

MENP REGULATION 14 CONSULTATION – GENERAL COMMENTS

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Consideration should be given to liaising with the Borough Council/Highways to have the speed limit on the A6 from Bedford direction on approach to Milton Ernest reduced to 40mph where the dual carriageway reduces to a single line carriageway (where the speed camera is). This would enable cyclists/pedestrians to cross more safely at the end of the cycleway and also introduce a gradual speed reduction on the approach to Milton Ernest (as happens at the opposite end of the village).	• Reduce 50mph to 40 mph on A6
The segregation disadvantages to the village by the A6 is referred to several times in the MENP. The A6 and Milton Ernest is a shortcut to the M1 South from both the A14 and A45. A significant increase in HGV and other traffic has occurred since the completion of the western bypass creating even more congestion, noise and pollution to the disadvantage of the villagers and their health. Milton Ernest is the only village in Bedfordshire without a by-pass between those major trunk roads and the M1. With the possible exception of Clophill, the same is true for the A6 to Luton. A continuous effort should be made by the Parish Council to push the BBC for a development that includes such a by-pass.	• Must continue to push for a bypass
The ever increasing traffic flow is a major concern and divides the village. Surely the village should at least be listed for a bypass. At the very least, a crossing should be put in place to link safely the footpath/cycleway across the A6 at the end of the dual carriageway and the Clapham junction	• Should have a bypass
I would encourage proposals for an A6 bypass of Milton Ernest, noting the village is the only settlement between Luton and Rushden without one.	• Should have a bypass
We think on verge parking in Radwell Road should be stopped because the grass areas are being turned into muddy patches. Also, on road parking on Radwell Road ,where it joins the A6 in particular, to be reduced by providing off road parking wherever possible and more generally in that road. Also, provision of more paved walkways around the village and between adjacent villages. Some pavements are in need of repair around the village, as they are somewhat dangerous for the elderly. Restoration of the annual bulky waste skip please and restoration of green bin collections during winter months. Provision of orange sacks restored. A6 bypass long overdue. Milton Ernest is a really lovely village to live in, and speed cameras have been very helpful. An active and thoughtful Parish Council is to be commended.	• Parking on verge problem Radwell Road • Pavements in need of maintenance • Restore annual bulky waste collection and green waste during winter months • A6 bypass needed
How do you intend to effectively minimise the impact of new developments and increasing traffic generally for residents in Radwell Road & Thurleigh Road having to cross the A6? What plans support this statement?	• Need to minimise impact of traffic from new development
Any further housing developments on the A6 through Milton Ernest will cause greater problems for residents trying to get onto the A6 from Radwell Road. This is difficult at the best of times and any increase will make it even worse. I also fear that in giving permission for these houses to be built in this small village increases the likelihood that further houses will be built along the A6 hence completely ruining this lovely, quiet village	• Traffic from proposed new development will cause problems exiting Radwell Road to the A6

