

**Oakley Neighbourhood Plan
Consultation Statement
Date: March 2019**

Contents

Introduction

Summary of Community Engagement

Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

Appendix A – List of Statutory and other Consultees

Appendix B - Consultation Comments Received and Response Made

Introduction

This Consultation Statement summarises the community engagement programme and the Regulation 14 consultation that were undertaken for the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan (Consultation Draft September 2018). It shows how the requirements of Regulations 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 have been satisfied.

The Consultation took place between 19th September and 31st October 2018.

The Oakley Neighbourhood Plan was formally signed-off by the Oakley Parish Council at their monthly meeting on 5th March 2019.

Summary of Community Engagement

The strategy for community engagement

Throughout the preparation of the plan we regularly consulted and engaged the community. Since the launch event in October 2014 we have:

1. Provided regular updates in the Oakley Village Newsletter which is published 4 times a year.
2. Launched a website in 2014 specifically for the neighbourhood plan.
3. Produced a newsletter questionnaire in March 2015.
4. Published an update in the 2015 and 2016 Oakley Directory.
5. Produced a more specific questionnaire in October 2015.
6. Gave an update at the 2016,2017 and 2018 Parish Council Annual Meetings.
7. Arrange for a Housing Needs Survey to be carried out in March 2016.
8. Completed a consultation exercise regarding the draft policies in January 2017.
9. Completed a further consultation exercise at the Village Hall in May 2018.
10. Completed the Statutory 6-week consultation (Reg14) in September/October 2018

The opinions and comments arising from community engagement exercises help form the bases on which this plan was written. Likewise, the policies are formed both on community engagement and based on a clear planning rationale, underpinned by relevant data/evidence.

What was done?

A survey of village residents was carried out to identify key areas of concern, particularly with reference to transport, housing and the preservation of the identity of Oakley as a rural community with green spaces for the enjoyment of all.

Residents were also consulted on their views on the landscape features that they considered to be important. This consultation took place in two ways:

1. Firstly, through a consultation event in the Village Hall, where residents were asked to identify either on a map or by writing on post-it stickers, the landscape features they considered to be important.
2. The main areas identified in the consultation event were incorporated into the landscape section of the village Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire, which was delivered to every household and was also available for residents to complete online.

The five landscape areas identified in the questionnaire were as follows:

1. The river, river bridges and river valleys that surround much of our village and the associated fields and meadows.
2. The views to and from the village over open countryside.

3. Wooded areas such as Browns Wood and Judges Spinney.
4. Open spaces separating Oakley from Clapham and other villages.
5. The open and rural feel of our village characterised by the hedge and tree lined principal roads – the open frontages in the centre of the village and the Village Green.

Respondents were asked to identify the level of importance they attached to each area and also to indicate areas not included in the list which they considered important. The results from the questionnaire showed that all five areas were important/very important to the residents of the village.

The findings from the Oakley LCA, coupled with the Bedford Borough LCA, clearly align with the views expressed through the village Neighbourhood Plan Questionnaire. Both indicate that the conservation and enhancement of the character of Oakley village and the surrounding area are key priorities for residents when considering future developments.

Having established the wishes and aspirations of the residents of Oakley the important decision on the location and size of individual housing developments was considered. Site surveys were undertaken and consideration was given to potential issues and advantages of each site. Once the proposed sites had been selected a consultation exercise was held in May 2018 focusing primarily on the development sites.

Who was targeted?

All residents in the Village, local businesses and key stake holders such service providers and adjacent parish councils.

Outcomes/Feedback

Feedback was provided on the outcomes of community engagement both in the Village News Letter and Village Website. The feedback was discussed at the regular Steering Group meetings and incorporated into the plan, as appropriate.

The main issues were around traffic both the speed and volume of traffic, safety due to the narrow roads and footways, school traffic in relation to parking at arrival and departure times, further development in the village.

Further development in the village was probably the greatest concern. There were many issues around this, increasing traffic volumes, on street parking, drainage and services being overstretched, loss of green spaces and joining up with other villages.

The allocation of development sites was very carefully considered. Along with many supporting comments, it was decided that development spread around the village was preferable to one large site and the sites selected were displayed at a consultation event at the Village Hall in May 2018.

Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

The consultation started by the publication of the dates for the 6-week consultation period and an article in the Village Newsletter explaining the process and how to comment back to the Parish Council. Feedback forms were also enclosed with the newsletter in readiness for the consultation. The Newsletter is delivered to every resident of the village giving it at circulation of approx. 1,000 copies.

All adjacent Parish Councils, LPAs, statutory bodies, non-statutory bodies, etc. were emailed with details of the consultation. See appendix A for details of all the organizations contacted.

Access to the draft plan was available at the village Post Office, Churches in the village and the local PH. Copies of the draft plan and feedback forms could also be downloaded from the Parish Council website, or on request, a paper copy sent in the post by the Parish Clerk.

Comments were accepted by email, in the post, or dropped into the village Post Office using the proforma or a letter. All the comments were recorded under one of three categories – Green Spaces, Development Sites and Policies. Where more than one response has raised an identical comment, the number of responses has been recorded against that particular comment. See appendix B for details of all comments received.

All the comments were carefully reviewed by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Parish Council. The main issues involved traffic volumes, vehicle speeding, infrastructure being able to cope, drainage, loss of arable land and the need for more housing development. The issues raised remained consistent with previous consultations. Appendix B gives details of the response by the Parish Council.

With respect to Green Spaces, nearly all responses supported all the spaces being proposed. There were two objections to one of the proposed spaces and this space was reviewed again against the criteria and the original decision was found to be sound.

