipping.
- 40.5% were very concerned and 36.8% were concerned about dog fouling.
- 38.2% were concerned and 36.4% were very concerned about litter.
- 27.3% were concerned and 18.6% were very concerned about crime.
- The maintenance of footpaths and bridleways was identified by some as a concern.

There was limited concern about light and noise pollution, flooding, grass cutting frequency, anti-social behaviour, vandalism, burglary and car crime.

In relation to the six existing areas of designated Open Space, the support for the protection of these spaces was overwhelming:

- 96.9% supported the protection of the School playing fields as green space.

- 84% supported the protection of the natural green space and public footpath of the High Street as green space.
- 87.3% supported the protection of the Bury Hill wooded area as green space.
- 84% supported the protection of the area of informal green space and private garden in front of Vicarage Green as green space.
- 87% supported the protection of the Village Garden as green space.
- 96.3% supported the protection of the Playing Fields as green space.

There was also significant support for the protection of the Memorial Garden (in Church Yard) with 96.3% of respondents supporting its protection.

Other places identified were the reservoir, pub garden, Cross End bridleway, corner of Robins Folly (with bench), corner of The Close and Keysoe Road.

The respondents felt that there should be a robust policy to prohibit the following:

- Industrial wind turbines (61.6% of respondents).
- Small wind turbines (29.8% of respondents).
- Industrial solar farms (50.3% of respondents).
- Small solar farms (26.3% of respondents).

OBJECTIVE 4 – RECREATION, SPORTING & COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The following community facilities are used occasionally or as stated:

- Broadband: 86% daily.
- Bus service: 52.2% never, with 29.6% occasionally.
- 85% never use the village bus.
- Over 80% occasionally use the mobile post office.
- 50.9% used the village pub.
- 50.9% use the Sports and Social occasionally with 39.9% never using it.
- 52.8% use the playing fields occasionally.
- 67.1% use the village hall occasionally.
- 9.8% use the church weekly with 51.1% using it occasionally.
- 75.2% never use the mobile library.
- 50.9% never use the play area at the playing fields.
- 54.9% use Scald End Team Rooms and farm shop.
- 45.7% used the Farm Centre.

The following are seen as very important facilities:

- There was considerable support for improved "high-speed" broadband provision in the village (with almost 94% of respondents regarding this important or very important).
- 55.2% regarded the bus service as very important (with a further 35.6% classifying this as important).
- 34.8% regarded the community bus as very important (41% classified this as important).
- 49.1% regarded the mobile post office as very important (with a further 41.1% classifying this as important).

- 43.9% regarded the Jackal Public House as very important (with 37.8% classifying this as important).
- 34.8% regarded the Sports and Social Club as very important (with 40.9% classifying this as important).
- 56.7% regarded the playing fields as very important (with 34.1% also classifying this as important).
- 44.5% regarded the Village Hall as very important (42.7% classified this as important).
- 51.2% regarded the Church as very important (33.3% classified this as important).
- Over 60% regarded the Mobile library as very important.
- 50.9% regarded the play area as very important (36% classified this as important).
- 32.7% regarded the Scald End Team Rooms and farm shop as important (with 22.4% of respondents classifying this facility as very important).
- 31.5% regarded the Farm Centre as important (20.4% classified this as very important).

The consultation also identified the aspiration for additional or improved facilities as a consequence of small scale new development, such as play areas for children (with support from 56.4% of respondents), a communal broadband facility (58.5% of respondents), improved mobile telephone network (78.7% of respondents), provision of a local/community shop (86.4% respondents), more recreational or sporting facilities (48.7% of respondents) and provision of an outdoor exercise/gym equipment (34.6% of respondents).

There was also a high level of support for an improved local bus service, medical provision and dental care facility. There is a good level of desire for the provision of a Village Shop if more houses are built.

The strength of "community" in the village scored highly (with over 40% of respondents considering that it is excellent or good, 40.9% average and only 16.2% poor or very poor).

The importance of village identity, community spirit and feeling part of the community was regarded as important to many, as did Thurleigh being a quiet village, its rural atmosphere, the peaceful and safe neighbourhood and existing local services. In particular:

- 43.5% regarded Village identity as important (24.8% as very important).
- 52.2% regarded feeling part of a community as important (22.4% as very important).
- 50.3% regarded community spirit as important (21.4% as very important).
- 43% regarded local services as important (17.2% as very important).
- 42% regarded having a say in decisions affecting the village as important (37.7% also classified this as very important).
- A quiet village was regarded as very important by 56.2% of respondents (with a further 35.8% regarding this as important).
- Easy access to the countryside was important or very important to 90% of respondents.
- 53.8% regarded rural atmosphere as very important (36.9% as important).
- 71.8% considered that a peaceful and safe neighbourhood was important or very important to over 95% of respondents.

OBJECTIVE 5 – BUSINESS & EMPLOYMENT

<p>The response was not convincing in terms of the need for more employment land allocations in addition to the existing Thurleigh Business Park, with only 25.9% of respondents providing positive feedback. 46.9% disagreed that there needs to be more employment land allocations made.</p>
<p>Feedback did, however, emphasise the importance of the Airfield site in meeting the need for employment land allocations.</p>
<p>36.7% of respondents considered that Thurleigh has poor job opportunities, with a further 25.9% regarding job opportunities as very poor.</p>
<p>12.4% of respondents operate a business from home, whilst 20.7% work from home.</p>
<p>There was little prospect of new business start from the local community, with only 4% of respondents indicating the possibility of starting their own business.</p>
<p>There was some limited need for new premises to rent for office space, workshop space, storage units, studio space and shop/retail space.</p>
<p>The feedback to the consultation identified some concerns in making new employment land allocations in Thurleigh. Adequate parking, traffic impact (including HGV's), noise, hours of operation, scale of development and type of business were identified as significant concerns.</p>
<p>There was a mixed reaction to the use of the Officers Mess site being used for potential employment use.</p>
<p>In terms of providing further employment opportunities, respondents felt that the following types of business should be encouraged in Thurleigh:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Tourism and leisure (47.3% agreed and 7.4% strongly agreed).• Office based business (28.2% agreed and 47% strongly agreed).• Retail (46.7% agreed and 14% strongly agreed).• Small scale industrial (skilled artisans etc) (45.6% agreed and 3.4% strongly agreed).• Agriculture and food production (53% agreed and 10.6% strongly agreed).• Service trades (56.4% agreed and 6.7% strongly agreed).• Pubs, cafes and restaurants (40.8% agreed and 13.6% strongly agreed).• Only 8.8% agreed or strongly agreed that no new employment provision be made.
<p>65.5% agreed that there should be land reserved for businesses suited to Thurleigh's rural environment with 58.5% agreeing that the NDP should have policies to encourage existing and small to medium businesses to develop in the parish.</p>
<p>To encourage future employment opportunities in Thurleigh the following were considered to be important:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 38.4% agreed (and 21.9% strongly agreed) that improved transport links to other places could help encourage growth.

- 36.6% agreed (and 6.5% strongly agreed) that more suitable business premises available to rent within Thurleigh were important (37.3% were neutral).
- 37.1% agreed (and 5.3% strongly agreed) that more suitable business premises available to buy within Thurleigh were important (37.1% were neutral).
- 36.4% agreed (and 7.9% strongly agreed) that access to communal office facilities was important.

Several remarked strongly that there should not be a new recycling/composting/incinerator facility in the area.

The need for faster reliable broadband speed was regularly identified as an issue to address.

OBJECTIVE 6 – YOUNG PEOPLE

Provision in the village for young people was generally viewed as adequate:

- Over 70% consider that the School and Pre-School are adequate/very adequate.
- Almost 65% consider that sports facilities are adequate/very adequate.
- 70% of respondents consider that children's play areas are adequate/very adequate.
- Only 43% of respondents considered facilities for teenagers to be adequate or very adequate, whilst 38% felt that they were limited or not adequate.

Potential additional or improved facilities for the village were identified as follows:

- 57.2% supported additional or improved child care/nursery facilities (5.9% of respondents did not).
- 53.9% supported additional or improved recreational/sporting facilities for the youth (4.5% did not).
- 48.3% supported additional or improved facilities for teenagers (5.3% did not).
- 68% supported additional or improved play areas for children (5.9% did not).
- 42.8% supported the provision of a youth centre (13.8% did not).
- 29.8% supported outdoor gym provision (33.8% did not).

There was also a view that the play area did not cater for all age ranges.

There was other suggestions made (including provision of a cycle or skate park, tennis courts and bowls provision) and a recognition of the benefits of social interaction. There was also recognition that, for example, facilities had closed due to lack of interest (e.g. a previous youth club) and that sometimes facilities rely on volunteers or need to be supervised.

OBJECTIVE 7 – LOCAL DISTINCTIVENESS

The following were seen as very important when considering the distinctive landscape:

- Protecting, managing and enhancing nature conservation (biodiversity, flora and fauna) with 92.7% of respondents regarding this as important or very important.
- Maintaining existing views/vistas, with over 90% of respondents regarding this as important or very important.
- Protecting local wildlife and habitats with 97% of respondents regarding this as important or very important.

- Maintaining rights of way for the benefit of local people and visitors with 91.5% of respondents regarding this as important or very important.
- Preserving hedgerows and trees from further loss with 93.4% of respondents regarding this as important or very important.
- Protecting the "Village Garden" with 82.9% of respondents regarding this as important or very important.

There were high levels of support for additional or improved facilities, including planting of trees/orchards (with 84.7% agreeing or strongly agreeing), recreating wildlife meadows (with 79.2% support), improving footways and bridleways (88.4% support), provision of new footpaths e.g. Village to Cross End (with 86.1% support), developing a series of Parish Walks promoting less well routes and features of local interest (with 80.5% support) and enhancing signage and environmental improvements to increase accessibility to the landscape (with 72.8% agreeing or strongly agreeing with this proposal).

53.7% agreed that there should be an NDP policy to make provision for maps, direction signage and information boards.

48.2% agreed that there should be an NDP policy to support existing and new Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) for individual trees or groups of trees in the parish. It was also agreed (48.2%) that the NDP should support a tree planting scheme.

OBJECTIVE 8 – HERITAGE ASSETS

39.3% agreed and 17.8% strongly agreed that there should be feature illumination of the church. 18.4% disagreed with the proposal and almost 25% remaining neutral on the issue.

