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# Introduction

This Consultation Statement accompanies the submission of the Biggleswade Neighbourhood Plan. It summarises the community consultation programme and the Regulation 14 consultation that were undertaken. It shows how the requirements of Regulations 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) have been satisfied.

# Summary of Community Consultation

Biggleswade Town Council (BTC) have consulted the local community extensively throughout the process to understand the views of the local community. There have been three public consultations which were extensively publicised, and questionnaires were available at each consultation to gather local community views. The publicity covered both social media, newspaper and radio, and posters, leaflets and banners were placed at numerous locations in Biggleswade. The feedback received to the first two public consultations helped shape the Biggleswade Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 document. The comments received at the Regulation 14 Consultation were individually considered and modifications were made to the plan as detailed in pages 17-43.

Relevant stakeholders have been consulted including developers and landowners. Biggleswade Town Council have also worked closely with officers at Central Bedfordshire Council on the maps included within the Neighbourhood Plan.

## 2.1 List of engagement activities undertaken:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Details** |
| 25/02/2019 | An invitation was sent to all Town Centre retailers and the Chamber of Trade for a consultation meeting on 5/3/19. The invitation explained that Biggleswade Town Council were putting together a Neighbourhood Plan and that the Town Council wished to hear their issues, suggestions and ideas. |
| 05/03/2019 | The meeting with retailers and Chamber of Trade was held to discuss Neighbourhood Planning and other topics of interest were raised by the attendees. This was a public meeting and was publicised on our website and noticeboards. |
| **First Public Engagement March 2019 – List of engagement activities undertaken:** | |
| **Date** | **Details** |
| 13/02/2019 | A4 & A5 leaflets to Town Centre shops delivered to the following shops: Sheldon Electricals A4 & A5, Gunn's Bakery A4 & A5, Spectra Carpets A4, Pictures of Lily A4, Red Kite A4 & A5, Greggs Bakery A4, The Crown A4 x 2, Nationwide Building Society A4, Halifax Building Society A4 & A5, Tracey Jane A4, Surfin Café A4 & A5, Subway A4, Job Centre Plus A4 & A5, Silverbox Jewellery A4, Stratton House Hotel A4 & A5, The Rose PH A4, Sweet Alley A4 & A5, Coffeelicious A4 & A5, Quince Stone Masons A4 & A5, On the Wire A4 & A5. |
| 06/03/2019 | Posters put up on all Town Council noticeboards |
| 06/03/2019 | Details displayed on social media (Biggleswade Town Council Facebook & Twitter, We Love Biggleswade Facebook Page) as well as Biggleswade Town Council Website. |
| 06/03/2019 | Banners placed at Dan Albone & the Town Centre. |
| 06/03/2019 | Public Consultation Event Posters displayed in Sainsbury's, Asda and the Library. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Details** |
| 12/03/2019 | Public Consultation Events & Surveys Information e-mail was sent to the following organisations: Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity & Biggleswade Good Neighbours, Bedfordshire Fire & Rescue Service , Café Connect - Community Action Bedfordshire, Bedfordshire Police, Central Bedfordshire Council, Biggleswade Community Safety Group, Central Bedfordshire Council, Carers in Bedfordshire, Central Bedfordshire Council - Social Care, Health & Housing, Healthwatch Central Bedfordshire, Biggleswade Churches Together, Biggleswade Library, Mayflower Club, To all Remembrance Service Contacts, all Biggleswade schools. |
| 14/03/2019 | 15 paper copies of the Public Surveys distributed at the Biggleswade library with free post envelopes. |
| 14/03/2019 | Paper copies of the Public Surveys distributed at Parklands Place (older persons accommodation). |
| 14/03/2019 | Neighbourhood Plan Flyers handed out in the town centre. |
| 15/03/2019 | Poster handed into the Ivel Medical Centre. |
| 15/03/2019 | Email sent to all of NCS' (National Citizen Service) contacts and younger age groups. |
| 20/03/2019 | Email sent to Biggleswade Baptist Church on the Public Consultation Events & Surveys Information. |
| 21/03/2019 | 20 additional paper copies and free post envelopes handed into the library. |
| 20/3/2019 & 21/03/2019 | ‘Your Views Matter' Public Consultation Events were held on 20th and 21stMarch 2019, from 7pm onwards on both days, with one evening at the Town Council Offices and one at the Orchard Centre. Attended by the Neighbourhood Plan Group and the Town Clerk and Deputy Town Clerk. Display boards were used to detail the five different topics of the plan. Hard copies of the questionnaire were available and laptops were set up to encourage members of the public to complete the survey at the event. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date** | **Details** |
| 23/08/2019 | Neighbourhood Planning Workshop invitation - Email sent to all who registered an interest in helping to develop the Neighbourhood Plan when completing the Public Survey (76 people). |
| 10/09/2019 | Neighbourhood Planning Workshop Preparation - Created summary of those who registered an interest in helping to develop the Neighbourhood Plan, their details and their main concerns. This work was carried out in order to address these concerns during the Workshop and through the presentation. |
| 18/09/2019 | Neighbourhood Planning Workshop - the workshop provided an update on where we were with developing the Neighbourhood Plan. Cllr. Russell, Chairman of the Neighbourhood Plan Strategy Group gave a presentation with questions and answers. One of the attendees of the workshop later attended the Neighbourhood Plan group meetings. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Green Infrastructure Engagement** | | | |
| **Date** | | **Details** | |
|  | | The Neighbourhood Plan Group worked with Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity to update the Biggleswade Green Infrastructure Plan, which was first produced in 2010. This work also included identification of Local Green Spaces for possible inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. | |
| 28/01/2020 | | Green Infrastructure Public Consultation Events - press release prepared and events publicised on Twitter, on the Biggleswade Town Council website, in the Biggleswade Chronicle newspaper and on their website and circulated via email to all who completed the Neighbourhood Planning Public Survey. | |
| 01/02/2020 | | Green Infrastructure Public Consultation Market Stall | |
| 05/02/2020 | | Green Infrastructure Public Consultation at the Orchard Community Centre. | |
| 06/02/2020 | | Green Infrastructure Public Consultation at the Town Council Offices. | |
| 05/08/2020 | | The upcoming GI event was sent to the Mayflower Newsletter Distribution List which includes over 150 Biggleswade residents. | |
| 24/09/2020 | | The GI Plan public survey was sent to the Mayflower Newsletter distribution list which has over 150 Biggleswade residents. | |
| 03/10/2020 | | The GI Plan leaflets were handed out at the Biggleswade Rotary Club’s market stall. | |
| 10/10/2020 | | The GI Plan leaflets were handed out around the Town Centre by a member of the Neighbourhood Plan group. | |
| **Second Public Engagement – March 2021 - List of engagement activities undertaken:** | | | |
| **Date** | | **Details** | |
|  | | Because of the Covid 19 pandemic, the Neighbourhood Plan Strategy Group worked with Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity to carry out this consultation online through Survey Monkey. BRCC produced the survey for the Neighbourhood Plan Group and produced the analysis of the responses. | |
| 24/3/21 | | 50 A4 posters & 50 A3 posters placed at the following locations: Town Council noticeboard & Market Square noticeboard, shop windows in the Market Square and the Retail Park, circulated to the Chamber of Trade, Orchard Centre, churches, petrol stations, parks and gardens, cemeteries (Stratton Way & Drove Road), the Health Centre. | |
| 26/3/2021 | | 5 large banners (2.5 metres in length by 0.75 metres in height) placed at Century House, Sainsbury’s roundabout, the Pocket Park, Dan Albone Car Park and the Weatherley Centre. | |
| 29/3/2021 | | Social media publicity - publicised on Biggleswade Town Council’s website and social media, Biggleswade Town Council Facebook & Twitter and We Love Biggleswade. Pinned to the top of the We Love Biggleswade Facebook page. | |
| 29/3/21 | | Biggleswade Today article – local newspaper website. | |
| 29/3/21 | | Email to all Biggleswade Town Council elected Councillors to ask Councillors to reach out to the wider community and their contacts. | |
| 30/3/21 | | 250 A5 flyers distributed to Surfin Café and other cafés within Biggleswade. | |
| 9/4/2021 | | 1250 A5 flyers given to Biggleswade Community News newsletter circulation and door-to-door drop in. 750 of these flyers to be distributed with paper copies of the Biggleswade Community News newsletter and the other 500 flyers to be circulated door-to-door in the surrounding area of Kitelands Road. | |
| 9/4/2021 | | 100 printed questionnaires given to Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity. Jemma McLean from BRCC was available to post out to individuals on request the paper copy of the questionnaire. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Formal Public Consultation – October/November 2021 - List of engagement activities undertaken:** | | |
| **Date** | | **Details** |
| 27/09/2021 | Online Feedback Form and Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan document placed on the Town Council website. | |
| 27/9/2021 | 10 printed feedback forms kept at the Town Council Offices for anyone that wished to pick up a paper copy. This was made clear in all consultation. communication. | |
| 27/09/2021 | 3 sets of Neighbourhood Plan Policies and Maps in A1 size displayed at the Town Council Offices, the Orchard Community Centre, and the Market Square stand. | |
| 27/09/2021 | Publicised on social media - A Facebook post and twitter post was placed onto the Town Council Facebook and Twitter accounts. Both posts were pinned to the top of the page. The Facebook post was shared to the We Love Biggleswade page which has 33,000 members. | |
| 27/09/2021 | Email sent to Biggleswade Voluntary & Community Groups informing them of the consultation and encouraging them to submit their feedback. | |
| 27/09/2021 | Email sent to Statutory Consultees informing them of the consultation and encouraging them to submit their feedback. | |
| 28/09/2021 | Article published in Biggleswade Today. | |
| 1/10/2021 | 250 A5 flyers distributed to Surfin Café and other cafés within Biggleswade. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | | **Details** | |
| 1/10/2021 | | 50 A4 posters & 50 A3 posters placed at the following locations: Town Council Noticeboard & Market Square Noticeboard, Shop windows in the Market Square and the Retail Park, Circulate with the Chamber of Trade, Orchard Centre – place poster on noticeboard, Churches, Petrol Stations, Parks and gardens, Cemeteries – Stratton Way & Drove Road, Circulate A4 and A3 poster to the Health Centre. | |
| 4/10/2021 | | Leaflet circulation to all of Biggleswade - each address received a leaflet on the Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 consultation. The leaflet explained what a Neighbourhood Plan is, where to view the Regulation 14 document and how to submit feedback. | |
| 5/10/2021 – 21/10/2021 | | Drop-in session at the Town Council Offices and the Orchard Community Centre Use the green display boards to display the maps and policies. Paper feedback forms to complete at the drop-in sessions as well as hard copies of the Regulation 14 document:  The Orchard Community Centre - Tuesday 5th October 2021 , 10am – 2pm, 4pm – 8pm, Tuesday 12th October 2021, 10am – 2pm, 4pm – 6pm  The Town Council Offices, Saffron Road, SG18 8DL - Thursday 14th October 2021, 10am – 2pm, 5pm – 8pm, Thursday 21st October 2021, 10am – 2pm, 4pm – 8pm | |
| 07/10/2021 | | 5 large banners (2.5 metres in length by 0.75 metres in height) placed at Century House, past Sainsbury’s roundabout, Pocket Park, Dan Albone Car Park, Weatherly Centre (All entrances to Biggleswade) | |
| 16/10/2021 – 6/11/2021 | | There was a Neighbourhood Plan Market Stall 10am – 2pm on the following dates: Saturday 16/10/2021, Monday 1st November, Tuesday 2nd November, Wednesday 3rd November, Thursday 4th November, Friday 5th November, 6th November 2021. The stall was attended by both Biggleswade Town Council elected Councillors and staff. Over 100 copies of the Regulation 14 document were distributed. A3 laminated copies of the maps were displayed. Paper copies of the feedback form were available for members of the public to complete, as well as a laptop to complete the online feedback form. Staff filled in the form where members of the public were dyslexic. | |
| 21/10/2021 – 9/11/2021 | | BigglesFM – publicised on local radio station BigglesFM each day from the 21st October 2021 – 9th November 2021. | |
| 26/10/2021 | | An email sent to all Councillors to ask them to reach out to the wider community and their contacts. | |
| 26/10/2021 | | Article published in the Biggleswade Bulletin. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date** | | **Details** | |
| 26/10/2021 | | Email sent to the Community Engagement Group informing them of the consultation and encouraging them to submit their feedback. | |
| 29/10/2021 | | Advert posted on Facebook to target those living within a 50km area of Biggleswade. | |
| 1/11/2021 | | Biggleswade Community News – publicised in the Biggleswade Community News newsletter. | |

## 2.4 Outcomes/Feedback

How feedback was provided on the outcomes of community consultation.