On specific developments sites, loss of arable land, road safety, drainage, loss of privacy and potential infrastructure issues were raised. A number objected to one site in particular, site 171. For this proposed development site further discussions took place with the land agent in order to see if some of the issues could be addressed. See appendix B and conclusions section for details of the outcome.

Conclusions

The steering group took some months looking at all the issues to ensure that where we can they are covered in our plan. Our policies are designed to mitigate these issues, improve facilities and protect the environment in the interest of the whole village. To further support these policies, we have now produced site specific criteria, by clarifying how the policies relate to that site, to be used by planning officers and developers at the planning application stage.

The agent for the land owner of site 171 has been in contact with the steering group to discuss the ongoing issues, policies and site-specific criteria. They understand that their initial proposal of 20 dwellings may be ambitious and are prepared to look at reducing the site to 10 dwellings with a housing mix, including bungalows. A reduction of 10 units could potentially be covered by the additional 10 units being proposed at the Parrott's site in Lovell Road. The steering group believe that this offer will help in resolving some of the challenges this site may have and is a proposal they would welcome.

With regard to Green Spaces, there were two objections to one of the proposed spaces and this proposed Green Space was reviewed again against the criteria. It was concluded that the original decision to designate this space was sound so the space would remain in the plan.

The Parish Council and steering group aim is to protect and improve the village community and the landscape within which it sits for all residents. We will continue to aim for this whilst acknowledging that sometimes compromises have to be made.

Appendix A

Statutory and Other Consultees

Marine Management Organisation
The Environment Agency
English Heritage
Natural England
Network Rail
Office of Rail Regulation
Highways England
Bedford BC
Bromham Parish Council
Milton Ernest Parish Council
Clapham Parish Council
Pavenham Parish Council
Stevington Parish Council
Thurleigh Parish Council
Bedfordshire Police
Bedfordshire & Luton Fire Service
East of England Ambulance Service
BT
NHS England
Bedfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group
Health and Wellbeing Board
HealthWatch
British Gas
National Grid
EDF
Eon
SSE
Npower
Anglian Water
Beds & River Ivel I.D.B. (Bedford Group of Drainage Boards)
Homes England
Federation of Small Businesses
Bedford Breakfast Club
Bpha
Jephson
Bedford Garden Carers
Civil Aviation Authority
South-East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership
Englands Economic Heartland
Citizens Panel
Borough Councillor

MCAC

Members of Parliament/Members of European Parliament

Amenity, recreation and countryside groups

Bedford BC Sport Development

Golf Club

Environment and conservation groups

Bedford BC Environment Services

The Conservation Volunteers Bedford

Wildlife and biodiversity organisations

Priory Rangers - Browns Wood

Bedfordshire Wildlife Trust

RSPB

Allotment Association

Education

Sharnbrook Academy

Lincroft School

Oakley Primary

Oakley Pre-School

Clapham Children's Centre

Transport Groups

Villager Minibus

Landowners & Developers

DLP Planning

Mr. Brown, Westfield Lodge, 7SU

GC Planning Partnership

Robinson Hall

Mr. Ainsworth, Westfield Farm, 7SX

Optimis Consulting

David Russell

Fisher Garman

Faith Groups

Parish Church

Methodist church

R. C. Church

Hard-to-reach groups,

including those with protected characteristics

Lovell Homes

Day Centre

Village organisations

Beavers/Cubs/Scouts

Blunham Angling Club

Rainbows/Brownies

ATC

AFC Oakley

Oakley Toddlers

Youth Club

Youth Cricket

Badminton
Carpet Bowls
Pilgrims Cricket Club
Gardening Club
Oakley Motorcycle Club
Village organisations (Continued)
Old School
WI
ORA/OSSC
Bellringers
Oakley Archive
Village Hall

Businesses
Accoustic Guitar
Almond Garage Doors
Architectural Design
Ashley Builders
Barton Petroleum
Bays Media
Bedford Arms
Bedfordia Farms
College Farm
Dog Walking and Pet Care Services
DJR Tennis
Echoes Vintage Furniture
EMC Design
Forestry Fuels
Hazel Kaye
Saunders Agricultural Services
JAP Sound
Kitec Healthcare
Metrosigns
Mubsta Business Photography
NLW
No 3 Emporium
Oakley Angels
Oakley Building Services
Oakham Decorators
Oakley IT
Oakley Post Office
Oakley School of Motoring
Old Road Securities
PDB Consulting
Pet Paws Animal Services
PMG Carpentry
Power Academy of Dance
Sundorne Bouncy Castles

Jay Tovey Farriers
Tudor Rose
Tumblepups
VC Property Maintenance
Whites Lawn Mowers

Appendix B

Consultation Comments Received and Comments Made

2018 Final Consultation Comments Log – Green Spaces				
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Green Space	Comment	Response
Historic England			none	
Bedfordia	45	152	Does not consider that the proposed Local Green Space designation no. 7, site 152 - Oakley Academy Playing Field Station Road, meets the criteria for a Local Green Space allocation set out within National Planning Policy. Please refer to the letter submitted with these representations for further information.	It is believed that the playing field meets the criteria of NPPF Paragraph 100 by providing recreational value for both pupils of the academy and for other groups in the village, such as the Oakley Rangers. This land forms part of the Local Gap between Oakley and Clapham and is viewed as important/very important by 67% of respondents to the Village Questionnaire. It should also be noted that a grant was given to the school by the Parish Council (£106 following the development of The Furlong) on the basis that there would be public access to the site.
EMC Designs		All spaces	Agree	
Oakley AFC	45	152	Agree. However, we would want to be clear that particularly in relation to site 7 (New Field) that this agreement is specific to the need for playing field space to support both the school and local sports teams' requirements, as served by the New Field. Were there to be a suitable proposal brought forward that were to provide the same, or (ideally)	

			increased capacity, within the village by replacing this site, we would not want this agreement to be taken as precluding this.	
Clapham PC		All spaces	Agree. It was obvious to the NDP team that due care and attention had been made in preserving open green spaces and landscapes.	
Bedford BC			None	
Natural England			None	
Environment Agency			No longer able to provide bespoke advice but suggest consider document - Planning Advice Guidance.	
Hazel Kaye			The Council has nominated our green space for development so I disagree with their policy. Letter attached about wildlife.	See comments below on Local Green Spaces.

