

Turvey Neighbourhood Plan

Sites for New Houses – Stage 2 Summary of Consultation Outcomes

September/October 2019

Introduction

1. A consultation process took place in September/October to seek residents' views on the recommendation that Carlton Road should be included in the plan as our second site for housing and to invite residents to give views and comments on the plan policies.
2. The consultation started with an exhibition at the village hall on Friday evening, 13th September and in the daytime of 14th September. 123 people visited the exhibition over the two sessions. Booklets containing the exhibition displays and questionnaire were distributed at further consultation events which took place at the Three Cranes and at Turvey Primary School. The booklets were also available at All Saints Church and the Abbey. The full exhibition displays and an online questionnaire were also available on the Turvey NDP website at www.turveyndp.org.uk. The consultation closed on 11th October.
3. A total of 131 completed questionnaires were received. This report provides a summary of the key messages from the consultation with a detailed analysis of all comments received shown in the appendix.

Summary of questionnaire responses

The following questions were listed in the questionnaire;

- Question 1.1
Have the criteria been applied correctly to show Carlton Road as our best second site? *(Please give your reasons)*
 - Question 1.2
Is there another site (from those available) that you believe is more suitable? *(Please give your reasons)*
 - Question 1.3 We believe we should plan for 40 to 50 homes in Turvey, which of these should we put forward in the plan? *(Please give your reasons)*
 - Question 2.1 Do you have any comments about the Plan Policies?
 - Question 2.2 Are there any changes to the policies that you would suggest?
 - Question 2.3 Are there any additional policy areas you would like to see included
4. The responses to questions 1.1 and 1.2 regarding the recommendation of Carlton Road as the best second site for housing were as follows;

- **Agree to Q 1.1 – 91 (70%)**

- **Do not agree to Q 1.1 – 36 (27%)**
- **No clear reply to Q 1.1 - 4 (3%)**

5. The comments most commonly made about the proposal to recommend Carlton Road were as follows;

- i) Comments at Q 1.1 from those replying yes, the criteria been applied correctly to show Carlton Road as our best second site Carlton Road
 - Concern about traffic congestion on Carlton Road (26)
 - Minimal impact on traffic from 20 to 25 houses (3)
 - Support for layout and screening proposed (5)
- ii) Comments at Q 1.1 from those not supporting Carlton Road
 - Concern about traffic congestion on Carlton Road (12)
 - Carlton Road site not close to village facilities (3)
 - Impact on open countryside (2)
- iii) Comments at Q 1.2 from those suggesting that another site is more suitable;
 - Newton Lane East preferred (12)
 - Meadow House preferred (2)
 - Station End preferred (1)

6. The responses made about the number of houses we should plan to deliver were as follows;

- **Support 25 houses per site – 82 (62%)**
- **Support 20 houses per site – 42 (32%)**
- **No preference stated – 7 (6%)**

7. The comments most commonly made at Q 1.3 about the preferred number of houses per site were as follows;

- i) Those who prefer 25 houses per site;

- More affordable housing (28)
- Better housing mix (12)
- Less likely to need to be required to take more housing in near future (9)

ii) Those who prefer 20 houses per site;

- Less impact on roads (10)
- Smaller developments more in keeping with village character (4)
- Smaller developments have less impact on the environment (6)

8. A number of comments were made about plan policies which were generally supportive of the policies. Where comments have been made suggesting changes and new areas for policies, these will be considered by the Steering Group with a view to strengthening the policies where possible.

Key messages from responses and comments

9. The key messages arising from the responses and comments submitted are;

- i) 70% respondents agreed that Carlton Road was the best second site for housing**
- ii) 62% respondents stated a preference for 25 houses per site to achieve a total of 50 new homes**
- iii) 30% of respondent expressed concern about traffic congestion and safety on Carlton Road**
- iv) 68% of respondents expressing concern about traffic congestion and safety on Carlton Road did not believe that these issues were sufficient to exclude Carlton Road as a suitable site for housing.**