What were the main issues emerging?

How did these inform the content of the plan?

Please click [**here**](https://biggleswadetowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/NP-Survey-Summary-as-at-11-4-19-331.pdf) to view the first Neighbourhood Plan Public Engagement Analysis.

Please click [**here**](https://biggleswadetowncouncil.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Biggleswade-NP-consultation-report.doc) to view the second Neighbourhood Plan Public Engagement Analysis.

# Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14)

## 3.1 How the Consultation Was Undertaken

Biggleswade Town Council (BTC) adhered to the Gunning principles in full by ensuring that the consultation was inclusive of all aspects of its community. Biggleswade Town Council’s Regulation 14 Consultation commenced on the 27th September 2021, 9am and ran to Monday 8th November 2021, 9am. This ensured a full six-week consultation period.

Biggleswade Town Council implemented its consultation outreach plan using online, social media, banners, and hard copy leaflet distribution as well as drop-in sessions and a regular market stall.

**How the Consultation was publicised**

All Biggleswade residents were informed of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation by leaflet distribution. A reputable company was used to distribute a leaflet to every address in Biggleswade.

The following publicity was also used to promote the consultation:

**Social Media**

* Facebook Advert with the target audience being anyone within a 50km radius of Biggleswade.
* Facebook post pinned to the top of Biggleswade Town Council Facebook Page.
* Facebook post shared with the We Love Biggleswade on numerous occasions throughout the consultation. The We Love Biggleswade has 33,000 members, which are Biggleswade residents as well as those who live in the surrounding towns and villages.
* Twitter post, pinned to the top of the We Love Biggleswade page.

**Website**

* The Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 Consultation was promoted at the front of our Biggleswade Town Council website for the entirety of the consultation. This linked to the Neighbourhood Plan page on our website which displayed the full Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 14 document, the online feedback form, and further information relating to the Neighbourhood Plan.

**Email**

* Email sent to all statutory consultees at the beginning of the consultation period.
* Email sent to Biggleswade Chamber of Trade.
* Email sent to Biggleswade’s Community Consultation Group.
* Email sent to Biggleswade’s voluntary groups and community groups.
* Email sent to all Biggleswade Town Councillors who were encouraged to circulate with their contacts.

**Drop-in sessions**

* 8 drop-in sessions at the Orchard Community Centre and the Town Council offices, held throughout the day to give maximum opportunity to those who wished to attend.

**Market Stalls**

* 7 Neighbourhood Plan stall events, totalling 28 hours. Two of these events were held on a Saturday to cater for members of the public who work during the week.

**Radio**

* The consultation was promoted daily on local radio station BigglesFM from 19th October 2021 to 8th November 2021.

**Newspaper**

* The consultation was promoted through the Biggleswade Bulletin, both through their website and through paper copies.
* The consultation was promoted through the Biggleswade Chronicle, both on their website and in the printed newspaper.
* The consultation was promoted through the Biggleswade Community News newsletter.

**Banners**

* Banners – 5 placed around key areas in Biggleswade with high footfall.

**Leaflets**

* Leaflets circulated to Sainsbury’s petrol station.
* Leaflets circulated to all Churches in Biggleswade.
* Leaflets circulated to café’s in Biggleswade Market Square.

**Posters**

* Posters placed at both Biggleswade cemeteries, Town Council owned play areas, and all Town Council noticeboards.
* Posters circulated to all churches in Biggleswade.

**How feedback was invited**

Biggleswade Town Council had an online feedback form as well as a paper feedback form. A paper feedback form allowed those members of the public to comment who were not comfortable using technology. Both paper and online feedback forms were present at every drop-in session and market stall event. Additionally, Biggleswade Town Council staff members assisted certain members of the public with writing their responses who were not comfortable with writing or had dyslexia.

## 3.2 Statutory Consultees

Details of the statutory bodies that were consulted by email at the beginning of the Consultation:

|  |
| --- |
| **Organisation** |
| SEMLEP |
| Citizen's Advice Bureau (Dunstable) |
| Citizen's Advice Bureau (Mid Beds) |
| Citizen's Advice Bureau (Leighton Linslade) |
| Bedfordshire Humanists |
| Healthwatch Central Bedfordshire (Health Inequalities) |
| Sight Concern |
| Bedfordshire & Luton Fair Play (Gender Equality Issues) |
| Disability Resource Centre |
| Bedford Council of Faiths |
| Mind BLMK (Mental Health) |
| Grand Union Housing Group (Housing) |
| Hope Central (Faith & Poverty Issues) |
| POhWER (Learning Disabilities & Mental Health) |
| Age UK (Older People) |
| Marine Management Organisation |
| Natural England |
| Historic England |
| Environment Agency |
| NHS England |
| Highways England |
| Secretary of State for Transport |
| Homes England |
| Defence Infrastructure Organisation (MOD) |
| Bedfordshire CCG |
| Central Bedfordshire Council (Partnerships & Performance) |
| Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce |
| Bedfordshire & River Ivel Internal Drainage Board |
| Bedfordshire Rural Communities Charity (BRCC) |
| CPRE (Bedfordshire) |
| Woodland Trust |
| The Chilterns Conservation Board |
| Wildlife Trust |
| RSPB |
| Greensand Trust |
| Sustrans |
| Greater London Authority |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |
| Bedford Borough Council |
| Stevenage Borough Council |
| North Hertfordshire District Council |
| Dacorum Borough Council |
| Milton Keynes Council |
| Buckinghamshire Council |
| Hertfordshire County Council |
| St Albans City & District Council |
| South Cambs District Council |
| Luton Borough Council |
| Huntingdonshire District Council |
| Cambridgeshire County Council |
| Adjacent Central Bedfordshire Towns & Parishes |
| Police and Crime Commissioner |
| Hertfordshire Police Authority |
| Cambridgeshire Police Authority |
| Bedfordshire Police HQ |
| Bedfordshire Fire & Rescue |
| Gypsy Council |
| Network Rail |
| Vodafone & O2 |
| Three |
| OpenReach BT |
| EE |
| Virgin Media |
| National Grid |
| UK Power Networks |
| Anglian Water |
| Thames Water |
| Affinity |
| Severn Trent Water |
| Cambridge Water |

## 3.3 Issues

There were 54 responses to the consultation. The issues and concerns raised and how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in modifications to the proposed Neighbourhood Plan are set out in the next part of this statement.

