

<b>Summary of Main Issues Raised in Questionnaires</b>		
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Change made if required</b>
<b>1. Vision</b>		
The Vision in functional rather than visionary	The Vision for Arlesey Cross is informed by Policy MA8, baseline information, feedback from the public exhibitions and the constraints and opportunities. A key aspect of the vision is that the development will enhance the pedestrian environment in Arlesey. This will be achieved through the provision of new green links through the town which include a new north-south route for pedestrians and cyclists, environmental enhancements to the High Street, enhanced links to the existing footpath network and a network of green routes through the development.	Text amended to add emphasis to improvements to the pedestrian environment.
The Vision will improve the north end of Arlesey only	The allocation area is located towards the north of the settlement, where the population mass is greatest, however, the uses proposed in the Local Centre are considered to complement the existing Civic Amenity area located more centrally within Arlesey and S106 money could be used to ensure it does not suffer as a result of the Local Centre. In addition parking rationalisation and other improvements on High Street and Hitchin Road are proposed which will benefit the south of Arlesey.	None required

Too much is potential and not definite	As outlined in Section 1.10 of the Draft Masterplan, the purpose of the document is to guide the development of the site and to provide a further layer of policy to build on Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD, which will assist CBC in dealing with planning applications. The Draft Masterplan cannot be expected to provide full detail on all of the issues surrounding the development, or fix matters absolutely at this stage, as this can only be done once planning applications are submitted with the detailed supporting information that will accompany them.	None required
The Vision should make clearer the route of the relief road is to run from the 5 ways junction to the A507	It is not considered this level of detail is necessary in the vision. Section 5 of the Draft Masterplan covers the relief road in detail.	None required
<b>2. Scale of Development</b>		
The development is out of proportion with the size of Arlesey and will harm the village feel	The Masterplan provides guidance on delivery of the quantum of development required by the Site Allocations DPD, which has been through independent examination by a Central Government Inspector and found to be sound.	None required
<b>3. Disposition of Land Uses</b>		
The local centre is proposed to be in the wrong place and will be too far from the centre of Arlesey	The position of the local centre was informed by consultation responses following the 2012 exhibition when the majority of respondents suggested that this should be provided near to Chase Farm close to the relief road/ High Street junction. The local centre will need to serve the new community as well as the existing and this is the most central location for both.	None required

<p>Concerns that Arlesey will lose its heart by siting the local centre away from existing amenity centre with this detracting from existing services</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the existing amenity area provides a core of local facilities which include the school, nursery, resource centre, Town Council offices, hall and doctor's surgery. Section 106 contributions can facilitate an upgrade of the existing amenity area and expansion of the doctor's surgery.</p>	<p>Wording added to Section 9 to clarify that as part of any S106 contribution towards 'community facilities and services' money could be spent on improvements to the existing amenity area to help maintain its viability.</p>
<p>Development will result in a north/south divide and separate the community into two with all of the benefits going to Church End and the north of Arlesey</p>	<p>Section 106 contributions can be used to facilitate an upgrade of the existing civic amenity area at it's current location. The existing school will also remain in this location. Environmental enhancements will also be made to the entire length of the High Street between the new local centre and the five ways junction to improve the pedestrian environment.</p>	<p>Wording added to Section 9 to clarify that as part of any S106 contribution towards 'community facilities and services' money could be spent on improvements to the existing amenity area to help maintain its viability.</p>
<p>It would be more appropriate to redevelop the existing civic amenity area than create a new centre as it is more centrally located</p>	<p>There is not the land available to extend the existing civic amenity area, however, the new local centre will have a retail focus and existing amenities can be improved at the existing civic amenity area. Vehicle access to the new local centre would be from the new relief road to avoid additional pressure upon the existing Highways Network. Environmental improvements would be made to encourage walking and cycling between the new and existing amenities.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Support the expansion and mix of uses</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Development on the western land is inappropriate</p>	<p>The western land forms part of the allocated site and should therefore needs to be included in the Masterplan</p>	<p>None required</p>

Land adjacent to the development area should be included if made available by landowners to avoid fragmented development in the future	Any further allocation of land would have to go through the due planning process and be subject to formal examination, this could happen at the next review of the Development Strategy	None required
Developable land alongside St John's Road to the south of the western expansion area is being overlooked for built development without reasonable justification	The development areas have been distributed on the basis of urban design principles taking into account site constraints and not on the basis of landownership	None required
The distribution of houses appears to favour the major landowners whilst not reflect constraints and opportunities	The housing areas have been distributed on the basis of urban design principles taking into account site constraints and not on the basis of landownership	None required
Lack of detail for the amount and location of open space, play areas and attenuation	The concept plan at figure 4.1 provides an indicative indication of the distribution of open space, play areas and attenuation to guide future planning applications, which will provide more detail	None required
Community gardens should be located near to the existing Chase House care home	Community gardens could be provided within an enclosed court yard as part of the Extra Care facility. The gardens would be safe and secure and overlooked by residents.	None required as this can be dealt with at the planning application stage.
Development is proposed too close to the A507. There should be more open space separating it.	The nearest residential dwelling would be over 250m from the A507. The employment area will provide a noise buffer between the A507 and residential dwellings. There is also substantial open space between the employment and residential areas (around 25m in width).	None required
The red line site boundary includes some land which is not included within the MA8 Local Plan allocation site and excludes some small areas which are	Only open space is proposed on land outside of the allocation area, the location of which would help maintain the visual separation between Arlesey and Stotfold and Fairfield Park, which is a stated aim of Policy MA8. The red line within the Masterplan is based on information provided by landowners.	None required
<b>4. Housing Design/Density</b>		