Sites for New Houses Consultation Stage 2 – full analysis

<p>1. RESPONDENTS WHO AGREED to Q1.1 - Have the criteria been applied correctly to show Carlton Road as our best second site?</p>	<p>91</p>
<p>Comments made @ Q1.1;</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no need to screen off Turvey House – an open view of the house and grounds would improve the development outlook (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would public parking on the development impact on safety within the site? (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site appears to have low impact on outlook and approach to the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about traffic and parking (25) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath from village centre to proposed new sites should make better provision for pushchairs (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures to improve traffic flow should be in place before development takes place (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic impact can be limited with appropriate measures in place (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of 20 to 25 houses in different locations will have a minimal impact on traffic (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria should consider the impact of developments in surrounding villages, particularly traffic (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of landscaping to protect views and maintain village feel and ethos especially valuable (5) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best for access and impact on surrounding area (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least traffic impact (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How would school drop-off/pick-up be affected (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Least impact on views of Turvey approaching the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nice fit with the footpath and the recreation ground (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the idea it is set back from Carlton Road (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like that it spreads development around the village to the north and south (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that extending the village boundary at Carlton Road will allow further expansion disproportionate to the village (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton Road site imposes less incursion on the landscape and heritage features of the village (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location is close to village facilities especially the school and recreation field (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location is sympathetic to the village and has no impact on existing properties or residents (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development should encourage younger adults and families into the village so the priority should be for semi-detached smaller properties rather than large detached houses (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A cycle lane should be incorporated into the footpath to encourage young families to cycle to village facilities (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think all criteria have been met and Carlton Road will balance out the new houses to the South of the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the idea of public parking in village sorely in need of more parking space (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs to provide adequate off-road parking to ensure there is no need for residents to park on the roadside (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has enough space been allowed for an extension to the cemetery? (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The developers plan shows how it will be screened and it does not encroach into the open countryside too much. If done correctly I can see it complimenting the village view (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carlton Road will balance out the new houses to the South of the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like the idea of public parking in village sorely in need of more parking space (1) 	
<p>Comments made @ Q 1.2 - Is there another site (from those available) that you believe is more suitable?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No (74) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other sites are more intrusive on landscape and historical setting of the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes agree Carlton Road but Newton Lane East is an equally suitable site and may make it a more seamless part of the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newton Lane East is also suitable because it is in the centre of residential housing (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes agree but Newton Lane East is also suitable with less impact on traffic (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any 'large' development either along Carlton Road or Newton Lane is going to cause problems with extra traffic (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newton Lane East would be even worse traffic wise (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other sites would have a more negative impact on traffic (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mill rise and Carlton allow for the dispersal of the extra traffic that these sites will bring (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carlton Road is a better alternative to Newton Lane East (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other sites would have a significant impact on existing housing, Newton Lane East has already been declined for very valid reasons (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes but the field opposite the Abbey may be equally suitable (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The only other site is Newton Lane East which would be opposite current housing and fit better with the village. However with Mill Rise it would be too much on Newton Lane. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meadow House would just be an infill so less concern about further development (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other sites have more disadvantages and limiting development to 2 sites should contain disruption (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meadow House is equally suitable (1) 	

Comments made @ Q1.3 – We believe we should plan for 40 to 50 homes in Turvey, which of these should we put forward in the plan?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticked box for 25 homes per site 	71
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Less likely to need further sites in future (7) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More homes results in more affordable housing (27) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Only agree 25 homes per site if affordable housing is guaranteed (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meeting the Borough requirements in full will reduce the risk of speculative development (9) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If the planners are looking for 50 then comply to retain your position on the consultation process (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ensure a higher number of smaller homes which is most needed for first time buyers and downsizers (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More 3 bed homes for young families wanting 3 bed homes from 2 (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The smaller developments have disproportionate numbers of detached homes. 25 homes per site would provide more opportunities for those needing smaller terraced or semi-detached affordable homes (4) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Better balance of small to large homes (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will encourage community spirit (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two smaller developments will have less impact on traffic if in two locations (1) 	