**Responses to Representations**

The following lists the issues raised during the Regulation 14 Consultation with the considered responses:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondent type (individual identities not given as confidentiality cited in questionnaire)** | **Page No.** | **Policy/**  **Site Ref.** | **Representation** | **Response** |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | General | This is a really good Neighbourhood Plan. It contains very specific community knowledge, with clear, concise and well written Policies, which will be vey useful for guiding future development proposals in Biggleswade. I have however suggested some minor improvements/ alterations, which I feel could improve the plan prior to formal submission.  The plan is professionally presented and well designed throughout, however, there seems to be a lot of empty pages separating sections of the plan, which are not necessary and harm the flow of the plan. Each sections cover page and the well used differences in colour makes a clear enough distinction between different sections to remove the need for these blank pages. Therefore, I suggest the following blank pages are deleted:  2,3,4,6, 8, 12, 22, 32, 40, 76, 86, 100 & 101 | Blank pages ensure new chapter not on a back page. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | General | Although not essential, I would also suggest that the polices are placed within a text box with a light fill background, so they are easier to pick out from the preamble. | Box will be used. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BSP1 | Really good Policy. The Policy is specific to Biggleswade, does not duplicate the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (CBLP) and will be useful in guiding development proposals in the future. | Noted. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BTC1 | Point 7 - I'm not sure its good to say 'not through surface provision'. The Policy and Policy preamble make clear parking is needed and should be accommodated, so then saying it should not be on the surface seems to go against these aims? It may be more beneficial to say something similar to:  'To ensure the efficient use of land, parking provision within redevelopment schemes should, where possible, be accommodated within the building footprint of the scheme or through multi-storey provision. Where surface car parking is the only alternative, the parking should not dominate the streetscene and should be well integrated with the development.' | Parking should be balanced with making efficient use of land and town centre recovery. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BRD1 | Another really good Policy - locally specific, clear, concise and not just a duplication of the NPPF or CBLP. | Noted. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BGS1 | Point 3 - this is an unrealistic expectation for householder, some minor developments and some change of use applications and I would therefore suggest this Policy is amended to specifically except these types of development or to state at the start of the bullet point 'where appropriate'. | Deleted ‘All’. Added to interpretation that the policy should be applied in a way that is proportionate to the scale and nature of development. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BGS2/BGS3 | Good Policy, with clear expectations. | Noted. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BPD1 | Last paragraph of preamble to this policy - I would suggest altering relaxation to changes. The recent changes to the General Permitted Development Order have not relaxed PD rights, but rather enhanced them by allowing more freedom to build without planning permission, so this does not seem to be the correct word. | Interpretation clarified. Changed to ‘recent changes to permitted development rights’ and deleted ‘relaxation’. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BPD2 | Point 1 - Retention/ maintenance cannot be required, as ceasing use of something does not require planning permission. I would therefore suggest alterations are made to the Policy wording, to make it deliverable e.g. 'Development proposals which propose the removal of active shop frontages within the Town Centre Location will not be supported, unless a suitable replacement shopfront is proposed.' | Disagree. This is about the shop front, not use. Retention of shop fronts can be required, even where the use changes. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BPD3 | Point C - this is overly restrictive and not in accordance with the NPPF. Paragraph 111 of the NPPF states:  ‘Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.’  As such, any loss of parking below two spaces due to development proposals would have to be considered with regard to its impact on highway safety and road capacity. Moreover, within a sustainable location, i.e. within the Town Centre, two parking spaces may not be necessary. I therefore suggest the Policy wording is altered to something similar to:  'Developments which propose to remove off-road parking spaces will be supported where alternative provision is made which increases or maintains the number of accessible parking spaces available on or within the immediate vicinity of the site.'  I note that the Haynes NP had a similar policy to this and that the Examiner, within the Examiner's Report, requested that the Policy wording be amended to that shown above. | NPPF quotation relates to highway impacts rather than parking requirements.  BPD3 refers to housing extensions – not altered. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BH1-BH3 | Good Polices. | Noted. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BTM1 | Point 3 - I'm not sure what is meant by 'a mix of provision' - please could this be clarified?  Point 5 - good and valuable point, however, I would recommend removing 'must be overlooked' as it may not be possible for every house in a row of, say 5 terraces, to overlook a parking court, if it is located to the side of one of the end houses? & a parking court to the front elevation may dominate the streetscene? | The interpretation makes clear what mix of provision means (for avoidance of doubt amended wording in interpretation to ‘mix of provision’).  The wording does allow some flexibility and overlooking by some of the properties would be sufficient. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BSP1 | Really good Policy. However, it might be worth adding a sentence on what is meant by 'football facilities' within the interpretation section. For instance, does this mean grass pitches? 3G pitches with lighting? Clubhouse? As football facilities alone is quite ambiguous. | Added to interpretation: ‘football facilities could include pitches and associated facilities.  Added to the policy ‘subject to there being no significant adverse impacts on the amenities of residential properties’. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BTC-1 | 7 - This policy appears to make all parking that’s not within a building or a multi storey car park unacceptable. So hypothetically a new retail development couldn't have a parking space to the rear for staff or a dwelling couldn’t have parking adjacent. | Dwellings with conventional drives would not meet the design or conservation policies anyway. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BTC-1 | 8 - "or nearby" is too unclear. What does that mean? | Altered ‘nearby’ to ‘in close proximity’. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BEM - 1 | 1.b - 1.b – Appears too restrictive, to remove PD rights blankly just because something is outside a defined “town centre” doesn’t make it unacceptable or unsustainable. These may be amenities which enable communities to have access to services within walking distance of their homes etc. Could possibly considered a size restriction (e.g. if over Xsqm then PD right should be removed to ensure no change of use to retail etc), but at a small scale it seems onerous. | Added to policy – ‘where there is potential for harm to the vitality of the Town Centre’. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BEM-2 | 3.a/b – Does the application need to demonstrate both of these things? Is it “a and b” … also it doesn’t define under 3.b how long something needs to be marketed for, hypothetically it could be marketed for 1 day and meet the requirements of that policy. | Added ‘or’ between a and b. Added to b “at market value for at least 12 months”. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BRD-1 | 1 – What is “close to”? This appears to be further than “adjacent” but could be anywhere really. | Deleted ‘close to’ and rely on adjacent. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BRD-1 | 4 – does this policy always make off site financial contributions unacceptable? | The policy says ‘should’ so does allow for some flexibility. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BPD-3 | 1a - This policy makes ALL front extensions anywhere in Biggleswade at any scale unacceptable in principle. This will be very problematic, for example technically this would make a bay window or a porch unacceptable. | Added to the interpretation to make clear that it would not necessarily preclude limited front projections, such as bay windows or porches. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BSP-1 | Why is football not included within the definition of “sports pitches”, does it mean that “football facilities” includes buildings/lights/stands etc, and does the intention of the policy make buildings, stands etc associated with other sports unacceptable? (as in other sports can only have pitch facilities and nothing ancillary)? | Added to interpretation: ‘football facilities could include pitches and associated facilities’. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | General | Would be helpful to have a list of policies at the end of the Contents page | The contents include the full list of policies. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BSP1 | This is a forward-thinking policy which acknowledges the need for development, providing it's appropriateness and sustainability. | Noted. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | General | It would be helpful to put the policies within boxes to make it easier to differentiate preamble and policy. | The policies are in bold and in coloured text. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BPD3 | Policy is overall fine, but these points will be picked up anyway through the planning application process and the assessments Development Management Officers must undertake. | Noted. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BRD1 | Some duplication of Policy H1: Housing Mix. But generally not of concern. Not sure there is any national policy which provides the evidence to require screened storage space for bins/recycling. This also goes for requirement 7. | There is a lot in national policy on design and sustainability, both are addressed in the policy. Failure to make provision for bins is poor design and poor planning. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BH3 | Some text is required within this policy to accept that if development has the potential to impact upon a Scheduled Monument or its setting, it will have to demonstrate that the harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits. Thus outweighing the harm or loss of significance. Some regard is also needed with paragraphs 132 to 134 of the NPPF. | Text added.  See below re Policy HE1 in the Local Plan. |
| Central Bedfordshire Council |  | BTM1 | Point 7 - I agree it is important to include electrical vehicle charging points. However, at the moment there isn't national policy requiring this. It can most certainly be encouraged, however. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 45 | BRD1 | Paragraph 1 (a) refers to "low rise apartments" in the town centre area with a reference to "apartments" in 2 (a) concerning the suburban areas. In my opinion, higher rise apartment blocks - 6 or 8 stories - should be welcomed as they provide accommodation using a lower land area. I suggest there is a specific reference in the Plan document that such buildings are seen as suitable developments and are encouraged. | Existing policy is no more than 3 storeys due to conservation area. Plan includes design policies. |
| Local Resident | Page 92 | BTM2 | Cycle ways should not be provided in place of existing roadway for vehicular traffic. For example, the designated cycle lane on London Road should be removed. If a cycle track is needed it should be provided on the verges, | Agree cycleways should be segregated but this is a highways matter outside of the scope of the plan. Segregation required for new developments. |
| Local Resident |  | BSP1 | Sadly current development appears to be taking place mostly on green spaces and agricultural land | The policies address strategic green spaces, LGS and agricultural land. |
| Local Resident |  | BRD1 | There is no bungalows being built, this makes the few available ones unaffordable, which means we older people are stuck in a house that could accommodate a family of four or more, because I for one will rather go strait on to the wooden box that in to a flat.  For wat I have seen and been told storage is totally inadequate, so is parking and the garages are to narrow for the big cars and ever bigger people of today. | Clause 2 already supports housing suitable for older people.  Advice added to the interpretation of the Transport policy (BTM1) on garage sizes. |
| Local Resident |  | BEM2 | More houses mean more people, more people require more Doctors and Dentist Surgeries also Schools and nurseries | BEM2 supports new community facilities. No change necessary. |
| Local Resident |  | BGS1 | Current developments are destroying habitat crucial to wildlife.  Recently established development's like McDonalds are destroying the local environment (their rubbish is everywhere) | BGS1 addresses loss of habitats. In addition, the Environment Act contains requirements for biodiversity net-gain. No change necessary. |
| Local Resident |  | BGS4 | Does any one know how to get around the Green Wheel? | There are booklets available from the Town Council. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Emergency vehicles aces to Rutherford Road "kings Reach" at the junction with Planets Way is compromised by the narrowness of the road and the vehicles parked on it.  The traffic calming chicanes in Kings Reach are a danger to life, specially the ones on Planets Way on a bend between Venus Avenue and Rutherford Road, were with vehicles parked on one side you are not able to see on coming traffic, and every were else were these awful obstructions are the danger to cyclists is enormous because nobody gives way to a cyclist and even les to some one on a scooter an these are becoming ever more common, those types of obrutions also create a stop - start - stop - start situation witch increases exhaust emissions which harms the environment. | The policy seeks to address this issue in future development. |
| Local Resident |  | BSP1 | I don't believe development is being discouraged with so much building on green fields and agricultural land. | BSP1 seeks to protect playing fields. |
| Local Resident |  | BEM2 | Where is the support for more GP's and dental surgeries ? I have lived here for nearly 6 years and with all the new housing there are no new surgeries. | The policy supports new community facilities. But the Neighbourhood Plan cannot instruct service providers to provide new or expanded facilities – it can and does enable such development. |
| Local Resident | Page 29 | BTC1 | The removal of buses stopping at Century House bus station in the centre will improve the centre visually  The need for additional parking close to the station.  Modern day bus shelters that both protect from the weather elements and inform transport users of times of arrivals  Allowing town centre shop fronts to be able to use modern affordable materials which also are in keeping with historical appearances | Decisions on bus stops would be for transport bodies and providers. The plan just highlights the possibility.  The later design policies include advice on shop front design and materials (BPD2). |