The Church featured a few times in terms of ideas to exploit heritage assets, with feedback suggesting that more events should be held and publicised to attract people (such as afternoon teas and jumble sales).

39.3% agreed and 36.1% strongly agreed that there should be access provided to Bury Hill. Other feedback suggested that Bury Hill should be cleared to provide access and that an information board should be provided for visitors to Bury Hill.

58% agreed and 28.4% strongly agreed that the NDP should identify locally important heritage assets as protected assets.

At a more general level, heritage trail leaflets were suggested, together with a website showing buildings of interest.

Appendix C- Feedback from event May 2016

The feedback from the initial village consultation can be summarised as follows:

- There is support for small scale development with over 45% of respondents indicating a priority for more than 20 new dwellings, and the highest number (representing 20% of respondents) indicating a preference for over 30 new dwellings. This was in addition to the local need for 11 homes that had been ascertained from a recent Housing Needs Survey.
- The respondents felt that new housing development should comprise a mix of dwellings, with the majority supporting a mix of 3 or more bedroom detached housing, 2/3 bedroom semi-detached or terraced housing and the provision of bungalows.
- The respondents felt strongly that flats/apartments and three storey housing should not be provided as part of new developments.
- There was a very good level of support for retirement housing and affordable homes for sale or rent, with over 73% supporting the allocation of a rural exception site to make provision for locally established housing needs as part of new provision in the village.
- In terms of location, there was a very good level of support for sites that were originally submitted in 2014 and these are numbered 274 and 276 on the Map below, with over 46% agreeing or strongly agreeing with new development at site 274 and over 68% agreeing or strongly agreeing with new development at site 276. Access constraints were identified that would render development at site 274 as small scale "infill" development, with a more significant allocation at site 276 preferred for a sensitive, mixed use development.
- There was robust feedback from the survey for low density development (less than 20 dwellings per hectare) and an emphasis for a few medium sized developments (62.4% of respondents) or several small developments (63.3% of respondents). The support for individual plots, including gardens of existing houses, was less obvious.
- Land adjacent to the Village Hall, on Church land, was identified by several respondents for development. This land has now been submitted as part of the Borough Council's further consultation process (identified as site number 402). It has the potential to improve access and capacity for the highly valued school and improved parking capacity for the Village Hall. It occupies a good, central village location close to local amenities and, as such, has the potential for small scale development.

The "Officers Mess" site was also been identified for a sensitive housing development, with 66.1% support (80 in number) for such development. This land has now been submitted as part of the Borough Council's further consultation process (identified as site number 629). There is a view that this site would be suitable for homes for the elderly, although its location and remote proximity to services were regarded as serious issues facing development in this location.

Appendix D- Results Issues and Options Questionnaire Nov/Dec 2016

Theme 1- Housing

Summary of Feedback:

- (a) In terms of the level of growth, there was very strong support for allocating suitable sites sufficient to accommodate a total of up to 30 residential units within the Local Plan period to 2035 in addition to the local need for 11 homes that had been ascertained from the recent Housing Needs Survey.
- (b) In terms of locations for growth (and in the context the level of growth identified at (a) above), the feedback indicates that the preferred sites and scale of development to meet housing needs would be as follows:
 - (1) Land known as The Beeches, High Street, Thurleigh (Call for Site reference 274) for a small to medium size development of up to 10 dwellings.
 - (2) Land known as Hayle Field, High Street, Thurleigh (Call for Site reference 276) for a medium to large development of up to 20 dwellings.
 - (3) Land behind School, adjacent to the Village Hall (Call for Site reference 402), as a site for 11 dwellings to meet local need.
- (c) There is less support for allocating land at High Street, Cross End, Thurleigh (Call for Site Reference 444), although this could potentially be identified as a Reserve Site for the development of new houses in the event that there are issues with bringing forward development on sites 274, 276 and 402 that cannot be resolved - such as the inability to demonstrate that land designated as Important Open Space will not be compromised or that suitable highway access can be provided to the site.
- (d) It is recognised that there are risks associated with bringing land forward for development, including land designation issues in respect of Site 402 (behind the School) that need to be resolved. Whilst it may be possible (with community endorsement) to include an alternative Reserve Site in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, the community convincingly rejected all other sites submitted for potential development. There was real strong resistance to the development of The Jackal site (Site 550).
- (e) As an alternative to the option of designating a Reserve Site, the community preference was that the proposed allocation of houses should be distributed over the other preferred locations for growth- (i.e. sites 274, 276 or 402) in the event that there are issues with bringing forward development that cannot be resolved.
- (f) There is a positive endorsement for the inclusion of a Village Design Statement in the Neighbourhood Plan to define car parking space standards, amenity space standards, height, massing and external finish standards.

Theme 2- Infrastructure needs

Summary of feedback

- (a) The feedback from the consultation confirms that any proposal for development should demonstrate that it will provide sufficient capacity for sewerage, water supply, electricity, telephone land line and broadband service.
- (b) The Consultation feedback also confirms that there is positive endorsement for the implementation of traffic management improvements in the village. There is overwhelming support that any applications for development in Thurleigh should identify and demonstrate the additional level of traffic that they are likely to generate and that there should be a presumption against development which would impact detrimentally on road safety. Applications should assess the potential impact of this traffic on pedestrians, cyclists, road safety, parking and congestion within the Parish and include within their proposals measures to mitigate the impact. Proposals which are likely to increase the impact of traffic on road users will need to demonstrate how that traffic will be managed.

Theme 3- Green Spaces

Summary of feedback

- (a) The feedback from the consultation confirms that there is positive endorsement for protecting existing green space in the village and also for a new protection of the area comprising the two reservoirs and the immediately adjacent area (on last to the North of the Village and west of Keysoe Road).
- (b) In terms of allotments, there is a good level of support for the provision of allotments and good support for working jointly with other Parishes to identify the overall demand for allotments and potentially identify a suitable shared space for allotments in the area. The Parish Council will need to consider arrangements for working with the local community to identify whether interest exists in establishing a Thurleigh Allotments Association and, if so, to identify land locally for the provision of allotments.
- (c) The consultation feedback confirms that there is positive endorsement that any new development should include new appropriate and proportionate green spaces for leisure, recreation and enjoyment. The potential establishment of wind farms or solar farms within Thurleigh was not, however, supported.

Theme 4- Recreation, Sporting and Village Facilities

Summary of Feedback

- (a) The feedback from the consultation confirms that there is positive support for the protection and improvement of local facilities and services, including the promotion of the Village Hall, and for the allocation of developer contributions/Community Infrastructure Levy to enable such improvements to be realised. The support for the provision of recreational facilities is, however, dependent on the design and scale being in keeping

with the local character and not adversely impacting on the amenity of surrounding residential properties.

- (b) There is strong support for the protection and enhancement of local amenities and a presumption against development which would detrimentally affect community assets such as The Jackal Public House, The Village Hall, Sports and Social Club, Playing Fields, The Church, The War Memorial, Memorial Garden, Bus stops, post box and benches. There was a high level of support for the provision of a village shop, medical provision and dental care facility.

Theme 5- Business and Employment

Summary of Feedback

- (a) The feedback from the consultation confirms strong support for the enhancement of local employment prospects. Over 63% of respondents supported or strongly supported the allocation of the former "Officers Mess" site, on Keysoe Road, for additional employment growth in the village, with employment uses restricted to those classes that do not rely on the regular use of commercial traffic movements. Over 56% supported or strongly supported the allocation of the former "Officers Mess" site for the development of live/work accommodation to enable flexible working practices.
- (b) By contrast, almost 65% of respondents were of the view that the Neighbourhood Plan should not identify possible new sites for employment provision in Thurleigh but that the aspirations and concerns raised from the community engagement exercises undertaken as part of the process would be referred to Bedford Borough Council to ensure that these issues are made aware to the Local Planning Authority.

Theme 6- Young People

Summary of Feedback

- (a) The feedback from the consultation reaffirms the positive support for the protection and improvement of local facilities and services, including the promotion of the Village Hall, and for the allocation of developer contributions/Community Infrastructure Levy to enable such improvements to be realised. As already identified, the support for the provision of recreational facilities is dependent on the design and scale being in keeping with the local character and not adversely impacting on the amenity of surrounding residential properties.
- (b) The responses further support the protection and enhancement of local amenities and the presumption against development which would detrimentally affect community assets such as The Jackal Public House, The Village Hall, Sports and Social Club, Playing Fields, The Church, The War Memorial, Memorial Garden, Bus stops, post box and benches. Support for the provision of a village shop, medical provision and dental care facility was reinforced.

Theme 7- Local Distinctiveness

Summary of Feedback

- (a) The feedback from the consultation confirms that there is positive support for environmental improvements (i.e. the promotion and enhancement of Parish Walks and improved linkages to neighbouring parishes). Moreover, there is overwhelming support for new developments in excess of five dwellings to produce a green infrastructure plan to show how the development can improve green spaces and corridors for people and nature and how wildlife can be protected and enhanced.
- (b) There is overwhelming support for the protection and enhancement of the biodiversity of the area, local wildlife and its habitat and trees and for the preservation of ecological corridors and sites of special interest. There was also a very commitment to maintain the distinct character of the village by preserving, protecting and enhancing the green and rural identify of the surroundings.