The proposed density of development is too high	The Masterplan provides an indicative indication of overall density only. Density will ultimately vary across the development with there being different character areas and will be determined at the planning application and stage through design coding	None required
Need to be more precise on scale and density of the development in the Masterplan	This will be covered in the detailed planning application stage through design coding	None required
Until the mix of housing is known it is not possible to comment whether it is the most appropriate way of accommodating the land use	Further consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage	None required
New houses will not be for the local community so this will have a negative impact on Arlesey	People in Arlesey in housing need will be eligible for affordable housing through the local lettings policy.	None required
50% of houses should be allocated for Arlesey and Stotfold residents only	The Council cannot control market housing and who is able to purchase it.	None required
Development should include larger homes to provide for the needs of families	CBC Policy requires a mix of housing sizes on development such as this and it will therefore include larger properties suitable for families	None required
Support the provision of new homes to meet need of growing population	Noted	None required
Support assisted living housing for elderly people	Noted	None required
Houses should be reasonably priced	CBC cannot control the price of new homes as this will be established by the market. There will however, be a proportion of affordable homes of different tenures delivered as part of the development.	None required
Adequate parking required in new developments to avoid on street parking	The development will need to comply with CBC's adopted parking standards	None required
Arlesey has a mix of housing styles and a development of new houses would be out of character with existing town	Paragraph 4.13 states: 'The Council expect the design of the proposed dwellings to reflect the best features of local architecture. Proposed developers will need to undertake a contextual analysis to inform the design process, which should form part of future Design Coding and Planning Applications.'	None required

Arlesey has a mixture of building styles so a Fairfield Park style of development would be preferable	As above	None required
Height restrictions needed to keep a village feel	Paragraph 4.12 states that new development will comprise predominantly 2 storey housing with a maximum of 3 storeys where appropriate. It is likely that buildings within the local centre will be 2.5 and 3 storeys in height. The detailed design and coding will need to consider the scale and massing of the local centre in relation to adjacent land uses and built form to help ensure a good fit with the existing settlement.	None required
Aesthetic development required that blends in with rest of Arlesey	This requirement is reflected in para 4.13 of the Masterplan Document.	None required
Houses should include renewable energy ie solar pannels	Current CBC policy in the Core Strategy requires a proportion of the energy used in new development of this size be derived from renewable sources. This will be secured at the planning application stage.	None required
<b>5. Affordable Housing</b>		
No need for 35% affordable housing - it exceeds the needs of Arlesey	CBC's policy is for affordable housing to be delivered on all developments of 4 houses or more to help meet the wider need within Central Bedfordshire.	None required
Arlesey residents should have priority in private and social housing	People in Arlesey in housing need will be eligible for affordable housing through the local lettings policy.	None required
Concerns that affordable housing will attract social problems	The Council has a duty to provide safe and affordable housing for all sections of the population	None required
Affordable housing should be seperated from private housing	CBC's policy is for affordable housing to be distributed across the development to promote social integration	None required
Affordable housing should be attractive and varied	CBC's Policy is for housing to be tender blind so there is no difference in the character of affordable and private market housing	None required

<b>6. Employment</b>		
Employment should be located outside of Arlesey	Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD requires the provision of employment as part of the development.	None required
Land close to the A507 is ideal for employment development	Noted	None required
Employment should be located to the west of High Street backing onto the railway line	The employment is considered to be in the best location in terms of attracting interest from the market. It would also provide an acoustic buffer for the housing proposed on the eastern land to reduce noise from the A507.	None required
Location of employment will increase commuting to Arlesey from elsewhere	The provision of employment as part of the development is a requirement of Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD and will generate employment opportunities for local people, which may reduce out-commuting.	None required
Existing industrial areas not fully occupied so why the need for more? Is there actually evidence that this is required?	The provision of employment as part of the development is a requirement of Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD. The availability of land for speculative development and to provide a range of opportunities will attract further business investment in Arlesey.	None required
More industrial units will not create new jobs, it will simply be a case of relocation of business/jobs from one area to another	Whilst this may be a consequence of the provision of further employment land being available it would at least retain employment in Arlesey and could also create new employment opportunities.	None required
The proportion of new jobs created would be low compared to the amount of housing	It is estimated that approximately 1,000 jobs could be provided across the various employment uses proposed as part of the development, which include B1, B2 & B8 Use Classes, extra care and retail.	None required
Jobs should be available for people in Arlesey first	It is not possible under current employment laws to restrict the availability of jobs in this way, but provision of new employment would at least provide job opportunities locally.	None required

This will not create jobs for local people	The provision of new employment land as part of the development would at least create job opportunities, which local people could apply for.	None required
Existing employment areas in Arlesey should be relocated to this land	The employment land would go to the market so there would be opportunities for existing businesses in Arlesey to relocate if desired.	None required
Arlesey is a commuter area so no need for more employment	The Site Allocations DPD requires the delivery of 10 ha of employment land as part of the development and the Masterplan must reflect this.	None required
Further information on the type of employment should be included in the Masterplan	More detail on the type of employment will be provided at the planning application stage and there will be a further opportunity to comment then.	None required
No hazardous industry should be allowed to locate at the site	Any planning application for employment development would have to comply with the Council's Development Management Policies, which seek to protect the amenities of nearby housing and would also be referred to the Environment Agency and the Council's Public Protection Department for comments.	None required
More employment would contribute to traffic congestion at the south end of town	The employment land has been located as close as possible to the A507 so that the majority of traffic would utilise the A507 rather than travelling through Arlesey.	None required
Concern about increase in HGV movements as a result	The employment land has been located as close as possible to the A507 so that the majority of traffic would utilise the A507 rather than travelling through Arlesey.	None required
A positive part of the plan providing access is restricted to being from the A507	It is considered that the majority of HGV traffic would inevitably use the A507 as the nearest major road and the quickest means of reaching the Strategic Road Network.	None required



