

AMPTHILL APPENDICES

Please Note: that the Consultation Report is a collection of all comments received during the consultation process. Comments included within this document are those of individuals and organisations and do not necessarily represent the views of the District Council.

AMPTHILL APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H052

These representations were made by people who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Richard Holden	Again "white land" - but not mentioned on today's list - should be in the final list.
Simon Evans-Evans	Any consideration needs to make provision for the increase in bottle neck traffic problems at the roundabout on the A507 and in Ampthill Town Centre. People living in this development are likely to drive into Ampthill and therefore additional central parking will be required. The Council also needs to provide a high proportion of affordable housing for sale, part sale and rent.
Mark Smith	As this site was in the previous local plans as a site for development I support its development. Although, I would hope that the same consultation exercise that was delivered in determining the development of the land off Tavistock Avenue down to the bypass was employed here. It would be good to incorporate cycle ways between Abbey Close & Flitwick Road particularly for Redborne School Children. However, I can not support a connection through Lammas Way or the potential of a through-road to Abbey Close.
Douglas Collin	I am not fully familiar with the site but I believe facilities are needed for youths, for example leisure centres. I hope there might be a possibility for this.
Nigel Pollard	I am surprised that this area has not already been used for housing. However, it may be that some of it would be best served as a new ambulance or fire station as it is very handy for the by-pass.
Mrs H Wilson	I feel this site could be used if there is careful planning and the surrounding woods were considered. Traffic would be a problem if the only way into town was Oliver Street; I think there would have to be public transport to the area.
Rosemary Park	I would agree to a smaller number of houses being built on this site for all the reasons identified above.
Valerie & Stuart	Lammas Way, Fallowfield and Russell Drive are of insufficient size to take an increased volume of traffic should Lammas Way be opened up. This option would be a danger to pedestrians, particularly children.
Paul New	Local roads would need significant improvement.
S Deckonlu	Most suitable site.
Mrs Val Thomas	Need to make the centre of Ampthill unattractive for through traffic to Bedford. This can be achieved with road bumps and traffic lights. Traffic will need to be encouraged to use the Ampthill/Maulden by-pass to A6 to Bedford or the proposed increase in cars in the centre of Ampthill would be untenable.
Margaret Wright	Provided it does not encroach onto school site.
Mr R Crowther	Secondary access via Lammas Way could be very dangerous for traffic winding its way to Russell Drive and Glebe Road. Also we must avoid ribbon development.
R Franceys	There is an ongoing need for a new Ampthill Station, particularly in the light of the Centre Parks development in addition to other proposed developments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr C Garraway	This is an area of derelict land whose loss would not significantly impact on the town or change its character. It is small enough to be absorbed without impact.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is the least damaging site for further housing development in Ampthill. However, we feel that Ampthill is already fully developed and more housing will inevitably bring more traffic congestion and more pressure on local services. There are also few employment opportunities for new residents, especially as a recent major employment site (ex MBDC offices) is mostly going to provide further housing.
Simon Lewis	This proposal - possibly together with H083/4 - is the only realistic development proposal in Ampthill as it is not a green belt. Also it is adjacent to existing housing and schools, and does not greatly extend the current town limits. These two developments together would provide c. 500 houses, which is 10% of the Mid Beds target. It should be remembered that all these proposals are over and above those already given planning permission but not yet underway.
S Melville	This site has the potential and the least impact on the town.

These representations were made by people who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
R.L. & B.J. Holt	Our concerns are for the vehicle and pedestrian traffic in Oliver Street which is already a very busy road. Concerns relating to Bedford Hospital ability and capacity to cope with potential increases. (Relative to Wixhams project).
Mr F. J. Morris	All recent expansion in Ampthill is on the south side, but no children's leisure facilities have been incorporated. This area could be used (partly) for this purpose. Why not build a small leisure centre - aimed at children - incorporating say four or five table tennis tables, pool tables, tennis courts and a comfortable lounge where teenagers can meet and play cheaply. Outside there should be a large grass area to kick a ball about and play foot ball, and also there should be a skateboarding and rollerblading facility. Slides and a play area should be provided for young ones. It is a long way up to Ampthill park from this part of town.
James Gibb	Although this development would extend the boundary of the town south-eastwards, it is between Redborne school and the main bulk of the town so the visual impact would not be great. It would clearly support the schools in the town. Flitwick Road is busy so there would be an adverse impact on traffic. It is some distance from the town centre, so one suspects that people would be more likely to shop in Flitwick than Ampthill. In either case there will be an unwelcome increase in car use.
Wood	An acute problem with development in Ampthill is increased congestion in the narrow streets of the town centre and associated car parking problems. The distance from the town centre suggests that car use would be the norm.
Mrs. K.S. Tyrrel	Cycle path networks and pedestrian walkways linking to the school and town centre should be provided. No roadside parking should be allowed!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
L. R. G. Page	Development of this site for housing has long been a possibility. Of major concern is the proposed access via Flitwick road. My concerns reflect growing traffic volumes in Flitwick road and a widespread failure to observe the 30mph speed limit; existing problems related to the daily arrival and departures of +1000 pupils at Redbournes School, an event already dangerous and is compounded by inconsiderate "school run" parking, and concerns that residents of Grange Park estate using Tavistock Avenue (our only access road) would face huge problems concerning access. Access to this site via some other route would be preferred, ideally to the EAST is in my view vital for safety and social reasons.
Barry Cannon	Flitwick Road is already at or beyond its traffic carrying ability. More traffic especially so close to Redborne School will make matters intolerable. If this site is to be considered for development much careful thought is needed regarding traffic flow. This site would probably be better for industrial use or left undeveloped.
Patricia Douglas	Further traffic generated in Flitwick Road will increase congestion and could cause problems with the Upper School nearby.
Mrs K Gray	H052 what does "secondary access" mean? Pedestrian access at Lammas way is ok, vehicular access absolutely not. It is very dangerous through this crowded estate. Both these developments will impact dramatically on traffic along Glebe Road and Russell Drive (access to the tidy tip); it is a road clearly very unsuitable for more traffic. Look at this route any given day or evening please.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	One of the more appropriate and proportional proposals for the Amphill development, but I notice that nothing of this combined magnitude is planned for Woburn, why is this?
Priscilla Davies	It should be though seriously about traffic flow along Lammas Way and the impact on the roads, for example in Fallowfield, Aragon Road and then that dreadful Russell Drive.
B. Dackombe	Suitability depends upon reducing density and improved road access. Linking Flitwick Road and Abbey Road more suitably to relieve traffic on Oliver Street would be appropriate.
Mr J Welch	The proposal to open up Lammas Way for access to H052 would be an error. Many vehicles would use this to avoid the main road and for access to the waste recycling centre. There is no way it could be enforced as only secondary access. These proposals also concentrate too much on the development of the southern edge of town, changing completely the nature and environment of that area.
Mrs M Coomes	The site could be self contained with the only access being from the main Flitwick Road similar to the Tavistock estate. The additional vehicle access road would further congest and impact on Lamas Road, Fallowfield and Glebe Road which are narrow residential roads with limited parking space and where the roads and pavements are already blocked when residents use both sides of the road for additional parking. The additional traffic cutting through Russell Drive to Oliver Street as a short cut to the by-pass or Maulden would make an already dangerous slalom course extremely hazardous.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jack Wetherill	This is the best location if houses must be built around Ampthill. It makes least impact on the beautiful countryside that surrounds the town. However the traffic implications would have to be carefully thought through. Access onto Flitwick Road could be very tricky whilst any thoroughfare involving Lammas Way and Aragon Road would have to be very carefully thought through with the possibility that it would have to be ruled out.
Ian Nutley	Would be acceptable for housing as it is near to schools etc and not in the green belt.
Alan Cardwell	Would support limited development in this area but must be restricted due to the potential strain on facilities like schools, medical and emergency services.