Theme 8- Heritage Assets

Summary of Feedback

- (a) There was almost unanimous support for the Parish Council to identify undesignated heritage assets whose local significance justifies protection from harmful change. This task will now be undertaken so that these assets can be identified in the Neighbourhood Plan.
- (b) There was also considerable support for the Parish Council promoting dialogue with English Heritage with a view to opening up access to Bury Hill Ancient Monument for visitors and, as part of this, will ensure that a Monument Management Plan is prepared to ensure that the heritage asset is protected and maintained

Appendix E- Comments from Consultee's Pre-Submission consultation June 2019

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	re new housing it would be prudent to insist on car electrical charging points for each new dwelling and a minimum of two parking spaces per household. Government targets for future zero emissions will mean that we will all require car charging points in the near future.	Government started a consultation July 2019 and we await a formal policy from them in due course. The number of spaces per dwelling is driven by the Bedford Borough Council parking Standards, although we have suggested more visitor spaces than their policy requires	
	Re housing growth, an obvious place for new housing is on the left of Keysoe Road from The Close to as far as the mower shop/end of housing. The massive current hedge on that side detracts from the housing opposite and with cars parked on the opposite side of the road the road would benefit from being widened.	This site is part of the Call for sites, however the Highways Assessment rates this as amber, whereas the two sites included are green	
	The officers mess site would better lend itself to being a small housing estate as what business would be likely to use that area? We have a massive disused airfield with plenty of scope for that. The derelict tech site behind Jacksons would be ideal, though not within the village proper.	This site is Red on the Highways assessment, is too far from the current SPA and would also open up the opportunity for infill building	
	Any business will generate more commercial traffic	This depends on the type of business on the site, but it is known that it will generate more traffic of some description	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS2 agree on provision that building does not extend beyond that site into adjoining fields	The site will be as shown on the plan and not beyond that point	

	RYS1 signage has been removed from The Jackal and current owner stats he will not be re opening the pub, a huge loss to the village	The Parish Council would support a community group who may wish to reopen the public house	
	On coming to live in Thurleigh in 1979 the village has a post office, newsagents, convenience store, a pub, another convenience store, a garage and petrol station, a greengrocer (at the windmill), a undertakers. All of these have been lost. it is difficult to fathom why anyone would want to move into a village that does not have any such amenities. The doctors surgery is in the next village and there is no direct bus link therefore requiring access to a car or friends/neighbours for transport or local charity- Harvey Trust- to arrange this. The current bus service is limited with the last bus in/out 6pmish and only runs Mon to Saturday	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning Consultant response
Resident	LPA4 this has already been gone against with the removal of hedgerow at Hayle Field	This matter has been referred to Bedford Borough Enforcement team	
	RYS3 this is the main thing the village needs, the officers mess would be perfect for a play park that's fit for purpose and other recreational facilities such as tennis courts for example, also a community allotment.	This site is too far out of the village, within a 60 mph zone	
	RYS1- too late. The Jackal is gone and the social club is far from family friendly 98% of the time with groups of men swearing and a bar maid who only acknowledged you if you are in said group of men	The Parish Council would support a community group who may wish to reopen the public house	
	GS2 any new development compromises wildlife and habitats (removal of hedgerow	The applicant would have to provide reports about the effect on wildlife as	

<p>at Hayle Field has destroyed huge habitats needlessly). It also compromises highway safety and character landscape.</p>	<p>part of the planning process</p>	
<p>IF2 roads here already dangerous, extra development will just worsen this</p>	<p>The applicant would be required to mitigate any danger as part of their planning application</p>	
<p>HS4(j) this is unavoidable with new development.</p>	<p>This would be taken into account as part of the planning application</p>	
<p>A small village shop would be lovely as would a pub.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>I see no need to a medical centre. They struggle to staff current surgeries so I can't see that being feasible. It's also unnecessary.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>No mention of schools. A potential 30 (minimum) houses could mean over 60 children- where will they go to school? Sharnbrook High school is already oversubscribed and the village school doesn't have that type of capacity</p>	<p>It is understood that Thurleigh Village School is undersubscribed and that children from Rushden travel to the school, spaces would be available to local children ahead of those outside the current catchment area</p>	
<p>I have lived here for almost 12 years and chose to because I love the fact there is no housing estate of new builds. The village is small enough that once my children are slightly older I feel safe letting them out to play with their friends. This would change with a bigger village.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
<p>What about community health services? District nurses are stretched, they have few staff for huge areas and large caseloads. Developments in Harrold, Sharnbrook and now Thurleigh could be hugely detrimental to patient care as there would still not be any more money in the pot to fund more nurses but they have even more patients to visit- district nurses visit any patient</p>	<p>NHS Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group has been consulted as part of Regulation 14, as it is their duty to ensure facilities are available for new dwellings</p>	

	who cannot get to a GP surgery.		
	Lots of communities plant trees for every new house built. We have lots of green space which isn't utilised. To make up for the destroying of habitats it would be nice to see a field planted full of trees.	Noted, this would depend on landowners being willing to give up their land	
	In regards to ensuring houses fit in with the current feel of the village there needs to be a lot of community input on this. As the village has everything from beautiful thatched cottages to a block of flats which look totally out of place compared to the rest of the village.	Input comes as part of the planning application process. The Applicant should also follow policies laid down in this NDP as well as those laid down by Bedford Borough in its planning policies	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	We do not need acres of new homes, estates and housing. We are a village, we do not have to accept over development. People move to and live in villages to avoid the built environment and enjoy the green and open spaces. Thurleigh does not need to accept development of surrounding land	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS3- don't want this at all	Noted	
	RYS1- Jackal no longer there	The Parish Council would support a community group who may wish to reopen the public house	
	Any development should only be on brownfield sites, e.g. officer's mess. No building on green spaces at all	Noted	
	The jackal should not be mentioned at all as no longer part of the community.	See above	
	Although a few houses at the Beeches would be acceptable	Bedfordshire CCG consulted as part of	

	the infrastructure locally wouldn't sustain any further properties. Schools, hospitals etc. are already over subscribed	regulation 14 with no response, Thurleigh School is believed to be under subscribed, and places for total students would be allocated at Sharnbrook Upper School	
--	---	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS2- not to build here as it effects lots of existing residents views	Noted	
	HS3 only effects a few existing residents views	Noted	
	Do the residents of Thurleigh know that at this present time there is no allocation requirement from the Borough for building houses in Thurleigh? However it is a good back up to have our Neighbourhood Plan for future builds to ensure houses are built in appropriate locations.	The launch to the Regulation 14 makes it clear that there is no formal allocation, but the Housing needs survey shows there is a need for housing in Thurleigh and any development would form part of the 'windfall' figures allocated in the Boroughs Local Plan.	
	Please can we have a 20mph restriction near the school to safeguard our children? the traffic is often fast along here and I have witnessed children at risk	The Parish Council is working with the Borough Council to review speed limits on the High Street	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS1- we object to any building in Thurleigh We object to the building of any further housing in Thurleigh. This is due to the strain on the tiny school, increased traffic and the council not identifying any need for it	Noted, although it is believed the school is undersubscribed	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response

Resident	<p>HS2- we purchased in Vicarage Green over 39 years ago mainly to be able to enjoy open countryside views and a large garden. in consequence we have the largest unscreened view of the proposed development of The Beeches. Looking out onto 10 dwellings plus numerous vehicles, would ruin our open aspect view. In addition our lovely, generally quiet, corner of the village would be adversely affected by extra noise and our privacy greatly compromised. Even the proposed bungalows for our end of the development would still be obtrusive without substantial tree screening.</p>	Noted	
	<p>We are also very concerned about the additional traffic turning into and out of the site, both during building and subsequent occupation, onto the already very busy High Street.</p>	<p>The Planning Application will have to provide detail information about the turning and how they can make sure it's safe</p>	
	<p>We feel that the Hayle Field site is far more suitable offering twice the capacity of The Beeches whilst affecting fewer current residents</p>	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	<p>In response to RHYS1- Can the TPC protect the demise of the Jackal from the current owner?/ Developers - what will they be encouraged to contribute, ideas could include: shop, tennis courts, club refurbishment (especially with no pub).` The Jackal - is there any opportunity to reopen the village pub? the village is suffering massively as a result (even with the sterling effort in the pop up pub</p>	<p>The Parish Council would support a community group who may wish to reopen the public house</p>	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	The village might just manage to absorb an additional 10 houses but not 30, the school is already full so any children may have to be driven to adjoining villages until they reach the age of 11. The nearest doctors surgery at Sharnbrook as so many patients that there is already an average of 2.5 weeks waiting for a non-urgent appointment. We have no shop, a minimal bus service so it is inevitable that traffic will increase. Most households will have 2 vehicles. We may support increasing facilities, shop, doctors/dentist and provision of increased recreational facilities. We don't have a shop or public house because neither were financially viable. Doctors and dentists are moving to larger, shared premises and there is a nationwide shortage of GPs. it is nothing but fantasy to think that a new small surgery will open in such a small village. I believe that the village should be allowed to grow slowly as it has done in the past. It is not a suitable site for a new housing estate.	Bedfordshire CCG consulted as part of regulation 14 with no response, Thurleigh School is believed to be under subscribed, and places for total students would be allocated at Sharnbrook Upper School	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	Before I comment on the content of the NDP I would like to know why the one major eyesore in the village; the dilapidated rundown garage area just off the High St is not mentioned in this report. Almost all the garages are in a state of disrepair and I am sure will shortly be a hazard to anyone accessing the public footpath through the area. Surely, the	The Parish Council is liaising with bpha about the garages and has regular conversations about how this area could be utilised	

	<p>Parish Council should be vigorously progressing a solution, via the various stake holders, to this problem and indicating the proposed way forward in this NDP.</p>		
	<p>Almost all of the proposals/aims put forward by the NDP appear to be either so obviously desirable or innocuous/non-contentious that I suggest no one would be against them and it therefore seems a pointless exercise to ask residents to comment on them. e.g. Item 13 states - . The Parish Council will support the provision of new or improved recreational facilities provided that their design and scale are in keeping with the local character and that there is no adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding residential properties. I can't imagine anyone disagreeing with this statement, but why hasn't this statement been included the criteria for the 2 proposed new housing developments?</p>	<p>Referred to Planning consultant.</p>	<p>Policy AD28 sets out what open space requirements are for each development. The associated 'Open Space Supplementary Planning Document' adopted 2013 confirms what types of space will be specifically be required on residential developments and whether this provision should be 'on site' or met by way of a 'financial contribution'. Based on this guidance the allocated sites would attract the following open space requirements - <i>Possible provision of an on-site equipped/natural play area (depending on distance to nearest existing facility) & Informal and amenity green space.</i> Recommend discussion with BBC to agree what would be delivered for each site and including an additional criterion to HS2 and HS3 setting any specific requirements. <i>Nov 2019 TPC contacted Bedford Borough who advised to rely on policy AD28. Working party agreed to leave this to</i></p>

