

Hallam Land Management – Response to Site Assessment Pro Forma ID 3234: Land West of Milton Road, Clapham			
Site Assessment Criteria		Bedford Borough Council's Assessment	Hallam Response
1a. Within or adjoining UAB SPA or built form of a small settlement	?	The site is within or adjoining a defined settlement policy area or within the built form of a small settlement.	It must be noted that development of the site would elongate the overall form of the village along the former A6 corridor to over a considerable distance from the village centre by 1.6km.
1e. Outside, adjoining or within the air quality management area?	+	The site is not within or adjoining the air quality management area.	Noted.
2a. Within or adjoining site of nature conservation importance	x	The site is within or adjoining a site of nature conservation importance.	Noted.
2b. In an area where protected species are known or likely to exist?	x	Protected species could be affected.	Noted. The limited scale of the site and implications for density etc (see below) significantly limit the opportunities to put in place an effective ecological mitigation strategy and or biodiversity strategy to deliver net gain. This is considered as a major (XX) negative of the site.
2c. Potentially able to achieve a net gain in biodiversity?	?	Uncertain or insufficient information.	500 dwellings and primary school are proposed for a site of 24.3ha which will require development densities which may compromise the wider character of Clapham, or conversely with lower densities will impact on opportunities for green infrastructure to contribute to biodiversity net gain. This is considered as a major (XX) negative of the site.
2d. Able to link into the green infrastructure opportunity network?		Nothing chosen.	It is considered opportunities are constrained by the A6 Paula Radcliffe Way and existing development. This is considered as a (X) negative of the site.
3a. Proposing a renewable energy scheme or extra energy efficiency standards?		Nothing chosen.	Noted.
4a. Likely to impact on designated or non-designated heritage assets or their settings? For more detailed assessment see Site Pro formas supporting document. www.bedford.gov.uk/LocalPlan2040	x	The proposal has the potential to cause harm to heritage assets. This harm may range from low to high. There may be options to avoid, reduce or mitigate this harm and where sites have not been ruled out altogether for other reasons, further assessment will be undertaken to more fully explore impacts on significance and options for harm reduction and mitigation. This further assessment may ultimately lead to the conclusion that the site should not be allocated.	Agreed.

Conservation Comments (informs 4a above)		No likely impact on built heritage assets.	Noted. In the context of wider design and placemaking considerations we would question the impact of developing a site of this size with 500 dwellings and a school, which will require higher densities at the edge of Clapham, impacting on the wider overall character of Clapham and rural edges. While impacts on conservation may be neutral the impacts in terms of place making are negative (and should be factored in)
Archaeology Comments (informs 4a above)		Potential high harm to (?)locally significant archaeological remains = low/moderate overall impact? Known heritage assets of archaeological interest within site (cropmarks). Moderate to high potential for previously unidentified heritage assets of archaeological interest. Limited potential for the proposal to impact upon the setting or settings of heritage assets of archaeological interest. Will require pre-determination archaeological evaluation.	Agreed.
5a. Likely to increase future economic and employment opportunities?		Nothing chosen.	Noted. However since the site is located a substantial distance from the principal village centre and shops and commercial businesses, there will be very limited economic benefits arising from the development and/or an increase in car borne journeys for local services. This is considered as a major (XX) negative of the site.
6a. Proposing a main town centre use in, on the edge or outside of a town centre?		Nothing chosen.	Noted.
8b. Within the existing settlement form?	+	The site adjoins a defined settlement policy area or the built form of a small settlement.	It must be noted that development of the site would elongate the overall form of the village along the former A6 corridor to over a considerable distance from the village centre by 1.6km. The site's location – relative to the built form – should be considered as a major (XX) negative of the site.
9a. On previously developed land?	x	The site is not previously developed land as defined in the NPPF.	Noted.
9b. On best and most versatile agricultural land ie grades, 1, 2 or 3a?	x	All or a majority of the site is best and most versatile agricultural land as defined in the NPPF.	Noted

10a. Within a groundwater source protection zone?	0	The site is located within a source protection zone but the proposed use is unlikely to be a risk to water supplies.	Noted.
11a. At risk of flooding?	+	The site is within flood zone 1 (areas that have been shown to be at less than 0.1% chance of flooding in any year).	Noted.
15e. Connect highway without constraint?	+	No access constraints.	<p>Whilst noting there are no access constraints, it is considered that wider accessibility considerations need to be considered including the proximity of local services and facilities in Clapham and their accessibility by walking and cycling.</p> <p>The potential impacts of providing a primary school in this location must be considered if its catchment is likely to attract journeys across Clapham.</p>
15f. Highway or junction capacity issues	?	Potential capacity problem requiring mitigation.	Noted.
Highway comments. For more detailed assessment see Site Pro formas supporting document. www.bedford.gov.uk/LocalPlan2040		<p>New vehicular access is proposed at two separate points onto Milton Road, both of which seem appropriate. There can be some light traffic in the area, however the site has excellent access to the A6, though this development and other neighbouring ones may contribute to congestion. There are a pair of bus stops directly outside the northern vehicular access where the 51 bus provides a roughly hourly service between Bedford and Rushden. Both proposed access points have a pavement on the opposite side of the road. Near the north of the site on Bedford Rd there is a shared cycle/pedestrian path running along the A6 to Milton Ernest. A Transport Assessment is required to assess cumulative impacts of this site and others proposed in the vicinity. Include pedestrian crossings at both proposed access points to ensure pedestrian access to the existing pavement on Milton Road.</p>	<p>A key disadvantage of this site is the remote location from the village centre (by some 20 minutes or 1.6km). The function and character of Milton Road and High Street and its attractiveness as a route for walking and cycling between the site and village centre must also be considered.</p> <p>Both Milton Road and the High Street are former sections of the A6 through Clapham village and despite the benefits of diverting the A6 along Paula Radcliffe way, the physical legacy of the A6 remains insofar that the High Street and Clapham Road corridor retains the majority of engineering features that supported the trunk road's function – movement remains to be prioritised over place.</p> <p>Significant improvements are required to improve connections between the site and Clapham Village if they are to provide attractive environments where walking and cycling become modes of choice. Locating a primary school at this site makes this ever more important.</p> <p>Traffic generation from the site moving in the prevailing direction to Bedford will result in significant flows through Clapham. Traffic choosing this (shorter) route will travel the length of the village.</p> <p>It is recommended/apparent that traffic issues should result in a negative score on this criteria..</p>

Contaminated Land		Nothing chosen.	Noted.
Environmental Health		Noise concerns relate just to proximity to A6. Twinwoods business park may be a source of noise.	Agreed.
Minerals & Waste conflict of interest		No answer given.	Noted.
Natural England Risks Opportunities		Does not pose risk.	Noted.
Mineral Safeguarding Area		Site does not fall within the boundary of a MSA.	Noted.