| Local Resident | Pages 49/50 | BGS3 | Technically there is limited social space to allow a dog off the lead or for children to play fottball with parents in the North of the town on the Fairfield estate.  Second meadow is now a football club  First meadow is the cricket club and  Biggleswade Common has live farm animals and restrictions  There is ample walking space and a very small playground with swings etc but this is inadequate for both parents wishing to play ball games with children, children wishing to play with children and responsible dog owners giving their pets an opportunity for a 5 min run | The Chapter 8 policies seek to protect green spaces but regulation of dog walking is outside of the scope of the Plan. Comments on dog walking to be forwarded to the local authority.  Comment on play facilities to be forwarded to the appropriate local authority or developer management company. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | The lack of doctors in this growing town is dangerously worrying.  The infrastructure needs to grow in this respect  As is the lack of NHS dentists. Dentists exist but they are increasingly turning private forcing residents to travel to Bedford and other outlaying areas...increasing unnecessary traffic and carbon emissions. There seems to be a tacit acceptance of this and an alarming ignoring this is a priority too | The policy supports new community facilities. But the Neighbourhood Plan can’t instruct service providers to provide new or expanded facilities – it can and does enable such development. |
| Local Resident | Page 42 & 88 | BTM2 | The building of new estates have generally been good. To the south of the town this has increased good roads which circumvent the town  The idea of building to the North east of the railway line is criminal. The main artery through the town from the A1 to Potton is dangerous and the impact of building ANY housing north of this is negligent and thought by people wh clearly do not use Potton Road which many parents and schoolchildren do at peak times and others find difficult to transport during other times.  The north and South roundabouts are now exceptional busy when traffic is flowing well as they join a National North to South Motorway (the A1M).  The time exiting from Biggleswade has risen 600% in the last 3 years. This will increase with further development  Please note this is when traffic is flowing well. Approx 5% of occasionally it is exponentially longer. I expect this % to increase when the Southern development nearer Dunton (South of the Baden Powell way is completed) However this , I would not describe as dangerous | The proposal to build to the north relates to site allocations in the Local Plan so is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. For the record, Biggleswade Town Council did object to development to the north of the town, as part of the Local Plan process.  Comments will be forwarded to Central Bedfordshire Council, the local planning and highways authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 81 | BH2 | The town needs a heritage centre. The local history society need maximum support .  A museum would be a great asset . Sadly (or not so depending on your perspective) the local Wetherspoons have done more for the heritage other than the historical society  Although the heritage pages in the plan are welcome they focus on conservation areas and monuments and neglect areas such as Vikings, Dan Albone, Thunderbirds Car, the two Number 1 singers from the town, the Great Fire of Biggleswade, the birth of the Town, the history of the Town Hall, railway station and the IVEL river, doomsday book references etc | The Neighbourhood Plan contains policies for development. New community or cultural facilities are supported in Policies BCT1 and BEM2. So the plan would support a heritage centre in the right location, especially in the Town Centre. |
| Local Resident | Page 30 | BTC1 | Hitchin Street is a wreck - the historical reversal was an avoidable error and subsequent 're-surfacing' a disaster. The future of Hitchin Street requires major consideration and the top part to Mill Lane should be an integral part of the town centre. | Agreed that Hitchin Street needs further consideration but this is outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Local Resident | Page 36 | BEM1 | There is a danger that the A1S approach to Biggleswade might become 'an industrial corridor'. A tree belt of sufficient magnitude to completely mask all non-agricultural activity should be demanded.  In future, all commercial development should require suitable landscaping and screening. | The policy already deals with vehicle impacts and includes landscape requirements. |
| Local Resident | Page 45 | BRD1 | The national Technical Housing Standards are far too complex and leave room for manoeuvre. We should impose something akin to the Parker Morris space standards of the 1960s, which were far more straightforward and recognised the space that people needed to live in. Parker Morris standards were only for the public sector but should have applied across both public and private and should apply now. | Parker Morris is an old standard. Writing such a standard into policy could be seen as too prescriptive or onerous.  However, interpretation to the policy now emphasises that the national standard should be considered as a minimum. |
| Local Resident | Page 73 | BPD2 | The guidance for shop fronts is appropriate. However, this needs to be properly enforced.  Current work in the High Street fails to reproduce the original detailing of the chemist's shop (the timber stall riser). Rather than the proper mouldings, the builders are putting in a very sub-standard replacement, rather flat. The mouldings are not to such a large scale and will not have the same visual impact as the original detailing. | Once the Neighbourhood Plan is made, it becomes part of the statutory development plan. The local planning authority will be responsible for implementation and will need to comply with Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.  The policy does draw attention to the importance of mouldings and the interpretation highlights the need for sectional plans to be submitted, to show the detail of mouldings. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | I feel that the town is in need of more healthcare facilities, especially NHS Dentists, Doctors Surgeries and medical facilities, also  Schools . Especially in view of all the new housing developments in and around Biggleswade. | The policy supports new community facilities. But the Neighbourhood Plan can’t instruct service providers to provide new or expanded facilities – it can and does enable such development. |
| Local Resident | Page 13 | BTM1 | I support an overall design for Biggleswade with eco friendly public transport at very regular intervals and at an affordable cost, to bring access to the whole area together, so that everyone is able to access the whole town. The Market Square should continue to be a place where people can meet, sit and mingle, with new housing to bring more security into the town centre and make it a multi purpose area. But this should be carried out without removing the undercover bus terminus and toilets, without providing something close by for those that cannot walk very far as they become more frail or disabled as the Market Square is still the prime destination for most residents. Bus routes should have bus stops near to all important facilities. i.e. Hospital, community centres, Schools, Social care facilities, Saxon Gate, Retail Park and Business Park, and when developed the Country Park. Where possible, real time information should be available at every major stop, seating and weather protection when possible and information accessible for those who are not connected or cannot access the internet as they may be the main groups using the transport. A park and ride facility perhaps at the Rose Lane car park, which when I went passed it at 11.30am the other weekday morning had only 20 cars parked in it. Or such a facility elsewherewith a free feeder into the town or retail park. | The policy supports sustainable transport.  Other comments deal largely with matters for transport and education and health providers. However, the comment does relate also to one of the opportunity sites identified after Policy BTC1. Comments noted. |
| Local Resident |  | BRD1 | Then majority of the jobs moving to Biggleswade are in the logistics sector, renowned for low paid low skilled roles. Yet perhaps the majority of the housing being erected or built in the 2000s appear to be four to five bed detached houses, or 4 bed terraced houses on three floors. One assumes that people have moved to this area for a better standard of living including a larger home, or room for their family to grow. As these can cost over £1/2 million pounds one might ask where are the lower income workers the town needs, are expected to live, particularly as local house prices are rising rapidly.  Biggleswade's population has risen by 3% since the 2011 census making it one of the fastest growing towns in the UK. It is also one of the most densely populated with Biggleswade having a compact footprint with constrained boundaries. There seems to be a mismatch between low entry jobs and the housing being built albeit many newcomers could be commuting tomore high level jobs in Stevenage, Cambridge, Milton Keynes, and London. Also walking is not always an option for those people with busy lives and family commitments. Particularly with long journeys to schools and train station from the new housing complexes. And some of the main footpaths between KIngs Reach and the older town (i.e. off Eagle Farm Road, are overgrown and intimidating to walk through. | The comments address sustainable live-work patterns and are noted.  The plan supports diversity of employment in Biggleswade, through policies BSP1, BTC1, BEM1 and BEM2 in particular.  Post-COVID, home working is also a significant element. Policy BRD1 has been amended to require high speed broadband infrastructure within the curtilage of all new dwellings, so as to be ready as services are improved. |
| A developer |  | BSP1 | From a developer: We write in full support of your draft Biggleswade Neighbourhood Plan. We believe it is an excellent document which fulfils two mutually reinforcing key objectives:    1. It gives comfort to the community that their town will be protected and safeguarded.  2. It gives responsible land-owners/developers - and their investors - the confidence to move forward decisively.  We write in full support of the Town Council in enshrining this Neighbourhood Plan to protect the heritage assets of the town and to promote a clean, green, inclusive community which is properly planned, with appropriate infrastructure and good community facilities provided.  As a key town in the Central Zone of the Ox-Cam Arc, housing growth in and around the town is an inevitability, and the Town Council has worked hard - through the Neighbourhood Plan process to ensure that it comes on the right terms for the people of Biggleswade. | Comments welcomed and noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 38 | BEM1 | BEM1- more ideas re future development of new large sites needs to be included to cover e.g. site SE3? Is it to be just industrial, office related, etc and it should include provision for all types of start up businesses. | Interpretation amended to make clear that the policy relates to Use Class E. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | BEM2- a statement re the provision of community facilities when new larger scale developments are put forward should be included. | Clause 2 of the policy already addresses this issue. |
|  | Page 45 | BRD1 | BRD1- this policy should refer to the infrastructure needed re supporting these by e.g. referring to community facilities, transport, etc. and the appropriate policy. Also in view of climate policies reference should be made to the installation of e.g. heat source pump facilities, car charging points, etc.. | Policy BEM2 clause 2 addresses community facilities to support residential development.  Green design is already addressed in Policy BPD1 and its interpretation. Environmental protection is already dealt with in Policies BGS1, BGS2, BGS3, BGS4.  BTM1 already requires charging points. The Government intends to legislate to make this a requirement for all new houses. |
| Local Resident | Page 64 | BGS4 | The policy should consider all cycleways, including those in existence where paths/roads are incorporated into the cycleways which cause conflict between e.g. pedestrians and cyclists where they are not wide enough. | The policies relate to development, to inform the determination of planning applications.  Improvement of existing facilities would be an improvement project. Comment to be forwarded to the local highway’s authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 69 | BPD1 | Reference should be made to new builds including the use of e.g. solar power, hydro power, heat source pumps, etc. for sustainable energy. | Green design is already addressed in Policy BPD1 and its interpretation. |
| Local Resident | Page 91 | BTM1 | No mention is made of the need for developers to provide public transport links including long term future financing of the same. | BTM1 has been amended to add possible financing of new bus services for larger schemes. |
| Local Resident | Page 29 | BTC1 | BTC1-7 There may be the need for some surface car parking. the final 6 words should be less absolute | The policy uses the word ‘should’ rather than ‘must’, so does allow for some flexibility in its application. |
| Local Resident | Page 29 | BTC1 | Para,7 Agree that parking must be within the building footprint but sufficient parking must be provided for the residents of the dwellings and for commercial/business users. It is not acceptable to rely on all residents to rely on public transport ie don't have a car. | The policy does allow for some parking, but equally recognises that some people choosing to live in town centres will not have cars, particularly in younger age groups. |
| Local Resident | Page 45 | BRD1 | BRD1 Section 2a Laudable aims but very few of the new developments, if any, have bungalows and there is no indication of proportion of the types of housing required. | The policy supports housing suitable for older people, but does not seek to amend Local Plan policies on housing mix. |
| Local Resident | Page 48 onwards | BGS1 | All laudable aims but no detail of how they are to be achieved. Particularly where replacements are provided these should be as close to maturity as their predecessors. With regard to hedging, there must be a costed plan for maintaining said hedge in perpetuity. None maintained hedges grow out and become of less value to wildlife. | The policy already requires replacement trees to have ‘a similar level of amenity’. The plan can’t control future growth of hedges. However, the interpretation has been amended to highlight the importance of longer-term arrangements for maintenance. |
| Local Resident |  | BGS2 | The field north of Fairfield Second Meadow would make an admirable green space with the possibility of allotments and additional amenity space. Twenty years ago, Biggleswade Second Meadow was not fenced and therefore provided 'kick about' space for older children. The current play space is not suitable for children over 10. There is no public parking in that area for parents of small children. This space is identified in the Neighbourhood Plan as 'Green Space aspiration'. An aspiration has little meaning without a plan in place to actually achieve same. | This is a project rather than a requirement for development. However, comment is noted by the Town Council, which would support improvement of green spaces. |