			<i>Policy AD28 of the Borough Councils Allocations and Designations Local Plan</i>
	<p>It would appear that the only contentious issues detailed in the NDP are the 2 proposed housing developments. Both of these will introduce additional 'T' junctions on the High Street with a consequential increase in traffic and potential conflicts. The NDP states (IF2) that the parish council will be against any development that would be detrimental to road safety, but neither development proposal gives any indication as to how the inevitable increased conflict potential will be mitigated. Also, pedestrian access/egress to the development at the 'Beeches' will result in all pedestrians crossing the High St as there is no footpath on the South side on the High Street at this location. This appears contrary to the aims of 17. LPA3 (New Development and Connectivity - New developments will be expected to demonstrate connectivity to existing Public Rights of Way network and provide new footpaths and cycle paths, allowing improving access to the local amenities and services, to green spaces and to the open countryside).</p>	<p>As part of the planning application the developer has to provide a highways assessment report and details of how they will mitigate any potential issues, including having to ensure junction safety.</p> <p>LPA3 referred to public footpaths and bridleways as opposed to footways (pavements). It is noted that residents would have to cross the road, and this could be taken into account at the time of the planning application being discussed</p>	
	<p>In my opinion, the development at Hayle Field should extend to include the whole field which would permit the construction of a round-a-bout at the access road without affecting any existing dwelling. This would provide safe access to the development and also reduce vehicular speeds on this section of the High Street.</p>	<p>By developing the whole field you would get approx. 90 houses on this field which is far more than is required by this plan</p>	
	<p>In short there are many references in the NDP to</p>	<p>Traffic safety- the Parish Council is</p>	<p>Traffic safety is a not land use issue and</p>

	<p>maintaining/enhancing traffic safety but not one actual proposal to achieve this. The NDP refers to 'Village Green Space' and 'Villager Open Space' with no clear definition as what these terms mean.</p>	<p>currently working with the Borough Council on speed limit reduction on the High Street</p> <p>The plan refers to green space, Village Open Space and Local Green Spaces. Village Open space is a classification given to a piece of land which is particularly important in maintaining the function, character and identity of villages and meets criteria laid out in Bedford Borough Council Allocation and Designations Local Plan 2013. Local Green space designation allows local communities to protect green spaces of local importance for reasons including setting and nature conservation. Local communities can identify green spaces through their local and neighbourhood plans, which will then receive protection equivalent to green belt land</p> <p>Planning consultant to comment.</p>	<p>therefore it is not appropriate that these are covered in the NP. These could be addressed through non land use actions but of course they are not part of the NP. Add Local Green Space and Village Open Space to the glossary.</p> <p><i>confirmed with BBC that everything should be allocated as Village Open Spaces and items amended. VOS added to Glossary</i></p>
--	---	--	--

Name	Comment	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
resident	Please note that Bury Hill is NOT a Green Open Space but still privately owned and protected by English Heritage	The fact that the land is privately owned does not preclude it from being classified as a Village Open Space, or being given LGS status	

Name	Comment	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	<p>I have lived in Thurleigh for the last 46 years and from when I can first remember the village has been divided into factions, each with their own agenda and reluctant to work with others for the greater good. I identify these groups as: • The Social Club & Playing Field • The Church & Village Hall • The Jackal & Vicarage Green I see the Neighbourhood Development Plan as a chance to break barriers down and work together to make Thurleigh a more inclusive and enjoyable village to live in. This may involve making difficult decisions which not everyone will agree with, but will benefit the village in the long term. I list my opinions below, in no particular order.</p>	Noted	
	<p>Garage Block – accessed from the High Street opposite The Beeches I hadn't had the pleasure of walking through this area for some time, but used it as a thoroughfare when taking rubbish to the bulk waste collection. This is Thurleigh's very own ghetto and a disgrace to the village, attracting abandoned vehicles and fly-tipping. BPHA or whoever the owners are should be made to implement one of the following options: • Refurbish the garage block to the same standard as those near the flats • Demolish the garages and build homes similar to those in Glebe Close • Demolish the garages and leave open for communal parking to relieve The Close congestion</p>	The Parish Council has had and continues to have conversations with bpha over their plans for the garages	
	<p>The Village Hall Although the village hall plays host to a variety of events, it should be moved to a more appropriate</p>	Noted	

	<p>location in the village and either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convert the present building into a village shop • Demolish the building and build homes similar to those in Glebe Close 		
	<p>The Social Club & Playing Field This is now the only venue in the village licenced to sell alcohol which is open 7 days a week. Although for long tarnished with a 'working mans club' label, the present regime has made efforts to make it more appealing to all. This has included two recent family days, one at Easter and one in May, which were both well attended. Previously, the only time certain people would venture there was on Bonfire Night. With the demise of The Jackal, it has unfortunately been unable to attract the majority of the Vicarage Green fraternity. The function room is underutilised and should become the new location for The Village Hall. A number of children's parties have been held in the function room with The Playing Field outside a much more attractive proposition as opposed to the main road at the current Village Hall site.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
	<p>Land at Hayle Field, High Street, Thurleigh Although after the initial consultation it was stated that this site received a very good level of support for a small development, this appears to be somewhat waning following the recent hedge removal and ditch reinstatement works. There is currently an outline planning application for 20 houses on a small proportion of this land. It has been pointed out that the highways access proposal for this application is far in excess of what would be necessary for</p>	<p>Should the current application be successful, and the NDP pass at referendum then the SPA will be moved from that shown in the NDP to what is in the planning application to ensure further building would be outside the SPA</p>	

<p>just 20 houses. This begs the question – What is the owner’s intentions for the remainder of the field? I also note that the proposed Settlement Policy Area boundary encompasses almost half of the field up to its most Northern extent, but with the intention of allowing 20 more spaced out homes. However, if the current application is successful will the SPA boundary be moved in line with the extent of this development? If not, what is there to stop more houses being built on the remaining field that lies within the SPA?</p>		
---	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	<p>I object to the development of Hayle Field because I believe that the long term plan of the owners is to build on the whole field. The owners have already shown a lack of empathy with the village and a disregard for the law by removing the hedgerow in April. This was followed by a rather distasteful blame game. What a coincidence that the tenant farmer decided to clear the ditch as the family submitted a planning application, and not only that but the ditch clearance correlated exactly with the depth of the development. The dangerous mess of broken glass and deep trench that has been left behind pretty much sums up their attitude towards the village. The village already has a problem with speeding drivers and I theoretically they could build up to 80 properties on the field which could mean an extra 160 cars in the village. It wouldn't affect the owners</p>	<p>Noted, Ditch reported to enforcement Planning application being process via Bedford Borough as LPA</p>	

	<p>because they don't live in Thurleigh. At the last Parish Meeting there appeared to be a difference of opinion with regards to the Police objection of the Hayle Field application, I have included the body of the letter in my comments. It suggests to me a concern about burglary and anti-social behaviour and an emphasis on safety and well-being. "Re 20 dwellings adj. 67 High Street Thurleigh 19-00711-MAO</p> <p>Thank you for the letter regarding the above. My main concerns can be summarised as follows; It was agreed and documented in the Bedfordshire Community Safety Supplementary Planning Guide (SPG) that vehicular access to dwellings should be to the front, and that segregated routes for pedestrians should be avoided. This is to avoid the most criminogenic features of the Radburn layouts which proliferated in the 1970s and which continue to be problematic to this day. The units on the north-east of the scheme conflict with the SPG for these reasons. As regards certain sections of the proposed parking (north-east side), this conflicts with the following sections of Secured by Design (SBD); 16.3 Rear car parking courtyards are discouraged for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• They introduce access to the vulnerable rear elevations of dwellings where the majority of burglary is perpetrated• In private developments such areas are often left unlit and therefore increase the fear of crime• Un-gated courtyards provide areas of concealment which can encourage anti-social behaviour		
--	--	--	--

	<p>The NPPF states; 127. Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments: f) create places that are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users; and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience. Possibly not surprisingly given the above, the applicant's Planning Statement doesn't appear to make any reference to community safety. Bedfordshire Police object to this application, which appears to substantially conflict with SBD, the NPPF, and county-wide agreements between the force and the local planning authorities. If it may appear that I have misunderstood any aspects of this application, perhaps you would be kind enough to advise. Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance"</p>		
--	---	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	<p>Policy HS3: Unsure has to how this in being included in the survey for consultation, due to there being a planning application submitted ref: 1900711/MAO) as listed in the public notices in Bedford Times and Citizen dated April 11 2019. Already there has been work undertaken on the ditches, with the removal of trees and hedging. This work has also blocked a path leading to the playing field. Application is for up to 20 dwellings. Green field sites should be avoided for housing. Green fields are a</p>	<p>The owner has pre-empted the NDP , however should they be successful in getting planning permission the dwellings can still be included as part of the plan.</p> <p>Other comments noted</p>	

	<p>very useful commodity for providing food for the population. Once land is concreted over, drainage becomes a problem, could cause flooding, where none previously existed, and also the lost of habitat for a wealth of fauna and flora. Hedges and trees absorb carbon dioxide. Improve air quality, provide shade and protect buildings from the elements of wind, rain and sun. They also absorb polluting particulates in order for us to be able to breathe in oxygen. If areas of trees and hedging are removed these should be replaced</p>		
	<p>Policy HS4: Affordable housing. What is classified as affordable housing? At what price? To be able to afford the cheapest housing in the village, a young couple are required to save for at least £30k for a deposit, and be able to get a mortgage. Be able to repay at least £1,000 per month on the mortgage together with meeting all the other monthly costs. They would need to be earning at least £60k per annum to justify the outlay. This is not achievable on the annual salary of most young couples. The idea of part rent, part buy is more costly per month than if just having a mortgage.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing criteria is laid down in policy s59 of the emerging LP 2030</p>	
	<p>Policy GS1: No solar farms or wind turbines to be considered. New solar farm is already being built in Little Staughton/Great Staughton area.</p>	<p>This is outside Thurleigh Parish</p>	
	<p>Policy RYS2: Any medical/dental facilities would increase the amount of traffic going through the area, as the practices would also require patients coming from other villages/towns for appointments. Would the NHS have the</p>	<p>Bedfordshire CCG consulted as part of regulation 14 with no response, Thurleigh School is believed to be under subscribed, and places for total students would be allocated at</p>	

	<p>necessary funding and staff to support this? A village shop would be beneficial, however as the village has not had this amenity for a number of years, the residents have since made other arrangements. The advancements of the internet have certainly helped greatly in this. Having a village shop would need the whole of the community to support this facility to make it variable and the goods that are sold competitive. It would also increase in the vehicle movements as the shop would require stocking and other customers from surrounding areas would use their vehicles for getting there. The shop would certainly need these customers coming from further afield to make and keep it variable. Any further housing in the parish will need to consider the impact on the local schools, both in the village and at Sharnbrook. Consideration of the Increased amount of traffic and parking arrangements would certainly need to be looked at. A better bus service would be required. At present it does not meet the needs of the younger generation in getting to further education, work, or leisure pursuits. They need to be able to drive to enable them to get there, thus increasing the vehicle movements in the village. Working hours are now no longer 9-5!</p>	<p>Sharnbrook Upper School</p> <p>Parking arrangements for new dwellings would have to meet Bedford Borough Councils parking standards policy, as well as the extra criteria laid down in the NDP for visitor parking</p>	
--	---	---	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	thoughts on the Officers Mess area: A Community area containing Doctors Surgery, Veterinary Practice , Combined Shop and Post Office counter,	Noted	

