

**Schedule of proposals supported by Executive and any changes proposed (18/12/09)**

<b>Name of area</b>	<b>Supported Site(s)</b>	<b>Detail of Proposal supported by Executive (10/11/09)</b>	<b>Changes</b>
Ampthill	H052	Development of 150+ dwellings	None
	H203	Development of 40 dwellings and long stay car park	None
	H083	Development of approximately 270-360 dwellings	Slight reduction to 260 dwellings
	E64	B1 Business use (1ha)	None
	E68	B1 Business use	5.2ha identified
Arlesey	H293/E12a (incorporates H048, H156, H165 and E12)	Mixed use development of 1000+ dwellings, community facilities and 10ha of employment. The task force also commented that support of this site related to the development of a new relief road.	None
Biggleswade	H210	Development of between 60 dwellings	These two sites are suggested to be deleted. They are not required to meet the Core Strategy figures and the employment importance of the site can now be maintained.
	H098	Development of 65 dwellings	
	H347	Development of 330 dwellings. The task force noted that this development would occur at the end of the plan period, after the relief road associated with the development on land to the east of Biggleswade was in place.	None
	E67	Development of 15ha of employment	None

	New site	Former Council Offices on London Road	Proposed new site with 43 dwellings. Planning permission has been granted.
Blunham	H091	Development of 36 dwellings	None
Brogborough	E15	Development of 8ha of employment. The task force also commented that support for this site was provided with the caveat that no development took place in the northern tip of the site due to its proximity to the housing development.	None
Clifton	H206	Development of 50 dwellings. The task force also commented that access issues related to this site needed to be addressed in development.	These two sites are now considered one proposal with a reduction from 100 to 80 dwellings in total to help alleviate concerns over the site of development in this village.
	H261	Development of 50 dwellings	
Clophill	H042	Development of 12-15 dwellings	Following further discussions with Ward Members and the Parish Council site H353 is suggested as an alternative to site H042.
	H353	N/A (Development of 12 dwellings)	
	H157	Development of 10 dwellings	None
Cranfield	H322	Part of combined site with H040 and H133	Site H322 is a new site next to H040 and 133. A enlarged/replacement lower school may be needed in Cranfield. The addition of H322 would maintain the possibility of a
	H040	Development of 100 dwellings and doctors surgery	
	H133	Development of 25-35 dwellings. The task force supported allocation of a total of approximately 160 dwellings in Cranfield.	

			school as part of a single allocation, including 135 dwellings.
	H104	Development of 20-25 dwellings	Proposal for 25 dwellings
	E82	Development of 10ha of employment	Proposed reduction from 10 to 5ha due to provision at Wixams.
Dunton	H192	Development of 10-15 dwellings. The task force commented that the preference for this development should be bungalows.	Proposal for 15 dwellings
Everton	H246	Development of 8 dwellings	None
	H244	Development of 7 new dwellings and 1 renovation	None
Flitwick	H077/E62	Development of 475-500 dwellings and 0.6ha of commercial development	Proposal for 450 dwellings and 1.1 ha of employment
	H113	Mixed use development of 85 dwellings, employment, retail and leisure use with transport interchange.	None
Gravenhurst	H270	Development of 7-8 dwellings	Site is proposed to be removed from the allocations
Henlow	H135	Development of 15-25 dwellings. This was the preferred site for development in Henlow but the task force did resolve to revisit this site if necessary.	Site is proposed to be removed from the allocations
Houghton Conquest	None	It was considered that due to the development to the north (Wixams) no further sites should be supported for development in Houghton Conquest.	N/A
Langford	H164	Development of 44 sheltered homes for the elderly with cemetery, it was commented that this development was strongly supported	None

		for sheltered accommodation and a cemetery.	
	H160	Development of 5 dwellings	Slight increase proposed to 9 dwellings.
	H123	Development of approximately 30 dwellings along the frontage of the site. The task force commented that this site would only be required if there were not enough sites elsewhere.	Site is proposed to be removed on the basis that there are enough sites elsewhere.
Lidlington	H081	Development of approximately 45 dwellings	Site is proposed to be removed from the allocations
Marston Moretaine	E09	Mixed use development of approximately 100 dwellings and 7ha of employment. The task force commented that this site was also supported as a 'reserve' site for a further 320 homes which would only be developed if other developments at the Wixams were not developed on time.	Proposal of 125 dwellings, 7ha of employment and a contingency housing allocation of 320 dwellings.
Maulden	H218	Development of 60 dwellings	Reduction in proposal from 60 to 15 dwellings
	E18	Development of 1.8ha of employment. The task force commented that this site should be recommended as a reserve.	None (1.8 ha employment proposed)
Meppershall	H174	Development of 68 dwellings, cemetery, GP surgery, community hall and playing field	None
Moggerhanger	H154	Development of 17 dwellings. The task force additionally commented that concerns relating to traffic and access to the site needed to be addressed and that an appropriate number of affordable homes needed to be provided.	None
Potton	H356	Development of approximately 50 dwellings	These two sites are being

	H237	Development of approximately 60 dwellings	submitted as one for a proposal of 90 dwellings
	H075/H199 (combined proposal)	Development of 150 dwellings, 1ha B1 employment and community facilities	None
Sandy	H240/H276	Mixed use development of 65 dwellings	Proposal for 50 dwellings and 0.5ha employment.
	H295	Development of 77 dwellings	Proposal for 60 dwellings
	E38	Development of 10ha of employment	None
Shefford	H163	Development of 59 dwellings	None
	H055	Development of 135 dwellings. The task force commented there may be a need to revisit sites in Shefford as no decision was made on site H019/H171 regarding the 2ha of employment land, which is required.	Proposal for 120 dwellings
	H019	Mixed use development to include 70 dwellings and 2ha employment	See above. In view of the need for further sites across the Minor Service Centres, this site is recommended for inclusion
Shillington	H006	Development of 24 dwellings. The task force also commented that matters relating to access to the site needed to be resolved as part of the development.	None
Silsoe	H106	Development of 380 dwellings with B1 business use	None
Stondon	H079	Development of 70 dwellings and community facility. The task force also commented that matters relating to access to the site and sewage needed to be resolved as part of the development.	Removal of B1 (office/ light industrial) element

	H176	Development of 13 dwellings	None
Stotfold	<b>NB</b> The sites recommended by Task Force for the Minor Service Centres were less than is required by the Core Strategy. In particular the sites recommended in Stotfold (94 dwellings) were below the Core Strategy range (150-250). To remedy this, two sites have been proposed that have been discussed previously. Both are within the existing settlement envelope.		
	H260	Development of 85 dwellings.	None
	H129	Development of 8 or 9 dwellings	Proposal for 9 dwellings
	Roker Park	Development of 43 dwellings	New site – outline application due to be considered at DM committee early in 2010
	Roecroft Lower School	Development of 40 dwellings	New site – initial consultation undertaken on school relocation. Principle of redeveloping existing site considered acceptable.
	E25	Development of 1.8ha of employment	5ha employment land Site with planning permission amounts to 5ha
Wixams	H278/ E14	Mixed use development of approximately 1,000+ dwellings, employment, education and community facilities.	1,000 dwellings and a minimum of 5ha employment
Wrestlingworth & Cockayne Hatley	H090	Development of 21 dwellings. The task force commented in relation to this site that if there were enough rural development sites then this one should be removed from development.	Site is proposed to be removed from the allocations