| Local Resident | Page 56 | BGS3 | Section 2: Exceptions - There is so little green space within Biggleswade, small scale development should never be allowed. | This would be unreasonably restrictive and counter-productive as the development allowed is specific to the community use of the space. |
| Local Resident | Page 64 | BGS4 | Maintenance of footpaths is apparently a low priority. It is pointless having a extensive network of footpaths if, because of lack of maintenance, they are impassable for several months of the year. The large number of housing developments within the town has spawned an almost epidemic of temporary footpath closures which are in grave danger of becoming permanent if the Powers that Be are not super diligent. Recent housing developments have replaced what was a green footpath with a Right of Way through housing, which, although maintaining access, spoils the enjoyment of that Right of Way. | The policy protects footpaths.  Comments on maintenance and temporary closures to be forwarded to the CBC as Rights of Way authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 83 | BH2 | Para. 3 The proposal to use the field north of Second Meadow as a green area would provide an admirable example of maintaining the landscape setting for Fairfield House. | Comment noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 92 | BTM2 | Laudable aims but proposed developments which would rely on access via existing roads eg Potton Road, must also satisfy this requirement. | Improvement to the existing road network would be outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment to be forwarded to the highways authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 97 | BSP1 | Para 2 States 'a priority of this Neighbourhood Plan for the allocation of infrastructure monies is to provide new allotments'. These new allotments should be within walking distance of the majority of the town population ie there must be a number of allotment sites. | Added in ‘preferably within walking distance of residential areas’ although there are limited options available. |
| Local Resident | Page 97 | BSP1 | The neighbourhood plan has recognised the need for additional recreational facilities but it has not outlined how it will help the voluntary organisations in the town, particulary youth groups with the rapid housing growth. Current youth groups have huge waiting lists and facilities/meeting venues that cannot cope with the demand. It has in fact, by virtue of the title, limited it to sports and allotments. This section should make reference to all recreation.  By recognising the need of voluntary groups in the neighbourhood plan, it will enable Section 106 money to be used to help develop local community groups, infrastructure and support recruitment into the voluntary organisations that have provided essential support to the mental and physical health of our community. Infrastructure does not make a neighbourhood or a community, people do. This seems somewhat lost in the neighbourhood plan. It would be really good to recognise the diversity and richness of community groups and voluntary organisations that support our neighbourhood and community and build in an aim that development should not be to the detriment of community groups and where possible should support community groups, especially in areas of designated recreational space, not just sports and allotments.  For example, in the map attached in that section of the report, it looks like the space between Abbotsbury care home and Mead End is designated recreational space, this is uniquely located near to the existing scout hut, but without recognising the important role that the voluntary organisations play in the community, this will not be taken into account when the change of use for Abbotsbury is eventually put to consultation. | This is outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan, but the comments, including mention of Section 106 monies, to be forwarded to the local planning authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 49 | BGS3 | The country and town park is mentioned here as a high priority yet doesn't seem to appear in the plan (unless I missed). Surely something of high priority should be addressed more prominently in the neighbourhood plan?  I believe the common and Riverside area of town has been badly overlooked for years to be a better managed leisure resource for the town. | This is a project/proposal rather than a matter for planning policy. Town Council to consider comments outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Local Resident | Page 20 | BEM2 | No mention of the plans for the council offices on London Road due to be demolished. This would be ideal for Community services such as a health hub rather than more housing in an inconvenient location that will cause more traffic problems on an already stressed road network | The Neighbourhood Plan would support new health facilities.  Comment to be referred to local authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | The town keeps growing but still has only 2 doctors surgeries. People struggle to access GPs so this is something that needs to be addressed urgently.  Also, bus services are woefully inadequate and need upgrading. | The Neighbourhood Plan would support new health facilities.  Comment on bus services to be forwarded to the highways authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 1 | BEM2 | There should be an aim to provide ease of access to health care facilities as the town expands not after the expansion | The policy addresses the need for new housing to be supported by community facilities. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Access to and from Biggleswade onto the Al at both junctions needs upgrading to avoid even longer queues than this already existing at peak times.  Access onto Potton Road from side roads needs addressing and safer ways of crossing as a pedestrian.  Town centre parking should be free for say 4 hours in order to encourage shoppers to stay longer and support town centre businesses. | Improvement to the existing road network would be outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment to be forwarded to the highways authority. |
| Local Resident | Pages 48 - 64 | BGS2 | Strategic Green Spaces, Local Green Spaces and Footpaths and Rights of Way  To start with the maps are all out of date and there is significant development not captured in the maps. The housing development behind Saxon Drive Linear Wood is not captured. The development between the Common south of Potton road and Baden Powell Way is not captured. The proposed Substation is not captured.  The Green space plan is not ambitious enough. I understand we must have our share of new homes and commercial development, but this should be accompanied by green space allocation. The plan protects some space but proposes nothing new.  Why can't the agricultural land around Jubliee Wood and orchard be turned into some form of country park? It would create breathing space for massive housing developments to the East of Biggleswade without removing too much farmland. The residential and commercial developments are worth millions; the town should get some reward from this.  The networking of Footpaths and rights of way needs to be thought through. There are various footpaths that cross the A1 south of biggleswade without a bridge or tunnel. Why can't the new developments pay for this. The green wheel is great, but we should be thinking of this as a corridor where there is no development or agricultural land 30m either side of this. The green wheel from Fairfield to Edward Peake School and on to Baden Powell Way is not green - at the moment one can't access part of this and the use of the road is inevitable.  The green wheel should be expanded and green space should be around it, providing breathing space for Biggleswade's population and wildlife alike. | Developments referred to are not yet built. The existing plans are clear enough to define the spaces in question.  Open space requirements are addressed in the Local Plan.  Comments on possible park and other projects to be considered outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan.  Section 106 should address works essential to the granting of planning permission.  The plan seeks to protect agricultural land, if other sites are available (BSP1). The 30-metre buffer is difficult to justify though. |
| Local Resident | Page 2 | BSP1 | How can you think of more development when the current services are abysmal and not fit for purpose I.e doctors surgeries, refuse collections, education, police services | The plan supports new community facilities, including to support new development. |
| Local Resident | Page 10 |  | The introduction does not mention any requirement or wish to meet the needs of the less mobile.  Also, should it have a sentence confirming the scope of the plan is the area outlined in the map on p11 - which extends beyond the traditional borders of Biggleswade? | Amended Policy BPD1 (5) to include ‘for people with different levels of mobility’.  Policy BTM1 amended to highlight to cater for people with differing levels of mobility.  The designated Neighbourhood Area coincides with the Town Council’s administrative boundary. |
| Local Resident | Page 14 |  | Should aim 3 read '... and all the diverse local needs' rather than just '...diverse local needs' ?  Also, should 7 be reworded to say something like 'to promote safe walking, cycling, and other....'? | Aim 3 – appears to make little difference to the meaning.  Aim 7 – The word ‘safe’ added. |
| Local Resident | Page 21 | BSP1 | Re point 2 (I think) - Is new build development supported in areas where good pedestrian / cycle access to the town centre cannot be arranged?  (It is surely important that new development links up to existing development, and if this cannot be arranged - perhaps upgrading existing roads or paths in built up areas - would the development be supported?) | Policy BTM1 already addresses sustainable transport and walking. The local planning authority, in dealing with planning applications, would need to consider whether the requirements of the policy had reasonably been met. |
| Local Resident | Page 25 |  | second bullet - re retail provision in planned urban extensions.  Might it be desirable to express somewhere an aim that such retail provision cannot be repurposed to residential for at least two years after the roads on the development are adopted? (On Kings Reach some business units have been converted to residential 'because the developers couldn't let them', yet they didn't put much effort into this, and the roads are such a mess that any sensible business wouldn't want to locate here!) Also, could the developers be required to open the business and manage it for a period - as happened in Welwyn Garden City? | Permitted development rights currently allow change of use from Use Class E to residential. This could lead to very damaging outcomes but the Neighbourhood Plan cannot amend national legislation. |
| Local Resident | Page 29 | BTC1 | Re parking: if the pedestrian routes into the town centre were better, and people were encouraged to walk into the centre, there wouldn't be a need for so many parking spaces there. (Large cities are actively discouraging cars from entering their centres because they know people like environments where there is little traffic!)  Should there be something about encouraging more pedestrian footfall / pedestrian use of the town centre - reducing obstruictions, enforcing parking rules, etc? Should there be something about restricting closure of the pavements to outside shopping hours - last week the pavement outside the old HSBC was closed by the builders at 11am on a Friday, with no warning signs for pedestrians or road traffic, pedestrians just being left to take their chance in amongst the buses and lorries!  Should there be something about not encouraging development that would attract more heavy goods vehicles to the town centre? | Comments noted and will be passed to the local highways authority.  The plan already encourages and supports walking in policies BRD1, BGS4, BPD1 and BTM1 in particular.  Amended Policy BTM1 to highlight impacts of HGV on Town Centre and other sensitive locations. |
| Local Resident | Page 30 | BTC1 | Bonds Lane - the new development there (circa 2017) left the pavement obstructed with steps and planters; new development should improve the footways, leaving them at least meeting modern standards in terms of surface, width and dropped kerbs. | This partly relates to highway design and standards. However, the Neighbourhood Plan design and transport policies have been amended to place emphasis on design for people with differing levels of mobility. |
| Local Resident | Page 38 | BEM1 | There is a desperate need for a lorry park in the Biggleswade area - the streets of the Stratton Business Park are littered with (unpleasant) refuse from lorry drivers who have spent the night parked up there. The nature of the waste would also surely support the provision of public toilets in the area.  Also, there need to be good pedestrian routes between the residential and employment areas of Biggleswade; there is one footpath (off the Green Wheel) to the Stratton Business Park but it is not surfaced, and is not very easy to follow - it was redirected a few years ago, it used to come out by Henlow Building Supplies but was diverted to go a long way round. This was a mistake! Surely we want those who work at the business park to walk or cycle to and from work? | Policy BEM1 has been amended to refer to general industry being supported by adequate facilities, including parking and amenities for drivers of commercial vehicles. |
| Local Resident | Page 45 | BRD1 | Residential Development adjacent to the town centre - there is a desperate need to improve pedestrian access to the railway station from the east (where most people live). Could this be recorded as a long term aim, in the event of any redevelopment around The Dells? At present many people probably drive to catch a train because it is so convoluted to walk to the station from the east.  Re point 6 - as well as screened storage space for bins, should new properties have a defined space for collection of bins so they don't block the pavement on collection day?  Also, should new dwellings have a defined space (garden or pavement), say at least 2m wide, between the front door and any part of the road that a vehicle may use? There are houses on King's Reach that don't have this. | The plan places emphasis on pedestrian permeability and connectivity, as emphasised under policies BTM1, BSP1, BPD1(4) and BPD(5).  Defined space for collection of bins may be difficult to justify and may create operational issues for bin collectors.  Generally, there has been a move from quantifiable garden standards towards consideration of context and good urban design. |
| Local Resident | Page 52 | BGS1 | Currently developers seem to agree to provide a number of trees and hedging as part of a development, they plant but don't maintain them so many die. Is there any way that developers can be 'encouraged' to ensure that the landscaping they commit to is actually delivered in the long term? | The policy interpretation now emphasises the importance of putting management systems in place to ensure long-term maintenance of landscaping. |
| Local Resident | Page 54 | BGS2 | Should there not be a strategic green space to the north east - there is the possibility of development up towards Sutton? | Noted but to be taken into consideration should any development proposal come forward. Currently good agricultural land. |
| Local Resident | Page 56 | BGS3 | There are no Local Green Spaces on King's Reach or around Stratton School / Weatherley Centre? | Local Green Spaces have to meet the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework. |