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
I will add that I would like to see an improved provision of public transport from the village to both Bedford and Rushden, particularly in view of the proposed numbers of new homes and so residents. Included in the proposal is housing for low income, and older households, both of which would benefit from an adequate public transport provision	Better public transport needed
The proposed new development opposite Butterfield Court will cause added congestion for accessing the A6. In addition no consideration to how residents safety has been considered when accessing the rest of the village along the A6. The pathway is too narrow and the overgrown hedges on that side of the A6 adds to the danger of using this facility to access other parts of the village from Butterfield Court. Butterfield Court has now been in existence over 15 years and its about time that Milton Ernest PC took into consideration this small estate when considering the Neighbourhood Plan	- Development will cause congestion for Butterfield Court residents accessing the A6 - Pathway alongside the A6 is too narrow and hedges are overgrown
Important factor is increased traffic on the A6 through Milton Ernest and access to the A6 from Radwell Road and Thurleigh Road	Concern about increased traffic on the A6
I would prefer the plan which redirects the A6	A6 to be diverted
i am concerned about the extra traffic on the A6 as the A6 is already a nightmare for turning traffic. The impact of sewage. this site is popular for dog walkers	Concern about increased traffic on the A6
The traffic situation on Thurleigh Road is already bad with very few people slowing down for the speed humps, with close proximity with the church, village hall and the primary school, which affects all ages from young to old. The last thing we need is an influx of extra traffic on this road, from a safety aspect. Currently the junction on Thurleigh Road and the A6 is already busy, so to have more homes/traffic would make this situation worse	- Traffic on Thurleigh Road is bad - Extra traffic from the development will cause problems at the Thurleigh Road junction
We really need A6 bypass, the is so much traffic going through the village and air quality and noise is unacceptable. Has the air the air quality been monitored?	Need a bypass
The New Plan falls short on "Transport" It does not mention that decisions have been taken by other Parish Councils (and supported by BBBC) that affect the traffic flow in Thurleigh Road at Milton Ernest. (i.e. Clapham Parish Council Minutes 20-01-09) No effort has been made to rectify this and have the perfectly excellent concrete road to Twinwoods reopened for all Yarl's Wood Immigration Centre and Business Park traffic. Since most of the traffic comes from Bedford this would mean a shorter journey less pollution and help the environment. Access to the Twinwoods Road would also mean that vulnerable visitors to the immigration centre would not have to pay double the taxi fare from Bedford Station as they must now	The plan should include measures to reduce the traffic on Thurleigh Road, for example getting the concrete road from Clapham to Yarl's Wood reopened
I believe that it is very important that any future development in and around the village of Milton Ernest, especially regarding social and leisure facilities, are proposed in a manner which pay attention to enhancing the lives of as many local residents as possible. Especially taking into account the possibilities of enhancing local services, facilities and potential employment opportunities.	Future development should support the enhancement of local services and facilities

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
the site are is not suitable as i cannot understand why we would use a green site when we have so many brown site to consider. i am concerned about the extra traffic on the A6 as the A6 is already a nightmare for turning traffic. The impact of sewage. this site is popular for dog walkers.	Site not suitable; sewage issues, should use brownfield site
I do not agree with any more housing developments in Milton Ernest!! It will have a detrimental effect on the existing community and put a drain on village resources...not to mention the already terrible traffic conditions and parking problems. Leave our village alone!!!!	Doesn't agree with any new developments
The reason the village of Milton Ernest is an ideal place to live is because it is rural. Building 25 houses at Rushden Road A6 is taking some of the rural away. I feel saddened that green agricultural land is even being considered for housing	25 more houses will impact on the rural feel
Didn't like the way the questions were worded, they were worded as if it is fait accompli that housing developments are going ahead and it was a case (for simplicity) of whether people would prefer to see red roofs, brown roofs or grey roofs on the new houses. Every question bar one I opted for 'other' and left my own answer, generally along the lines of 'Not applicable as no new developments to be permitted' The only question I agreed with was 'existing community facilities to be protected from loss'. In general, a very poor questionnaire. Can someone please tell me when the next Parish Council meeting is, as I would like to attend	Poor questionnaire – seems like a fait accompli
I agree that the village needs to grow and provide more housing. The proposed site seems a logical next area for development. I am concerned that there is no mention made of the infrastructure needs for a new development. Is there sufficient water supply and sewage capacity? Will the electricity network cope with the likely need for electric car charging points in all the new houses, as well as in the rest of the village. The new houses will also need electricity for heat pumps etc. Has the Oakley exchange the capacity for broadband need of this development? Thanks for all the work that has been put into this plan.	Agree village needs to grow. Concerned about the supporting infrastructure
Development on land next to the garden center on Radwell road, opposite the playing field could be a more suitable site and/or the brownfield site where the old garden center used to stand (near Milton Ernest Hall). Any site would need to be heavily screened with substantial planting of trees and appropriate hedging to mitigate some of the environmental impact. My view is that the allocation of housing would have a lower impact on the locality if it was divided into two or more smaller developments. To meet obligation of 25 dwellings, the old Mill site on the A6 already has planning permission for 12 flats, as I understand. This should surely count towards the allocation of 25 dwellings.	- Does the old Mill site 12 dwellings count towards the 25? - Would be better split into two smaller sites - Land next to the garden centre opposite the playing field would be more suitable
More broadly, the 2015 questionnaire results highlight a very clear sentiment from village residents that brownfield sites should be used from development purposes. I also question whether development on the other side of the A6, closer to the amenities (i.e. the garden centre, park, pub etc) would potentially suit better - one point being, to reduce the number of road crossers and hence traffic flow interruptions. However, I do appreciate the need for new housing and therefore the need for the village to play its part, so as a stakeholder I'd be happy to discuss views further.	2105 questionnaire showed preference for brownfield sites - Understand the need for new housing - Wouldn't the other side of the A6 be better?
Living on the border of the proposed development at Rushden Road, I have a number of concerns driving my disagreement of the site and its location. These include, in no particular order, 1) A6 traffic and the impact of more standing traffic from turning vehicles (i.e. fumes and flow), 2) very close proximity of the development to listed buildings spoiling their setting which is enjoyed by many walkers on a daily basis, 3) broader concern of	- Concerns about standing traffic and fumes - Close proximity to listed buildings