	<p>coffee and cake shop. If the veterinary practice could include a vet capable of both small and large animal work, so much the better. The coffee shop would draw its customers from those people using the surrounding facilities, as well as passers-by. The shop could sell local produce as well, including food from Scald End Farm. The area could be landscaped sympathetically, with a tidying of the mess left when the Bomber Squadron Memorial was moved into the village. A replacement plaque with relevant information about the site's history would surely be much appreciated. This type of development would I assume, be useful to the village as it would in the first instance lower the carbon footprint of the area, with less vehicle travel required. It would remedy the horrendous eyesore which the officers mess area has become. It used to be kept smart and tidy!</p>		
	<p>The Jackal could hopefully be bought back into use, probably more as a food establishment, but still selling alcohol if required. Assuming there will be no housing development in its garden that could be turned into a children's play area, akin to the business that was at the Strawberry Farm near Cross End which has ceased trading. Thurleigh used to have several amenities, but is now dying on its feet. There was a garage, a Post Office and shop combined, there was also another general shop at the other end of the village, a fruit and vegetable business selling excellent produce at reasonable rates at the Windmill and two houses in the High Street that also sold vegetables. There was also a</p>	<p>The Parish Council would support a community group who may wish to reopen the public house</p>	

	pub, The Jackal, and a Sports and Social Club. It was a busy and interesting village. The only place left from that list is the Sports and Social Club. Many thanks for reading this and hoping some of the ideas are useful.		
--	---	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	There is a pond and small coppice in Hayes Field .Who decided to extend village boundary? Are more houses actually needed in Thurleigh do we HAVE to provide them?	Housing Needs survey shows there is a need for some housing in Thurleigh. The extension of the village boundary will form part of the NDP	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	I support the need for new houses, shop, pub Drs etc. I would really want to see average speed cameras from the Thurleigh village sign all the way through to Strawberry Farm (village end) and possibly prohibiting HGVs from using our village as a cut through from the A6 to the A1	Noted, there are ongoing discussions about speed reduction and Thurleigh is on the list for Average Speed Cameras but at the moment would not be considered a priority. Large transporters are already banned, however there are a number of local, well established businesses who use HGVs so it would not be possible to ban them completely	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS2- disagree- increase of traffic speeding in the High Street a concern Traffic calming needed in the High Street Average Speed cameras 20mph outside school	The Parish Council is working with the Borough on reducing the speed limit of the High Street	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response

Resident	HS 2 and HS3 (d) and (e) at least 3 spaces per house on each house plot minimum because access to the village is by car	Refer to planning consultant BBC Parking Standards detail what is required anyway, and we have done some extra visitor spaces.	I recommend that unless you have evidence to demonstrate that a higher car parking standard is justified, then you defer to the Borough Council's adopted standards set out in their supplementary planning document. <i>TPC agreed to defer to BBC planning policy as we are allowing .5 per visitor which is slightly more than they allow.</i>
	HS4 (a) extensive black top surfaces are to be avoided- Then why does the pavement on The Close look like this?	The Close is an old development, this is the opportunity to ensure this does not happen on any new developments	
	HS4- Minimum 3 parking spaces per house on each house plot. People living in rural areas need to travel by car	Refer to planning consultant BBC Parking Standards detail what is required anyway, and we have done some extra visitor spaces.	See above
	EM1 Anything you put there will have a detrimental effect on traffic	Noted	
	LPA1 current footpaths need to be re-opened and sign posted	The Parish have an environmental Network team who do a lot of work ensuring the footpaths remain open	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS4(j) loss of light- is this material?	Refer to planning consultant	Loss of light is a material planning consideration. I am unsure as to the context that this comment is made though. <i>Left in Document</i>

	HS5 should include a sentence to require a restriction is placed on the transfer of affordable house such that the new owner/part owner/occupier satisfies the criteria of Thurleigh resident/worker, neighbouring parish resident/worker, other (in that order)	HS5 follows the policy laid down by Bedford Borough Council	
	HS4 should be stiffened to require new development to be presented in the 'vernacular' of the local area- not merely 'consistent with adjacent housing' otherwise proposals could come forward that tend to the lowest quality consistent with HS4 in its current drafting	Noted- its felt the current policy is acceptable	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	Whilst new housing and more facilities in the village is desirable priority must be given to speeding traffic. The village is currently dangerous	The Parish Council is working with the Borough on reducing the speed limit of the High Street	

Name	Comment	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS4 (a) point 5- has any consideration been given to the provision of self-build plots? Would avoid 'estate' type of housing development.	Refer to planning consultant	The Borough Council are obliged to keep a self-build register. You should check with them to see if any persons or organisations are looking to self-build in Thurleigh. If there is then you could consider including some self-build plots on the allocated sites. <i>Nov 2019 Working Party checked, difficult for the Borough to advise of actual figures due to how</i>

			<i>they compile data, but there has been some interest. Agreed that this could be dealt with on a case by case basis if interest is shown</i>
	GS2- would welcome renewable energy development (as long as it complied with policy)	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	not keen to see development that would close up the gap between cross end and the main part of the village as this would change the character of the village. The stumping out of the hedges that front the playing fields on Hayle Field have had an adverse effect on the appearance of the playing field!	Noted	

Name	Comments	NNDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	GS1 car park needed behind school for safety and for the village school survival.	The parish council is investigating solutions to parking in that area of the village	
	Develop the Officers Mess site, ??? a level of heritage markers because of it being such an important landmark in the 20th century. Small village business, eg workshops, office space would be ideal.	Noted	
	Essential to do some development to facilitate school parking. Imperative for child and adult safety both pedestrians and passing traffic. it is currently so dangerous	Essential to do some development to facilitate school parking. Imperative for child and adult safety both pedestrians and passing traffic. it is currently so dangerous	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	HS1- A shame that bungalows are being extended to several storeys- where will the elderly live?	Bedford Borough Council Planning team allow these applications	
	Church End- considerable noise and excessive and increased Manor Farm lorries this needs to be monitored and reduced to operate in suitable hours. Road surface is being damaged due to heavy vehicles and speed of vehicles is also a problem	We understand that the business has the correct licences to operate his business	
	Schools How will the schools cope with all this new development	We understand Thurleigh Village school is undersubscribed and children from Rushden are currently attending	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	GS1: my concern is the field on the west side of village hall must be a car park not a green space to serve the village hall, school and church.	The parish council is investigating solutions to parking in that area of the village	
	I have concerns over the officers mess site because of its location a business park may not work As I commented earlier parking at the village hall is not good enough to serve the 3 venues it serves- School Church and Village Hall therefore bpha want to help cure parking in The Close and social housing supply- should have been in this document	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	I would like to say that in theory these plans look good in practice will they work. I would like to see new people in the	Noted	

	<p>village but I strongly believe that they need to be vetted as drug dealers and drug users are put in by BPHA anywhere and don't care and other people have to suffer!! (*every fortnight have a pop up repair shop in the community hall for men to help the community) (* car boot sales £5 per car at the sports and social club to bring in some revenue for the village) (* every fortnight have a women's cooking, make different recipes and different cultures get together) * to get better use of the community hall</p>		
--	--	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	<p>This village, which I have only lived in for the past 10 years, is a village, I think? with a lot of potential. When my wife and I arrived from a thriving village in Wilstead, Beds we were hoping for a more quiet life (in our 60's) but with some amenities to go with a rural village life. At the time we moved home (2010) there was a pub (The Jackel) a bit over priced but never the less a place of meeting fellow villagers. Now it's all gone! and all that is left is a social club. I think we need to bring back a bit more spark!! to our village or it will die slowly</p>	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
	<p>Policy HS1 should also needs warden housing</p>	<p>Refer to Planning consultant to see if this amendment is acceptable</p>	<p>This can be considered. However, as with all policies in the plan you will need to evidence this if the policy is to stand a chance of being adopted. Did the the housing needs survey identify a need for</p>

			<p>this?</p> <p><i>HNS checked, no mention of warden housing being required, therefore agreed not to include</i></p>
--	--	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP Group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	Traffic Calming is essential for Thurleigh High Street	The Parish Council is working with the Borough on reducing the speed limit of the High Street	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning Consultant response
Resident	Traffic/speed reduction on the High Street	The Parish Council is working with the Borough on reducing the speed limit of the High Street	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning Consultant response
	I disagreed with GS2, because I felt it did not go far enough in promotion and encouragement of renewable energy schemes. Housing schemes should be encouraged to install renewable energy or be built to passivhaus standards. Interest should be looked into support for a suitable, community renewable energy installation. Which could be in the form of low level solar, providing an income/lower energy costs to the village.	<p>Amend Policy HS2 and HS three. Add a line Installation of renewal energy schemes is encouraged?</p> <p>Referred to Planning Consultant</p>	<p>The Borough Council have existing and emerging local plan policies which deal with this matter (CP26 and 57 and 58). All new housing must demonstrate an a carbon reduction over what is currently required under the Building Regulations.</p> <p><i>It was agreed there is no requirement to amend the policy</i></p>

Name	Comments	NDP Group response	Planning consultant comments
Resident	In ref to EM1 "Sensitive to the remaining historic buildings" - There are no buildings left	Policy EM 1 to be amended to	Noted. Yes it is.