These representations were made by people who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr. L. A. Lowe	Development of this site will lead to overloading of local services such as the post office, local shops, in-town parking, schools and surgeries. Also it will lead to increased traffic, and parking problems on the Glebe Road and Russell Drive area of Ampthill as there is already inadequate and dangerous parking at the small shops in Russell Drive. Finally there will be a loss of land for any future expansion of school or college facilities.
J. Booth	Access to the site is a major consideration as it is already a problem trying to exit Tavistock Avenue in rush hour. Additional traffic would be a safety issue being so close to the Upper School where pupils are already walking out onto traffic as they go to and from school. Concerns over the Lammas Way and Flitwick road entrance forming a rat run with potential safety concerns.
I. Church	Ampthill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added approximate 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring to the roads would bring traffic to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution which I don't want my children to be exposed to: the reason I moved to small town in the first place. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population let alone the proposed increase; bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands.
David Yallop	Ampthill is a small market town that is the envy - in the nicest possible way - to most districts within Mid-Beds. Its main attractions are good schools, facilities for the present population, excellent restaurants and shops. The proposed infrastructure to accommodate the Centre Parks Project will if anything take traffic away from the centre of Ampthill. What we do not need is a development that causes more congestion and stretches local amenities like the Doctors. The Schools are probably over subscribed already. Obviously businesses would welcome "more chimney pots" as it will increase trade but at what price? Please do not spoil one of the lovely Market Towns in Bedfordshire. Thank you.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Paul ODell	Amphill is already congested with traffic. Little parking is available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixham town estate which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixham development is so close to Amphill that it will already have a detrimental affect on the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people: something which should take effect as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
L. Sumsion	Amphill services are very poor and nothing has been done to rectify this. We cannot take any more housing. The Georgian Centre (our heart) is being ruined by traffic and large vehicles. The access from Lammas Way will cause untold accidents and emergency vehicles will have trouble getting through. The land should be used to enlarge Redborne School as all a [illegible] are strengthened. We also have sewage problems.
Jennifer Anderson	Amphill as it is, is a largely used town with streets far too small for the amount of traffic that comes through its streets at this time, never mind the amount that more housing would add.
Mrs Linda Craddock	As I live opposite the shops in Russell Drive I am Already concerned about traffic using Russell Drive as a racetrack and feel if there is access to the proposed site at Lammas Way this will cause more problems. With the bends and traffic already parked due to window business and a physiotherapy clinic I feel a serious accident is waiting to happen. Although I am sympathetic to the need of more housing I feel rather upset by the fact that I've lived in Russell Drive for 41 years and brought up 3 daughters only 1 of whom can afford to live in Amphill. The 2 youngest have been forced to move away.
Sue Hamon Watt	Children and staff from Redborne school walk home on a short cut this way off the main road. How will they get home if it's built on?
Denise Hill	Extending the school to accommodate additional children in Amphill would be a far better way of using the land. Allowing the development of more houses as you drive straight into Amphill ruins the overall feel of the town. Why should this be a case of filling up every piece of green space you come across? It would be a disaster for the town and what about the wildlife in the area? What would happen to them?
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	Flitwick Road is extremely busy at all times with traffic movement, making it extremely difficult for existing residents to enter the flow & dangerous for Redborne School pupils. Any further major housing developments should therefore be resisted.
Mrs P King	Green belt.
Wade Nicolette	H097 is of particular concern. Building houses on the rugby club means that a significant local resource which has provided children in the area with an opportunity to play sport will be lost. I cannot find any information about alternative provisions there is already very little in the way of resources for children and young people. The roads are already very congested and these proposals will make it worse.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs V.A Woodcraft	I cannot believe you are planning to build on this site and with such a large amount of dwellings. How can the existing infrastructure (schools, Dentists and especially the doctor's surgery) support this!! And have you really looked at the impact on the traffic flow in Ampthill which has already increased three fold in the last year since the opening of Waitrose, and making from my point Flitwick Road an ever-increasing danger. I think it is a great shame and I feel sadness that you seem hell bent on overpopulating what was a wonderful old historic market town which is unfortunately being destroyed by over development. I wonder how much of the housing would be allocated for people already living in the area as I feel people coming into the area so to use the train link into London will purchase them. Finally I live directly opposite this site and would like to know what personal impact this will have on me?
Ian Devereux	I can't believe that local schools would be able to support the number of possible children coming into the area with this proposed development. Secondly it is already extremely difficult to get to see a doctor and that is with the increase in the number of practises locally. Traffic around the area has increased significantly with the introduction of Waitrose in the centre of the town and would need a major investment and further development if more houses were to be built in the area. Lammas way would become a rat run if opened; the roads would need to be widened as the whole area is single lane traffic especially early in the morning and late afternoon and evening. Finally would the sewage works need extending as it seems that there have been major problems here over the past few years.
Gail Hobday	I feel development of this site would impact on the access to Redborne School and cause traffic congestion as one entrance would be opposite the entrance to Tavistock Avenue. I also feel the local infrastructure would not be able to support that number of houses.
Corrina Durcan	I understand you intend to open up a secondary access to this new development via Lammas Way. All roads in this area are already narrow and this would create a potential rat run for traffic and implications for safety of children and pedestrians. Redborne School is already over subscribed and plans to expand are currently on hold. I strongly object to a development in close proximity to Redborne School and to opening up access in a private, quiet residential area.
Pete Luddington	I would be horrified to think that this estate could have an access through Lammas Way. The adjoining roads, Glebe Road and Russell Drive are already a rat run for traffic wishing to avoid the town and Oliver St. The shops in Russell Drive have hopelessly inadequate parking. The police recently undertook a purge on vehicles parking on the pavements and the approach to the road is dangerous because of all the bends. I have no issue with a footpath and/or cycle way access to Lammas Way but would strongly object to vehicle access. Some years ago a supermarket was proposed on the Dollittle Mill site. This was rejected because of the traffic implications in the area. What has changed to allow such major developments in the Ampthill area....nothing.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals and must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?