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Green Space	Comment	Response
Lincroft Academy	45	152	Unclear as to the rationale for Local Green Space designation no. 7 'Site No. 152 – Oakley Academy Playing Field, Station Road.' It is understood that the designations are intended to protect 'green spaces'. However, school sports pitches and playing fields are already protected from development by the Secretary of State for Education. The grounds also, are not a public asset nor in public use unless with the consent of the school, and this means they do not fit with the definition of a local green space in terms of their recreational value. Accordingly, we consider that it is neither necessary or appropriate in the above circumstances for Site No.	The field provides a feeling of space and rural environment to the area and is designated as part of the Local Gap between Oakley and Clapham in the Allocations and Designations Local Plan 2013, Urban Area Planning Review. Local green space designation is not precluded by sports field protection.

			152 to be designated a Local Green Space.	
Optimis – on behalf of Client			Agree	
Anglian Water			There are existing sewers in the ownership of Anglian Water within the boundaries of a number of the designated local green spaces (Sites 3, 4, 5 and 9). It is therefore suggested that the Neighbourhood Plan should be amended to include reference to the circumstances in which development would be permitted in the designated local green spaces included utility infrastructure provided by Anglian Water	The plan conforms to the Bedford Borough statements relating to Anglia Water
Resident		General	Disagree. Already going to build on green spaces, if any left. The Conservative leaflet says no building as well. Has Henry Burt been lobbied for his take? At 3.30 I have just seen the traffic chaos outside Lincroft School without another load of houses opposite.	The plan needs to nominate developments sites. Careful consideration was given before sites were selected. Also, see comments below about Local Green Spaces.
Resident		General	Disagree.	
Residents x 69	49	Land at Site 171	Disagree. Pastoral grazing land with established ecology are important to the village and should be protected green spaces	A number of sites were considered as to whether they fully met the definition of a local green space. The result was that 10 sites were selected, an increase of 5 additional sites above the original recommendation of the Borough Council.
Resident		Land at site 170	Agree - partly. Don't accept that so many houses are being put at top of field at Station Road.	Potentially the maximum number is 30 but is subject to planning approval.
Resident x 64		All spaces	Agree	

2018 Final Consultation Comments Log – Development Sites				
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Historic England	47-49	All sites	Recommends taking a proactive approach to the design, layout etc for those sites. In particular, development on these locations should sustain and where possible enhance the significance of heritage assets and make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness. The general policies will be a useful aid to this process, but you may wish to explore the potential to develop site specific development briefs for those sites identified, to ensure that the development on them meets your aspirations. See website for guidance. For further advice regarding the historic environment and how to integrate it into your neighbourhood plan, we recommend that you consult your local planning authority conservation officer, and if appropriate the Historic Environment Record at Bedford Borough Council.	Key historic are assessments are referred to in the plan.
Bedfordia	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree in principle to the allocation at Station Road but consider the Neighbourhood Plan does not consider the full opportunities from this site in accordance with the proposals put forward in collaboration with the SAF for Lincroft Academy. Please refer to the letter submitted with these representations for further information.	This possible site allocation was previously considered. The sports field has community value and creates a separation.
EMC Designs	48 - 49	Site 170 Site 171	In part agree with the proposal for houses off Station Road. However, do not agree with the 20 opposite the Bedford Arms. As someone who uses	The initial consultation the majority residents felt that 20-50 new dwellings during the

			the high street every day for both commuting (I live locally) as well as visiting family on the street, choosing the narrowest entrance way and section of the road to facilitate 20 dwellings and all their vehicles seems like a crazy place. The High Street has been identified already as being a very narrow road and the road could not be widened much at this junction due to the pub literally hanging over the road already. The plan rightly identified that whole area as a site of historical importance and the Duke of Bedford Cottages that line the road would lose a lot of their rural heritage if a new housing development was put here.	10year period would be appropriate. Bedford Borough Council allocated 25-50 dwellings to Oakley in their Local Plan to 2030. Site 170 has been considered and allocated and helps meet the growth requirements. Site 171 traffic will be assessed as part of a planning application. Planning applications need to conform to the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.
AFC Oakley	47-49	All sites	Agree	
Clapham PC	47-49	All sites	Agree	
Natural England	47 - 49	All sites	No comment	
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Bedford BC	47 - 49	All sites	You should ensure that the relevant supporting documents are available on your website. In particular these should include: A consultation statement A statement setting out how the Plan meets the basic conditions i.e. it: has regard to relevant national policies and advice issued by the Secretary of State contributes to the achievement of sustainable development is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan is compatible with EU obligations is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats	SEA report has been considered Habitat Regulations Assessment has been considered and their suggestions have been incorporated Timetable given to the Borough Council