		<p>The Parish Council in principle will support appropriate and flexible re-use of the Officers Mess site on Keysoe Road. Proposed uses could be small business and start up business premises but they should not be reliant on the regular use of commercial traffic movements.</p> <p>Refer to planning consultant to ensure this is acceptable</p>	<p><i>Policy amended- see also BBC comments</i></p>
	In ref to LPA4 "Shame this didn't apply to Hayle Field"	Noted	
	<p>I have not ticked the sections HS2, HS3, & HS4, they state "The design and layout respects and enhances the natural build and historic environment" is this something we already have? Why do we have to all have houses that look similar the world is full of amazing new technologies & innovation in building construction, yet we want all new developments to be "brick faced" and "rendered block walls"! If we are to have all new developments to be similar then lets stand out as being a forward looking village, state that all new housing must aim for energy self-sustainability i.e. solar panels, heat sourced pumps, rainwater flushing toilets, living green roofs, every bit helps! I welcome new housing as I too have a family that may not be able to afford to buy a house. Over the years I have felt the community feel is fading with the loss of the post office and local pub, it would be good to think we could get some of these facilities back & we can't do this without growth.</p>	Borough Council have required policies to cover this	

	I hope we are actually going to do something with these plan and have to keep filling them in.		
--	--	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant comments
Resident	If they build all the estates that Bedford are considering, there will be far too much housing in the Thurleigh area without building a single house in Thurleigh. Also, over the last 10 years at least 10 new dwellings have appeared in the Parish without there being a Policy of any development at all. Houses get built without having to designate Housing estates.	The NDP is looking to make Thurleigh sustainable, and the Housing Need survey showed a need.	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant comments
Resident	I believe the Parish Council has applied inadequate and deficient oversight to the development of the NDP, including a total absence of independent appraisal of the employed consultants. The Steering Committee became defunct and did not perform its necessary role, as supported by feedback from Steering Group members (relayed to the Parish Council). The NDP has been overly dominated by Cllr M Towler and cannot demonstrate independence from parties with vested financial interest.	Noted, Resident was a member of the NDP/PC	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Resident	1. Infrastructure is a key issue. There must be proper enforcement of speed limits and parking restrictions. The school is a small primary; does it have the capacity to cope	Parish Council working with Borough on speed limit reduction on the High Street, has asked the Community Speed watch to attend and is	

	with additional pupils without temporary classrooms or extra specialist areas?	setting up a community speed watch group. It is understood the village school is under subscribed	
	2. Policy HS4 is broadly welcomed but must be applied with discretion. Blanket rules are often unhelpful and a dose of common sense would help.	Noted	
	3. Policy RYS1 is welcomed but the reference to The Jackal Public House is puzzling. So far as we can establish the building has not been used as a public house for three years.	The Parish Council would support a community group who may wish to reopen the public house	

Name	Comments	NDP group responses	Planning consultant responses
Resident	Any development in this village will add to the already large number of vehicles using the local roads, 20 extra dwellings could easily add 40 extra vehicles twice a day. We live in a Grade two listed cottage which already suffers from damage caused by vibration from the high level of traffic including HGV's using the High Street daily. Any increase in traffic levels would be detrimental to the village and existing housing. If any further development were to take place we would at least expect average speed cameras to be installed and restricted access during rush hour times as per several other local villages (Milton Ernest and Ravensden).	<p>Vehicle activated sign shows the part of the High Street outside the school has the least speeding problem. School traffic may reduce as children are not brought in from Rushden but now live locally.</p> <p>The Parish Council is working with the Borough to look at reducing the speed limit on the High Street, and has requested they are placed on the list for Average Speed Cameras, but Thurleigh will not be a priority site. (there are at least 40 villages waiting for AC's at a cost of £60k per set)</p>	

Name	Comments	NDP group responses	Planning consultant responses
Resident	I disagree with the statement no 2 as it refers to developments rather than development. Also as the	Unable to find statement no 2. The NDP group has taken into account planning permission	

	Bedford Borough Council has already stated we no longer need to build new houses 10 rather than 20 in any proposed development is enough. Remember that the chapel conversion is adding to the housing stock and opposite us in Cross End has now become a dwelling, so the housing has increased since the beginning of preparing this plan	gained or new properties since the commencement of the plan and has reduced the original figures in the first consultation of 40 to 30 in this revised plan	
--	--	---	--

Name	Comments	NDP group responses	Planning consultant responses
Resident	I think the Offices Mess site would be ideal to support small individual Artisan type Businesses.	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group responses	Planning consultant responses
Resident	The officers mess development should be allowed and not be restricted to minimal traffic stipulations. There are no existing building and the site is a disgrace to those who served during the war on the airfield.	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group responses	Planning consultant responses
St Modwen	We write on behalf of our Client, St Modwen Developments Ltd, in response to the Pre-Submission (Regulation 14) consultation on the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan dated June 2019 (the 'Draft NDP'). St Modwen Developments Ltd have land interests within the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Area, comprising Thurleigh Airfield to the north of Thurleigh village and the Former Officers' Mess Site on Keysoe Road. The Draft NDP states, at paragraph 1.5, that development of Thurleigh Airfield,	Comments noted, and due to the fact that St Modwen indicate that they do not believe the site is suitable for employment Policy EM1 relating to the use of the site for employment has been removed, and a note annotated to state that the NDP working group wished to allocate this site as employment but have been made aware by the owner that it is	

	<p>which currently operates as a Business Park, is not covered in the Draft NDP. Given this, our representations focus the approach taken to the Former Officers' Mess Site, which is allocated for employment development under Policy EM1. St Modwen Developments Ltd welcome the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the Draft NDP and to continue dialogue on the opportunity presented by the Former Officers' Mess Site, a 1.82 hectare brownfield site that is well related to the main built up part of Thurleigh village.</p> <p>St Modwen Developments Ltd have engaged with the Parish Council and local community in respect of development of the Former Officers' Mess Site, including two presentations at Parish Council meetings in 2018. The first of these on the 8th January 2018 considered options, both residential and non-residential, for the Site. The second was on the 21st May 2018 where a proposed residential scheme was presented. No objections were raised to the principle of the proposed development, with discussions focused on affordable housing provision, open space provision and potential transportation impacts.</p> <p>St Modwen Developments Ltd support the principle of a neighbourhood plan for Thurleigh but consider that residential development is the most appropriate and deliverable use of the Former Officers' Mess Site. 28544/A3/SH/sw 2 17th July 2019</p>	<p>not available for this purpose</p>	
	<p>Response to the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission Version</p>	<p>The NDP would be looking at small business and start up business premises</p>	

	<p>The Former Officers' Mess Site is allocated in the Draft NDP for employment development under Policy EM1. St Modwen Developments Ltd have concerns with an allocation for employment development. These concerns are twofold:</p> <p>i (i) Demand: Policy EM1 seeks to restrict employment uses to those that are not reliant on regular use of commercial traffic movement, which will constrain demand for employment use of the Site. Moreover, given the proximity to Thurleigh Airfield Business Park, it is difficult to foresee any demand for commercial floor space on the Site. St Modwen Developments Ltd, as any other developer, would simply not develop commercial space speculatively in this location. It is therefore likely that the Site will remain vacant if allocated for employment development, not making best use of this brownfield site.</p> <p>i (ii) Impact of development: Whilst further work would be needed to quantify the impact, it is likely that commercial development would have a greater highway impact than residential development, including the impact of HGVs, with the High Street/Keysoe Road junction of particular concern. In addition, commercial development may result in a more visually harmful built form, if designed to meet market demand.</p>	<p>which are not available at the airfield</p> <p>see above its unlikely there would be heavy commercial traffic</p>	
	<p>St Modwen Developments Ltd consider residential development would be a more appropriate and viable, and therefore deliverable, use of the Former Officers' Mess Site.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	
	<p>St Modwen Developments Ltd welcome that the Draft NDP allocates land for housing growth, with Land at The Beeches allocated for 10 dwellings under</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

	<p>Policy HS2 and Land at Hayle Field allocated for 20 dwellings under Policy HS3. However, St Modwen Developments Ltd consider that the Former Officers' Mess Site should be allocated for residential development either in addition to, or in place of one or both of, the proposed allocations. The Former Officers' Mess Site, as Land at The Beeches and Hayle Field, could provide a mix of housing, including affordable housing, and help sustain local services and facilities. However, a significant advantage of the Former Officers' Mess Site is that it comprises previously developed (brownfield) land, whereas both Land at The Beeches and Hayle Field comprise greenfield land. It is acknowledged that the Former Officers' Mess Site, as Land at The Beeches and Hayle Field, will require sensitive development that respects the adjacent open countryside. However, unlike Land at The Beeches and Hayle Field, the Former Officers' Mess Site, being previously developed, reintroduces built form onto the Site and, as such, development is appropriate to the historic structure and form of Thurleigh village. Furthermore, unlike Land at The Beeches which is adjacent to the Conservation Area, the Former Officers' Mess Site is at a sufficient distance to not have a direct impact on this heritage asset.</p>		
	<p>The concerns raised in the Site Assessments Report (Mato' Design Associates, November 2018) regarding the distance of the Former Officers' Mess Site from the village and absence of footpath links are noted. However, St Modwen Developments Ltd are confident that a footway between the Former Officers' Mess Site and main built part of the village could be achieved. Moreover, it is</p>	<p>Borough Council Highways report advises the sites are remote from public amenities including bus stops and no footways so they are unsuitable for development. In addition there is concern that if the site is development for residential dwellings</p>	<p>Noted. This response appears to be reasonable.</p>

	<p>unclear from the Site Assessment Report as to the criteria and scoring applied in the site assessments, and as demonstrated in Bedford Borough Council's assessment of sites¹ the Former Officers' Mess Site</p>	<p>this leaves the field between this site and the last house on Keysoe Road open for infill development.</p> <p>It could be difficult to move the SPA to incorporate this site as there would be a large gap between the end of development on Keysoe Road and the Officers Mess site</p> <p>Refer to planning consultant for acceptability of this response</p>	
	<p>¹ Local Plan 2030, Sustainability Appraisal Report September 2018, Appendix 16. 28544/A3/SH/sw 3 17th July 2019</p> <p>performs similarly to Land at The Beeches and Hayle Field in terms of walking distance to local services and facilities.</p> <p>For the reasons given above, in terms of suitability for residential development the Former Officers' Mess Site performs as well as, if not better than, the two sites allocated in the Draft NDP – that is, Land at The Beeches and Hayle Field.</p> <p>Furth+C159:E166ermore, as set out in the Summary of Sites, residential development of the Former Officers' Mess Site is supported by the local community, with 66% of respondents to an initial consultation supporting residential development. Taking account of the community engagement outcome reported in the Issues and Options Report, dated November 2016, this is similar to the level of support for Land at Hayle Field (68%) and significantly above that for Land at The Beeches (46%). The Issues and Options Report also notes</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