Parking and access for the employment is in the wrong position	The concept plan within the Masterplan is indicative only and parking and access for the employment areas will ultimately only be determined at the detailed planning application stage when there will be a further opportunity to make comments.	None required
There is insufficient infrastructure for the employment	New transport infrastructure in the form of the relief road and a new junction on the A507 close to the location of the principal employment area are to be delivered. Any reinforcements required to gas, electricity, water or other services would also be paid for through the development to ensure these are in place.	None required
Employment area to the east must have good screening	The Green Infrastructure Concept Plan at Figure 6.1 indicates a strong landscaping screen between the proposed employment land and the A507.	None required
Employment units should be limited to 2 storeys in height	The design of the employment units is a matter that would be considered at the detailed planning application stage and through Design Coding. Any proposal would need to meet CBC's adopted design policies and the CBC Design Guide.	None required
<b>7. Transportation/Highways</b>		
Concern about the resulting increase in traffic and congestion generally in Arlesey.	Any planning application would be supported by a Transport Assessment which would assess the potential impact of the proposed development on the local highway network. In the event that capacity issues are predicated, mitigation measures will be funded by the developer.	None required

<p>The relief road will not work and is really just an estate road for the development proposed.</p>	<p>The proposed relief road will provide an alternative to the main route through Arlesey of High Street, House Lane and Stotfold Road. It will be designed so that the carriageway is not restricted by parked cars enabling traffic to flow and it will therefore be a more desirable route than the existing. This, in conjunction with traffic calming measures on the existing route, will encourage people to use the relief road thereby relieving congestion.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>The Masterplan should refer to the potential for further clay extraction to take place at the landfill site, which benefits from a planning permission until 2042</p>	<p>There is a permitted mineral reserve remaining under old legislation which expires in 2042, the site is gault clay and to the south of the existing restored site and is greenfield. However, the view of the Minerals and Waste Team leader is that it would be highly unlikely that it would be worked as the material is not high quality and the works required to extract are significant.</p>	<p>Text in Draft Masterplan amended accordingly</p>
<p>A507 cannot cope with the current extent of traffic at peak times</p>	<p>Any planning application would be supported by a Transport Assessment which would assess the potential impact of the proposed development on the local highway network. In the event that capacity issues are predicated, mitigation measures will be funded by the developer.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Impact on Junction 10 of the A1M, which is already congested</p>	<p>The Highways Agency have requested that an assessment of Junction 10 of the A1(M) is included within the Transport Assessment which will accompany a future planning application on the site.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>The Sustainability Appraisal on the Core Strategy in 2009 takes into account technical issues outside of Arlesey e.g. mitigation of Junction 10 of the A1M. What is unclear is how the Masterplan has been assessed against other recent developments and the proposed 1,000 dwellings in</p>	<p>All allocated sites within Arlesey and Stotfold have been accounted for in the junction capacity modelling undertaken to date. Additional network growth for the locality has also been accounted for.</p>	<p>None required</p>

There are concerns that without knowing the precise extent of development now residents cannot properly assess the traffic flows and relief road issues	Further public consultation will be undertaken at the planning application stage allowing members of the public to comment on the detailed highways modelling in the Transport Assessment.	None required
Arlesey needs the relief road and for it to be a quick way into and out of the town	The relief road will be designed so that the carriageway is not restricted by parked cars enabling traffic to flow.	None required
The Masterplan is inconsistent in the terminology it uses to describe the proposed relief road.	Agreed	Draft Masterplan amended to tidy up wording
The proposals will push the traffic problem to the south of the proposed 5-ways junction and no assessment has been made of this. Proposals are only focused on part of Arlesey and not the settlement as a whole	Any planning application would be supported by a Transport Assessment which would assess the potential impact of the proposed development on the local highway network. In the event that capacity issues are predicated, mitigation measures will be funded by the developer.	None required
Question why no traffic survey has been completed south of the 5 ways junction	Whilst locations south of the 5-ways junction were not included within the original scoping of the Transport Assessment, subsequent traffic count data was obtained at the Arlesey New Road/Hitchin Road junction to enable analysis of the volume of traffic travelling south. CBC is aware local residents have concerns that capacity issues may occur on Hitchin Road, south of the 5-ways junction during peak hours and this will be assessed in detail as part of future planning applications.	None required
It is suggested that measures are implemented at the 5 ways junction to prevent traffic travelling south	It would not be practicable to prevent traffic from exiting Arlesey to the south.	None required
The new road will attract traffic from the A507 travelling towards Hitchin	It is considered that the relief road through the site would not be an attractive alternative for traffic from further afield travelling towards Hitchin. Vehicles accessing via the A1 would take the most direct route via the A602.	None required

Congestion issues will arise along House Lane	The proposed relief road and the proposed new A507 access roundabout will mean that vehicles seeking to access/exit the proposed development will not need to travel along House Lane to reach the site.	None required
The relief road should be provided to the east of High Street from Hitchin Road to the south of the proposed 5-ways junction	The Masterplan must relate to the allocation land, which requires a western route for the relief road. A question was asked about the local desire for an eastern relief road in addition to the western option in the consultation to gauge public feedback. This is something CBC can explore further as part of a review of the LDF.	None required
Relief road should be provided on the western side of the railway	A route to the west of the railway would not be suitable for a relief road given that this land lies within the flood plain.	None required
Arlesey needs greater accessibility to both the east and west	The scheme would deliver a new junction on the A507 and a section of relief road running east from High Street so would improve accessibility.	None required
It is essential that heavy vehicles are dissuaded from using Stotfold Road, House Lane and High Street and encouraged to use the relief road instead	The relief road will be designed to a suitable standard to adequately accommodate the movements of HGVs. The relief road will therefore become a more desirable route for all vehicles that the existing route via Stotfold Road and House Lane.	None required
A HGV ban should be imposed throughout Arlesey	Provision of the relief road through the site will provide a more direct route for HGV's thereby relieving their impact upon the existing road network.	None required
Upgrade West Drive to a full road to allow another route out of Arlesey	This route would not be suitable given that it would pass through residential development at Fairfield Park.	None required
Question whether it is necessary to have a new roundabout on the A507 or if it is feasible to use the existing roundabout with Stotfold Road to save costs	It would not be possible to engineer the existing roundabout to include a 5th arm to access the development.	None required