			<p>and Species Regulations 2010) A report prepared in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 or a determination that an environmental assessment is not required. You should include site specific policies for each development site being allocated. These should set out the requirements that any future planning applications should comply with. Offers to discuss the NDP and supporting documents and requests expected timetable for submission.</p>	
Lincroft Academy	47 48 - 49	Site 152 Site 170 & 521	<p>Considers the two allocations as proposed will not resolve the existing challenges for the school. Feel they must express their disappointment with regard to some aspects of the draft Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in terms of its relationship with the Academy, with regard to Site No. 152 – Oakley Academy Playing Field, Station Road, and Site 170 & 521 – Station Road. You will appreciate the aspirations that the Academy has previously set out for the reorganisation of the land parcels on the eastern side of Station Road working with the landowner for Site 170 & 152 for the enhancement of the school and its playing field provision as well as wider benefits for the village and community. We feel the draft Neighbourhood Plan has not listened to the concerns expressed by the school and the majority of the parental body and the approach it</p>	<p>In Oakley’s the initial consultation the majority of the residents felt between 20-50 houses would be appropriate over the 10year period. The Housing Need Assessment was undertaken by BRCC and it gives details of the types of houses and around 40 dwellings over the 10year period of the plan. The Borough Local Plan has allocated of between 25-50 houses in Oakley. The assessments showed that the number of houses far exceeded the both the allocation of houses in the Borough Local Plan</p> <p>Possible site allocation previously</p>

			advocates represents a missed opportunity in not recognising these enhancements. It is fully recognised that the school's operation has raised and continues to raise a number of	considered and all the constraints were considered before making the decision.
--	--	--	---	--

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
			<p>issues particularly in terms of access/transportation and parking and the disturbance this causes. Also, the nature of the school campus layout and the separation of the main part of the school from the sports/recreation area causes a number of issues for the delivery of the school curriculum and also gives rise to potential safety issues. In effect the strategy advocated by the Neighbourhood Plan would seriously inhibit the school's ability to address these issues. As the Parish Council is aware the aspiration for the Academy is for a self-contained campus for both Oakley Primary Academy and Lincroft Academy. This will allow for the further development of both schools and would overcome the above issues. This would include the addition of dedicated parking provision and circulation space on site as well as the creation of a new main access and driveway. The Academy considers that the proposals previously presented to the Parish Council provided an optimum opportunity to address all of the above matters, and also to bring into effect a series of traffic calming measures that include the closing off of Station Road</p>	<p>Possible site allocation previously considered. The Sports Field has community value and creates a separation.</p>

			<p>as it currently is and its diversion onto a new access/distributor road. Traffic problems along Station Road are an ongoing issue and the plans previously presented to the Parish Council probably provide a once in a generation opportunity to address these. The reference to Site No. 152 on page 45 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan incorrectly references that the Academy Playing field is opposite the school. It is separated by some distance from our main site and for reasons already outlined and as previously established gives rise to both operational and safety issues.</p> <p>The proposals presented by the school and the land owners would achieve both the positioning of the playing fields opposite the school and the creation of a singular campus such that a range of school activities can be self-contained, and expansion accommodated. This would also benefit local residents and the community at large. The proposals would also allow for a significant upgrading of the existing facilities and would provide for the creation of a range of sports facilities to fully meet and enhance the requirements of both the school and the many community sports clubs that would use them.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
			This would consolidate the breadth of sports/recreation available to students, but also the capacity of the facilities to the benefit of students and	

			<p>their health and well-being. Community use of the existing sports provision is good with the Football Federation recognising the potential of the site to provide first class facilities for local football clubs including the club within Oakley.</p> <p>In this regard the draft Neighbourhood Plan proposals would appear to be short-sighted, with the current strategy, if followed through, removing any opportunity to positively address the issues currently faced by the School and the community.</p>	
Hazel Kaye	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>Disagree. There will be danger to drivers and pedestrians at the proposed point of entry. Also there will be disruption to the High Street with the increase in traffic; it is already too congested. Therefore, I strongly disagree to the proposal to develop site 171. Finally the field is too small to put 20 houses on it. Letter attached on traffic and safety.</p>	<p>Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory Document. Site reduced to 10 dwellings</p>
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>Disagree. I would like to object to the development of 20 houses opposite the Bedford Arms for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A development of this scale would have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of local residents, by reason of (among other factors) noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc. • Development would be of considerable loss to the local ecology, which both benefits and adds to the green village atmosphere to the village of Oakley. • The visual impact of the 	<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment was undertaken and any comments incorporated into the plan. Natural England no comment Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a Statutory document.</p>

			<p>development would have a detrimental effect on the more scenic area of the village and significantly alter the character of the neighbourhood</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners • The development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users. The entrance point to the site is already a natural pinch point for traffic due to the narrow carriage way. There is also no possible provision for a foot path on the public house side of the road, putting pedestrians at risk. 	The site number has been reduced to 10 dwellings.
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Anglian Water	47 - 49	All sites	Consideration should be given to including a specific policy or policies for these sites which outline criteria relating to Anglian Water's existing water and water recycling infrastructure in the plan to be submitted to Bedford Borough Council. As the Development Plan is intended to be read as a whole any additional text should be considered in the context of the adopted and emerging Bedford Local Plan.	Anglian Water existing water and water recycling infrastructure will be considered in the context of the adopted and emerging Borough Local Plan
Optimis on behalf of client	47	Site 166	Disagree. Conclusion - site 166 is in residential use and compatible to the historic residential uses and pattern of development along the High Street. The verdant tree boundary to the north-west sets a permanent and defensible boundary to the village and contains this site which is not visible from the countryside beyond. the site	All these issues were carefully considered when assessing the sites for development.