<p>support for development of the Former Officers' Mess Site but sets out that only 26% of respondents support employment land allocations.</p> <p>St Modwen Developments Ltd's proposals for the Former Officers' Mess Site have directly responded to community views expressed through the neighbourhood plan process and have evolved in consultation with the local community through the Parish Council meetings in 2018 as noted above.</p> <p>An Illustrative Masterplan (Dwg No. RG-M-03 Rev A) is attached to demonstrate how the Former Officers' Mess Site may come forward for development.</p> <p>Directly responding to a preference for small and medium scale housing developments, a total of 15 new homes are proposed, comprising market and affordable housing to meet housing needs. Whilst the housing mix is to be determined, the Illustrative Masterplan shows how a mix of larger detached houses could be delivered, together with smaller semi-detached and terraced houses, which is in line with the Policy HS1 (New Housing Mix) of the Draft NDP.</p> <p>This results in a low-density development, which is also in line with Policy HS1 (New Housing Mix). There is ample space for on-plot parking and gardens, in line with Policy HS4 (Thurleigh Village Design Statement). The Illustrative Masterplan also shows significant open space provision, which has the potential to meet the needs of future residents and provide a wider community asset. This will enhance the setting of the existing open space on Keysoe Road to the frontage of the Site, noted as the Memorial Garden in the Draft</p>		
--	--	--

	<p>NDP, which is in line with Policy RYS1 (Local Facilities and Services).</p> <p>As shown on the Illustrative Masterplan, the proposed development will retain and enhance existing vegetation, which will assist the development to assimilate into the landscape. This is in line with Policy HS4 (Thurleigh Village Design Statement) and Policy LPA4 (Protection and Replacement of Existing Landscape) of the Draft NDP.</p> <p>The existing access on Keysoe Road will be utilised, and there is potential for improved pedestrian links along Keysoe Road in line with Policy LPA3 (New Development and Connectivity) of the Draft NDP.</p> <p>To conclude, residential development would be an appropriate and deliverable use of the Former Officers' Mess Site. In terms of suitability for residential development it performs at least as well as the two sites allocated for housing in the Draft NDP, if not better given it comprises previously developed land. Moreover, there is community support for residential development of the Site. St Modwen Developments Ltd's proposals for the Site have evolved in consultation with the local community and the Illustrative Masterplan demonstrates how a scheme could come forward in compliance with policies within the Draft NDP. 28544/A3/SH/sw 4 17th July 2019</p>		
	<p>Proposed Revision In light of the above, St Modwen Developments Ltd respectfully request that Policy EM1 is deleted and that the Former Officers' Mess Site is allocated for residential development.</p>	<p>The NDP will continue to support the site for Employment</p>	
	<p>Other Matters</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

	<p>The aspiration for the Twin Reservoir at Thurleigh Airfield to be protected and enhanced, as set out in Non-Land Use Action 2 at paragraph 9.5 of the Draft NDP, is noted by St Modwen Developments Ltd. As stated at paragraph 1.5 of the Draft NDP, development of Thurleigh Airfield is subject to policies under the direct control of Bedford Borough Council and as such is not covered in the Draft NDP, which is an approach supported by St Modwen Developments Ltd. Nevertheless, St Modwen Developments Ltd wish to assure the Parish Council and local community that they will continue to liaise with them in respect of development of Thurleigh Airfield, including any proposals that include the Twin Reservoir.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Historic England	<p>Thank you for inviting Historic England to comment on the Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Draft of the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, and are pleased to note that the historic environment of Thurleigh is considered throughout. In particular, we welcome the inclusion of Non Land Use Action 7 - Public Access to Bury Hill Ancient Monument, and the stated intention to work with us and other parties to secure the future management and conservation of the monument. We would welcome a dialogue with the Parish Council and other stakeholders regarding the best way to approach public access, and would be pleased to advise regarding the production of a Monument Management Plan in due course. For further advice regarding this issue, please contact Dr Will Fletcher (Inspector of Ancient Monuments) or David Kenny (Heritage at Risk Project Officer). Their contact details can be found at the bottom of this letter. For additional guidance, we would refer you to our recently updated detailed advice note, which can be found here:</p>	Noted	

	<p>https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/planning/plan-making/improve-your-neighbourhood/.</p> <p>For further localised 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.</p> <p>To avoid any doubt, this letter does not reflect our obligation to provide further advice on or, potentially, object to specific proposals which may subsequently arise as a result of the proposed plan, where we consider these would have an adverse effect on the historic environment.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP Group Response	Planning consultant response
Natural England	<p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this Pre Submission draft neighbourhood plan. However, we refer you to the attached annex which covers the issues and opportunities that should be considered when preparing a Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted	

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Gladman	<p>Thurleigh Neighbourhood Plan This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the TNP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored prior to the Plan being submitted for Independent Examination. Policy HS1- New Housing Mix In principle, Gladman support the general thrust of this policy</p>	Referred to planning consultant as this was done via HNS and local knowledge. Comments noted	The HNS is the evidence base for this policy (at least in part). Providing this supports the 2/3 beds requirement then I think all that you need to say here is that the HNS identifies a need for 2/3 bed dwellings. Local knowledge will not qualify as evidence and should not be relied upon.

	<p>which seeks to provide a mix of housing types. However, it is currently unclear how the proposed housing mix, which seeks to support a higher (requiring at least 30%) percentage of homes to be 2-3 beds has been derived. As such, there is no robust and proportionate evidence to support this policy requirement as required by the PPG. In this regard, housing mix will inevitably change over a period of time and this policy should instead seek to secure a greater degree of flexibility going forward. Gladman suggest that this issue is discussed with the Council's housing team to ensure that they align with the Council's housing mix and tenure preferences. As housing needs can change over time, there is also a real risk that this policy will become outdated as new evidence of local need comes to light and the neighbourhood plan should contain suitable measures (i.e. if up-to-date evidence is provided) so that it can respond positively to changes in circumstance which may arise over the plan period.</p>		
	<p>Policy HS4- Thurleigh Village Design Statement The above policy sets out a range of design principles which development proposals should seek to meet. While the government has shown support for development to incorporate good design principles, Gladman would note that the Framework also states: 'To provide maximum clarity about design expectations at an early stage, plans or supplementary planning documents should use visual tools such as design guides</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

	<p>and codes. These provide a framework for creating distinctive places, with a consistent and high-quality standard of design. However, their level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances in each place and should allow a suitable degree of variety where this would be justified.’ Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high-quality design, in accordance with the requirements of the Framework above, design policies should not aim to be overly prescriptive and require some flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. In essence. There will not be a ‘one size fits all’ solution in relation to design and sites should be considered on a site by site basis with consideration given to various design principles.</p>		
	<p>Policy HS5 – Allocation of Affordable Housing Whilst noting the aspirations of this policy, this is not a land use policy and should be removed from the TNP. The PPG1 states that neighbourhood plans should contain policies for the development and use of land. Wider community aspirations than those relating to the development and use of land should be clearly identifiable, set out in a companion document and it should be made clear in the document that they will not form part of the statutory development plan.</p>	<p>refer to planning consultant for response</p>	<p>Noted. Affordable housing is a planning matter. If the Borough Council have not indicated it is unacceptable then I would leave it in and see what the Inspector says.</p>
	<p>Conclusions Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

	<p>from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the TNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the strategic policies for the wider area.</p> <p>Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p>		
--	---	--	--

Name	Comments	NDP group response	Planning consultant response
Bedford Borough Council	<p>I refer to your consultation on the Thurleigh Neighbourhood Development Plan. Officers of Bedford Borough Council have offered informal comments throughout the preparation of the draft Plan with the aim of helping you improve the document. These comments are not repeated here, although in certain cases they remain relevant. The Neighbourhood Plan is your document and you have final responsibility for its approach and detailed contents. Comments on the current consultation document are outlined below.</p>	Noted	
	<p>It is not clear when the Neighbourhood Plan will be submitted. If it is now likely to be after the adoption of the Local Plan 2030, references to development plan documents (eg. Core Strategy will need to be deleted) will no longer be relevant. There are other references throughout the NP</p>	Looking to get final sign off January 2020 and move to Regulation 15	

	that will also need to be updated.		
	Paragraph 1.4 – The Plan should mention that Thurleigh Castle is a designated Scheduled Monument.	Clerk to amend plan/ amended 21.11.2019	
	Paragraph 2.1 – The introduction of the draft Plan describes some of the historic buildings so it might be a good idea to add reference to the historic environment to the Vision Statement to reflect the role that it plays in the local identity of the parish. It is suggested to reword to “ <i>Any future development should, therefore, be sustainable and sensitive, respecting the character of our Village and protecting its beauty, vitality and the historic and natural environment</i> ”.	Noted but this is the vision agreed by the group at the start of the process	
	Page 5 – the map legend states ‘Designated Open Spaces’. If these are Village Open Spaces as designated in the current development plan, then the key needs to use the correct policy title otherwise there may be some confusion.	Clerk to amend all references to start Village Open Spaces, amended 21,11,2019	
	Para 3.4. This will need updating to the Bedford Borough Local Plan 2030.	Clerk to amend, amended 21.11.2019	
	Policy 4.8 – there are a lot of other documents that support the development plan. Changing this into sentence to ‘Other documents that support the development plan include:’ It is then clear that the list is not meant to be exhaustive. Perhaps the Plan could for completeness just explain that these and other supporting documents are available on the Council’s website.	Clerk to amend, amended 21.11.2019	
	Paragraph 4.9 – The bracketed text is noted, however unless you intend to formally submit the plan in the very near future,	Planning consultant to respond	Noted. Yes the plan can be updated at the appropriate time to reflect the current

<p>it may be better to replace these policy references (and elsewhere in the document) with the Bedford Local Plan 2030 references.</p>		<p>development plan status.</p>
<p>Paragraph 4.10 – Please refer to ‘Village Open Spaces’ rather than ‘Important Open Spaces’; the latter is the old policy title which was replaced in 2013 when the Allocations and Designations Local Plan was adopted. The sentence might read better and be clearer if it said ‘The other key designations include six Village Open Spaces and land which falls within a designated flood zone’. This would avoid people thinking that the open spaces are in the flood zone.</p>	<p>Clerk to amend, amended 21.11.2019</p>	
<p>Paragraph 4.12 – In order to be up to date the first sentence might start as “The Local Plan 2030 does not require land allocation in Thurleigh”...</p>	<p>Noted, prefer to leave it as it is</p>	
<p>Paragraph 4.14 - The screening for the need to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment will need to be done by the Parish Council, however we can provide a template to guide the work and complete many of the fields within it. Others will need to be populated by the Neighbourhood Plan group or their appointed technical experts. Locality funding is available to help with the screening process. This should be done before the pre-submission consultation. It would be helpful to summarise the outcome of the Habitats Regulation screening in the neighbourhood plan.</p>	<p>SEA obtained</p>	
<p>Paragraph 7.2 –To be in line with national legislation and guidance the Heritage section might be re-worded to read: <i>“preserving the special interest</i></p>	<p>Clerk to amend, amended 21.11.2019</p>	