○ The extra 5 houses with have little to no added impact to the village (1)	
○ Development bringing more children into the village to attend our school is a good thing (1)	
○ 50 houses in Turvey is reasonable considering the size of the village (1)	
○ Economy of scale and optimisation of village and site facilities (1)	
○ Avoid danger of Borough imposing sites (2)	
○ Help keep the village alive: school, pubs, shops etc. (1)	
Ticked box for 20 homes per site	20
○ To reduce traffic impact and parking (5)	
○ Why do we need more housing? (1)	
○ Smaller development would be less intrusive (1)	
○ Concern about increase on local services shops, doctors, sewage (1)	
○ Both sites would be enhanced with room for integral sympathetic landscaping between houses (1)	
○ Means more space for dwellings. Only a couple fewer social houses if this option goes ahead. Why not utilise three sites, but with fewer houses on each site? (1)	
○ Whichever site is chosen - its going to cause extra traffic. (1)	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Working on the maximum this time might set a precedent for any future expansion to the village. Would all 50 houses sell or could they affect sales of other houses in the village. 40 would allow for a healthy housing market throughout the village and not just on the new sites (1) 	
<p><u>RESPONDENTS WHO SAID YES to Q 1.1 – response to Plan Policies section</u></p>	
<p>Comments @ Q 2.1 - Do you have any comments about the Plan Policies?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment on impact to Primary School – would it require additional funding/resource to cater for additional numbers? (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies are supported (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about traffic – already a problem at Newton Lane/High Street/Carlton Road junctions (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening houses on Carlton Road important to protect views from Turvey House (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affordable housing is an important factor (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive development to include replanting and conservation of trees/hedgerows (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apartments needed for younger and older people (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with more houses to enable families with children to live in our village. But needs to be done sensitively to prevent overcrowding in one space (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • Good that housing is stone or similar to fit with the feel of Turvey (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good that care is being taken with history, views and landscape (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough being done for people living in the village who want to downsize (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safeguards should be in place to make sure policies are adhered to and this should include the necessary visible splays can be provided (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy T2 suggests a mix of housing but it is not reflected in the scheme displays which are heavily weighted to large unaffordable homes (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How environmentally friendly will the housing be? (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carbon neutral or as near as possible (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New developments must have adequate provision for off-road parking (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see Station End and Laws House included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern that extending the boundary on Carlton Road opens the door for further developments (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not clear why the Burrows is no longer included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I believe Policy T7 should be reviewed in light of the declaration of the national and borough climate emergency (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I do have grave concerns about the traffic using Carlton Road. Parked cars between Corner Stores and May Road are a cause of frustration now. Is the plan, or will the plan ban vehicles from parking in this area and if so where the residents be allowed to park their cars? (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy T1: New Housing Growth states that new housing outside of allocated sites may be supported where it meets a number of criteria. An additional bullet point should be included to allow for development on the edge of Station End where it is well related to the existing established built-up area. This Policy should also recognise the site of the former grain store at Station Road, Turvey Station as a planning commitment given its status as previously developed land and the extant planning consent for a retirement village. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy T3 Natural Environment and Policy T7 Sustainable Design do not give anywhere near enough weight to broader environmental considerations, and climate change in particular. Any development must ensure the lowest possible carbon footprint, both in the choice of the materials used in the build and in the ongoing emissions from the houses. Insulation, use of sustainable energy, provision of electric vehicle charging points and planting of trees should be essential features of the design.(1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will these policies be transferable to a future development/ expansion of the village or just for this current round of development? (1) 	
<p>Comments @ Q2.2 - Are there any changes to the policies that you would suggest?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking on Carlton Road needs resolving (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures needed to ensure minimal traffic impacts (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car parking away from houses debateable as probably not used and security issues (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still don't see any properties for older people who want to remain in the village – seems to be only looking for need of singles and families (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More smaller 2/3 bed properties needed (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By increasing the village boundary we are creating infills for the future – some quite large (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The High St loop should be made one way (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies should ensure a greater proportion of affordable homes including bungalows (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Environment policy should be firmer; 'consideration' and 'encouraged' will not guarantee compliance (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we ensure village facilities receive investment from development eg., preschool and play equipment on the Rec (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like to see Policy T7 strengthened to require that development should be energy efficient and carbon neutral or a policy added to cover this in more detail. Concerned that the phrase 'subject to having no amenity" (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, I would like policy T7 to be repositioned and moved to T1 to reflect its importance, and to be reviewed in light of the declaration of a climate emergency (by both central government and borough council). I believe this policy should have a much stronger emphasis on building of sustainable homes, including a stipulation that any new homes built should meet the Code for Sustainable Homes at Level 5 or above (or whatever the equivalent is since I understand this code is to be replaced). We have a golden opportunity to ensure that the next 50 houses built in Turvey are the most sustainable ever built here and reflect a wider aspiration that Turvey can play a part in minimising environmental impact whilst honouring the requirements of borough council to provide more homes. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is considered that Policy T11 should acknowledge that Bedford Road (Station End) has already been subject to speed restrictions of 40 mph, which was funded by the extant planning permission for a care village at Station Road, Turvey Station. (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a footpath which runs from the proposed development to mill lane. Are there any plans to improve this path? (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on climate change must be given a much higher level of priority. (1) 	
<p>Comments made @ Q 2.3 – Are there any additional policy areas you would like to see included?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station Road/Turvey ribbon development (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable area for older children to use such as skate park, bike ramps (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional bungalows needed for younger families with children with disabilities (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bungalows for less mobile residents should be included (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Something that stops possible huge expansion once village boundary is extended (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be additional funding for local services eg., footpath from development to village re Carlton Road development with parking on roadside to include wide paths (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will current sewage works cope with increase (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses should be built along sustainable lines eg., solar panels, water recycling (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be additional funding for local services eg., school, GP (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration should be made of pressure on the school for places to ensure it can cope with additional demand (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved public transport should be included (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan should include a policy that supports the provision of specialist accommodation for older people. The Policy should acknowledge the existing commitment to provide specialist accommodation for older people at Station Road, Turvey Station, and that this would make a significant contribution towards meeting the need for this type of accommodation. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possibility of finding more public parking spaces. Look at finding more public parking spaces somewhere in the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management issues will need addressing on the Carlton Road / May Road junction particularly site lines and clear vision (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking does need to be addressed both on Newton Lane and Carlton Road especially. The Loop is also cause for concern. (1) 	
<p><u>2.RESIDENTS WHO DID NOT AGREE to Q1.1 - Have the criteria been applied correctly to show Carlton Road as our best second site?</u></p>	36
<p>Comments at Q1.1</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic on Carlton Road is already congested because of cars parked outside the houses (9) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about intense traffic, limited visibility, safety risks to pedestrians and motorists (7) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic on Carlton Road is much worse than Newton Lane and has reached a dangerous level (2) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More houses would have more than minimal impact. Carlton Road is already congested particularly from school traffic and heavy agricultural vehicles (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic will also increase from new housing in surrounding villages (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton Road is not close to village facilities and too far away from the village centre (7) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More street lighting will be needed resulting in loss of dark night sky and impact on wildlife (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of productive arable land (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits land availability for further extension of the cemetery (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on open countryside (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close proximity to school (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will open the floodgates to further development which will destroy Turvey as a village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale for Carlton Road is sound, but not as second best site. Don't agree to 2 sites only - could include Newton Lane allotments as well (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant negative impact on valued landscape, views and the conservation area. Significant encroachment into open countryside with worry that this opens the door to vast amount of building (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A plethora of smaller sites within the village should be considered first (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increased traffic from the development would be impacting a residential area where the local school is. The school is on the corner of May Road and Carlton Road. At school start and finish times both these roads are congested. The development at Meadow House was assessed as a disadvantage 'due to the impact on traffic via a residential area including a school' (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incursion on footpath through the Rec, concern about safety (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about safety of Rec users (1) 	
<p>Comments @ Q 1.2 - Is there another site (from those available) that you believe is more suitable?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newton Lane allotments would be better (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Rise x 10, Newton Lane allotments x 10, Meadow House x 10, Carlton Road x 10 (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newton Lane East (8) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newton Lane one larger site. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newton Lane East is close to the sewage works - already problems with the sewage system to Station End. The distance of Carlton Road to the sewage works could pose more issues (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few houses can also be built at Station Road as well as the care village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meadow House with alternative access to A428 (4) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Rise not Carlton Road as we live there! (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about potential to swamp the village with further forced planning requirements in future because of the available land near the site (1) 	