			has suitable access, reinforced by a highway's expert, and is capable of serving the development to meet BBC highway standards. We have concerns relating to the assessment of sites undertaken by Urban Vision and have set out our response to these points. Earlier consultation with the public identified this site as the most favourable location. This public opinion has not been respected or included within the latest draft of the ONP.	
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. Station Road is already a daily nightmare for traffic due to the proximity of the school and several businesses. Any housing works carried out here would be potentially disastrous for existing residents.	Traffic will be assessed as part of a planning application. Planning Applications need to conform to the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. No strong disagreement but would suggest that allowing development of up to 50 homes on the one site on Station Road would limit the inevitable disruption caused by building traffic and other activity to one part of the village rather than two. Also the Station Road site lends itself to development but limited by the railway and Station Road but there will be inevitable pressure to extend this site at some stage in the future so why not do it now?	Extension of the site. There are policies in the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan to show this is a "local gap" and anti-coalescence policies that ensure that settlements do not become one.
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. Station Road site is too close to existing housing and too many squeezed into top corner of a huge field.	The site will need to conform to the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan Policies that detail open space and appropriate landscaping that

				keeps the open space and green character of the village
--	--	--	--	---

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>I have previously submitted a response to the Committee saying that although I was not happy with the proposed site 171, I understood the need for Oakley to accept the Borough Council's specified number of houses, and sites had to be found. However, after further consideration I have now concluded for the reasons below, that site 171 is inappropriate.</p> <p>I have now been involved with Speedwatch for a few months and I am frankly staggered by the amount of traffic through Oakley already. Clearly we have to control the speed of the existing traffic from current housing but equally we have to be very careful where we place new housing to avoid creating new danger spots or increasing the danger at places where the risks are already high. I now consider the road near the Bedford Arms and the junction of the High Street and Church Lane to be such a spot. My reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exiting traffic from site 171 will have a limited view of vehicles arriving from Church Lane and only a short period in which to react and then only a narrow road to exit onto. 2. Buses already have difficulty in making the turn from the High Street into Church Lane and cannot do so if there is any traffic coming up from Church Lane. They are forced 	<p>Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. The planning application will need to conform to the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.</p> <p>The number of dwellings on the site have been reduced to 10.</p>

			<p>to wait and cause holdups for traffic behind. Any traffic from new housing on site 171 will experience this problem regularly.</p> <p>3. There is a bus stop near the Bedford Arms gardens which again would limit the view of exiting cars from new housing on site 171 and difficult though it is to believe, many drivers coming down the High Street overtake standing buses despite the fact they have no view of traffic approaching from Church Lane. Again increasing the risk to exiting vehicles from site 171.</p> <p>4. I have previously made representations to the Parish Council on speeding vehicles entering Westfield Road from both the High Street and Church Lane and the difficulty we and my immediate elderly neighbours have on exiting our drive especially on foot when my young grandchildren are with us. The problem has been exacerbated in the last few years by the increase in “white van men” making deliveries. As well as the narrowness of the road near the Bedford Arms and the junction, vehicles use the small island at the end of</p>	
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
			Westfield Road to do U-turns. New housing nearby will lead to an increase in vehicles and inevitably to more deliveries who will find a need to use this “facility”.	
			Conclusion. I have heard the reasons why the NDC proposed limiting the number of new homes on site 170 and utilising the land at site 170. However, I think in this world	Traffic issues were considered very seriously.

			<p>of difficult choices that sometimes the least worst option has to be selected. In my opinion, increasing the number of homes at site 170 to the fifty required by the Borough Council's directive would at least put traffic onto a wider road with easier access to exits from the village and shorter routes into the Oakley to this new housing for "white van men" doing deliveries. Due to its situation there is also more opportunity to make changes to the road, its borders and layout to reduce the risks than there would be near the narrow road from the High Street exit from site 171. I repeat, putting the required fifty houses all on site 170 is not the ideal solution but probably the least worst.</p>	
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	<p>Firstly, may I state that I fully support the need to provide more housing in the village, however, there are serious road safety concerns with the proposed site as follows:-</p> <p>1) The road outside the building of the Bedford Arms is extremely narrow. There is a lot of traffic through the village during weekdays, and this road is on a main bus route. Currently, all buses and especially double decker buses have to manoeuvre into the middle of the road, as it is just not wide enough to accommodate them – especially when pedestrians are walking on the road due to the lack of a footpath. You can imagine the dangerous conditions this creates for both road users as well as pedestrians. The road quickly becomes backed up, and it's</p>	<p>The Borough Council planning department assessed all the sites and this site was considered acceptable.</p> <p>Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform to the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.</p>

			<p>cumbersome and difficult to pass, causing difficulties all along the High Street. Personally speaking, even now, I have to take action to avoid colliding with large vehicles such as tractors, lorries and the aforementioned buses by pulling into the proposed access road for the new site for oncoming vehicles travelling south.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
			<p>2) There is already a serious safety hazard for pedestrians on the main road near the proposed access road as there is no footpath on the side of the Bedford Arms Public House.</p> <p>3) In addition, taking into consideration the narrowness of the road, may I ask how you propose to resolve the question of coming from the direction of The Post Office and then turning right on the High Street into the new access road? It wouldn't be possible to do this without backing up traffic along the High Street – once again, adding to an already hazardous and dangerous traffic situation. The road is simply not wide enough for the village's current traffic requirements.</p> <p>4) I would respectfully suggest that the proposed access road is far too near to the bend. It would be very difficult to join the main road from the Access Road, particularly to turn right towards the bend.</p> <p>5) Heavy traffic congestion on this narrow road already</p>	<p>Both sites have problems of Traffic and drainage issues. Traffic and drainage issues will be addressed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document. Traffic will be addressed with the highway standards and drainage with the Borough SUDS policy which includes drainage.</p>