<p>The access from the A507 is not shown in the location on the Site Allocations Proposals Map</p>	<p>The route to the A507 shown as part of the Allocation on the Proposals Map was only intended to be indicative. The route proposed on the plans within the Draft Masterplan has been the subject of discussions with CBC's Highways Department and is supported by them.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Access off the A507 should be the only means of access to the development</p>	<p>Additional access to the development is required in order to provide a route to land west of High Street. It is also necessary to provide linkage in order to ensure that the new development is fully integrated with the existing town.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>It is considered that the proposed shared surface double mini-roundabout site access will not be safe. Should be traffic lights</p>	<p>The shared surface environment will be designed such that it will create a safer place as drivers will anticipate that pedestrians/cyclists may be seeking to cross the junction and will adapt their behaviour accordingly. The finalised proposal will also be subject to an independent safety audit.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>The double-mini roundabout junction will be difficult to build in phases.</p>	<p>Access arrangement drawings (including phasing if necessary) will be submitted to and agreed with CBC as part of the planning submission for a future planning application on the site.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Concern about relief road passing through housing on St John's Road and also the width of road achievable</p>	<p>A corridor of land in the St Johns Road development has been reserved for the relief road and the scheme was design with this specific intention in mind. The corridor of land would enable a carriageway width of 7.3m. This is in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Concern about secondary roads onto High Street from western land</p>	<p>It is good design practice to create permeable settlements. Links from the High Street to the relief road provide a choice of routes onto the relief road to prevent unnecessary car journeys through the High Street. Environmental improvements on the High Street will make it a better pedestrian environment.</p>	<p>None required</p>

Secondary roads onto High Street from the western land would need to be low level access points designed on 'Home Zone' principles with target speeds of 5-10 mph and this should be made clear in the Masterplan	The concept masterplan describes these routes as secondary routes. The secondary routes will be narrow with tighter radii than the pedestrian routes.	None required
Access onto Stotfold Road should be for cycles only as Stotfold Road is already congested	A capacity assessment of the proposed access onto Stotfold Road will be included within the Transport Assessment submitted in support of a future planning application to demonstrate there would be no capacity issues as a result of this part of the proposals.	None required
Figures 5.1 and 5.4 are confusing and contradicting in respect of potential or proposed access points	Figure 5.1 is considered to be clear. Figure 5.4 is to be updated in response to other points about parking rationalisation measures.	Figure 5.4 updated
Figure 5.2 would benefit from being overlaid on an existing plan of High Street.	Agreed	Figure 5.2 updated accordingly
Why is the 5 ways junction not part of this Masterplan and why was it the subject of a separate planning application?	The 5 ways junction is included within the red line in Figure 4.1 of the Draft Masterplan with the relevant planning permission reference numbers annotated. Planning permission was granted as the land involved is located within the Settlement Envelope of Arlesey and its redevelopment is therefore acceptable in principle in planning policy terms.	None required
The existing Arlesey Road/Arlesey New Road/Hitchin Road priority junction should be replaced with a mini-roundabout	At such time as a detailed planning application is submitted a full Transport Assessment will be prepared and submitted. The Transport Assessment will assess the extent to which capacity issues are predicted in this location. In the event that issues are predicted to occur, as a result of the development, alternative junction layouts would be considered.	None required

<p>The relief road should be constructed prior to construction of housing/phasing needs to be properly considered</p>	<p>The road would be funded by the development through the sale of houses. It is therefore, no financially viable to build the road prior to housing development commencing. The road will be built in phases alongside an agreed number of houses that affects the accessibility requirements at each stage of the development. The latter will be determined through detailed Transport Assessments submitted in support of any future planning applications. Appropriate triggers for the delivery of highway accesses as well as any off-site highway mitigation measures will be included in planning conditions or legal agreements attached to any future planning consent,</p>	<p>Text in the Masterplan covering phasing to be amended to provide further clarification</p>
<p>The Masterplan should make clear that the whole of the relief road will be secured by way of legal agreement to ensure delivery. A low threshold should be placed on housing numbers ahead of delivery of the relief road</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>As above</p>
<p>Wording should be added to Principle 5 to make clear that the timing and provision of environmental improvements to High Street must be linked to delivery of the relief road.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Text in Principle 5 to be amended accordingly</p>
<p>House lane and Church Lane should be turned into a one-way system</p>	<p>This is not considered necessary as traffic on these roads will be reduced once the section of relief road from High Street to the A507 is completed.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Measures need to be taken to prevent a 'rat run' between the new relief road and the Railway Station via Church Lane</p>	<p>The relief road through the site would provide an alternative for vehicles travelling towards the railway station from the A507 to the south. Church Lane would therefore be the most desirable route for some road users seeking to access Arlesey Railway Station, however, it is not considered that this would be a 'rat run'.</p>	<p>None required</p>
<p>Concern there will be insufficient off-street parking leading to further parking issues/sufficient parking needs to be provided with development</p>	<p>The development will need to comply with CBC's adopted parking standards</p>	<p>None required</p>