Submitted by	Comments
Malcolm & Audrey Johnson	In particular, the proposal to create secondary access via Lammas Way would simply aggravate what is already a serious problem of insufficient off-road parking along Lammas Way, parked cars would impede access to emergency services and speeding traffic to and from the houses at the closed ends of the cul-de-sac would evolve into speeding traffic to and from the proposed new development.
Duckett P.A.	Insufficient infrastructure of all forms; roads, schools, medical facilities, sewage and drainage.
Helen Manley	Lammas Way and surrounding roads are not suitable to have quantities of traffic passing through them. There will be implications for the safety of pedestrians (especially children) and much increased noise levels. Redborne School cannot take hundreds more pupils. Are you proposing to build a new upper school?
Donna & Neil Croxton	Major concerns access to new site. Oliver Street is already an issue with parked cars especially round the GF Motors.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Mrs. J. Yallop	On the 23rd February 2008 I went with my husband to the Alameda School for the presentation of "addition houses for Ampthill". Although my husband has taken this survey I was told that I could add my additional thoughts to his comments in the survey. The existing infrastructure in our area is already under strain. The existing flora and fauna should not be demolished. The trees that edge the stream running at the rear of homes off Fallowfield, Lammas Way and Flitwick Road should not be tampered with. The copse and shrubbery at the rear of our homes in Flitwick Road are a source for a large array of wild life. Munt jac, pheasants, foxes and an abundance of wild birds exist to enhance this area of Ampthill. Build on this area and character and beauty will be gone forever. We have been led to believe that there was a preservation order on this area at the rear of our home.
Mr W L B Bowmer	Problems arising from the development of this land include: the loss of green space between Ampthill and Flitwick virtually linking the two towns together, it is now a haven for wildlife which will be lost. Part of the site is currently used by Redborne School farm - a very good use - for sheep. Traffic problems: a junction on Flitwick road would cause even more danger and disruption than already exists. Lammas Way is a narrow, car lined road: its use for access would be disastrous. Our schools and GP surgeries are already oversubscribed. No nearby shops.
Mrs B Luddington	Proposed vehicle access from Lammas Way is wrong. This will create a rat run from Oliver St through Russell Drive etc. This is already a very congested route & will be dangerous. Also access onto Flitwick road a problem, already school traffic & Tavistock Avenue cause jams/congestion. Permission for a supermarket was turned down at doolittle mill because of congestion and how can this housing development now be suddenly no problem!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Susan and David Lane	Re: H052 The development of this site will not contribute in any way to supporting local services, in fact it will tend to cause the reverse. In particular there would be a further load on schools and doctors surgeries. The development would be detrimental to the adjacent area, providing a rat run via Lammas Way to the endangerment of the families and in particular their children. It would open an outlet near to Redbourne School, feeding further vehicles to the One-O-One roundabout which would increase congestion. In addition an escape route from Lammas Way would encourage the criminal element and could lead to more burglaries and other offences in the area.
Barbara Shepherd	Residents on this site may use Flitwick local services rather than Ampthill as they are just as close to there as Ampthill Town Centre. The site backs onto Redbourne School, if the population is to expand further school amenities will be needed to accommodate the additional pupils and expansion of the school will be necessary. A through road may be considered from Lammas Way, this would create an unacceptable level of traffic in an area that is already suffering from too many vehicles for a residential area. This will leave us with barely any green space from the far side of Tesco in Flitwick to the area beyond Waitrose in Ampthill. As a non driver I am aware public transport has been cut rather than increased.
D. E. Mann	Sewerage facilities no good. Too much traffic on estate. Not enough amenities for school - doctors. I object to all the buildings being proposed.
Nichola Phillips	Since the introduction of Waitrose the traffic in Ampthill has significantly increased - should another development of 150+ houses with cars be given the go ahead I can only seem Ampthill becoming more and more congested. On another subject the sewer system in the Fallowfield is privately owned, we have had several problems with this lately, how will another housing development improve this situation? I feel that if you are going to drain on resources even further this can only compound the problem - will you be taking the sewers over? Regarding investment into Ampthill I would strongly suggest that you concentrate on pavements, roads, the small shopping centre around Fallowfield, Lammas Way, Russell Drive etc, they are in an appalling state.
Mrs P Bolsom	The access to Lammas Way is not suitable because the road is narrow, has cars parked on the road and leads to other narrow busy roads. Drivers will be using this way to avoid the busy Flitwick Rd which is already difficult to access.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Anthony Kerr	The council has a duty to provide additional housing. It also has a commitment and duty to safeguard the quality of life and interests of existing Mid-beds inhabitants. The proposed development of H052 would not meet this requirement. The environmental pollution to those, particularly in Lammas Way, whose side elevations face the site and are close to the boundary, would be devastating. The proposed secondary access from the site onto Lammas Way would be disastrous for existing residents. It would become a short cut for all. The existing roads could not cope with the extra traffic. The proposal makes no mention of the drainage dyke that runs along the north of the site. This is essential, but in the past proven inadequate, to cope with heavy rain drainage water is flowing down Fallowfield and Lammas Way, resulting in localised flooding in gardens and garages. The proposal makes no mention of the drainage dyke that runs along the north of the site. This is essential, but in the past proven inadequate, to cope with heavy rain drainage water flows down Fallowfield and Lammas Way, resulting in localised flooding in gardens and garages. Efforts should concentrate on larger, self contained developments such as developing the eyesore at Elstow storage depot.
Phyllis & Roger Pheasant	The current environment which includes muntjak deer, rabbits, pheasant & partridge, hawks, skylarks, owls and general birdlife. Together with toads, newts and wildlife in general would be lost during construction and thereafter. The loss of the school farming facilities is a retrograde step for education in a supposedly rural area. There is no provision for any infrastructure to benefit Ampthill, on a site logically more suitable for education or welfare facilities, items missing from all current proposals even though highlighted by you. Traffic from the secondary access is onto narrow winding roads which will cause danger to children and families. The principle access will add an unacceptable load to the existing bottlenecks at the school and thro town.
Mrs Alaine Clark	The estate of Lammas way Fallowfield and Russell Drive has very narrow streets that twist and turn, added to that all the parked cars it can be quite dangerous for both pedestrians and drivers. There is not enough parking by the few shops in Russell Drive without more use because of a new estate being built. I have seen Ampthill double over those years. Ampthill is now virtually joined to Maulden on one side and now Mid Beds want to join Ampthill with Flitwick on the other side. It is sad that children of today have little freedom without us taking away the beautiful fields, woods etc that we are too frightened to allow them to investigate on their own but can still view from their windows. When I told my daughter that houses may be built at the back of our house she said "But Mum that's my view I can see the sun rise and set from my bedroom window I wont be able to if houses are there".
Lockett	The infrastructure we have cannot cope with these plans. Our roads cannot cope with the additional traffic and rat runs will be created, through roads that are already congested and not particularly safe for the schoolchildren in the area.
R Evernden	The parking and general traffic around Lammas way/Russell Drive is already a problem. Having secondary access through this area will only add to the issue. The shops and amenities close by are also inadequate for additional families which will only lead to an increase in anti social behaviour around this quiet part of Ampthill.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Nicola Crick	The proposed site is too large; it takes away valuable wooded areas which are becoming fewer in number not just in this area but also in the country. We should be focusing on redeveloping neglected buildings not for ever taking away countryside. The council should stop building on every bit of spare land before there is none left. A proposed secondary exit/entrance onto this site via Lammas way would create problems. Lammas way and Fallowfield are quiet roads where children ride on their bikes and walk around freely, this would no longer be a safe option if the proposal went ahead. Glebe road and Russell drive are windy roads on which cars have near misses with other cars and pedestrians as it is difficult to see what is coming. The proposal would add to this problem and make it worse.
L. SUMSION	The site is the only natural site left in Ampthill, Ampthill's historic roads cannot take the through traffic as it is & our infrastructure cannot cope. The amount of housing proposed leaves no room for any thing else, the addition of Waitrose has made traffic very slow through the centre. I live in Lammas Way & access through Lammas Way is an accident waiting to happen, driving down from Fallowfield as it is ,is a case of weaving through parked cars. The access point you are purposing is very narrow with cars parked on either side, making barely a cars width to get through. If there was an emergency access would be very difficult. With all the new housing surely Redbourne would need to expand with that amount of housing there surely is no chance. With one very over priced supermarket, a long wait for a Doctors appointment & our schools full this tiny, & may I point out historic town, is being ruined. I strongly oppose this development. as it is & our infrastructure cannot cope .The amount of housing proposed leaves no room for any thing else, the addition of Waitrose has made traffic very slow through the centre. I live in Lammas Way & access through Lammas Way is an accident waiting to happen, driving down from Fallowfield as it is, is a case of weaving through parked cars. The access point you are purposing is very narrow with cars parked on either side, making barely a cars width to get through. If there was an emergency access would be very difficult. With all the new housing surely Redbourne would need to expand with that amount of housing there surely is no chance. With one very over priced supermarket, a long wait for a Doctors appointment & our schools full this tiny, & may Point out historic town, is being ruined. I strongly oppose this development.
Andrew Budd	The site needs to be viewed in the context of the massive nearby development already agreed on land to the West of Ampthill. If agreed, this sized development (i.e. 150+ further houses) would serve to completely change the nature of Ampthill as a small market town, and would cover another important green space with housing. Development in Ampthill should focus on opportunistic infill with small developments, not building further substantial housing estates.
Philip Field	The traffic impact on an already overcrowded road (Flitwick Rd) with a considerable number of school children walking from Ampthill to Redborne School. At rush hours it already takes up to 5 mins to enter this road. A complete change in character for Ampthill. Increased pollution.
E F Howard	The use of Lammas Way is, in my opinion, totally unacceptable. The road is too narrow and is not suitable for the number of cars that would be used by the residents of the new housing estate.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Robin Jenins	There are major issues with the sewage handling capability for the area of Ampthill adjacent to this site. There have even been sewage overflows in the streets last year, as reported on both BBC and ITV local news programmes. Building on this land would push the system over the edge. A secondary point is that the land is the home to a colony of Smooth Newts, which have their breeding pond within my own garden. Although not a nationally-endangered species, they are threatened within Bedfordshire so the land should not be built on.
Nicola Kane	This is a ridiculous idea for Ampthill. Ampthill is already over submitted with housing, we do not have the infrastructure to cope with the present amount of people and housing to date. I bought my house for the position on a very quiet cul-de-sac with no through traffic for the safety of my child as we moved from a busy road in Flitwick. If this proposal goes ahead there will be more noise, pollution, rubbish, safety and noise issues, crime levels will go up and house values will go down. This is not the reason I moved to Ampthill. We already have a problem with drains and sewerage and we pay the highest council taxes in the area + the most money for food etc. You may ask why I live here - Very good question. There is far too much around Glebe Road, Fallowfield, and Lammas Way to begin with. I strongly object to extra housing in this area.
Nigel Hopwood	This is a very busy road close to Redborne school, the additional traffic would not only add to congestion but would also endanger pupils encouraged to walk to school. The access via Lammas way would also spoil a quiet close and increase the volume of traffic passing through this family area. Current residents are cautious I cannot see people using it as a rat run taking such care.
John Pitts	This is creeping development towards an enlarged Flitwick/Ampthill conurbation and is yet another nail in the coffin of greenspaces around Ampthill. It will also add a strain to drainage, traffic, social and educational facilities within this area which taken with other planned development in the area will as a whole totally swamp the existing infrastructure.
Mrs P R Welch	This proposal to put secondary access through Lammas Way is not necessary as there will be a dual access through Flitwick Road & Abbey Lane (by the Spur Rd).
Peter Luddington	This represents gross overdevelopment. If this estate is linked with Lammas Way it will cause major traffic issue for Glebe Rd, Russell Dr, Lammas Way and Aragon Rd. Local shops already present major parking and safety issues. If this is built then access should be from Flitwick Rd by way of a roundabout. Schools in Ampthill were already oversubscribed and this proposal will overstretch already inadequate services.
Mrs. A. Vickers	This site should be left baron, or agricultural, until the time that Redborne School needs to expand, even if it is 20-30 years time. Once the land is used for housing that school development opportunity has gone. Access should never be allowed from Lammas Way through the housing estate.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Andy McGowan	This site should ideally be retained for expansion of school / educational facilities if needed. The additional traffic that it would likely cause would add risk to students in an already congested area at school start and end times. Ampthill lacks a swimming pool - this would be a good site for such a facility being close to Redborne (our sports academy), it has also acted as a location for fun fairs, travelling circuses et al. The use of the site for housing would further degrade the green space within the town.
Stuart Dunn	This site should not even be on the table for consideration it is totally inappropriate. Firstly, I disagree with your comment that this land is not greenbelt, according to the Plan Search Plus survey I had carried out before moving to Lammas Way it shows this site as green belt with wildlife prevalent. Secondly, the impact this site would have on the residents of Lammas Way would be immense in terms of noise pollution, traffic chaos, road safety issues and possible parking restrictions. As you would appreciate, this would clearly lead to a significant devaluation of the properties in Lammas Way which were purchased on the premise of no through road and the quality of life of its residents. Thirdly, building up around Redbourne School will inhibit its own expansion which will obviously be needed with the new children moving to the area. Developing on top of the school farm is clearly not desirable from either an animal or resident point of view. I strongly urge the people tasked with the decision making process to reject the proposal for development on this site.
D T Withers	This site was irresponsibly changed from Greenfield. It is a necessary wildlife corridor which should remain. The idea of "breaking" into Lammas Way is ridiculous, already overcrowded and road narrow.
Marc Henshall	This will ruin the area, build in the big towns, leave the small ones alone! Not to mention the fact that this is getting dangerously close to making Flitwick and Ampthill the same place. Not something the people of Ampthill want!
C. Knibb	This would create a rat-run along Fallowfield, ruining the quiet area. It would increase high-density population, ruin Ampthill's identity, making it a part of Flitwick, destroy wildlife, and restrict the school (esp its farm).
Colin Ambler	To open up Lammas Way as a second exit will make Lammas Way a rat run for all traffic and drunken idiots of Ampthill etc. and make the existing road to Lammas Way more of a race track than it is already.
Steve Davies	Traffic congestion in the town is already at unacceptable levels. Please give consideration to the fact that Ampthill is a historic Georgian Market Town and is not suited to increased traffic. Since the opening of Waitrose supermarket the traffic in the town centre has become extremely congested and additional housing and traffic will only add to this problem. Local people do not walk to the supermarket as they do not want to walk home with bags and bags of heavy groceries.
Mr T. Atkins	Traffic congestion round Fallowfield and Lamas Way and on to the main road and being too near Redborne School.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Audrey Boulter	We appreciate the need for housing and this site in principal would fulfil some of these needs, but we object strongly to opening up of Lammas Way on the grounds that it will create a lot of concern to residents because we would no longer be able to allow our children to play in safety and make their way to school without the added danger of a vast increase of through traffic. At present we enjoy a relatively quiet cul-de-sac situation and this would completely change peoples lives. This would create a cut-through situation which would generate a lot of traffic not only in Lammas Way but the immediate surrounding approach roads and footways.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	We feel it is important to maintain a green borderland around Ampthill and, as far as the South is concerned, this site plus the Redborne School grounds are it ! Please preserve ! Flitwick Road is already dangerously overloaded at busy times and we do not need further sites debouching traffic onto it and presenting further hazards to the hundreds of Redborne students who walk/cycle to/from school along it and could be forced to cross extra traffic flows from both this site and Site H121. We do support some extra housing in the Abbey Lane area and a useful consent condition could be the provision of a metalled footpath/cycleway from it to Redborne through this site with a link to Lammas Way. A safer route to school for many!
Martin Joynes	Why has the deadline for comments moved from 9th April? 1. Secondary access via Lammas Way is a daft idea. This street, Fallowfield and Glebe Rd are very narrow. Many cars are parked on-street. Opening this up to traffic would result in accidents and endanger children and pedestrians. 2. This site, once green belt, and now protected for housing (great euphemism) is the only remaining open land on the eastern side of Flitwick Rd. Developing on this land WILL cause the effective coalescence of Ampthill and Flitwick that the Local Plan says should be avoided. 3. Why Ampthill & Flitwick? Already horribly congested at peak times, both have major road bottlenecks at their centres. And yet more houses are proposed? Now that the A421 is being improved, why isn't more housing being allocated to the SWBSC?? Delay in improving the A421 was one of the reasons that Ampthill and Flitwick were targeted. Now that this is no longer the case, surely the decision should be reviewed?

These representations were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr D M King	Road structure inadequate - You refused application form Sainsbury's giving this as one of your reasons for refusal. Schools already stretched with current numbers. The sewage system, I feel, is not going to be able to cope. Services in town are poor and parking is the same.. To describe it as a major service centre is like asking to believe that there are men on Mars. We have no train station which means further over use of road structure. Ask all the estate agents if there is a housing shortage. There are also rare habitat sites and environment to consider.