			exists, therefore the addition of 20 houses would certainly contribute to worsening traffic conditions, and again, would lead to serious safety fears. 6) Lastly, whilst I appreciate that this may not be your department, there is currently also a drainage problem with the field, and I would be interested in obtaining information as to how this will be resolved also. The other proposed site of Station Road would seem to be a much safer option, and indeed a more suitable site generally in terms of safety.	
Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. Can't see the need for 50 houses. 20 - 30 would be plenty.	
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree. Think there should be fewer houses on plot 171 to minimise traffic and environmental impact. Maybe only 10 houses.	This site has been reduced to 10 dwellings
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Agree. Prime agricultural land. Congestion on Station Road if houses built on Station Road.	All the surrounding land is prime agricultural land.
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Agree. Traffic on Station Road if these houses built. School times great congestion.	Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Agree. Concerned about traffic on Station Road particularly during school times. Huge congestion. Parking on Station Road, Lincroft, Reynes Drive when school on.	Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform to the Borough Local Plan

				and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree. But plot 171 should be restricted to 10 houses to minimise the impact of traffic at a potential dangerous junction & minimise the environmental impact.	This site has been reduced to 10 dwellings
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Agree. Only concern is access on High Street.	This will be assessed as part of the planning application
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. Bedford Arms not suitable on a bend/High Street. What are we doing about new houses on Church Lane/Lovell Road? Do they count to the 50?	The detail will be assessed as part of the planning application. The Borough Council when assessing all the sites decided that this site could be developed.
Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. All the council want to do is put max houses in village in any spare space.	The Housing need consultation conducted by the BRCC showed a need for future housing. It is supporting document to the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan
Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. Insufficient infrastructure.	
Resident	48 – 49 48 - 49	Site 171 Site 170	Disagree. Bedford Arms site most unsuitable and potentially dangerous. Station Road not ideal.	Both sites were agreed by the borough council as being possible development sites. The planning application will need to conform to the Borough Local Plan and Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. To develop near the Bedford Arms will lead to road accidents.	As above.
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. The 20 houses proposed will lead to road	Site is reduced to 10 dwellings

			accidents & congestion. Poor decision not thought through.	
Tenant of site 171	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. Station Road will soon be full of houses in the future, so why not put all 50 houses there then all new infrastructure can be concentrated to support the 50. Station Road will eventually be full for the complete length with houses apart from a school playing field and hopefully the infrastructure will be put in place to support this density of houses. Therefore, why put the 20 houses opposite the Bedford Arms with an entrance & exit in the narrowest part of any road in the village and also have to duplicate infrastructure and utilities just for 20 houses.	The initial consultation of the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan residents felt that between 20-50 houses should be developed over the 10-year plan. The Borough Local Plan and the Housing need Consultation undertaken by BRCC showed a need for between 25-50 houses. Both the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document state that this land is a "local gap" and coalescence policies state that it should not be developed.
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Resident	48 - 49	Site 170	Disagree. We should not allow building on green spaces. Once built on it is gone forever. The building in the field opposite the school is crazy. So many people walk their dogs around there and the plants and animals are beautiful. Destroyed forever.	The site is an agricultural field and is subject to a "local gap" and coalescence policies of the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley neighbourhood plan when it is a statutory document.
Resident	48 - 49	Site 171	Disagree. The housing should all go in Station Road as the field opposite the Bedford Arms has limited access and housing will change the character of this part of the village as all the trees opposite the pub will need to be felled. The site in Station Road can accommodate the entire 5 houses so it seems pointless to	All the comments will be assessed against the Borough Local Plan and Oakley Neighbourhood Plan policies when a planning application is forwarded to the planning authority.

			allow creeping urbanisation in two areas if it can be contained in one. It is also likely that if the 30 houses are allocated now that in the future more houses will be allocated to the Station Road site. Three species of bat are known to use the field opposite the pub for feeding. These are Soprano Pipistrelle, Long-eared and Noctule. It is also used for feeding and foraging by Great Crested Newts. All these species have some protection and would be adversely affected by development.	
Resident	47 - 49	All sites	Disagree. The Neighbourhood Plan questionnaire (November 2015) defined the scale of future development on the edge of the village as being: small sites (less than 10 homes), medium sites (10 – 20 homes) and larger sites (more than 20 homes).	This has been revised to conform to the sites that the Borough assessed as possible development sites.
Residents x 48	47 - 49	All sites	Agree	
Residents x 69	48 - 49	Site 171	Strongly disagree to the proposal for site 171. Please see the attached letter. Letter expresses concerns about safety of road users, increased traffic congestion, damage to the ecology, impact on drainage & soil and loss of privacy/amenity/quality of life for neighbours.	Traffic will be considered as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document.