Concern about loss of on-street parking on St John's Road where properties do not have sufficient parking as it is.	The corridor through St John's Road was reserved for the relief road in the S106 Agreement pursuant to the planning permission for that site and was never intended to provide permanent on-street parking for properties in that development. Parking for the properties is provided in rear parking courts.	None required
The proposed traffic calming measures along High Street will lead to more traffic travelling along the proposed new road	That is the intention of the relief road in order to ease congestion on the existing main route through Arlesey.	None required
Support as long as the problems on High Street of parked cars, traffic calming etc are not repeated on the relief road	Noted	None required
Existing parked cars slow traffic down/no need for calming measures on High Street	The traffic calming measures would be implemented to further dissuade people from using High Street as a through route once the relief road is open and their implementation would be tied to the completion of the relief road.	Text in Draft Masterplan amended accordingly
Parking restrictions should be imposed along High Street	This is not considered necessary and may cause more harm than good given the number of properties that do not have on-plot/off-street parking and therefore currently park on High Street.	None required
Traffic calming measures should be extended south to include the rest of High Street and Hitchin Road	Following a further survey of traffic conditions in the area it proposed to extend the traffic calming measures south to where the 5 ways junction is proposed. Traffic calming on Hitchin Road is not considered necessary.	Plans indicating potential traffic calming measures have been amended accordingly.
Additional parking provision should be provided at the access to West Drive	This can be explored as part of the more detailed work at the application stage.	None required
Marked parking bays will result in less parking available due to oversized spaces	Agreed	Plans indicating potential traffic calming measures to be amended taking out the proposed allocated parking bays.



Traffic calming measures will cause noise and air pollution as cars accelerate and decelerate	The intention is for High Street to be a calmed area following the opening of the relief road with lower vehicle speeds making for a better pedestrian environment.	None required
Speed cameras would be better than traffic calming	Speed cameras could be introduced as part of a package of measures to reduce speed on the existing road network and create a more pedestrian friendly environment. This will be explored further at the application stage.	None required
The main road through Arlesey needs to be cleared of parked cars	This is not considered practicable given the number of properties that do not have on-plot/off-street parking and therefore currently park on High Street.	None required
Footpaths on Hitchin Road should be narrowed to allow the carriageway to be widened	This is not considered necessary and would lead to a reduced pedestrian environment	None required
The proposed 'drop-off' parking provision outside Gothic Mede Lower School will cause congestion	Agreed	Plans indicating potential traffic calming measures to be amended taking out the proposed allocated parking bays.
Concern about proposals to reduce pavement widths on High Street. Where will people put their bins.	There are no proposals to reduce pavement widths on the High Street. On the contrary the suggested High Street improvements include widening the footpaths, where the carriageway width allows, to create more space for pedestrians.	None required
Reducing the width of carriageways on High Street is not needed and will slow traffic further	The intention is to introduce measures on High Street in conjunction with the opening of the relief road to calm High Street further, improving the environment for pedestrians and encouraging through traffic onto the relief road.	None required
Concern about narrowing of junction around Lymans Road given the existing parking in that area	The proposed traffic calming measures are only indicative and will be explored further at the detailed application stage and will be the subject of further consultation before being finalised.	None required

The cycle route should pass underneath the proposed relief road in order to ensure cyclist safety	Necessary measures will be taken to ensure the safety of cyclists and pedestrians at all locations of the site. With specific regard to the relief road, formal crossing facilities will be provided along the key desire lines.	None required
The north-south cycleway should be a cycleway only and not located next to a road	The north-south cycleway on the eastern land is proposed to be within a green corridor and is not located adjacent to a road.	None required
The proposed cycle/pedestrian route should be extended to link to West Drive	In the event that an eastern relief road is pursued it is likely that a non-vehicular link would follow this route. At this stage however, it is considered more convenient and beneficial in terms of cyclist safety for the route to link the existing and proposed dwellings within the town to the existing cycle route to the north.	None required
The more cycleways that can be provided the better	Noted	None required
There needs to be a safe cycle route linking to Arlesey Station	There is likely to be a S106 contribution towards new and improved cycle routes from the development.	None required
Proposed cycle and pedestrian routes should accommodate disabled road users	At the detailed design stage the relevant authorities will be consulted in order to ensure that all routes address the needs and requirement of less abled users.	None required
A sustainable link to Etonbury Middle School should be provided through a crossing over/under the A507 in the vicinity of the proposed new roundabout	In response to comments in support of this a technical solution is being explored and costed.	Masterplan amended to indicate the potential for a pedestrian link over/under the A507 in the area around the new
The proposed pedestrian/cycle loop through Fairfield Park to Stotfold via Hitchin Road would be a great community benefit	Further consideration will be given to the provision of this route at the application stage.	None required
Important to have an east-west cycleway	Noted and one is proposed as part of the scheme.	None required
A pedestrian link should not be shown at either Glossop Way or Little Field Close as these are private sections of road	Agreed	Masterplan amended to delete arrows indicating these potential links.

Road widths should be suitable to accommodate buses	All on-site roads will be designed in accordance with the appropriate national and local standards. It is envisaged that a new bus route will be incorporated in the design of the land to the east of High Street. The route will be designed in consultation with local bus operators and CBC's Public Transport Officer. The width of the roads along this route will be designed in accordance with the requirements of CBC's Design Guidance.	None required
Need for an extensive travel plan with improved frequency of bus services and connectivity with station	A Travel Plan will be submitted in support of a future planning application on the site. Full consideration will be given to the enhancement of existing bus services within the document.	None required
Need for increased rail service to accommodate additional custom. Discussions should be held with train operators	The provision of additional rail services is a decision to be made by the train operator, however, if the patronage increases it is likely that the services will be enhanced to reflect this. Discussions will however, be held with them to make them aware of the timescales for the development.	None required
Need for additional parking at the station	Additional parking at Arlesey Station is currently being provided by others. The development will focus on encouraging people to access the station by sustainable model of travel.	None required
Arlesey Station needs to be upgraded	This is a matter for Network Rail.	None required
Construction traffic should not use House Lane	CBC is likely to impose a condition on any planning application requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan be prepared prior to the commencement of development. This will include details of construction traffic routing and hours of operation.	None required
<b>8. Green Infrastructure and Open Space</b>		