<p>Comments made @ Q 1.3 – We believe we should plan for 40 to 50 homes in Turvey, which of these should we put forward in the plan?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticked box for 25 homes per site 	11
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should aim for higher number otherwise, as demand grows we will need to do this again in 5 years' time (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Higher number provides more affordable housing for young people to move into the village and older people who wish to downsize and stay (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More spread out small/affordable 2 and 3 bed homes (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If we are going ahead with the development we may as well meet the full Borough target, rather than have to go through this whole process again for additional development in the future. Also includes a higher proportion of affordable homes which the village significantly lacks at present. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I do feel that this could open the door to a much larger development. Has enough space been allowed for an extension to the cemetery? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticked box for 20 homes per site 	21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not such dense settlement allows and encourages rural setting in keeping with village (4) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Less impact on narrow country roads ie., Newton Lane, Carlton Road (4) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 20 houses would have a little less impact on the environment than 25 (2) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The number of houses should reflect the location and surrounding houses. Building just a few houses on such an open site could lead to large scale development (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Who is being stupid here!?! No developer will only build 20 on each site it will become more like 60 each when developments go into planning and before you and I know it the village will join Lavendon, Carlton. As has happened and going to happen with the Biddenham Bromham plan to merge the two into a town. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No preference stated 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I do not feel either will have any meaningful impact - 20 or 25 will not make a difference (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Number of houses should be based on the type of housing and site (2) 	
<u>RESPONDENTS WHO DID NOT AGREE to Q 1.1 – response to Plan Policies section</u>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation of Carlton Road suggests a lack of appreciation of the problems to people using Carlton Road (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sites present infrastructure problems and road and pavement conditions and could be a dangerous prospect for children walking to school (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carlton Road is not consistent with Policy T11 (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should take account of other development happening in other local villages and the impact this will have on Turvey traffic (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More surveys should be carried out on traffic usage on Carlton Road (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are the advantages from these proposed developments to the village and village life there should be investment in village facilities that follow from development (2) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should expect a greater % of affordable homes (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee should be aware that all new houses have impacted on the original village housing (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can't see how the New development would not have a significant adverse impact on traffic safety and capacity. The amount of extra lorries and building vehicles brought down narrow roads where families regularly walk to village amenities (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transport polices need to be applied to the whole village not solely the area of development. Where is the provision to improve public transport? The concern appears to be providing parking for vehicles not reducing the number of vehicles on the road thus reducing the impact on the environment and congestion. (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rubbish and unrealistic (no traffic issues) rubbish 20 per site unrealistic (1) 	
<p>Comments @ Q2.2 - Are there any changes to the policies that you would suggest?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second site should be Newton Lane (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I would like infrastructure to be considered very carefully for the safety of children particularly (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and selection criteria should require a financial or property assets contribution for the benefit of the village (1) 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guarantee improvement to traffic flow in the key identified areas, change parking, improve pavements (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-evaluate the current issues with one scale development in a less congested location. Who will seriously use the "parking and path across the rec..... No one. If you drive your kids to the school why would you want to park in a car park and walk your kids through a muddy rec. NO ONE. The park in will be used by the residents of the site no one else's would get a look in if you was stupid enough to try to use it (1) 	
<p>Comments made @ Q 2.3 – Are there any additional policy areas you would like to see included?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning ahead for the possible need for a new school (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for increased cemetery space (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy to limit further development on chosen sites and in the village to protect from mass development (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need a public debate (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan should be presented to the younger demographic/residents of the village (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking 2 per house for any new homes (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A drop off area for Turvey Lower (1) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realistic measurements to include traffic flow during construction delivery vehicles and residential vehicles every day and how they will move through the village along with the other general increase in 	