2018 Final Consultation Comments Log - Policies				
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Historic England	33	DH 1	Pleased to note the inclusion of robust policy (DH1) to achieve positive design including for the public realm, whilst retaining and enhancing local distinctiveness	Agreed
Historic England	34	DH 2	Notes this section refers to "Grade 1 and Grade 11" buildings and recommend that this is altered to "Grade II" to reflect the way in which the grades are written in national policy and to avoid "Grade Eleven" buildings, for example. We would also suggest that the requirements for policy DH2 could be backed up by the production of an Historic Area Assessment that includes characterisation analysis incorporating a discussion around local materials and form. This can then be included as an appendix to your plan, and referenced in your policy	Modification agreed An historic area assessment could be included in the evidence documents and be referred to in the neighbourhood plan. It is not good practice technical reports in the neighbourhood plan itself. This makes for an over-thick and complex plan. Key historic area assessments are referred to in the plan.
Historic England		Assets of Community Value	Suggests that NDP could also incorporate the designation of Assets of Community Value as well. This can include local community assets such as public houses, libraries, and others. This can help protect them from being lost to redevelopment or - from the point of view of the community - undesirable adaptation. More information on this process and its benefits	Designations of assets of community value is done under non-planning legislation. If assets of community value are included, it must be in a non-statutory part of the NP. Community assets are already incorporated in the discussion part of the neighbourhood plan.

			can be found on the Locality website. They note the inclusion of a map and a list of 'Village Assets', some of which appear from their descriptions to be good candidates for this process. They suggest also that some - for example the War Memorial, if it is not already designated - could be included on a list of 'Village Heritage Assets' that are assessed against a set of suitable criteria and then afforded the same protection as non-designated heritage assets are given in Policy DH3. See Historic England website for guidance.	
Bedfordia	22	BE 1	Supports the recognition of the importance of local businesses and employment in the village of Oakley but considers the policy should see a minor revision to recognise the opportunity for sensitive expansion of Highfield Park. Please refer to the letter submitted with these representations for further information.	This site is outside the settlement area and should not be extended.
EMC Designs		All Policies	Strongly agrees which is why I believe the site opposite the Bedford Arms goes against everything you have taken great pains to consult over and plan for.	Agreed with the policies. Site 170 has been considered and allocated. It helps meet the growth requirement.
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Oakley AFC		All Policies	Agree	Agree
Clapham PC		All Policies	Agree. The principles of good practice in providing a plan have been	Agree

			completed and the Oakley plan is based on a methodical approach by the people of Oakley to support actively sustainable development. It identifies the future needs for Oakley, to ensure that the plan supports the growth of the village in a way that protects the landscape around Oakley village, and ensures key services and infrastructure are not overstretched.	
Bedford BC		Policies - general	The Neighbourhood Plan includes a number of maps that illustrate how and where specific policies apply. It would be helpful if these could be combined to produce a single Policies Map.	Keep the maps that illustrate how and where specific policies apply
Bedford BC	20	HG 2	The reference to “evidence of local housing need” pre-supposes that an objective assessment of local need is being kept up-to-date, against which the developer’s justification can be judged. Who will be responsible for this? The text reference to space standards should be included in the policy (and reference made to your supporting evidence) that justifies use of this standard.	The developer will be responsible. This is a national standard.
Bedford BC	22	BE 1	A map would be useful to show the extent of the business parks.	Agreed a map to be added
Bedford BC	22	BE 2	You should define what is meant by “the existing centre of Oakley” so that the Council will know how to apply the policy.	Changed to show the centre of Oakley by a boundary

Bedford BC	24	BE 4	<p>As written, the policy sets a very high bar which may not be achievable in all situations. The word “must” should be changed to “should wherever reasonably possible”. The requirement to “not impact negatively on the functionality of the existing telecommunications infrastructure” is unlikely to be capable of assessment by the Council. Further explanation is needed or it should be deleted. The supporting text refers to a requirement for a “connectivity statement” to be submitted with planning applications. This would require an amendment to the Council’s Local Validation List for Planning Applications. I am not aware that you have reached any agreement with the Council that such a change can be made and until that has been agreed the requirement in the Neighbourhood Plan could not be enforced.</p>	<p>The wording to BE4 changed.</p> <p>Telecommunications infrastructure deleted.</p> <p>There is no reason why a new development should not incorporate high speed connectivity within sites as this is within the control of the developer. This makes all developments ready for higher speed services, when the wider infrastructure is provided.</p> <p>It is for the LPA to decide whether it amends its local validation list. This to be discussed with the LPA</p>
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Bedford BC	28	LE 1	<p>The policy heading refers to “Sensitive Landscapes” although the policy and supporting map refers to “significant landscape areas”. A consistent term should be used to make the policy clear. The policy refers to the supporting map for the</p>	<p>Heading changed Map replaced with an annotated one</p> <p>Local gap is a saved policy in the Borough Local plan 2030’ Significant landscapes detailed in the Bedford Borough Ouse Valley</p>

			<p>boundaries of “significant landscape areas”, however it is not clear from the map which these are (the map includes a number of colour shaded areas, none of which is defined in a legend).</p> <p>The supporting map shows “Local Gap” and “Important Landscape Views”, however these are not defined in the text or referred to in the policy. The policy refers to “the setting of significant landscape area” without defining what is meant. This could be difficult to interpret when considering planning applications.</p>	Landscape Characteristic document
Bedford BC	30	LE 3	<p>The supporting map suggests that you intend the policy to apply to surrounding parishes. However, the policies in your Neighbourhood Plan cannot apply outside of your Neighbourhood Area. The supporting map should therefore be changed.</p>	Map modified to show that it they do not apply outside the neighbourhood area
Bedford BC	35	DH 2	<p>The requirement to use “authentic” materials is unlikely to be considered reasonable except for listed buildings or in conservation areas. It is also not entirely clear what it means and therefore the term should be deleted.</p>	Text changed to durable. The authentic materials made to specific locations. e.g. Duke of Bedford cottages.
Natural England		All Policies	<p>No comment but refer NDP Group to document Neighbourhood Planning and the Natural Environment: information, issues and opportunities</p>	Habitat Assessment been undertaken.