There will be less green open space as development too big and being built on green land	Whilst the scheme would involve development on open land, much of it is private and therefore not currently publically accessible. The Concept Plan within the Masterplan indicates circa 17 ha of open space, including a town park, sports pitches, a community orchard and informal recreational areas, all of which would be publically accessible.	None required
Loss of biodiversity	The concept masterplan considers the ecological constraints. The eastern development area is open arable fields with limited ecology value. The western land parcel has a County Wildlife site and this will be retained with a landscape buffer between it and the housing. A full ecological assessments will accompany future planning applications.	None required
Loss of agricultural land	The site is allocated for the uses outlined in Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD and therefore the principle of its development for these uses is established.	None required
Why haven't the brownfield sites been elected to be used for housing development rather than important agricultural land?	When preparing the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs CBC undertook an assessment of the extent of housing that could be delivered on brownfield sites. This concluded that there is insufficient brownland available to meet the overall housing requirement in the north part of Central Bedfordshire and as a consequence greenfield land has had to be allocated to help meet this need.	None required
The whole site should be made woodland for wildlife	The site is allocated for development in the Council's Site Allocations DPD and the principle of its development is already established.	None required
Support provision of green links and wildlife areas	Noted	None required
Support provision of play areas	Noted	None required
As much open space as possible should be provided	The Concept Plan within the Masterplan indicates circa 21 <b>ha</b> of open space.	None required
Need for areas for dog walking	The Concept Plan within the Masterplan includes significant area of informal recreational space.	None required

A large play area in the town park and café would make a good focal point for Arlesey	One is shown indicated on the Concept Plan at Figure 4.1 of the Masterplan	None required
Area to east of main development identified as potential open space/green infrastructure should be committed to	Considerable open space is shown on the eastern land on the Concept Plan at Figure 4.1 of the Masterplan.	None required
Masterplan shows little in way of green space within actual local plan site allocation boundary	In excess of <b>21 ha</b> of open space is shown within the allocation site boundary. The area shown outside of allocation area will help maintain the visual separation between Arlesey, Stotfold and Fairfield Park, which is a stated aim of Policy MA8.	None required
Wooded park south of White Horse PH with play area should be created	This area could be planted with trees but natural visual surveillance and permeability will be retained to ensure that this remains a safe place. The detailed applications will provide more detail about the character of the open spaces.	None required
General distribution of public open space close to a railway line is questionable and is likely to be inappropriate from a child safety perspective.	Network Rail have been consulted and have no objections to the principle of open space in this location. The open space will be fenced off from the railway track and there will be no formal sports pitches as part of the provision. The open space provides a buffer of landscape between the housing area and County Wildlife site.	None required
Site proposed as a Community Orchard should be moved to the north of public footpath FP/ARL/3/10 where the former orchard was located	There are remnants of orchard both north and south of the footpath. Existing orchard trees on both sides of the footpath will be retained and orchard trees within proposed orchard to the south of the footpath will also be retained.	Text added for clarification
The development needs to make a significant contribution to the delivery of the Arlesey and Stotfold Green Infrastructure Plans and the emerging 'Green Wheel'. The proposals currently go some way towards meeting this	Options for a crossing of the A507, north-south green links and connected green corridors of open space and open space around the perimeter of the development (including a community orchard) will help deliver this.	Wording added to Principle 3 and various paragraphs, including 4.7 and 5.1 requiring options for a new crossing of the A507 in the location of the proposed new roundabout to be explored. Concept plan at figure 4.1 also amended to indicate this.
Would like to see GI and biodiversity added to the list of Planning Obligations	Agreed	Text added to paragraph 9.3 (now 9.9) of the Draft Masterplan

Commitment will be needed for maintenance and upkeep of green areas once the development is completed	This will be dealt with as part of the S106 Agreement on any planning application.	None required
If sports pitches are for different uses then there would be no harm splitting them up	Providing the pitches in a single location allows for flexibility in their use, shared facilities with the school, and a changing facility.	None required
Sports pitches are not easily accessible in their current location	The sports pitches are close to green pedestrian and cycle routes, the school and relief road.	None required
Expansion of current Arlesley Town Football Club and other pitches in Arlesley should be focused on instead of providing new pitches	CBC's current policy requires the provision of new sports pitches as part of the development.	None required
Changing facilities need to be of sufficient size	This will be considered at the detailed planning application stage	None required
Concern about anti-social behaviour taking place at play areas	The play areas are located where there is visual surveillance from adjacent properties.	Additional text added to Section 6 to make this clear
Retaining mature trees and planting hedgerows and wildflowers is important	A Tree Survey has been undertaken and informed the preparation of the Draft Masterplan. Wherever possible existing trees and hedgerows have been shown as retained	None required
Trees lining the south side of Stotfold Road should be maintained	The concept plan shows these retained where possible.	None required
Pedestrian link from Glossop Way would be better served into Chancellors Way so there is access to the play area	Link to Glossop Way is to be removed as it shows a connection via a private parking court.	Masterplan amended to delete arrows indicating these potential links.
<b>9. Retail or Community Uses</b>		
Retail facilities should be large enough to serve the expanded community/concern the Local Centre will not be big enough	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the aspiration for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required
A large 24 hour supermarket is needed	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the aspirations for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required

Additional car parking in local centre area should be provided	Development will need to meet CBC's adopted parking standards at the time a planning application is made for this part of the scheme.	None required
Extension of existing doctor's surgery needed	Additional doctor's facilities will be provided as part of the development. This may be through the relocation of the existing doctor's surgery to larger premises as part of the Local Centre, or through a configuration of the current uses in the civic amenity area to allow its expansion in the current location. This will be determined at the application stage following consultation with the existing surgery and local representatives, such as Arlesey Town Council.	None required
Would like to see a petrol filling station	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the aspirations for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required
A café/restaurant should be provided as part of the Local Centre	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the aspirations for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required
Would like to see a butchers and a bakers	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the aspirations for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required
Arlesey needs a manned police station	This is a matter for Bedfordshire Police to decide on and is not something that can be specifically delivered as part of the development.	None required
Improved banking facilities needed	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the Council's aspirations for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required
Sports Centre/cricket pitch/bowling green	Playing field provision to cover a range of uses will be provided as part of the development	None required