Submitted by	Comments
George Banks	The development of a large number of houses in one area such as this will definitely clog up the roads particularly in the town centre. There is no provision for extra car parking in the town. No schools and medical care. Ampthill is already struggling to keep the parks and roads - also drainage up to scratch.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.
David Payne	We don't know how you can say that the upper school has sufficient capacity without knowing how many houses/families will be new in Ampthill. The roads are already very congested and will be even greater with the Wixams etc.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H080

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
C. Fred John	I think this site provides the best development potential around Ampthill and could even be expanded to include health centre, amenity shops, restaurants etc, unlike Doolittle Mill which is in its current state a dreadful development, (mock Georgian blot on the landscape!).
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	This is an established and successful site for hi-tech employment and although a little way out of town, it has two buses per hour passing the gate to/from Bedford, Ampthill town centre, Flitwick and Flitwick station and, thus, would be suitable for further business and housing use. A long-appreciated feature of this site is its effective screening by woodland. This is fairly effective even from the roadside, but it is most impressive from the Greensand Ridge Walk, when you need to know that it is there before you are likely to notice it. Extension beyond the screen into Houghton Conquest parish would NOT be welcome, however. We assume this is in effect the same location as Site E71 (q.v.).
Denise	We should very seriously consider the development of housing on redundant land rather than try and squeeze loads of houses in between plots. This would be an extremely good proposal to meet the needs of Ampthill without having such an impact on other proposed sites under consideration.
Gary Mudd	This site near Ampthill is I suppose a brownfield site and thus should be used for development as too much green field seems to be proposed in an area deemed to be a Community Forest again thought to the infrastructure here. What facilities will it use Ampthill or Houghton Conquest. How much extra traffic with new jobs? Which school will it feed to and what is there capacity?
Ian Nutley	This is already brownfield land.
James Gibb	There is significant traffic to the current site anyway, so the proposed development is not likely to increase traffic volumes that much. Although not adjacent to significant other housing, it is actually no further from the town centre than H121, H052 and H083/084, and is much more likely to boost trade in Ampthill than, say H052.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	I believe that this is the most appropriate site for this kind of mixed use development. The existing LHM-Insys site will make a good foundation for this area to be used for industrial units or similar and the scale of the proposal is proportionate.
Kimberley Griffith	Yes, this would not disrupt anyone or anything. It is an ideal site.
M J Griffith	Build them where it won't upset people who are already there.
Mr V Paxton	Must be used for light industrial and warehouse only. NOT HOUSING. That's the reason for filling in E form.
Mr. J Lockley	An excellent place to "hide" new houses - and a good opportunity to have houses and work close together which will minimise use of cars.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs C.Lai	I think this development is well situated compared to other proposed sites as part of the site is already used for industrial use and it will not have a significant impact on the environment of either Ampthill or Houghton Conquest although the people of How End may not like it. I do think that the schools in the area at the moment cannot cope with the size of this development but new schools will have to be built anyway with the amount of extra houses which are inevitably going to be built.
Mrs. K Gray	With the exception of traffic along Bedford Road into Ampthill which I think will become a severe problem especially at the end of work time, I believe this is a very suitable site for expansion.
Nigel Pollard	Business Park YES, Housing NO!!
Theresa Jackson	I think this would be a potential site, the only downside would be the distance from Ampthill town centre encouraging more people into their cars and further adding to the congestion at peak periods in the town.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Helen Armitage	Traffic levels in Bedford Street are very heavy at times because of the bottleneck at the clock tower. This development would increase traffic level substantially.
June Collin	Probably suitable for mixed use, not housing only, providing some employment opportunities.
JV Speirs	The road from Houghton Conquest into Ampthill already gets congested at certain times and so I would only support this development if a new road could be built that would by-pass Ampthill.
Mr G. S. Bave	Overall disagree with the development as too big - a smaller scale of houses perhaps 100 is enough as roads too busy now (Ampthill Road) and could not cope with industrial and housing use and concerned green belt - again!
Mr G.S. Bave	Overall disagree with the development as too big (370 houses) perhaps on a much smaller scale say 50-100 max as the Ampthill Road already congested with use for industry and houses too much, for roads. Concerned about greenbelt again - nearby Wixams development v. close by.
Mr P.H.Dixon	A smaller scale development here would not impact on the environment as much as some of the other proposed sites.
Mrs Julie Bave	Improving the site sounds a good idea for employment. 370 is FAR TOO MANY houses, with a big impact on already congested roads (a nightmare getting into Ampthill now with new Waitrose store - built). "WIXAMS CLOSE WITH OVER 4000 HOUSES. NO need for huge housing developments 50 MAXIMUM!! If any?? Impact on wildlife and greenbelt again!!
Mrs. K. S. Tyrrel	The road network would have to be improved. Ampthill town centre cannot cope with any more traffic volume.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Paul Hammond	Access onto the B530 main road would need careful planning to make it safe and to avoid creating congestion. Given that we must find somewhere for new houses, this site would have less impact on the current community than many of the other proposals for Houghton Conquest. Transport links into Ampthill for schools, shops, etc would need to be included as walking is not viable unless changes are made on Ampthill Hill.
Paul Rowntree	No objection in principle, however object to this unless: A regular bus service between the hours of 6AM and 10.30PM is provided between Bedford and Flitwick Station via this route serving this development, the Wixams and Ampthill with minimum service frequency of 30 mins mon-sat, hourly sun and 15 minute interval mon-sat 07-30 - 18:30. in the event that H275 and H278 do not proceed 30 minute interval Mon- Sat 06.00 to 18.30 and hourly 18.30 to 22.30 Mon-Sat and Sundays would be acceptable. Otherwise it will risk unacceptable traffic levels on the B530 to Ampthill and unacceptable congestion in Ampthill.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alexis Webster	The development is not near to another area of housing and as such will not be supported by facilities. It will also introduce housing to the countryside where there are no other concentrations of houses.
B. Dackombe	Unsuitable site close to high security industrial site.
B.M.A.Hill	A place of beauty will be ruined
Barry Cannon	Totally unsuitable site for any type of development.
Brenda Hartley	I want this village to remain a village; we have had far too much development over the past few years; especially with the Wixhams. Our services and amenities are over subscribed already. I do not think that Houghton Conquest should be categorized as a large village. Over all we don't want to loose the village characteristics which we have, I would the village stay as it is.
Brian James Cowley	I consider such a huge population would be out of place and unsustainable in such a location.
C Goldthorpe	This area is already over developed. All the developments proposed for this area will change a "small" village into an urban sprawl.
C. Hedges	Existing infrastructure is not sufficient to support development of this size. Services have been continually reduced in the past. The site is clearly not suitable for residential development of this scale and an application has already been rejected. It is contrary to planning policy/legislation. It would be intrusive into areas of outstanding natural beauty. 370 houses in this location would potentially create a "ghetto" with no prospect of adequate services on site. Existing traffic levels already cause problems on the approach to the town. These will be compounded by development close to Bedford. The site could sustain some increased employment levels, but this would have to be instead of not as well as residential development.
Christine Dean	Although within boundary of Houghton Conquest site too far away, would probably cause further pressure on Ampthill.
David Lawlor	Near Marston Vale. Schools issue. Away from all facilities.

Submitted by	Comments
Doris Wickings	Development here is to near the nature reserve. So any building there would put pressure on the natural habitat.
Douglas Collin	I agree with the (illegible) provided.
Duckett P.A.	Too far from anywhere. Too near the Wixams. Poor access and egress. OK for light industrial use only.
E Brindley	I am against all the development in Houghton Conquest. Since moving into the village for a quiet rural life the village has already tripled in size. I was against the proposed Wixams development which at the time we were promised would not connect the this village. The hospital, doctors, ambulance, fire and police services are all overstretched and all this development will not help that and will quite possibly cause even more flooding as so much natural drainage will have been built on. Also if as much development is planned for other villages such as Stewartby and Wilstead everything will end up all joined together like a big city just like Milton Keynes. This area would cause even more congestion on the roads together with the rest of the Wixams development. Also will take away even more of the natural drainage of this area being a very clay soil would cause lots of problems for the whole area and should remain green belt.
E M Field	Would have very bad effect on landscape from Houghton House/ Kings Wood; one of Best views in Beds
Edna Brindley	The development of these sites assumes that people working in them will live in the proposed adjacent new developments for housing. In my view this will not happen and the end result will be traffic chaos on existing roads as people commute in and out. The infrastructure for this is & will continue to be totally inadequate.
Graham Bellamy	In woodland site.
Hill	Roads and services (water/gas/electricity inadequate now) drainage and road surfaces require updating, to take the increase in traffic in both quantity and weight. Parking is a problem now. In future each property may have three/four vehicles each home what will happen at peak times? The local utility services will not be adequate to cope with the increased population. The waste system will require improvement. Domestic bath/shower, sewage and storm water.
J Nester	Historical sites should be kept in [illegible] English heritage.
J Wyer	With the Wixhams we don't want any more buildings.
Jeremy Smith	At rush hour periods the roads in and out of Ampthill are reduced to a crawl. Even Saturday mornings are like this. The existing green belt and conservation area below and surrounding Houghton House would be completely blighted by the proposed development. If Centre Parks and NIRAH are added to the equation the whole road network will cease up, and most local services be overwhelmed. Surely this is what the Wixhams was developed for ?
Joanne Randall	This development which is nearer to Ampthill and people living here would I'm sure prefer to say they are from Ampthill is completely away from the village so makes no logic to say is part of Houghton Conquest!!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
John Hawker	Don't consider a village of the size and infrastructure of Houghton Conquest can sustain any more large scale development. With the extremely nearby Wixams development along with the proposed Nirah development I would say that this part of Mid Beds has its fair share of development. Please see below a number of points that I consider would need to be addressed before Houghton Conquest could sustain any further development. - Access onto the A6. Those who already live here have to contend with the extremely dangerous pull out, if they wish to access the A6 in a southerly direction. This can mean a wait of 4/5 minutes to access the road resulting in a long queue back into the side road. At present I can see this as accident waiting to happen without adding traffic. - Medical Provision; - Bus routes; - Social care; - Village infrastructure - paths, lights , road condition; - Schools; - Marston Vale Forest project; - Open spaces - park, playground.
Kevin Sherwood	Redevelopment as additional employment yes but no residential element.
L. R. G. Page	In my view the proposed development, perhaps for A5 many as 1500 people would be - isolated, requiring substantial support facilities - would potentially begin to impact the valuable landscape of the Greensand Ridge, especially when viewed from the north (Houghton Conquest).
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Lisa Frangiamore	This site is very distant from the core of the village, and housing development here is not practical
Mark Smith	This has already been turned down by MBDC & rightly so as this effectively creates a separate community from Ampthill & Houghton Conquest.
Michael Brooks	This site is remote from the town and on the other side of a steep hill. It is quite unsuitable for housing. Although an hourly bus service passes the site, there is no service in the evenings or on Sundays; travel to and from the site would therefore almost exclusively be by car. Journeys to any destination other than Bedford/Kempston would need to pass through the narrow and congested roads of Ampthill town centre. This site should be rejected for housing outright.
Mr & Mrs J Purdy	There are already significant traffic jams at the beginning and end of each shift at Lockheed Martin, and building houses and light industrial units would only exacerbate the situation.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market (?) towns may be worth consideration"?
Mrs Dawn Yvonne Cowley	We moved from a town, to get away from estates, we do NOT want this all in our back garden, we came to Houghton Conquest for a village life, certainly not for all this disruption in our life.
Mrs H. Wilson	I feel this site would cause huge traffic problems particularly at peak times. Just with Insys traffic one can queue from just past Insys to get into Ampthill in the evenings. Also the local countryside would be spoilt.
Mrs T Adams	This is far too large a proposal - 370 houses would have a terrible impact on local roads and light industry would be of benefit to the region as so many places closing down. No houses!
Mrs. A. Vickers	Too separate from Ampthill, would create a new village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ms C Thomas	No local services, Ampthill closest, town already heavily congested, no parking, supermarket opening not helped, parking on main road getting out of control. A6 Bedford/Luton notorious black spot along with A507 to Junction 13 of M1. A421 Broghborough also black spot, add The Wixhams, chaos! Getting into Bedford, already big issue. Houghton Conquest will become bigger rat run between the two roads, buses dwindled recently. Area of National trust& SSI land, current structures already and eyesore in area of natural beauty.
Paul Rolfe	This proposal was already refused recently as it would in effect create a new village without any infrastructure and there is no need for this type of development as there are currently 4,500 houses being built nearby.
RB Woodhouse	The upside is that its only 20 houses and there are buildings there already but a bit far out to benefit the village.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	Employment use on this site is acceptable, but with no housing element.
Richard Holden	Already been refused and appeal lost.
Rosemary Park	Traffic problems at peak times already a problem. This plan will exacerbate this problem. The site is not adjoining Ampthill there for residents will not consider themselves part of the town or willing to contribute to the town. This site will have a detrimental effect on the beautiful surrounding countryside.
Roy Brindley	The development of these sites assumes that people working in them will live in the proposed adjacent new developments for housing. In my view this will not happen and the end result will be traffic chaos on existing roads as people commute in and out. The infrastructure for this is & will continue to be totally inadequate. I am against all development in and around Houghton Conquest. I disagree that H.C. is a large village - Wootton, Cranfield, Wilstead maybe, H.C. is not. I would like to know what development proposals exist for adjacent areas such as Stewartby and Wilstead in order to appreciate the bigger picture. If we ignore the green belt in parts and develop it the legacy we leave will be the end of the green belt.
Stephen Thurtle	Concerns are with this and other sites in area are traffic increase, parking at Flitwick Station, doctors/health clinic provision, and schools. Load to much without getting the community right will be a future problem that will never go away.
Stewart Randall	Too big a development and not obviously part of Houghton Conquest
Thomas Arthurs	It is obvious that large scale sites have an impact on local residents, having lived in Luton I have seen the problems created when large estates are built i.e. the birds and Ravenhill sites in Lewsey farm they create ghetto type areas, untold damage to residents property/vehicles muggings, stoning of public service vehicles, mainly caused by a large input of teenagers with single parentage all being pushed together with no local ties or pride. I understand the need for housing and am not against small developments of 30-40 houses being spread about the village but am totally against large build areas which will obviously destroy village life.
V. Scargill	This would be an unnecessary encroachment into farmland and countryside. Moreover it would be a very isolated settlement inevitably increasing use of unsustainable transport.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Evelyn Matthews	Enough countryside has been destroyed here already, we have had our fair share.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H083