| Local Resident | Page 64 | BGS4 | Point 1, as well as 'must not encroach on', surely at time of redevelopment it would be appropriate to correct past encroachment on a footpath? (I complained to CBC about admittedly minor encroachment on FPE25 - an already too-narrow footpath - but they did nothing.  Point 3, should it not explicitly state 'widen' as well as 'to enhance...'  Similar points apply to pavements beside roads - The Baulk has a very difficult pavement (north side). | It would be unreasonable to have a policy requirement for developers to correct past problems or to widen public footpaths or pavements. However, this could be a subject for use of planning infrastructure monies. |
| Local Resident | Page 69 | BPD1 | Point 4 - should the paths be 'attractive, safe and convenient for all, including the less mobile', rather than just 'convenient to pedestrians' ?  Point 5 - 'Good pedestrian permeability'. How will this be policed? There are at least three locations on King's Reach where pedestrian routes through the development have been blocked (one to Edward Peake School, the Post Office in Stratton Way and the Town Centre) by householders who don't like people walking past their windows.  Point 7 - perhaps 'high standard and uniformity of finish' - some houses on King's Reach have a weird patchwork effect of roof tiles (visible from Baden Powell Way), this should be discouraged perhaps?  Point 11. Block paving, as favoured on King's Reach and in Hitchin Street, does not withstand hard wear. Should permeable asphalt (as used to be on the M40?) be preferred? | Amended the wording as suggested.  Comments on blocking pedestrian routes to be forwarded to the local authority.  Uniformity of finish would be overly prescriptive.  The surfacing of highways is largely a matter for the highways authority. Whilst asphalt is hard wearing, it may not be the best materials in terms of character and other environmental considerations, especially in sensitive locations. |
| Local Resident | Page 71 |  | In terms of problems with past developments, I would add:  - roads of inadequate width to allow large lorries to pass parked cars easily  - poorly laid out pedestrian routes connecting new development with the town centre | The Plan addresses both of these issues in the design and transport policies. |
| Local Resident | Page 75 | BPD3 | At least two households on Kings Reach have successfully applied for planning permission to build on a parking space, in both cases leaving the property with just one off street space. One of these properties has at least four bedrooms.  Also, is there a place here for a statement regarding the undesirability of areas planned as adoptable roads/footpaths being taken over for use as private gardens? (This has happened on King's Reach). | BPD3 addresses this.  Pedestrian safety and amenity are addressed in BPD1.  Other comments to be forwarded to the local planning and local highways authorities. |
| Local Resident | Page 81 | BH1 | Why doesn't the conservation area extend to the railway station southbound platform (one of the few original GNR timber buildings left on the line out of King's Cross)?  Should there be a statement to the effect that 'we should aim to ensure that any development close to a building of interest should be commensurate with it's environment, and any building that stood there in the past'. Examples - if the railway wanted to build on the northbound platfrom at the station, this should be in line with the listed buuilding on the southbound platform; also, in the town centre, there are modern 'boxes' (like opposite Rose Lane) in between older, more historc styled buildings; if the box were to be redeveloped, surely it should be more to something like the neighbouring properties, with sloping, tiled rooves, rather than a square box? | The Neighbourhood Plan cannot amend the Conservation Area boundary. Comment on the Conservation Area boundary to be forwarded to the local planning authority.  The buildings on the southbound platform are listed.  There are already special statutory duties for conservation areas and listed buildings.    Part of the character of the Biggleswade Conservation Area is appropriate architectural diversity. |
| Local Resident | Page 91 | BTM1 | There is a risk that points 2 and 7 contradict each other. On-street vehicle chargers will obstruct pedestrians.  Point 2 should include 'safe' as well as 'convenient' - the path from King's Reach to Hitchmead Road is often adorned with head high brambles!  There's a good blog article on this from The Health Foundation:  https://www.health.org.uk/blogs/we-need-to-talk-about-healthy-streets | There is no contradiction between these – charging points would be within the curtilage of properties, whilst point 2 relates to the design and layout of estates.  Added in word ‘safe’ as suggested.  Blog article noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 92 | 92 | Highways and footways -  point 2 - Living Streets are campaigning for a minimum clear width of 150cm for all pavements and footways - allowing for street lamps etc this means a pavement width of 180cm. You should add wheelchairs and pushchairs (including 'double buggies') - somewhere I have a picture of a wheelchair user and a double buggy meeting on the nettle and bramble strewn path from Kings Reach!  point 3 - my experience on King's Reach is that the 4.8m wide roads are not wide enough to allow large lorries (bin lorries, fire engines, delivery vehicles) to get around easily and safely, allowing for a few parked vehicles.  There should be a point stating that pavements and footways in built up areas should be hard surfaced. (Some on King's Reach aren't - Maunder Avenue, for example. This leads to the footpath not being used and being taken over by residents as part of their gardens.)  Does the Town Council have a view on Shared Spaces and the problems they create for some pedestrians? My experience is that they can pose a risk for the less mobile, car drivers do not understand how to use them, park in the wrong places and do not expect pedestrians to be 'in the road' - even if they have to be there to get in or out of their home! (CBC could put some notes on the use of shared spaces in the leaflet that they send out with the council tax bill every year?) | The Living Street guidance has been noted.  Comment on widths noted. The interpretation section of policy BTM2 recommends 5.5 metres.  Pavement surfaces are a matter for the highways authority and the Neighbourhood Plan cannot be over-prescriptive. Also, there are environmental benefits to using permeable surfaces.  The Neighbourhood Plan does not encourage or discourage shared surfaces. Comments to be forwarded to the local highways authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 67 & 88 | BTM1 | All the stuff about the town centre is great but the town council and CBC seem to be completely oblivious to the single most obvious problem faced by Biggleswade, despite it being raised almost constantly by residents - that being the severe issues crossing the railway from east to west or vice versa. With the area of recent new build to the east (Kings Reach, Ivel Chase etc) the pressure on the railway crossings, particularly that on Potton Road, has increased dramatically. With only three possible crossing points (Potton Rd., Crab Ln. and High St.) the congestion issues are already severe, and that's before the EXTREMELY ill advised 'Fairfields' development is inevitably greenlit over the objections of the community. I live in Ivel Chase and commute to Luton so I would ideally travel directly west toward Shuttleworth as part of my commute - instead I drive south to the southern A1 junction then come back north to Sainsbury and turn left, due to the ridiculous congestion on Potton Road. I know I'm not the only one just on my road who does this. That's an extra 4 miles twice a day, every day - more pollution, more cost to me, etc.  This plan does not address east/west travel - that despite it being directly referred to in the plan:  Page 67:  "A place making study was carried out for the Town Council in January 2020. The “First Thoughts” report and presentation identified a 12 point programme for the town, which included:  • Improving east-west connectivity throughout the Town"  Page 88:  "Chapter 9 of the NPPF 2021 deals with promoting sustainable transport and states: “transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals …” "  Given that your own document calls this out, the fact you have completely failed to address it in the plan and will carry on regardless speaks to the contempt in which you hold the residents and the lip service you offer our serious concerns.  Nb. I actually fully support further housing development to the east of the town but not without the proper infrastructural support being in place - namely, a new high-flow crossing over the railway to the north of Potton Road. I realise this isn't a realistic demand, but as such any further housing development to the east / northeast of the town should be reconsidered. | The plan does include policies on sustainable transport and walking which will work in conjunction with existing CBC Local Plan transport policies T1, T2 and T4.  The decision was made to not include housing site allocations, partly due to the need for transport infrastructure to be improved.  These comments relate to more strategic transport infrastructure issues so will be forwarded to the various transport providers. |
|  |  | BEM2 | Getting infrastructure for health services in place now to our area is critical, not when like now the demand for services greatly exceeds capacity for servicing the increased population demands. It appears to be the 'norm' that builders put profit above all else and then want to haggle over the sect. 106 sweeteners promised to gain agreement to build.  What about the Biggleswade hospital site? this already in place and could be commissioned for a full health hub very quickly, it apparently has been discussed to this end for a few years now with no action seen. | Policy BEM2 seeks to address these issues. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | While I agree that the town centre needs bringing up to date and making more pedestrian friendly, the general lack of facilties and wheelchair friendly areas around the new developments is terrible. There are no public toilet facilities except on the Market Square. Trying to use a wheelchair around the new parts of the Kings reach area are extremely difficult.  I do not feel that we should continue building more houses etc until we can improve the existing footpaths, street parking, street lighting and have the needed infrastruture to cope with the population that we already have.  Our Doctors surgeries and pharmacies are struggling to cope with demand and this is not all due to the pandemic. Our schools are struggling with taking in all the new children..  How many more new builds will there be before something goes horribly wrong ? ? | Comments noted but outside the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan except as outlined in BEM2. |
| Local Resident | Page 36 | BEM1 | Fully agree with the last paragraph concerning medical facilities.  I would like to bring to your attention the problems I have had, and am still having,  trying to contact our local doctors, The Ivel Medical Centre in Biggleswade. On one occasion I started dialling at 07:56am and kept dialling unsuccessfully until I got through at around 8:45am. I was then told there were no more appointments for that day and to ring back the following day. In all,  I rang 234 times.  Now I dread ringing the doctors because I know I will have to spend up to 45 minutes to get through.  If you take the time to read the entries on the "We Love Biggleswade" Facebook group, you will see many complaints about the inability to contact the doctors.  And yet they carry on building more houses in Biggleswade! The infrastructure is not sufficient to cope with the needs of the 21,000 or so Biggleswade residents  I would also like to add my feedback on the proposed Hallam development to the north of Biggleswade. I realise this is on a different page to the one listed above, but I'm finding your website very difficult to navigate. I have already lost a huge chunk of my answers for no apparent reason; the page on which I was filling out my feedback suddenly reverted back  to a previous page.  This proposed development is on agricultural land on which many birds forage or nest, including: crows, skylarks, wood pigeons. To lose this habitat for the birds would be a tragedy and also goes against the policies in this document (page 49 and 52 refer). The walk from Shortmead House over Linsells crossing and then onto Furzenhall Road is a very popular walk for bird spotters, dog walkers, cyclists, joggers and walkers. The views along this walk across all the farmland are beautiful and refreshing. To build on the proposed land would mean this walk would be through a housing estate and would spoil the walk for many people.  Another problem with this development is the limited capacity of Furzenhall Road for carrying traffic. In addition the T-Junction at Potton Road further exacerbates the problem. Travelling along the Potton Road is slow and tiresome at the best of times and worse at peak traffic times. The cars parked on the side of the left side of the road when going out of town necessitates constant stopping to let through traffic coming the other way. Extra cars due to the development will exacerbate this problem. Also traffic wanting to exit from Furzenhall Road onto Potton Road will experience long delays in doing so. The town does not have the infrastructure to handle any extra traffic in this area. | Comments to be forwarded to the various service providers. |
| Local Resident | Page 25 and others | BTC1 | There are many words in the document which are probably unfamiliar with a layman and me! The relevant pages and words are:  25 extant  30 exemplar green design  34 pipeline of employment land  35 co-located facilities  36 footloose strategic warehousing  38 co-working space  67 place making study  70 vernacular buildings  71 illegible development  71 quality of public realm  91 point 4 curtilage | Standard definitions are given in the National Planning Policy Framework and other national guidelines. |
| Local Resident | Page 19 | BSP1 | I agree with the adoption of the Biggleswade Neighbourhood Plan. I would like to add that Policy SP5 is really important to me and many other Biggleswade residents particularly in view of the proposed development of the land purchased by Hallam Land Management in North Biggleswade.  This particularly piece of land is well used by many local people, and has been for very many years. Building houses on this stretch of farm land will take away a locally loved recreational area, turning it into a housing estate and a busy road.  I honestly believe that the authority which gave permission for this development to go ahead, despite the many local objections, had absolutely no idea of it's recreational use and the loss of nature that will occur once building commences.  One of the most important points for the adoption of a local plan is that it will be local people who help plan our town. For example, only people who live here understand that these new houses will cause havoc on our already overcrowded narrow roads. They also understand the damage to nature and to an enjoyable exercise route. Literally hundreds of families walked that route during lockdown, and many still do! | Policy SP5 appears to relate to Local Plan policy, rather than the Neighbourhood Plan. Comments to be forwarded to the local planning authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | I have several concerns regarding the planning of Biggleswade, and to me and many other people this is a particularly important one.  Currently it is almost impossible to get an appointment at our local doctors surgery (Ivel Medical Centre). We start phoning just before they open at 8am. If we get through at all it's usually after 8.30am and can take hundreds of redials. By that time all appointments for that day have usually gone and we are told to phone again the next day when the whole depressingly similar routine starts over.  We live in fear of being ill and needing a doctors appointment these days, and I personally feel totally let down by our local surgery. I know it's not all their fault. I believe the problem lies with the huge increase in the local population due to the massive increase in house building in Biggleswade during the last few years.  We need houses, but we also need the infrastructure that goes with them. Only people living in this area are able to judge the needs of Biggleswade residents, so I hope it is possible to have a more local planning committee who understand local roads and services.  We also need dentists, schools and road improvements to be provided at the same time as new houses, not years after! Some of the roads in Biggleswade are tiny and not made for the huge increase in traffic we have experienced, particularly Potton Road.  We have benefitted from being a larger town too. The out of town shopping centre and an increase in eateries is one example. There is however a limit to Biggleswade's house building. We don't want to join with Sandy as the house building marches across the farm land and well used paths towards the RSPB in Sandy destroying ours, and other peoples well used and well loved country walks.    I believe it is important that we have a local plan. Biggleswade Town Council are aware of these issues, and although they can't magic up extra doctors, they are at least trying their best to do the best for our town. I believe it is important that the Biggleswade Neighbourhood Plan is agreed. | Comments to be forwarded to the various service providers. |