Leisure centre/swimming pool/cinema	It is unlikely that the development could sustain such uses, but there will be a financial contribution towards leisure and recreation as part of the S106 Agreement	None required
Public House	The Draft Masterplan provides an indication of the aspirations for new retail facilities to be provided in the Local Centre, but what is delivered will ultimately come down to market demand.	None required
Need a town square to give Arlesey identity	It is intended that the Local Centre area includes a high quality public realm and interface with the proposed town park to the north of it. The detailed design of this will be determined at the planning application stage.	None required
Gaining a supermarket will mean losing local shops	The extent of new development proposed as part of the scheme will bring considerable additional custom which will help to sustain both existing and proposed facilities and services. Furthermore, Arlesey's length and the position of the Local Centre will mean it is more convenient for those living in the south of the town to continue to use the existing shops and facilities there.	None required
Concern about the impact on the current civic area?	It is considered that the uses proposed in the Local Centre will be complementary to rather than compete with the existing civic amenity area. S106 money from the development towards community benefits could also be directed at rejuvenating the existing civic amenity area to ensure it remains a vital and viable part of the town.	None required
Where is the provision for teenage facilities to be located?	Further discussion about the location and type of facilities required will be carried out at the outline application stage	None required
Until there are better facilities Arlesey cannot sustain another 1,000 dwellings	The development has been allocated to help improve the level of service provision in Arlesey. The Masterplan outlines the likely benefits that will result.	None required



<b>10. Education</b>		
Need more information on how the educational requirement of the development will be met	A decision on precisely how the new lower school provision is to be managed will be made at the planning application	None required
New school needs to be in addition to Gothic Mede and delivered early in the development	The new lower school provision will be in addition to Gothic Mede School, but the existing Board will be given the opportunity to bid for managing the new school along with other parties.	None required
School should be run from two sites	The new lower school provision will be in addition to Gothic Mede School, but the existing Board will be given the opportunity to bid for managing the new school along with other parties.	None required
Extend existing school into library and surgery and then relocate those facilities	Having two school sites is considered to be better in terms of avoiding the potential for congestion around a single site located centrally in Arlesey a school opening and closing times.	None required
Would be better to provide one large school on the existing site and move other facilities to the development land	Having two school sites is considered to be better in terms of avoiding the potential for congestion around a single site located centrally in Arlesey a school opening and closing times.	None required
Middle and upper schools need to be taken into consideration	As indicated in Section 9 of the Draft Masterplan, S106 contributions are likely to be required towards all tiers of education to meet the need resulting from the development.	None required
School should not be lost amongst housing	The location of the school has been determined to allow the possibility of close links to the existing school site whilst still meeting the needs of the new development.	None required
Needs to be adequate parking and drop off/pick up areas for the education facilities	This is a matter for consideration at the detailed application stage.	None required
New school proposed to be too far from existing community	The location of the school has been determined to allow the possibility of close links to the existing school site whilst still meeting the needs of the new development.	None required

School site should have room for expansion	This is a detailed matter that will be considered at the planning application following further discussions with the Council's School Organisation and Capital Planning Department	None required
<b>11. Consultation</b>		
The community is being asked to support the scheme without having sufficient technical information	A significant amount of technical information has been undertaken to inform the Masterplan and has been referred to within the document and at the consultations undertaken. At the planning application stage technical assessments will be submitted in support of the proposals	None required
The Masterplan's boundary appears to have extended beyond the eastern boundary shown on the Proposals Map, this should be made clear on the concept plan so members of the public are aware	The concept plan does make clear where the allocation boundary is and the extent of open space provided outside of it.	None required
Consultation process has been weak and insufficient/residents views are being ignored	Considerable consultation has been undertaken during the preparation of the Draft Masterplan - more so than on any of the other sites of similar size brought forward to date. This is outlined in Sections 1 and 2 of the document. A Statement of Community Consultation will also be published with the Report to Committee on the Draft Masterplan	None required
CBC has not enabled or provided equality of opportunity for interested stakeholder groups and active members of the public. This is not in keeping with the NPPF	Considerable consultation has been undertaken during the preparation of the Draft Masterplan - more so than on any of the other sites of similar size brought forward to date. This is outlined in Sections 1 and 2 of the document. A Statement of Community Consultation will also be published with the Report to Committee on the Draft Masterplan	None required
CBC has failed to carry out a review of the effectiveness of its consultation processes in order to determine why there has historically been a low response rate	The response rate to consultation on the Draft Masterplan has been higher than on similar documents in other locations, as has the turnout at public exhibitions.	None required

Concern that the Stakeholder Workshops held in 2012 did not involve effective representation of the Arlesey community	A number of local interest groups were invited to take part and specific consultation was undertaken with Arlesey Town Council at the time of the Stakeholder Workshops.	None required
The consultation questionnaire is stilted with too many leading questions	The multiple choice questions gave respondents the opportunity to respond positively, negatively or neutrally and there were also open ended questions on each issue providing the freedom to make any other comments	None required
Concern about the emphasis placed on the Arlesey Town Plan when the site was allocated and the lack of open consultation on this and particularly the route of the relief road	CBC went through a rigorous consultation process before adopting both the Core Strategy & Development Management Policies and Site Allocations DPDs, with both documents being found sound by an Independent Inspector.	None required
Why raise the issue of an eastern relief road at this stage of the consultation if the western route is set in stone?	The intention was to establish the extent of support for the eastern option to be explored in addition to the current plan so that the Masterplan could be future-proofed if necessary.	None required
No justification for the development other than the Council owns the land	Full justification for the allocation of the site and the scale of development was provided in support of the Core Strategy and Site Allocations DPDs on the basis that the development would deliver a relief road, new housing to meet the need in Central Bedfordshire, an uplift in services in Arlesey and job opportunities.	None required
Concern that developers will not provide the full range of obligations and affordable housing on viability grounds	Detailed viability discussions will only take place at the planning application stage and CBC will seek to robustly assess any viability arguments to ensure the maximum benefits to Arlesey are received from the development	None required
<b>12. Miscellaneous</b>		