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	We would support a residential development on this site (though NOT on the expanded version : Site H084), provided that vehicular access is via Abbey Lane and not via Lammas Way, which is unsuitable for heavier traffic, or Flitwick Road, which is dangerously close to capacity already. [See our response to Site H052]. Abbey Lane can offer vehicles access West into Ampthill, North to Maulden & Bedford and South to the A507 bypass and "the back way" to Flitwick & the M.1. A useful consent condition would be the provision of a metalled footpath/cycleway linking Abbey Lane, Lammas Way and Flitwick Road via Site H052, offering shorter routes to local shops, schools & surgeries and a safer route to school from new & existing homes.
Denise Hill	I am in favour of this site within Ampthill since it will not impact existing housing within Ampthill and provides sufficient housing for our town to contribute towards the overall plan. Nor will this site impact the visual affect of our Market Town which is an extremely positive approach to take.
Douglas Collin	I am not fully familiar with the site but I believe facilities are needed for youth - leisure centres and hope there might be a possibility for this.
Margaret Mozley	This seems rather close to existing medical services and there is no transport but as it is not green belt land, better there than swallowing up more green belt land to east.
Mark Smith	As this site was in the previous local plan as a site for development I can support its development. Although I would hope that the same consultation exercise that was delivered in determining the development of the land off Tavistock Avenue down to the bypass was employed here. It would be good to incorporate cycleway between Abbey Close & Flitwick Road particularly for Redborne School Children. However, I can not the potential of a through road to Flitwick Road.
Mrs H. Wilson	I feel this site could be used if carefully planned and surrounding woods were considered. Traffic would be a problem if the only way into town is Oliver Street; I think there would have to be public transport to the area.
Nigel Pollard	Extension of Ampthill's boundaries to include this area seems quite logical and proportionate. I would support use of this land for housing provided (a) Abbey Lane widened/improved and (b) footpaths/cycle paths to town centre included in the plan.
Paul New	Local roads would need significant improvement.
Richard Holden	Safe-guarded "white land" - but no mention in lists provided today Saturday. Misleading. Should be in the shake up.
S Melville	This site has the potential and the least impact on the town.
Simon Lewis	As I noted under H052, this proposal offers scope for quite a large development without significant impact on the environment, in particular it doesn't impinge on the green belt. Access to the site might be an issue as it would increase traffic on Abbey Lane. If the developers do as they say in the proposal and improve woodland and access to it this does offer some wider amenity value as well.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
C. P. R. E.	See the potential for loss of green public amenity here. Therefore though adjacent to town envelope boundary should not be considered as a priority for development.
Ian Nutley	Would reluctantly accept as long as plan is adjusted to avoid woodland and buffer zone created. But there is a school problem, where would the school go?
James Gibb	The development would have a significant impact on the landscape to the south of the town. This would be mitigated if the existing band of woodland is to be retained.
Kenneth F Bripps	Already existing services are overstretched medical / schooling / sewerage and so on. Roads becoming congested. Most commute to work - better salaries by far and house cheaper here than say London. Residents in this area even commute out for entertainment and socialising. No work in this area could compete with London's rating.
L. R. G. Page	Such development can only exacerbate the growing traffic congestion in Ampthill and place further burden on the less than adequate facilities that already exist. Access via an "out of town" route would be essential, NOT via Flitwick Road (see H052).
Margaret Wright	This site could be developed in the future, but must not encroach on any woodland, to prevent coalescence with Flitwick.
Mr F. J. Morris	All recent expansion in Ampthill is on the south side, but no children's leisure facilities have been incorporated. This area could be used (partly) for this purpose. Why not build a small leisure centre - aimed at children - incorporating say 4 or 5 table tennis tables, pool tables, tennis courts and a comfortable lounge where teenagers can meet and play - cheaply. Outside should have a large grass area to kick a ball about - skateboard/rollerblade facility - slides etc. for young ones etc. It is a long way up to Ampthill park from this part of town.
Mr J Welch	The proposal to open up Lammas Way for access to H052 would be an error. Many vehicles would use this to avoid the main road and for access to the waste recycling centre. There is no way it could be enforced as only secondary access. These proposals also concentrate too much development on the southern edge of town, changing completely the nature and environment of that area.
Patricia Douglas	Abbey Lane is a narrow road and access to Ampthill would be along Oliver Street which is already becoming congested. More traffic would have implications for the junction of Oliver Street and Dunstable Street.
RL & BJ Holt	Concerns re vehicular/& pedestrian traffic in Oliver Street which is already a VERY busy road. Concerns relating to Bedford Hospital ability and capacity to cope with potential increases. (Relative to Wixhams project).
Theresa Jackson	I think this proposal is more suitable than proposal 2 as I do not think that the majority of the new houses in Ampthill should be provided by one site when there are other potential sites that could be used.
Wood	An acute problem with development in Ampthill is the worsening congestion in the narrow streets of the town centre and associated parking problems. The distance from the town centre suggests that car use to and from the centre would be the norm.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A. Swain	1. Loss of green belt between Ampthill and Flitwick. 2. Sewerage plant cannot cope now! Let alone extra storm water run off. 3. Rat run if Lammas Way is opened up for traffic. 4. Ampthill is big enough as it is.
Alan Cardwell	Would support limited development in this area but must be restricted due to potential strain on facilities - schools, medical & emergency services.
Alister Fuller	This area is one of a very few remaining green areas in Ampthill. My concern is that to build on this land would join Ampthill and Maulden together rather than have them as two separate villages and communities.
Andrew Budd	The site needs to be viewed in the context of the massive nearby development already agreed on land to the West of Ampthill. If agreed, this sized development (i.e. 330-440 further houses) would serve to completely change the nature of Ampthill as a small market town, and would cover another important green space with housing. Development in Ampthill should focus on opportunistic infill with small developments, not building further substantial housing estates. We need to look after our living environments green spaces both to protect our quality of live and the wildlife that depends on these.
Andy McGowan	The expansion of the towns housing southerly is highly undesirable. It reduces the green space surrounding existing housing. Access to facilities would be via Oliver Street which is already congested. Save for infill housing such as the Limes - Any major housing development would be to the detriment of the town.
Brian Russell	Concerned that this development would further blur the distinction between Flitwick and Ampthill. There needs to be a open corridor between the two towns.
C Jagusz	There are already enough houses/properties within this area and this has already had a detrimental affect on traffic, parking, road safety etc
C. Hedges	Local services etc. are already "over subscribed". Existing system is inadequate. Town already becoming grid locked. Site encroaches into countryside.
C. Knibb	Although this site is not within the green belt it does act as a division between Ampthill and Flitwick. If it is built on Ampthill will lose its own identity. Try looking at Brown sites such as Stewartby. It would also restrict the schools growth and create a high density criminal friendly designed estate.
D T Withers	This site was irresponsibly changed from Greenfield. It is a necessary wildlife corridor which should remain. The idea of "breaking" into Lammas Way is ridiculous, already overcrowded and road narrow.
D. E. Mann	Sewerage facilities no good. Too much traffic on estate. Not enough amenities for school - doctors. I object to all the buildings being proposed.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Dan Cherry	Whilst it would support local businesses and help bring money into the town i think this site is specifically the one that is not suitable for further development purely due to the fact that it will not only ruin large areas of countryside, but it also would cause congestion to the point that getting in and out of the town will be an impossible task during the times of heavy traffic e.g. mid-mornings when people are trying to get into work and parents are trying to get kids into the schools.
Donna & Neil Scroton	Major concerns access to new site. Oliver St is already an issue with parked cars especially round the GF Motors.
Duckett P.A.	Insufficient infrastructure to cope in every sense. Schooling, medical, transport, road, sewage, drainage, flood risk and too far to get anywhere without driving.
Gail Hobday	I feel this development is for too many houses and the site is too near the very busy Tidy Tip.
I. Church	Amphill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands).
Ian Devereux	Local facilities are not good enough to support the significant development proposed in this area. For example the bus service to Flitwick station does not run a regular service and at convenient times for those needing to travel to London, parking at the station remains a major problem. Schools and medical facilities are already struggling.
Ian Forrester	Amphill is a small Georgian town with a wealth of interest and of long standing historic interest. With the proposed developments and the already sanctioned building in and around this area the identity of the location would be lost forever. Therefore, any future plans to develop Amphill into a major town should be squashed and alternative areas found.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	Whilst not in greenbelt there are sports facilities used by many of Amphill's young people here. Further this provides a green buffer between Amphill and Flitwick and the A507. It also reduces the impact of the nearby tidy tip. Residential building on this land will cause significant traffic problems along abbey lane during rush hours. Over all this is disproportionate to the requirement. Especially compared with the limited developments taking place at other places in Mid Beds e.g. Woburn.