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
being overlooked in my own property which is open fronted, 4) dealing with potentially greater run-off water from the field (we currently have to address by maintaining a ditch with Bedfordia), 5) general impact on surrounding wildlife.	- Property being overlooked - Increased water run-off - Impact on wildlife
Polices Map Inset 19 The fact that the existing Settlement Policy Area Boundary can be breached after such a short time from when it was last agreed means there does not seem much point in drawing up future area boundaries. Spelling under Flood Risk Milton Earnest	What's the point of an SPA if it can be changed so quickly
Yet more congestion at the northern entrance to the village on the A6. A much safer and less damaging site on Radwell Rd. , next to the garden centre would be safer and far more appropriate. It would be far less intrusive on the site lines from the one or two properties opposite ,than the proposed site on the properties on Arkwright Rd. and have a far safer entrance to the site	Will led to more congestion
i believe we are sacrificing a green belt area, and losing a popular walking area for residents. i beleive to location of the proposed site would not be ideal.	Sacrificing green belt and losing a walking area
Sustainable Design - let's hope the new buildings are empathetic with the village and surrounding area.	Design must be sympathetic to the area
I suggest the separation of Twinwoods from the Parish of Milton Ernest should the 'new village' be proposed on the grounds of the potential size of the potential 'new village' with 4000 to 6000 homes compared with the existing village of Milton Ernest with a population of approximately 761 people. The planning needs for Twinwoods would be different	Separate Twinwoods from the parish
Very concerned at how traffic will access the A6 (roundabout/ lights?). Milton Ernest is the only village not to have been bypassed by the A6 and has a very high through flow of traffic. Also have concerns regarding sewage; there have already been issues with current sewage levels putting too much pressure on the system according to residents down River Lane. Will the current sewage system cope with additional housing?	- Concerned about traffic impact - Will the sewerage system cope?
The Milton Ernest NP Objective 5 is not met since the proposed development will not meet housing demand appropriate to the needs of the local community as expressed in its response to the 2015 survey. Site 518 reduces the village's rural atmosphere, it is not the preferred multiple small developments, it lays a foundation for more than the desired maximum 25 dwellings, it is not at Twinwoods, is not brownfield, it is overlooked on 3 sides, it does not preserve but destroys green and open space and it is a development outside the SPA. The Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group has not justified the proposed revision of the SPA. Section 8.2 of the NP states that one site (518) is considered suitable. This statement is not supported by the evidence presented. The NP Section 8.4 directs the reader to the site assessment report updated Jan 2019. This scores Sites 162 and 678 higher than Site 518 (which incidentally scores the same as Site 161 and Site 907, additionally assessed). We first learn now, in Nov 2020, that the masterplanning exercise reported April 2018 considered just the one site. Why was this?	- The allocation of one site for 25 houses does not meet housing demand - Preference is for multiple sites - Why was there only one masterplanning exercise done? - Choice of site not supported by site assessment
In my view, the decision to exclude the prime brownfield site of Twinwoods for any residential development whatsoever in favour of out-of-town commercial development ("office space") is a missed opportunity in terms of protecting the character of the village and will be less environmentally-friendly. Reduced need for office space in a post COVID-19 world reinforces this view	Twinwoods should have been included for development