Environment Agency		All Policies	No longer able to provide bespoke advice but suggest consider document - Planning Advice Guidance.	SEA considered.
Lincroft Academy	29	LE2	Has no specific comments to make. Comments on Policy ONP LE2: Local Green Space are considered specifically against the third question on green space detailed further below with particular reference to the school's sports pitch and playing field provision at the southern end of Station Road.	Possible site allocation previously considered. Sports field has community value and creates separation.
Oakley Business	19	HG1	The development of site 171 does not protect the rural nature of the village surrounding the area. It will cause traffic and transport issues.	Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it becomes a statutory document.

Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Policy	Comment	Response
Optimis on behalf of client	19	HG1	Disagree. Conclusion - the purpose of this representation is to strengthen the Oakley NDP prior to its adoption. The site which is the subject of this representation has been favourably assessed by Bedford BC. A Highways consultant has confirmed the suitability of access in response to comments raised in both the Site Assessments 2017 and the ONP. The proposed development is flexible in terms of the number, design, positioning and	The emerging local plan is not strategic local policy, in terms of meeting the basic conditions. However, the evidence behind the local plan may be part of the evidence base for the NP. It is reasonable to focus growth primarily in the settlement boundary, but allow infill elsewhere. The allocated sites cater for growth. Delete the First paragraph/sentence. The next paragraph amended to read:

			<p>size of dwellings so that it can be developed to accord with policies and aspirations set out in the plan. We are of the opinion that ONP HG1 is too restrictive in its wording to allow for appropriate development outside of the allocated development sites. We would also note that ONP HG1 does not comply with BBC policy 3S and as a result can be considered that in its current form the ONP is not in conformity with the development plan and is "unsound."</p>	<p>Housing Development will be supported where it involves development of allocated sites or sites within the Settlement Boundary and where it does not encroach into the rural area outside of the settlement Boundary.</p> <p>The first sentence of the policy is confusing- it is a statement of purpose rather than policy. The policy does not make explicit provision for the development of allocated sites. The policy does not make provision for allocated sites. Interpretation to be changed.</p>
Resident	15 - 20	Housing Policies	<p>Oakley together with other small villages, should be producing a plan to show both local and national government bodies that urban housing through the conversion and use of existing structures and sites is a far better use of land which would result in less damage to countryside, devalue fewer rural properties and prevent the need for inconvenience and disruption that comes with building new properties. The plans submitted for Oakley are short-sighted, policy pleasing and in my opinion disgraceful.</p>	<p>Disagree as the National Government Policies encourage housing in settlement areas based on local need.</p>
Resident	39	TR1/DH1	<p>We agree with building of new houses but parking on Station Road</p>	<p>Traffic will be assessed as part of the planning application. Planning</p>

			and in Lincroft is a major issue which needs to be addressed. Parking in Lincroft is making it dangerous for traffic as people are parking on bends and across narrow driveways. This will only become worse.	applications need to conform with the Borough Local Plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a statutory document
Resident	34 39	DH1 TR1	There is no reason why mediocre 1950s design should be perpetuated. There should be a one way traffic flow in Station Road & High Street	The Oakley Neighbourhood Plan does not seek to keep to 1950s design. This has been looked at previously and not supported.
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
Resident	39	TR1	Agree other than where business causes consequent indiscriminate parking including on pavement. Hazel Kaye.	Agreed Local businesses and Oakley Parish Council try to mitigate this.
Resident	39	TR1	20 house site is bad because roads will be affected.	Noted and will be addressed at the planning stage using Borough Local Plan and Oakley Neighbourhood Plan polices when it is statutory.
Resident	39	TR1	How can causing a dangerous road situation comply. The Beds Arms is a listed building & has already been hit by traffic.	See above
Resident	39	TR1	What village? With all the building the "village" is finished. Already a lot of houses being built in Parrott's Yard. Traffic and transport will be a joy. Hundreds of extra traffic movements every day. The road under the railway bridge will be more fun than it is now.	The NPPF states that development should be considered and housing need of each settlement

Resident	19	HG1	<p>According to the Neighbourhood Plan policies (January 2017) the consultation evidence showed that there was a clear preference for development on small sites of less than 10 homes. However, the development policy then changed the site definitions to: small developments (less than 20 dwellings), medium developments (20 – 40 dwellings). It also stated that development should prioritise brownfield sites first. Neither of the allocated sites are small sites of less than 10 homes and both are on agricultural land. Furthermore, if the Neighbourhood Plan acknowledges that part of the agricultural land off Station Road is suitable for residential development of 30 dwellings, it will be difficult for the local planning authority to resist the Bedfordia Group's proposals for development of the whole of the land east of Station Road and that company has every incentive and sufficient financial resources to take a full planning application for that scheme through all the necessary appeal processes.</p>	<p>This has been considered by the Neighbourhood Plan Group and the Oakley Parish Council. There is a lack of Brownfield sites in Oakley.</p> <p>Land surrounding Oakley is listed agricultural Land.</p> <p>Any future development on unallocated land will be resisted and subject to Borough Local plan and the Oakley Neighbourhood Plan when it is a Statutory document.</p>
Resident		All policies	I agree but do the money men?	
Residents x 69	35	DH2/TR1	Development of site 171 does not protect	Impact on the setting of the listed building can

			the rural nature of the village and will cause traffic and transport issues.	be positive as well as negative. They were very carefully considered by the NP group and will be considered as part of the planning application. Archaeological interest will be conditioned as part of the planning application if necessary. Oakley is not in the mineral plan.
Organisation/ Resident	Page Number	Development Site	Comment	Response
				All land surrounding Oakley is Grade 1 or 2 Agricultural land. Coalescence and a defensible barrier were considered carefully. Site to remain but reduced to 10.
Resident x 49		All Policies	Agree	Agree