Submitted by	Comments
Kerrie McIntosh	This site will greatly affect traffic from Abbey lane and into Oliver Street, Russell Drive, Fallowfield areas. At present the traffic is already very busy along this route as it is used as a cut through from the bypass, Flitwick and Maulden. The football ground on Abbey Lane is in regular use and traffic and parking on Abbey Lane is increased with this. At present this is just about acceptable as parking on Abbey Lane and along surrounding housing estates e.g. Osier Link is increased and becomes difficult for residents to gain access. If more houses are built this will only increase the parking and traffic and greatly affect residents off Abbey Lane e.g. Osier Link, Oak Tree Rd etc. estate. Besides traffic the woodland area is used by local residents off Abbey Lane e.g. Osier Link and Fallowfield and Russell Drive. It is used by local families and housing will affect the local wildlife greatly as the housing will impose upon this woodland area.
L. Sumsion	Amphill services are very poor and nothing has been done to rectify this. We cannot take any more housing. The Georgian Centre (are heart) is being ruined by traffic and large vehicles. The access from Lammas Way, will cause untold accidents and emergency vehicles as it is now would have trouble getting through. The land should be used to enlarge Redborne School as all a [illegible] are strengthened. We also have sewage problems.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Lockett	This area cannot cope with the additional traffic or infrastructure requirements.
Marc Henshall	This will ruin the area, build in the big towns, leave the small ones alone!
Marion Laurence	Cannot see any local services the site may have potential for. Abbey Lane is already used as a "rat run", with cars speeding at all times now - further development in this area will make the situation far worse. It is a narrow, quite dangerous road already - which is totally unsuitable for development near it.
Mr and Mrs N. Porter	Fallowfield is a narrow road. Parking is a problem in parts, especially by the Russell Drive shops. As you approach from Oliver Street, visibility by the shops is extremely bad with large vehicles parked. The town is very congested, even on Sundays now, with the advent of Waitrose. Schools already have port-a-cabin classes. Doctor's surgeries are extremely busy - difficult to get appointments. Public transport - not enough services to surrounding towns. No more development is sustainable.
Mr D M Kind	Road infrastructure could not cope. You turned down an application from Sainsburys for this very reason. Public transport I feel is inadequate and more housing would only make it worse. The local schools are already unable to cope would the current numbers. The sewage system is stretched to its limit. Parking is terrible. Even if you want to shop in town there is very little choice which to my mind and many other residents' minds begs the question why you claim the town to be a major service centre. We don't even have a train station. What about environment - sites of rare habitat.
Mr W L B Bowmer	Problems include:-Reduction of the green space to the south east of Amphill. It would reduce agricultural land in the area. Traffic problems would be increased especially on Oliver Street & Abbey Lane. If combined with H052 the problems would be even worse. Our schools and GP surgeries are already oversubscribed. No nearby shops.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Mrs B Luddington	Proposed access (vehicle) from Lammas Way is wrong. This will create a rat run from Oliver St through Russell Drive etc. This is already a very congested route & will be dangerous. Also access onto Flitwick road a problem, already school traffic & Tavistock Avenue cause jams/congestion. Permission for a supermarket was turned down at Doolittle mill because of congestion & how can this housing development now be suddenly no problem!
Mrs P King	Green belt.
Mrs P R Welch	This proposal to put secondary access through Lammas Way is not necessary as there will be a dual access through Flitwick Road & Abbey Lane (by the Spur Rd).
No name given	Ampthill does not need extra housing nor extra jobs.
Paul ODell	Ampthill is already congested with traffic with little parking available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixham town estate, which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixham development is so close to Ampthill that it will already have a detrimental affect to the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people - as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
Peter Luddington	This represents gross overdevelopment. If this estate is linked with Lammas Way it will cause major traffic issue for Glebe Rd, Russell Dr, Lammas Way and Aragon Rd. Local shops already present major parking and safety issues. If this is built then access should be from Flitwick Road by way of a roundabout. Schools in Ampthill were already oversubscribed and this proposal will overstretch already inadequate services.
Philip Field	If site H083 is granted planning permission then site H052 must be granted permission because of vehicular access required. The traffic entering Flitwick Rd would be unacceptable & dangerous for all the children walking to Redborne. A complete change of character for Ampthill. Increased pollution.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	A bad location for further housing with poor transport access - leading to more traffic congestion. Also would be over-provision and an unnecessary extension to the boundary of the town.
Sandra Reynolds	This area has the tidy tip which creates lots of traffic which back up at weekends. There is the football pitch which with more traffic would make it more unsafe for the young lads who play football there. Oliver Street and Russell Drive have lots of parked cars on them and the extra traffic would make it even more unsafe than it is now.
Sandy Reynolds	Abbey Lane is a very busy road with congestion at the weekends when people are visiting the Waste Disposal Site also there is a Boys Football Ground which will make it dangerous for youngsters coming and going to play football with lots more traffic that will be generated.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Steve Kirby	This land forms a valuable buffer on the outskirts of Ampthill and it is not necessary to developed here.
Susan Kirby	It is not necessary to develop this site. There are other areas in Ampthill i.e. the Redborne site that would provide the full quota of housing in Ampthill.
Nicolette Wade	H097 is of particular concern. Building houses on the rugby club means that a significant local resource, which has provided children in the area with an opportunity to play sport, will be lost. I cannot find any information about alternative provision there is already very little in the way of resources for children & young people. The roads are already very congested & these proposals will make it worse.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Davis Payne	We don't know how you can say that the upper school has sufficient capacity without knowing how many houses/families will be new in Ampthill. The roads are already very congested and will be even greater with the Wixams etc
George Banks	The development of a large number of houses in one area such as this will definitely clog up the roads particularly in the town centre. There is no provision for extra car parking in the town. No schools and medical care. Ampthill is already struggling to keep the parks and roads - also drainage up to scratch.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Drs surgery less than 30 minutes not more - only round corner to Lower School - 10.23mins! No transport nearby. If this site is developed Abbey Lane would need to be widened and to include cycleway/footpath to bypass to Flitwick Industrial Estate and through to Redborne School and Flitwick Road. Number of houses needs reducing.