	<p><i>of our listed buildings and their settings; preserve or enhance the special interest of the conservation area and protecting the scheduled (ancient) monument of Bury Hill Camp as well as other archaeological sites within the parish”.</i></p>		
	<p>Paragraph 8.6 – it is Policy CP8, not CP18 in the Core Strategy and Rural Issues Plan which addresses affordable housing. If the plan is submitted after the adoption of the Local Plan 2030, then the affordable housing policy will be 59S. Please be aware of the proposed main modification to this policy.</p>	<p>Clerk to amend, amended 21.11.2019</p>	
	<p>Policy HS1 - Is there any evidence to support the height restriction and the density requirements?</p>	<p>Survey</p>	
	<p>Paragraph 8.11 – We suggest replacing “as should any development adjacent to it” with “as should any development forming part of its setting”.</p>	<p>Clerk to amend, amended 21.11.2019</p>	
	<p>Policy HS2 – the first sentence should read ‘up to 10 dwellings’. Criterion b) should add in ‘local’ before the word need. Clarification is required for criterion d) regarding visitor on-street parking. We are wondering whether on-street parking is ideally what is desired for Thurleigh, or ideally would all parking be provided on plot? The requirement of 1 visitor space per 2 dwellings is broadly consistent with the SPD visitor space requirement of 0.4 spaces per dwelling. It starts making a difference for developments of 5 or more dwellings. Developers may seek justification in the NO for the slightly higher requirement</p>	<p>First Sentence: New Policy 59s advised (after amendment by BBC LP examination) that wording is amended to sites in excess of 10 or more residential units or .5 hectares will provide 30% affordable housing. Therefore leave as it is b) amended d) happy with criteria which is similar to Open spaces SPD 2013 g) amended 21.11.2019 h) these come from the HNS so leave as is</p>	

	<p>than that set out in the adopted Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>It is suggested that criterion g) reads 'The retention of as many trees and environmental features as possible'</p> <p>It may be useful for the requirement in criterion h) to be expressed as a percentage instead, so that if a smaller number of homes are developed, the provision of affordable housing will still be required.</p>		
	<p>Paragraph 8.22 - Site 276 Hayles Field – it should be recognised in the description that the site appears to contain the visible remnants of a World War II standing Wireless Transmission Station associated with RAF Thurleigh. Its retention should be explored from the outset within any development proposal. Its survival doesn't appear to have been checked for the purposes of the latest draft nor has the site assessment or policy been updated to take account of this. We note that there is a live outline application (19/00711/MAO) on the site however which currently appears to exclude the Wireless Transmission Station building from the development area.</p>	<p>The wireless transmission station is not near the proposed new SPA</p>	
	<p>Policies HS2 and HS3 –The policies should include a criterion requiring any planning application to be supported by the results of a pre-determination archaeological evaluation. We can suggest some wording if that would help.</p>	<p>Wording provided by BBC and changed in document</p>	
	<p>Policy HS3 - the first sentence should read 'up to 20</p>	<p>See policy HS2 response</p>	

<p> dwellings'. Criterion b) should add in 'local' before the word need. Clarification is required for criterion d) see comments on HS2.</p> <p>It is suggested that criterion i) could read 'The retention of as many trees and environmental features as possible'</p> <p>It may be useful for the requirement in criteria j) to be expressed as a percentage instead, so that if a smaller number of homes are developed, the provision of affordable housing will still be required.</p>		
<p>Policy HS4 – it would be helpful if you could clarify what is meant by 'visual variation in aspect' in criterion a).</p> <p>Heritage colleagues suggest rewording b) to say "Consider the significance of heritage assets as well as the contribution made by setting to their significance. Development within the village conservation area or forming a part of its setting should either preserve or enhance its character and appearance".</p> <p>It is suggested that criterion c) is amended to read – 'Buildings should be no more than two storeys high, however new housing fronting the High Street and the principal roads through the village should be no more than one and a half storeys high;'</p> <p>Point g) replace "conversation" with "conversion". Additional parking could also have a negative effect on the pattern of development so this would need to be considered.</p> <p>Criterion j) – the wording could</p>	<p>a) We believe the Visual variation is clear b) Clerk to amend c) Clerk to amend g) Noted j) Clerk to amend</p>	

	<p>be amended as it would be difficult to justify a refusal based on visual intrusion in that the development would be visible. The wording could be amended to visual bulk and / or the development would be overbearing</p>		
	<p>Policy GS1 – there is no need for this policy as Local Green Spaces are to be included in the Local Plan 2030 and the policy for Village Open Spaces is already in the Allocations and Designations Local Plan 2013. The maps also show Local Green Space, however this is yet to be agreed in the Local Plan 2030. To avoid confusion, these maps should be deleted.</p>	<p>NDP group wish to leave in but may amend wording depending on how the LP 2030 goes</p>	
	<p>Paragraph 8.33. When determining planning applications the planning authority can only require developers to address issues that arise directly as a result of the development or where it will make an existing problem worse. Developers cannot be required to resolve traffic congestion problems that are unrelated to their proposals. For that reason we suggest changing the last sentence to read 'New development should seek to improve the management of traffic in the village where appropriate'.</p>	<p>Clerk to amend. Amended 26.11.2019</p>	
	<p>Paragraph 8.36 – check the page numbering of the map. We think this should be page 29</p>	<p>Clerk to amend, 27 correct</p>	
	<p>Paragraph 8.40. It might be helpful just to say that the LGS designations are being made by the Borough Council in the Local Plan 2030 (two spaces are proposed to be designated by Bedford Borough Council's</p>	<p>Clerk to amend, amended 26.11.2019</p>	

	Local Plan 2030 in Thurleigh Village.....’).		
	8.43 As with para 4.10 please refer to Village Open Space rather than Important Open Space.	Clerk to amend, amended 26.11.2019	
	Policy RYS1 – The Jackal Public House is currently closed, so is it still considered to be a village asset and local service? Presumably the parish would like to see it reopened rather than converted to another use, in which case its inclusion in the policy would seem to be justified.	Yes	
	Paragraph 8.58 Policy EM1- Whilst the inclusion of dispersed sites associated with RAF Thurleigh for carefully designed employment uses is welcomed, the site depicted here is in fact the Women’s Auxiliary Air Force (WAAF) camp and not the Officer’s Mess Site. The WAAF camp highlighted does not appear to include any standing buildings as these were demolished prior to 2009. The Officer’s Mess Site is located to northwest of the WAAF camp immediately east of the reservoirs and does include a number of surviving buildings. Clarity is required here as to which site is being included in the plan.	Advised Borough its always been known as the Officers Mess, including by the owners, so they need to amend their records. Policy has been amended to reflect removal of buildings and proposed business units see above	
	Also consider the references to commercial traffic. Is it the number of vehicles that is of concern or their size? It might be better to say that a travel assessment will be required to demonstrate that the impact of traffic associated with the proposed use would be acceptable in this location. To avoid confusion, it may be clearer to state what type of uses would be acceptable on	Referred to planning consultant for response	Noted. A travel assessment could be a good way to deal with this matter. <i>Plan amended 29.11.2019</i>

	this location and state the use class.		
	Policy LPA1 – To make this policy effective we suggest adding ‘Where development is proposed, there will be a presumption in favour.....’ Without this wording it is not clear how the improvements referred to are to be achieved. For the same reason Policy LPA2 could say ‘The Parish Council will, where appropriate, work with developers to improve linkages.....’	Clerk to amend amended 26.11.2019	
	Policy LPA4 – the Council’s validation list is not currently up to date and we suggest it shouldn’t be relied upon or directly referenced in the policy. For clarity, it would be better to state which reports and surveys are required and list them in the policy.	Emailed Sonia to seek clarification on why and what reports/surveys would be required	<p>BC advice is that the reports relating to trees and hedgerows include tree surveys, arboricultural impact assessments, tree constraints plan and tree protection plan and arboricultural method statement. It may be that certain plans may not be relevant depending on the situation.</p> <p>You could also amend the policy to state that “Proposals which either result in the loss of or affect existing trees or hedgerows should be accompanied by the relevant supporting surveys</p> <p><i>Dec 2019 Agreed to amend wording to above</i></p>
	Paragraph 8.70 – The sentence could be reworded to say “The core objective is to preserve the special architectural or historic significance of listed buildings, to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of	Clerk to amend. Amended 26.11.2019	

<p>the conservation area and preserve the significance of the Scheduled Monuments and other archaeological sites". This will ensure that the terminology is in-line with national legislation and guidance.</p>		
<p>Paragraph 8.74 - Rather than 'historic built environment' this should be 'historic environment' to include archaeological sites of national and local interest which exist in the parish.</p>	<p>Clerk to amend. Amended 26.11.2019</p>	
<p>Glossary of terms – We suggest the inclusion of a definition of a 'conservation area' – <i>“an area of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance”</i>.</p>	<p>Clerk to amend. Amended 26.11.2019</p>	
<p>You will have the opportunity to make changes to your Plan before you formally submit it to Bedford Borough Council under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended by the 2015 Regulations). If you wish to discuss any of the points raised or would like any further advice on any aspect of the Plan or its supporting documents, do not hesitate to contact the Council. In particular, government advice (in the National Planning Practice Guidance) is that local planning authorities should discuss the contents of any supporting documents, including the basic conditions statement, with the qualifying body before a draft neighbourhood plan is formally submitted so that the plan does not fall short of meeting one or more of the basic conditions. I would be grateful therefore if</p>	<p>Noted</p>	

	<p>you could forward me copies of relevant draft supporting documents in due course.</p>		
	<p>In order to ensure that the Council has sufficient resources available to progress the Neighbourhood Plan through its formal stages, it would be helpful to know your expected timetable for submission</p>	<p>Dates shared with BBC hopefully- Jan 2020</p>	
	<p>Policy 4.8 – there are a lot of other documents that support the development plan. Changing this into sentence to ‘Other documents that support the development plan</p>	<p>amended 26.11.2019</p>	