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
In my view this is a missed opportunity to provide Milton Ernest with some much needed facilities. I would rather have seen a large number of houses built in the field next to the Playing Field but in doing so the developer would have to provide a new school alongside the field and a small supermarket off a new roundabout next to the A6 / New Road. In doing so Milton Ernest would grow but would have the facilities to meet the increase in population. The roundabout could be used to reduce traffic through Radwell Road and be the main access point to the North Beds villages. Extra population in ME would ensure there were enough children to keep the school viable and they would also help to ensure the pub and Garden Centre had enough custom to survive. Allocating a supermarket alongside the A6 would also be beneficial for the residents of the North Beds villages and those travelling to Rushden as well as the villagers making it a viable business proposition. Milton Ernest is lacking in amenities and the MENP is short sighted and could have been the catalyst to improving the village. Finally I disagree with the site chosen for the 25 new homes as it is in a field where water drains towards the A6 where the houses will be situated; it would mean more traffic accessing the already too busy A6; and is planned to be built on raised ground which would overlook the houses in Arkwright Road	• Would rather see house built near the playing field • Missed opportunity to provide much needed facilities. • Disagree with the Rushden Road sites because of increased surface water run-off and increased traffic
Very biased questions, the creator of this questionnaire has written the questions in the hope that the residents of Milton Ernest are Lemmings, very insulting, very unprofessional, very poorly administered questionnaire	• Questionnaire biased and unprofessional
My worry from looking at the proposal is that the boundary for 25 homes would then give the go-ahead for more housing based on the boundary of the call for sites Line of BBC site 518. A permanent buffer zone should be at least 20 metres to allow for traffic noise, light pollution and views for existing residents. The village already has a heavy flow of traffic through it and crossing the A6 can be unsafe, adding more housing with the potential for at least another 50+ cars and another junction would worsen it. I feel the village is already 'cut in two' with the busy A6, limiting the already few amenities the village has due to having to cross the busy road with my small children. We would welcome further facilities this side of the village.	• Worried about the site being extended in the future • Will worsen traffic flow on the A6
Cycling, leisure and community facilities	
Consideration should be given to incorporating a cycle path around the playing field to enable youngsters to learn how to ride a bike safely and then for ongoing exercise.	• Cycle path around the playing field for learning to cycle
We strongly support the development of an allotment site for villagers.	• Supports allotments
Some years ago, a number of residents were keen for the development of allotments for village use. This has only been touched on briefly in the plan, with no outcome envisaged	• Supports allotments
Regarding Policy ME CF1 ,can this be strengthened in any way. The importance of the connection of the Queens Head, the School, the Village Hall, the Green and the Church is recognised in the reports and policies but, for example, the Queens Head has remained closed during a period when it could have been re-opened.	• Concern about losing the pub

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
The Brewery web site has indicated that the facility would remain closed until the end of December and I have a concern that it will not be re-opened	
Cycling paths should be a top priority as part of our local and national commitment to a lower carbon footprint. These, and footpaths, will also . have huge well being benefits to the local residents in ME and neighbouring villages	• More cycle paths
Community Facilities vitally important to residents , all must be kept	• Community facilities are important and must be kept
The proposals for improved cycle ways through the parish are to be warmly welcomed. In particular, the ambition to provide a better and safer route for cyclists to cross the A6 at the northern end of Clapham bypass where the road returns to a single carriage	• Supports new cycleways and cycle crossing of the A6
Community Facilities vitally important to residents , all must be kept.	• Community facilities are vital
Now the manager has left the Queens Head to keep it operating as a public house/hotel for community meeting as its an essential for village life	• Concerned about losing Queens Head
What will happen if Green King decide to close the Queens Head?	• Concerned about losing Queens Head
It is important to me that wildlife is not adversely affected by any development	• Wildlife must be protected
The existing playing field is in an isolated part of the village and younger children do not feel safe playing there.	• Plying field is isolated and children do not feel safe
It is vital to maintain a village public house as a welcome hub for the community to congregate and socialise in	• Concerned about losing Queens Head
Greater emphasis could be placed on the concept of a circular walking route of around 5 miles all within the parish envelope; practical plans for the development of public allotments within the Parish	• Circular walking route needed
General comments on the plan	
I am very grateful to the NDP team for the the time, effort and expertise dedicated to producing this highly developed plan.	
Thanks	
All the above proposals are very honourable. I hope the very rural atmosphere of Milton Ernest is not destroyed by landowners and developers greed	
I Support this plan	
A well put together plan which I hope is adopted by the village.	

COMMENT	SUMMARY OF COMMENT
Well done for such a comprehensive document. I can see many hours have been dedicated to the MENP	
A good document, thank you	
Looks good.	
I am very grateful to the NDP team for the the time, effort and expertise dedicated to producing this highly developed plan	
The MENP is a coherent planning document	