| Local Resident | Page 16 | BSP1 | Strongly agree with paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 21 | BSP1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 29 | BTC1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 38 | BEM1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 45 | BRD1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 52 | BGS1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 54 | BGS2 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 56 | BGS3 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 64 | BGS4 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 69 | BPD1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 73 | BPD2 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 75 | BPD3 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 81 | BH1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 83 | BH2 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 85 | BH3 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 91 | BTM1 | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 97 |  | The policy has clearly been developed after careful consideration and has my full support. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 48-66 | BGS3 | Although the new estates seem reasonably well served with green space and parks, the older areas of the town are not so if this could be rectified it would be good. For example, i'm thinking of the older estates off Drove and Potton Road and around The Baulk. Adding in small parks/childrens play areas to these areas will mean these areas continue to be attractive to young families in future- otherwise the danger is that young families will flock to the newer estates, leaving the older areas to decline and be inhabited only by older generations and those without the financial means to choose where they live. | These could be local projects subject to funding but are outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan. Comment to be considered by the Town Council. |
| Local Resident | Page 88-94 | BTM1 | All additional housing development must be served by adequate roads (number of and quality of - existing roads suffer from awful surfacing in many areas), also there must be more provision of footpaths and cycle paths. The roads connecting these new estates to older areas of the town must be updated to take account of the increase in traffic, for example any new development off Furzenhall Road - Drove Road is already very congested and was not built to take the amount of traffic, other solutions need looking into. Some of the newer estates have no footpaths whatsoever leading to a heavy reliance on cars. Car parking provision in all areas must be increased to avoid roads being blocked by cars parking everywhere - this causes congestion where only one car can pass, and also is an eye-sore.  Biggleswade is only a small town but still many people drive everywhere - this is partly for reasons outside the Councils ability to affect, but also because of the lack of wide open walking/cycling highways - the roads all over the town and town centre are still massively dominated by cars - these should be narrowed where possible and footpaths widened to accommodate people and bikes. Trees could also be planted to make using these an attractive proposition, plus benches and small pay areas. I welcome the idea to introduce more electric charging points.  Large car parks on the edge of the town centre should be looked into to form what would essentially be mini-park and ride/walk system - this could free the town centre up to be largely traffic-free and pedestrianised, giving the opportunity for more green spaces and recreation areas within it. The town centre needs to provide a better offer to entice people away from the retail park, or at least make the retail park somewhere where they go to buy something quickly but then ocme into town to socialise and relax. This would attract people from the retail park - the town centre should become an area with large green spaces, children's play parks, cafes, restuarant,s quiet green wildlife areas etc. People would then eat, drink and shop in the smaller shops. Small car parks to serve the disabled could be maintained but most people could walk in/take short bus ride.  There is little point in creating a new bus interchange unless usage can be increased through cheaper prices and more importantly more regular and direct services. Some dedicated bus services should also go directly to key places, for example Bedford town centre rather than visit towns/villages on route which puts some off using the service as it takes too long.  Areas of recreation within the town should be joined up by dedicated walking/cycling routes similar to the Green Wheel - for example access to the under-used river area and play park off Hitchin Street should be better linked to the town centre. | Comments noted. The Neighbourhood Plan already has policies on sustainable transport, including cycling and walking.  The interpretation on BTM1 now says that cycleways should be segregated on new development. |
| Local Resident | Page 38 | BEM1 | Ref BEM1  There appears to be heavy emphasis on Warehousing. Biggleswade is in the Cambridge / Oxford corridor and more emphasis should be given to ensuring space is available to encourage high-tech startups and flexible office space. A small development area set apart as a 'Science Park' area would be a start.  It is unfortunate that the Town Council objections to the conversion of office space in Britten Place to housing were overruled by Central Beds! | The policy supports offices or light industrial uses, including co-working space or flexible workspace, so would support high-tech start-ups.  Biggleswade Town Council will consider the ‘science park’ suggestion as a future project (outside of the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan). |
| Local Resident | Page 51 | BGS1 | The document outlines Biggleswade's Agricultural and Market Gardening heritage but then appears only to indicate that small areas should be set aside for growing food - presumably Allotments.  The document should be stronger in resisting any further developments on agricultural land since recent developments and outline proposals have taken agricultural land on a large scale!  P51 Point (1) There are very few areas now in Biggleswade where development has not had an adverse impact on Biggleswade's green environment! | The plan addresses loss of agricultural land in Policy BSP1. |
| Local Resident | Page 14 | BSP1 | I did not receive my invitation leaflet about these meetings 5th Oct-21st Oct until 17th Oct: only one date and two meetings left out of 9. Is this last-minute information part of the Council's plan? | Noted.  Leaflet drops formed one part of a planned series and a variety of methods used to raise and increase awareness of the consultation throughout the duration of the consultation process to ensure that all interested parties had an opportunity to participate in the consultation. |
| Local Resident |  | BEM2 | Health facilities is mentioned throughout the document - I hope a GP surgery is included in this, as the current two GP practices in town cannot cope with current demand (the Ivel Medical Centre in particular).  On a separate note, I'd be interested to know if you're aiming for 10% biodiversity net gain or above. | Comment referred to NHS.  Biodiversity net gain is addressed in Policy BGS1.  A 10% net gain requirement is a requirement of the Environment Act 2021 (which received Royal Assent on 9 November 2021), so it would be inappropriate to include additional or conflicting requirements within the Neighbourhood Plan. |
| Local Resident | Page 64 | BGS4 | Please can consideration be taken in with wheel chair users as my I push my husband in a chair and have to plan my route into town. There are certain route where I have no choice but to use the road as the oath is too narrow. Also the camber on some makes it harder to push. Town is good but the getting to the town is hard. Especially saffron road and teal road and parts of Hitchin street. | Added references to people to differing levels of mobility into the design and transport policies. |
| National Highways |  |  | The draft policies set out are unlikely to have an impact on the operation of the trunk road, consequently, we offer No Comment. | Noted. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Maunder Avenue / road widths & no hard surfaced pavement, and too narrow (zoom in on the photo to  see the obstacle course that parked cars leave, and spot the legs of the pedestrian waiting behind the  parked silver car!)  Photo - Boxy 1970s building in the town centre  Photo - The old northbound platform at the station (and a roof on the footbridge, and lifts!) | Noted but outside the scope of the plan. |
| Local Resident |  |  | As if to make the point, I've just tried to help a Welch's transport lorry driver  who had a pallet to deliver to 10 Darwin Drive but couldn't get through  because of parked cars and the road was too narrow! | Noted. BTM2 interpretation refers to a minimum highway’s width. |
| Hertfordshire County Council |  |  | Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) welcome the opportunity to comment on this consultation.  HCC Services do not have any comments to make at this time. However, HCC would like to continue to be notified of updates and any further consultations in relation to the Biggleswade Town Council neighbourhood plan to ensure that where there may be cross-boundary implications into Hertfordshire that these have the necessary input from HCC services. | Noted. |
| Historic England |  |  | Neighbourhood Plans, should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. It is important that, as a minimum, the strategy you put together for your area safeguards those elements of your neighbourhood area that contribute to the significance of those assets. This will ensure that they can be enjoyed by future generations of the area and make sure your plan is in line with the requirements of national planning policy, as found in the National Planning Policy Framework. | The Neighbourhood Plan includes specific policies on heritage. |
| Historic England |  | BPD2 | We welcome the production of this neighbourhood plan, and are pleased to see that the historic environment of your parish features throughout. In particular we welcome Sections 9 and 10, and have the following minor comments to make. We welcome policy BPD2 and its supporting information, but consider that clauses 2 and 3 run counter to one another in that clause 3 sets out that applicants “must” follow the guidelines below for shopfronts in historic buildings, whilst clause 2 above supports contemporary shopfronts in historic buildings. This could be clarified. | The guidelines allow for considerable flexibility, including well-designed contemporary schemes. |
| Historic England |  |  | We would also suggest providing references to the Historic Towns and Villages Forum’s helpful information on shopfront design and material which, although published some time ago, still contains useful and detailed information. Historic England’s own advice on maintaining timber windows also has applicability to traditional timber shopfronts, and could also be referenced. In particular, we would highlight the benefits of avoiding modern plastic paint finishes and using linseed paint in terms of the preservation of external timber shopfronts. | This external guidance has been noted. |
| Historic England |  | BH1 | We welcome and support policy BH1 - Biggleswade Conservation Area. We would suggest strengthening it by making it a requirement for any application to be supported by a heritage statement that sets out how the proposals have taken the character and appearance of the conservation area into account in the development of their designs, and how they have avoided harm to the significance of the area. | Neighbourhood Plans cannot set submission requirements – these are set by national Government. |
| Historic England |  | BH2 | We welcome policy BH2, and would suggest it too could be strengthened by making it a requirement to adapt and reuse non-designated heritage assets on development sites, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not economically or structurally feasible. | Policy HE1 of the adopted CBC Local Plan covers this. |
| Historic England |  | BH3 | We welcome policy BH3, but consider that clause 1 duplicates existing local and national policy and legislative requirements and may therefore not be necessary. Clause 2 is welcome, but we would suggest that the neighbourhood plan could identify particular opportunities where this would be the case, to provide additional clarity and plan proactively for this eventuality. We would also suggest that, unless there is a Local Plan policy that does this already, the non-designated ‘Archaeological Notification Areas’ highlighted on the map on page 84 could also be subject to a policy requiring a Desk Based Assessment at minimum, as well as consideration of public dissemination of any artefacts and information discovered during the course of pre-construction archaeological investigations. | Policy HE1 of the adopted CBC Local Plan requires Archaeological Heritage Statements and covers public dissemination. |
| Historic England |  | BTM1 | We note the inclusion of Policy BTM1: Sustainable Transport. We would recommend altering clause 7 to ensure that charging points are installed in the carriageway, rather than on pavements, to reduce street clutter and pedestrian barriers. | Clause 7 has been altered as suggested. |
| Historic England |  |  | You can also use the neighbourhood plan process to identify any potential Assets of Community Value in the neighbourhood area. Assets of Community Value (ACV) can include things like local public houses, community facilities such as libraries and museums, or again green open spaces. Often these can be important elements of the local historic environment, and whether or not they are protected in other ways, designating them as an ACV can offer an additional level of control to the community with regard to how they are conserved. | This is dealt with under separate legislation. The Neighbourhood Plan cannot designate assets of community value.  The Town Council will consider. |