traffic taking into account all the other town and more locally effected developments in Charlton Sharnbrook the list goes on (1)	
3. RESIDENTS WHO EXPRESSED NO CLEAR PREFERENCE to Q1.1 - Have the criteria been applied correctly to show Carlton Road as our best second site?	4
Comments made @ Q1.1;	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic from new development in Carlton and Sharnbrook (3) 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic in Carlton Road will increase (1) 	
Comments @ Q 1.2 - Is there another site (from those available) that you believe is more suitable?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No (4) 	
Comments @ Q 1.3 – We believe we should plan for 40 to 50 homes in Turvey, which of these should we put forward in the plan?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticked box for 25 homes per site 	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should improve land utilisation, more homes per acre 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some less expensive houses should make it more attractive for younger people to remain in the village 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticked box for 20 homes per site 	3

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Traffic. Negative effect on the school 	
<p><u>RESPONDENTS WHO EXPRESSED NO CLEAR PREFERENCE to Q 1.1 – response to Plan Policies section</u></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy T1 needed as it is open farmland with no trees to shield it (1) 	
<p>Comments @ Q2.2 - Are there any changes to the policies that you would suggest?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan for Carlton Road shows the road is a cul de sac with a T turning bordering the NS footpath. This could easily be changed to allow further development to the east. Why not terminate it with houses to prevent this further intrusion? (1) 	
<p>Comments made @ Q 2.3 – Are there any additional policy areas you would like to see included?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities in the village to reduce commuting (1) 	