Ref Number: H084

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	We would support a residential development on this site (though not on the expanded version : Site H084), provided that vehicular access is via Abbey Lane and not via Lammas Way, which is unsuitable for heavier traffic, or Flitwick Road, which is dangerously close to capacity already. [See our response to Site H052]. Abbey Lane can offer vehicles access West into Ampthill, North to Maulden & Bedford and South to the A507 bypass and "the back way" to Flitwick & the M.1. A useful consent condition would be the provision of a metalled footpath/cycleway linking Abbey Lane, Lammas Way & Flitwick Road via Site H052, offering shorter routes to local shops, schools & surgeries and a safer route to school from new & existing homes.
Denise Hill	I am in favour of this site within Ampthill since it will not impact existing housing within Ampthill and provides sufficient housing for our town to contribute towards the overall plan. Nor will this site impact the visual affect of our Market Town which is an extremely positive approach to take.
Douglas Collin	I am not fully familiar with the site but I believe facilities are needed for youth - leisure centres and hope there might be a possibility for this.
Margaret Mozley	This seems rather close to existing medical services and there is no transport but as it is not green belt land, better there than swallowing up more green belt land to east.
Mark Smith	As this site was in the previous local plan as a site for development I can support its development. Although I would hope that the same consultation exercise that was delivered in determining the development of the land off Tavistock Avenue down to the bypass was employed here. It would be good to incorporate cycle ways between Abbey Close & Flitwick Road particularly for Redborne School Children. However, I can not the potential of a through road to Flitwick Road.
Mrs H. Wilson	I feel this site could be used if carefully planned and surrounding woods were considered. Traffic would be a problem if the only way into town is Oliver Street; I think there would have to be public transport to the area.
Nigel Pollard	Extension of Ampthill's boundaries to include this area seems quite logical and proportionate. I would support use of this land for housing provided (a) Abbey Lane widened/improved and (b) footpaths/cycle paths to town centre included in the plan.
Paul New	Local roads would need significant improvement.
Richard Holden	Safe-guarded "white land" - but no mention in lists provided today Saturday. Misleading. Should be in the shake up.
S Melville	This site has the potential and the least impact on the town.
Simon Lewis	As I noted under H052, this proposal offers scope for quite a large development without significant impact on the environment, in particular it doesn't impinge on the green belt. Access to the site might be an issue as it would increase traffic on Abbey Lane. If the developers do as they say in the proposal and improve woodland and access to it this does offer some wider amenity value as well.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Nutley	Would reluctantly accept as long as plan is adjusted to avoid woodland and buffer zone created. But there is a school problem, where would the school go?
James Gibb	The development would have a significant impact on the landscape to the south of the town. This would be mitigated if the existing band of woodland is to be retained.
Kenneth F Bripps	Already existing services are overstretched medical / schooling / sewerage and so on. Roads becoming congested. Most commute to work - better salaries by far and house cheaper here than say London. Residents in this area even commute out for entertainment and socialising. No work in this area could compete with London's rating.
L. R. G. Page	Such development can only exacerbate the growing traffic congestion in Ampthill and place further burden on the less than adequate facilities that already exist. Access via an "out of town" route would be essential, not via Flitwick Road (see H052)
Margaret Wright	This site could be developed in the future, but must not encroach on any woodland, to prevent coalescence with Flitwick.
Mr F. J. Morris	All recent expansion in Ampthill is on the south side, but no children's leisure facilities have been incorporated. This area could be used (partly) for this purpose. Why not build a small leisure centre - aimed at children - incorporating say 4 or 5 table tennis tables, pool tables, tennis courts and a comfortable lounge where teenagers can meet and play - cheaply. Outside should have a large grass area to kick a ball about - skateboard/rollerblade facility - slides etc. for young ones etc. It is a long way up to Ampthill park from this part of town.
Mr J Welch	The proposal to open up Lammas Way for access to H052 would be an error. Many vehicles would use this to avoid the main road and for access to the waste recycling centre. There is no way it could be enforced as only secondary access. These proposals also concentrate too much development on the southern edge of town, changing completely the nature and environment of that area.
Patricia Douglas	Abbey Lane is a narrow road and access to Ampthill would be along Oliver Street which is already becoming congested. More traffic would have implications for the junction of Oliver Street and Dunstable Street.
RL & BJ Holt	Concerns re vehicular & pedestrian traffic in Oliver Street which is already a very busy road. Concerns relating to Bedford Hospital ability and capacity to cope with potential increases. (Relative to Wixhams project)
Theresa Jackson	I think this proposal is more suitable than proposal 2 as I do not think that the majority of the new houses in Ampthill should be provided by one site when there are other potential sites that could be used.
Wood	An acute problem with development in Ampthill is the worsening congestion in the narrow streets of the town centre and associated parking problems. The distance from the town centre suggests that car use to and from the centre would be the norm.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
A. Swain	<p>1. Loss of green belt between Ampthill and Flitwick. 2. Sewerage plant cannot cope now! Let alone extra storm water run off. 3. Rat run if Lammas Way is opened up for traffic 4. Ampthill is big enough as it is.</p>
Alan Cardwell	<p>Would support limited development in this area but must be restricted due to potential strain on facilities - schools, medical & emergency services.</p>
Alister Fuller	<p>This area is one of a very few remaining green areas in Ampthill. My concern is that to build on this land would join Ampthill and Maulden together rather than have them as two separate villages and communities.</p>
Andrew Budd	<p>The site needs to be viewed in the context of the massive nearby development already agreed on land to the West of Ampthill. If agreed, this sized development (i.e. 330-440 further houses) would serve to completely change the nature of Ampthill as a small market town, and would cover another important green space with housing. Development in Ampthill should focus on opportunistic infill with small developments, not building further substantial housing estates. We need to look after our living environments green spaces both to protect our quality of live and the wildlife that depends on these.</p>
Andy McGowan	<p>The expansion of the towns housing southerly is highly undesirable. It reduces the green space surrounding existing housing. Access to facilities would be via Oliver Street which is already congested. Save for infill housing such as the Limes - Any major housing development would be to the detriment of the town.</p>
Brian Russell	<p>Concerned that this development would further blur the distinction between Flitwick and Ampthill. There needs to be a open corridor between the two towns.</p>
C Jagusz	<p>There are already enough houses/properties within this area and this has already had a detrimental affect on traffic, parking, road safety etc</p>
C. Hedges	<p>Local services etc. are already "over subscribed". Existing system is inadequate. Town already becoming grid locked. Site encroaches into countryside.</p>
C. Knibb	<p>Although this site is not within the green belt it does act as a division between Ampthill and Flitwick. If it is built on Ampthill will lose its own identity. Try looking at Brown sites such as Stewartby. It would also restrict the schools growth and create a high density criminal friendly designed estate.</p>
D T Withers	<p>This site was irresponsibly changed from Greenfield. It is a necessary wildlife corridor which should remain. The idea of "breaking" into Lammas Way is ridiculous, already overcrowded and road narrow.</p>
D. E. Mann	<p>Sewerage facilities no good. Too much traffic on estate. Not enough amenities for school - doctors. I object to all the buildings being proposed.</p>
Dan Cherry	<p>Whilst it would support local businesses and help bring money into the town i think this site is specifically the one that is not suitable for further development purely due to the fact that it will not only ruin large areas of countryside, but it also would cause congestion to the point that getting in and out of the town will be an impossible task during the times of heavy traffic e.g. mid-mornings when people are trying to get into work and parents are trying to get kids into the schools.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Donna & Neil Scroxton	Major concerns access to new site. Oliver St is already an issue with parked cars especially round the GF Motors.
Duckett P.A.	Insufficient infrastructure to cope in every sense. Schooling, medical, transport, road, sewage, drainage, flood risk and too far to get anywhere without driving.
Gail Hobday	I feel this development is for too many houses and the site is too near the very busy Tidy Tip.
I. Church	Amphill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands).
Ian Devereux	Local facilities are not good enough to support the significant development proposed in this area. For example the bus service to Flitwick station does not run a regular service and at convenient times for those needing to travel to London, parking at the station remains a major problem. Schools and medical facilities are already struggling.
Ian Forrester	Amphill is a small Georgian town with a wealth of interest and of long standing historic interest. With the proposed developments and the already sanctioned building in and around this area the identity of the location would be lost forever. Therefore, any future plans to develop Amphill into a major town should be squashed and alternative areas found.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	Whilst not in greenbelt there are sports facilities used by many of Amphill's young people here. Further this provides a green buffer between Amphill and Flitwick and the A507. It also reduces the impact of the nearby tidy tip. Residential building on this land will cause significant traffic problems along abbey lane during rush hours. Over all this is disproportionate to the requirement. Especially compared with the limited developments taking place at other places in Mid Beds e.g. Woburn.
Kerrie McIntosh	This site will greatly affect traffic from Abbey lane and into Oliver Street, Russell Drive, Fallowfield areas. At present the traffic is already very busy along this route as it is used as a cut through from the bypass, Flitwick and Maulden. The football ground on Abbey Lane is in regular use and traffic and parking on Abbey Lane is increased with this. At present this is just about acceptable as parking on Abbey Lane and along surrounding housing estates e.g. Osier Link is increased and becomes difficult for residents to gain access. If more houses are built this will only increase the parking and traffic and greatly affect residents off Abbey Lane e.g. Osier Link, Oak Tree Rd etc. estate. Besides traffic the woodland area is used by local residents off Abbey Lane e.g. Osier Link and Fallowfield and Russell Drive. It is used by local families and housing will affect the local wildlife greatly as the housing will impose upon this woodland area.

Submitted by	Comments
L. Sumsion	Amphill services are very poor and nothing has been done to rectify this. We cannot take any more housing. The Georgian Centre (are heart) is being ruined by traffic and large vehicles. The access from Lammas Way will cause untold accidents and emergency vehicles as it is now would have trouble getting through. The land should be used to enlarge Redborne School as all a? are strengthened. We also have sewage problems.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Lockett	This area cannot cope with the additional traffic or infrastructure requirements.
Marc Henshall	This will ruin the area, build in the big towns, and leave the small ones alone!
Marion Laurence	Cannot see any local services the site may have potential for. Abbey Lane is already used as a "rat run", with cars speeding at all times now - further development in this area will make the situation far worse. It is a narrow, quite dangerous road already - which is totally unsuitable for development near it.
Mr and Mrs N. Porter	Fallowfield is a narrow road. Parking is a problem in parts, especially by the Russell Drive shops. As you approach from Oliver Street, visibility by the shops is extremely bad with large vehicles parked. The town is very congested, even on Sundays now, with the advent of Waitrose. Schools already have port-a-cabin classes. Doctor's surgeries are extremely busy - difficult to get appointments. Public transport - not enough services to surrounding towns. No more development is sustainable.
Mr D M Kind	Road infrastructure could not cope. You turned down an application from Sainsburys for this very reason. Public transport I feel is inadequate and more housing would only make it worse. The local schools are already unable to cope would the current numbers. The sewage system is stretched to its limit. Parking is terrible. Even if you want to shop in town there is very little choice which to my mind and many other residents' minds begs the question why you claim the town to be a major service centre. We don't even have a train station. What about environment - sites of rare habitat.
Mr W L B Bowmer	Problems include:-Reduction of the green space to the south east of Amphill. It would reduce agricultural land in the area. Traffic problems would be increased especially on Oliver Street & Abbey Lane. If combined with H052 the problems would be even worse. Our schools and GP surgeries are already oversubscribed. No nearby shops.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Amphill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] Towns may be worth consideration"?
Mrs B Luddington	Proposed access (vehicle) from Lammas Way is wrong. This will create a rat run from Oliver St through Russell Drive etc. This is already a very congested route & will be dangerous. Also access onto Flitwick road a problem, already school traffic & Tavistock Avenue cause jams/congestion. Permission for a supermarket was turned down at Doolittle mill because of congestion & how can this housing development now be suddenly no problem!
Mrs P King	Green belt.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs P R Welch	This proposal to put secondary access through Lammas Way is not necessary as there will be a dual access through Flitwick Road & Abbey Lane (by the Spur Road).
No name given	Amphill does not need extra housing or extra jobs.
Paul ODell	Amphill is already congested with traffic with little parking available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixham town estate, which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixham development is so close to Amphill that it will already have a detrimental affect to the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people - as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
Peter Luddington	This represents gross overdevelopment. If this estate is linked with Lammas Way it will cause major traffic issue for Glebe Rd, Russell Dr, Lammas Way and Aragon Rd. Local shops already present major parking and safety issues. If this is built then access should be from Flitwick Rd by way of a roundabout. Schools in Amphill were already oversubscribed and this proposal will overstretch already inadequate services.
Philip Field	If site H083 is granted planning permission then site H052 must be granted permission because of vehicular access required. The traffic entering Flitwick Rd would be unacceptable & dangerous for all the children walking to Redborne. A complete change of character for Amphill. Increased pollution.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	a bad location for further housing with poor transport access - leading to more traffic congestion. Also would be over-provision and an unnecessary extension to the boundary of the town.
Sandra Reynolds	This area has the tidy tip which creates lots of traffic which back up at weekends. There is the football pitch which with more traffic would make it more unsafe for the young lads who play football there. Oliver Street and Russell Drive have lots of parked cars on them and the extra traffic would make it even more unsafe than it is now.
Sandy Reynolds	Abbey Lane is a very busy road with congestion at the weekends when people are visiting the Waste Disposal Site also there is a Boys Football Ground which will make it dangerous for youngsters coming and going to play football with lots more traffic that will be generated.
Steve Kirby	This land forms a valuable buffer on the outskirts of Amphill and it is not necessary to developed here.
Susan Kirby	It is not necessary to develop this site. There are other areas in Amphill i.e. the Redborne site that would provide the full quota of housing in Amphill.
Wade, Nicolette	H097 is of particular concern. Building houses on the rugby club means that a significant local resource, which has provided children in the area with an opportunity to play sport, will be lost. I cannot find any information about alternative provision there is already very little in the way of resources for children & young people. The roads are already very congested & these proposals will make it worse.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Davis Payne	We don't know how you can say that the upper school has sufficient capacity without knowing how many houses/families will be new in Ampthill. The roads are already very congested and will be even greater with the Wixams etc
George Banks	The development of a large number of houses in one area such as this will definitely clog up the roads particularly in the town centre. There is no provision for extra car parking in the town. No schools and medical care. Ampthill is already struggling to keep the parks and roads - also drainage up to scratch.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Drs surgery less than 30 minutes not more - only round corner to Lower School - 10.23mins! No transport nearby. If this site is developed Abbey Lane would need to be widened and to include cycleway/footpath to bypass to Flitwick Industrial Estate and through to Redborne School and Flitwick Road. Number of houses needs reducing.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H097