| Historic England |  |  | Communities that have a neighbourhood plan in force are entitled to claim 25% of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds raised from development in their area. The Localism Act 2011 allows this CIL money to be used for the maintenance and on-going costs associated with a range of heritage assets including, for example, transport infrastructure such as historic bridges, green and social infrastructure such as historic parks and gardens, civic spaces, and public places. As a Qualifying Body, your neighbourhood forum can either have access to this money or influence how it is spent through the neighbourhood plan process, setting out a schedule of appropriate works for the money to be spent on. Historic England strongly recommends that the community therefore identifies the ways in which CIL can be used to facilitate the conservation of the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting, and sets this out in the neighbourhood plan. | As the Qualifying Body, the Town Council would certainly consider the use of funding for this historic environment. However, CBC has not implemented CIL. |
| NHS Property Services Ltd |  | BEM2 | Policy BEM2 fails to address the need for flexibility within the NHS estate. NHSPS would advise the Town Council that policies aimed at preventing the loss or change of use of community facilities and assets, where healthcare is included within this definition, can have a harmful impact on the NHS’s ability to ensure the delivery of facilities and services for the community. Where such policies are overly restrictive, the disposal of superfluous and unsuitable healthcare facilities for best value can be prevented or delayed. Restrictive policies could prevent, or delay required investment in services and facilities. It is important to note that there are separate, rigorous testing and approval processes employed by NHS commissioners to identify unneeded and unsuitable healthcare facilities. These must be satisfied prior to any property being declared surplus and put up for disposal. With this in mind, we are keen to encourage that a greater level of flexibility be granted to the NHS via modification of the wording of Plan policies that ensure that the NHS can promptly and efficiently respond to the healthcare needs of the population as they arise.  We would suggest the following additional wording (in blue italics) be included in Policy BEM2 to make the policy more robust.  *3. The loss of existing community facilities will be supported only if:*  *a) A similar or better facility is provided in close proximity;* NHS Property Services Limited, 99 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NG Registered in England & Wales No: 07888110  *b) It can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer viable, including by placing it on the open market;*  *c) It can be demonstrated the loss or change of use is part of a wider public service transformation plan which requires investment in modern, fit for purpose infrastructure and facilities to meet future population needs or to sustain and improve services* | Given concern over the lack of NHS facilities in the town and the difficulties over the hospital site, no modifications to be made.  The Town Council will work with the NHS and CBC to support better facilities within Biggleswade. |
| NHS Property Services Ltd |  | BEM2 | In addition to this, we concur with part 2 of Policy BEM2 which refers to the impact of new residential developments on the capacity of local community facilities and, in instances where it is relevant, would welcome access to a more equitable share of developer contributions to provide new or expanded health infrastructure. We believe that healthcare facilities are essential infrastructure and where new or improved facilities are required; they should be delivered alongside additional housing units to mitigate the impact of population growth on existing infrastructure. The Biggleswade Town Council should work with NHS commissioners and providers to consider the quantum and location of healthcare facilities that will be required to ensure that new housing growth is sustainable.  We therefore believe it would be beneficial to expound on the supporting text relating to Community facilities policy BEM2 to make it more robust and encourage the inclusion of the following wording:  *‘Biggleswade Town Council will work with the clinical commissioning group and NHS bodies to understand the relationship growth has with their services and what this means for preparing a development strategy****’*** | The suggested wording is noted and welcomed by the Town Council, but is outside of the scope of planning policy. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Farmland must not be built on, Certainly not north of town or east. | Policy BSP1 addresses loss of agricultural land. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Healthcare not sufficient. What’s the plan for future growth? | Policy BEM2 supports new community facilities. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Bonds Lane development okay, but not enough car parking spaces/pavement. | Noted. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Why no solar panels for all buildings? Existing and new ones as per planning applications! | It would be over-prescriptive to require this for all buildings and existing buildings were approved in the past. However, Policy BPD1 includes various aspects of green design in the interpretation, including local energy generation. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Tops of buildings existing are all different. Why on new developments are they the same and boring? | The design policy seeks to promote better design. |
| Local Resident |  |  | New housing has small gardens and car parking, why? | Patterns of development, including gardens spaces, are addressed in Policies BRD1 and also BPD1. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Palace street. Lampost lighting brand new, never worked since installed. Maintenance Worker came to fix and left it not fixed, near sea scouts. | Noted but outside the scope of the plan. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Paving stone outside Iceland, now fixed. | Noted but outside the scope of the plan. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Century House improvements are good. | Noted but outside the scope of the plan. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Retail currently poor choice. Economy bad! | The plan seeks to support the Town Centre in Policy BTC1. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | Palace Street one way street. Dangerous drivers’ wrong way put in speed ramps. Lots of children for school dangerous. | Noted but outside the scope of the plan. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | I used to come to weekly meetings at Council | Noted. |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 & BTM1 | Lawrence Road potholes too many. Too many vehicles parked there going/commuting to London. This is wrong, should not be allowed. Driveways on London road all marked out but not on Lawrence Road. State of roads is appalling! More must be done to make pavements safer and too many wonky paving stones! | Noted. CBC already considering. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Traffic in Lawrence Road, people driving onto pavements when turning corners. No room to get in and out of homes. | Noted. CBC already considering. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Buses out to the villages ie the old warden bus service | Refer to Central Bedfordshire Council. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Too many houses. The most boring homes ever. It is the governments’ fault. No feeling of wanting to be there. Roads too small, large lorry’s can’t get through. Houses – issues with brickwork, badly done. Rooves need to be taken off after a few years. No gardens. Design them better than lego. Soulless | The plan includes design policy (BPD1). |
| Local Resident |  | BTM2 | There are pavements without suitable drainage creating (ice fields sheets) metal covers man wholes that are particularly slippery | Refer to Highways Authority. |
| Local Resident |  | BGS4 | The landowners association. A massive infiltration of, my previous speaking at the town Council, some years ago. It is a massive yellow flower branches in to many florets. There is a infestation in are surrounding fields dangerous to livestock. | Refer to CBC and Environment Agency. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Speeding in Biggleswade – Potton Road & Kings Reach. Sometimes 40-50 miles per hour | Refer to Highways Authority. |
| Local Resident |  |  | More litter bins around all of Biggleswade. More cycleways. Station lift/disabled access. Policing – would be good to have a police station in Biggleswade | Policy BTM1 supports cycling.  Network Rail already have a project for disabled access to station underway. Currently due for completion summer 2023. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Station access for disabled people. Re-doing pavement & trees in the market square. More doctors and doctors surgeries. What has happened to the medical hub in Biggleswade? Less houses, more infrastructure. Far more for people to do – cinema, clubs | Network Rail already have a project for disabled access to station underway. Currently due for completion summer 2023.  Other comments to be referred appropriately. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Energy charging points – expensive to run a car, where are the electric charging points. Are we in lockdown or not? Access to station if you are disabled. Pavements not level, lots of cracks. Social distancing, do people even know what this means? Is the Christmas Fair happening becaie of COVID. Teaching young – should they be wearing masks in school? | Electric charging point in new homes will be a legislative requirement from next year. |
| Natural England |  |  | Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 20 |  | Building sites HA506 &5A4 – Massive concerns where there sites will access onto existing roads. I don’t agree with building on flood plains or jamming too many houses on sites. Houses should accommodate at least 2 and preferably 3 parking spaces off road (mum/dad/first child). There should be electric charging fitted as standard to each house or on parking area nearby (this could be open to abuse) | Comments relate to the Local Plan, so to be forwarded to the local planning authority. |
| Local Resident | Page 53 |  | No mention made about the playing field at Eagle Farm Road, I sincerely hope that this is not planned for housing. It needs to be retained as grass (if only as somewhere for the MAGPAS helicopter to land). | Owned publicly by the Town Council. |
| Local Resident | Page 92 |  | I would support the Council on road widths especially 5.5m this should be after any other improvements eg cycleways, paths. (I am thinking especially of London Road and the possible enforcement of cycle lanes other than white lines) it isn’t wide enough with parked vans etc | Welcomed and agreed. |
| Local Resident |  |  | With regard to flood plains – they are there for a purpose – do not build on them unless on stilts. Look at Germany this year | Noted and agreed. |
| Local Resident | Page 21 | BSP1 | I am very concerned their may be development on flood plains. The risks of such developments are well known & frequently impact on older established housing. | Policy BSP1 addresses flood risk. National policy also addresses this. |
| Local Resident | Pages 49, 64, 88, 14 | BGS4 & BTM2 | Shared spaces is already a nightmare in Biggleswade. Cyclists do not respect the rights of pedestrians to walk safely. Cyclists race along shared space and the pavements causing accidents and near misses to pedestrians (I have personal experience of being knocked down by cyclists who did not stop).  Why do the police not evoke the highways act 1835 which prohibits cycling on footpath? Why do the council not ask the police to evoke the highways act 1835? | Added to BTM2 that on new layout, cycleways should be segregated.  Comments will be passed to Bedfordshire Police. |
| Local Resident | Page 56 | BGS2 & BGS3 | Green spaces fast disappearing & need to be protected. Spaces with community value in reality cater for a very limited section of towns folk. | Plan designates Local Green Spaces as allowed under guidelines. |
| Local Resident | Page 75 | BPD3 | There seems very little provision or appetite on behalf of the council to protect householders from adverse effects of neighbours building extensions. Do planning laws still apply in this area? | Many extensions are covered by permitted development rights. BPD3 applies where planning permission is required. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | It is clear the residential development of recent years has caused the near collapse of GP services. Both health services and education needs should be addressed before more housing is built. I seem to recall a doctors surgery being discussed for the Saxon Gate development. This was watered down to try and persuade Saffron GPs to move to Saxon Gate. Result – shortage of GPs and town people unable to access appointments. | CBC are planning a Health & Social Care Hub on the Biggleswade Hospital site. |
| Local Resident | Page 79 | BH2 | Local heritage does not appear to be well respected in Biggleswade. A sad example is the erection of a disproportionately large Chapter House on the Grade 2 listed St Andrews Church. Also the carpenters workshop in Shortmead Street is treated with no respect by the owners of the site. This unique structure should be listed and protected. | Noted. |
| Local Resident | Page 21 | BSP1 | Development must be deemed NEVER ACCEPTABLE in medium or high flood risk areas – there will never be strong enough reasons to justify building on flood plain land as flooding will result and cause havoc. The council will be culpable if this happened. | The National Planning Policy Framework has policies on flood risk – the Neighbourhood Plan must have regard to this. |
| Local Resident | Page 26, 29 | BTC1 | Night clubs should not be permitted in the town centre as social disorder and noise will result causing problems to nearby residents. | The Neighbourhood Plan could not prohibit night clubs in the town centre. |
| Local Resident | Page 49, 64, 88, 14, 69 | BGS4, BTM1, BTM2 | Walking routes – footpaths, pavements, footways etc should not be shared with cyclists who often treat pedestrians especially the old, disabled, toddlers etc with no care or consideration thereby creating danger to pedestrians. The Town Council, CBC and the police should liaise together to ensure illegal cycling on pavements throughout the town centre, but especially Shortmead street and the high street is properly dealt with. | Added to BTM2 that on new layout, cycleways should be segregated.  Comments will be passed to Bedfordshire Police. |
| Local Resident | Page 56 | BGS2 & BGS3 | There should be no exceptions to protecting strategic and local green spaces from development – “well designed” “community value” are very subjective. | This would prevent necessary operational development, such as maintenance equipment stores. No amendment. |
| Local Resident | Page 75 | BPD3 | 1a – 1e must be strongly adhered to especially sub para 1d | Note, the policy would only apply where a planning application is required, not where the extension is covered by permitted development rights. |
| Local Resident | Page 39 | BEM2 | No more residential development should be permitted until a properly functioning additional GP practice is operating that can properly cope with the increased population. Currently the existing GP practices in Biggleswade are over subscribed and unable to properly cope with the needs of the existing population. | Referred to the NHS. |
| Local Resident |  |  | Disability access to the train station (allowing people with prams too). Cars are going up one way streets so more signage and cameras are needed. | Network Rail already has a scheme underway. Currently due for completion Summer 2023. |