Document not considered to be a Masterplan as required by Policy MA8 of the Site Allocations DPD and needs to be much more detailed to provide appropriate guidance on the nature, form, scale and design of the development and how it is to be delivered	CBC is satisfied that the Masterplan provides sufficient detail at this stage to guide future planning applications	None required
The text at paragraph 1.8 should refer to 'requirements' rather than 'objectives'	Agreed	Text amended accordingly
The document does not provide detailed design guidance despite this being a stated purpose. It would normally be the case that a Masterplan would at least provide some guidance on densities and character areas to guide future submissions	The Masterplan makes clear that CBC will require Design Codes either with outline planning applications or prior to reserved matters, which will establish the detailed design requirements for the development	None required
Masterplan too general and does not provide a reasonable framework within which the development can be formally brought forward and delivered	The Masterplan is intended to be a high level document, but one that provides further clarity to developers on the requirements for the development in support of Policy MA8.	None required
Masterplan needs to be amended to better reflect historic environment issues	The Masterplan makes clear that a Heritage Assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	None required
It is disappointing that the Masterplan contains little reference to the historic environment, particularly in the Context, Vision and Masterplan sections. Other than the requirement for a Heritage Assessment in Section 10, there is no guidance on how development proposals should mitigate impacts against listed buildings and archaeology sites	The Masterplan makes clear that a Heritage Assessment will be required at the planning application stage.	None required
It is stated on page 22 that the Masterplan can only make improvements to land included within the allocation or in Central Bedfordshire Highways' ownership. However, the Masterplan appears to be including general land to the east not part of the highway to deliver part of the relief road and open space and houses outside of the allocation.	Text within the Draft Masterplan clarified on this point	Text within the Draft Masterplan clarified on this point
The constraints plan at figure 2.8 could benefit from updating to reflect the position of a main drain which runs from the existing St John's Road development northwards.	Agreed	Figure 2.8 updated accordingly

The opportunities plan shows a spur from the main road, running east to High Street in the vicinity of nos. 133-139 High Street. The key implies this is a main access and should be amended to reflect its status as a secondary route, as referred to in the rest of the Masterplan	Agreed	Figure 2.9 updated accordingly
In Figure 2.2 there are notations not included in the Key, such as the black double ended arrows	Agreed	Key updated accordingly
Paragraph 8.4 does not accurately reflect the wording of Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy	Agreed	Paragraph 8.4 has been amended to better reflect Policy DM1 of the Core Strategy
Paragraph 8.5 is confusing in implying that the Code for Sustainable Homes is mandatory, which it is not.	Agreed	Wording of paragraph 8.5 amended for clarification
Helpful if all 3 concept plans produced were provided as Appendix to Masterplan	The preferred masterplan has been prepared based on best fit with the results of the public consultation and site constraints. Putting all three plans in the final version would lead to confusion	None required
On west side Masterplan includes properties 133-139 High Street whereas local plan allocation excludes the houses and only includes a part of the rear gardens	This location has been identified as a suitable position for a secondary access between the western land and relief and High Street and has therefore been included in the Masterplan	None required
References to Areas A and B should be removed from the Masterplan as it as allocated as one site	The use of Areas A and B is descriptive as these are separate parcels of land on different sides of High Street and with different characters.	None required
If reference to Areas A and B relates to phasing it should be explained in the Masterplan	Areas A and B do not relate to phasing and this is not suggested anywhere in the Masterplan	None required
Phasing considered to be of great importance as will have an impact on how the proposed development is delivered and secured to the benefit of local people	Agreed, but this can only be dealt with at the applicatin stage. The wording of Section 9 is to be tightened to provide clarify on what CBC expects however.	Amendments made to the wording of Section 9 on phasing
Development on the east side of High Street should not proceed without that on the west side as it would be contrary to the allocation.	The phasing of the development can only be considered at the application stage	Amendments made to the wording of Section 9 on phasing
Pockets of land adjacent to the developent area should be adopted into the development if they are made available by landowners	This would be done at the planning application stage and would depend on the planning merits of including the land and any cost invovled	None required

Concerns that the proposals being offered are not financially sustainable	Landowners and development will consider the viability of schemes before submitting applications.	None required
Concern about reliance on developers funding and there being no guarantee that some of the other 'benefits' suggest will be delivered, particularly given the cost of the road.	CBC will robustly assess any viability assessment submitted with a planning application to ensure the maximum benefits possible are achieved for Arlesey	None required
Concern that existing infrastructure, such as sewers won't cope and nor will service providers be able to deal with the increased pressure	Initial dialogue has already been held with infrastructure providers and where existing facilities cannot cope with the additional pressure from the development financial contributes to facilitate upgrades will be made.	None required
Concern about drainage issues and increased flood risk. Arlesey has a high water table	The concept plan indicates attenuation measures will be implemented as part of the development to positively manage surface water drainage and to ensure that run off rates into existing watercourses will remain at greenfield levels. A Flood Risk Assessment will be required with any planning applications and the drainage authorities and Environment Agency will be consulted to ensure they are satisfied with the proposals	None required
The number of properties built elsewhere in Arlesey since the site was allocated should be deducted from the total	The Site Allocations DPD confirms a minimum requirement of 1,000 dwellings be delivered on the allocation land. The number of dwellings built since 2011 is less than 50	None required