This additional comment was made by a respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Ivor owen	This site should be developed with houses and flats similar to the development next to the Cheshire Homes as it has outlived its use as a sports ground due to its limited size and the massive growth in the participation in the rugby junior sections

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A. Swain	Loss of rugby club and playing fields.
Alan Cardwell	This site is on the very edge of town and would represent a new wedge on the edge of Coopers Hill & the park which is very undesirable.
Alex Booth	Amphill rugby club is a vital community resource. Amphill is noted for the strength of its rugby teams and it would be a disaster for that amenity to be lost. Provided that a suitable alternative site for the rugby club is available however, the site may well be suitable for development being close to Amphill town centre and its amenities and close to the park.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	As long as the Rugby and football clubs could be sited close to Amphill and have similar or better facilities as a result of the move I feel this proposal is proportionate and would go some way to meeting the required housing needs
Nigel Hopwood	It would be shame to lose the rugby club and sports pitches. Are there plans to include additional doctor's surgeries, schooling etc?

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Linda Kitchener	This site falls within the Green Belt and is against the Districts Councils Core Strategy that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt".
Alan Paterson	This proposal is obviously a red herring to make other areas more acceptable! The area is a recreational area for sport and should remain so. The area is surrounded by the park (Amphill Park) and SSI area and totally unsuitable for any type of building - residential or business.
Alan Reeves	The rugby club is next to open space and sports facilities, I suggest that the new Parkside Hall to be build there, which could also accommodate the Cadet Centre in Woburn Street, also other facilities could be included, such as squash courts, or indoor bowls, also outside tennis courts. Then the land where the Parkside Hall and Cadet Centre are now could be used for housing, it would mean that the town's facilities would be closer and people would be less likely to use their cars. I feel this is more in keeping for the area.

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Sprod	Moor Pond Piece is a natural boundary for the end of housing development. The band of woodland immediately beyond provides a natural barrier. Housing on this site would be very intrusive on the environment. There is no public transport along Woburn Street; journeys into town would probably be made by car.
Andrew Budd	I am very concerned about the implications of this proposal for Coopers Hill Nature Reserve/SSSI. Situating housing on adjacent land will inevitably result in increased pressure on this nationally-important wildlife site. The unwanted consequences would include damage from trampling as visitor numbers increase (including more dog walking etc), the risk of fire on the heath and, most importantly, the loss of the SSSIs ecological integrity as the housing would cut the site off from the surrounding countryside. The site also needs to be viewed in the context of the massive nearby development already agreed on land to the West of Ampthill. If agreed, this sized development would further serve to completely change the nature of Ampthill as a small market town, covering another important green space with housing. Development in Ampthill should focus on opportunistic infill with small developments, not building further substantial housing estates.
Andrew Hards	I have been a resident of both Flitwick and Ampthill for over 25 years. As a keen walker & naturalist I have walked all over the Mid Beds area. If, for example, you go to Coopers Hill in the Summer when the heather is in full colour you could easily be in the New Forest, such is the beauty of this site. As such I cannot understand why we should compromise our natural heritage by building on land that is adjacent. As a keen walker I am fully aware that there are plenty of other sites that could be developed, this site really is unique & needs all the help it can get.
Andy McGowan	It may be possible to make changes to the Rugby club to enhance its role as an entertainment venue within the town. For arguments sake, it may even provide a venue for part time doctor / physio / alternative therapy centre because it has parking and is little used (as far as I know) during the day. It would be catastrophic to the town if we were to sacrifice amenities such as the rugby club to housing and would significantly degrade the quality of life for townsfolk.
Anne Govier	This potential development is close to Coopers Hill, which is a rare habitat and could very easily be damaged. The site would also be in danger of losing viability if surrounded by housing.
B Armstrong	Historically this site is used for the community use as an enmity and planned as such. Not as a housing development.
B. Dackombe	The western entrance into Ampthill is one of the best. The area is historically linked to Ampthill Park and provides a visual link with the Firs.
Barry Cannon	The rugby and football clubs are an essential part of Ampthill life. These facilities must be retained.
Roderick Beate	The rugby club is an integral part of the greenbelt of the character of Ampthill. Aside from the loss of important sports facilities, any development of this site will have a severe detrimental effect on the town character and on Ampthill as a pleasant place to live. This development is completely unacceptable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Brian Russell	It would a tragedy if this site was to be developed. As an actively used sports facility within a few minutes of the town centre it is ideally placed. It also fits in very well with the Cricket and Football clubs in the park. Another concern is its close proximity to open woodland, especially Coppers Hill Nature Reserve and SSSI. Development of this site for housing etc would be wholly inappropriate.
Claire Jones	The area is of great value both aesthetically and socially (for sport) and it would be very sad to see it built on.
D T Withers	Too close to Coopers Hill SSSI. Will damage the nature reserve. Very rare habitat in Bedfordshire.
D. Blackaby	This is green belt. Lovely area opposite park. Joining Coopers Hill & Spinnies. Keep it as it is. Lovely area. Nice entrance to Ampthill.
D. L. and J. M. Hodgkinson	This is an appalling proposal. The site is the green hinge linking two of Ampthill's most attractive landscape areas, i.e. the Firs / Coopers Hill and Ampthill Park. It is not in the Green Belt for nothing ! Damage this area and you will deter visitors, drawn by Ampthill's magic mix of historic town and attractive country, to the detriment of local services, and lose a valued community sport & social amenity.
David Sedgley	This land is adjacent to the extremely important Coopers Hill SSSI with its rare heath land habitat. The present use as sports fields provides a suitable buffer between it and Ampthill Park. It should never be built on.
Douglas Collin	I am in agreement with comments made.
Dr Alison Brokenshire	Sports amenities are important to a community. The rugby ground is well used and ideally placed as traffic can avoid going through the town centre. Ampthill needs a long term car park site H203 is ideal. Sports amenities are important to the community. The rugby grand is well used and well situated allowing people to reach it without going through the town centre.
Dr M E Nellist	If this area is not required by the rugby and Football Clubs it should remain as a green recreational space or subsumed within the adjacent conservation area.
Duckett P.A.	Wholly inappropriate suggestion. Too near park, wildlife protected area and dangerous egress onto Ampthill bypass. Too far from town so more traffic congestion will ensue. Insufficient schooling, medical, transport and drainage facilities.
E M Field	Green Belt must be protected.l
Frances Neal	This proposed development is next to Coopers Hill Nature reserve. There are few heath land areas in Bedfordshire, why is it necessary to intrude on this? Disturbance and isolation of the site will simply destroy it. When there are so many other sites for building that would not do damage to wildlife this should not be allowed. Little wildlife sites like this are chipped away and chipped away by greedy developers and councils and once they're gone, they're gone for ever. This development must not be allowed, it is just not necessary.
Gail Hobday	This site is green belt land and the loss of The Rugby Club would have a great impact on the people not only of Ampthill but of surrounding towns and villages.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
I. Church	Amphill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands). It would be a crime to take sports facilities away from the Amphill people, moving the facility to Stewartby would be an irreversible step backwards for our town (you propose taking the football pitches from Abbey Lane too!!!!). You don't think sport and exercise more important than profit, power and pollution.
Ian Nutley	Oppose, greenbelt and too close to coopers hill SSSI.
J Roots	I can't believe that the Authorities are even contemplating the use of the rugby club as a development site. This is in the middle of green belt land next to the Firs and Amphill Park. Development would detract from the recreation facilities for all ages. Yes that's right the youth of Amphill who are doing something useful! Come on get your act together. Are you trying to kill Amphill's charm?
J.Booth	Where the rugby club to be re-located as this is a thriving asset to the town which provides an excellent amenity for local Amphill Boys to identify with. Should we take this away and re-locate outside Amphill we will loose an important part of Amphill community.
Jake Bishop	This is a sporting facility used by many people and is part of Amphill's attraction. There are other sites more suited for housing.
James Gibb	I strongly oppose any development of land in the Green Belt, while other options are open. Development here would destroy the attraction of the approach to Amphill from the west.
Jamie Lea	The site is too remote and isolated from the rest of the town. It would become a mini-community in its own right which is divisive. It's in the middle of a sensitive environmental area (park and firs) and thus not suitable for housing in my opinion. Its use should remain as a community facility or if developed used to enhance the firs and park by linking them. Such an investment would bring more visitors to the area and be good for businesses. I am sceptical these comments will be taken into account when making a decision which is a shame, in the end it seems its all about hitting targets! People don't have a voice anymore (Heathrow terminal 5 and the immanent 6 is testament to this). It is important Amphill remains a small market town and is not spoilt by cramming in additional houses etc. Increasing the population creates pressure on existing support services/facilities which leads to an imbalance which can only be rectified by further development in the future.
Jane Staples	This site is Green Belt and I urge the District Council to stand by their Core Strategy that "No development will be allocated in the Green Belt".

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	We strongly oppose the development of greenbelt land. The Rugby Club could utilise the land & pitch of the football club, adjoining, which we believe they must own, as this appears in your map as the whole of Dillingham Park. There are further football facilities at the Ampthill FC site opposite in Ampthill Park. Present usage of other local rugby pitches at schools should be welcomed in the spread of the rugby community in the town. The pitch used for junior training on Sunday mornings at Alameda School is very close to the clubhouse & car park. Local tax payers should be pleased that school facilities are being fully used at weekends & holidays by the local community.
John Hele	There are 2 issues with this site: 1. If it is developed where do the rugby and football clubs go? 2. Housing on this site would have a serious effect on the SSSI (the Firs) adjacent to it.
John Jarrad	This proposal is completely inappropriate for residential development. It accommodates a thriving leisure/sporting facility surrounded on all sides by other leisure, nature reserve and recreational uses. The motives of those who are promoting this site must be questionable. Unlike some, may be all, other proposals this is unlikely to be from an individual or corporate landowner attempting to realise a development value from a long held asset.
John Pitts	I strongly support the Wild Life Trust and totally agree that any development would be detrimental to the valuable and almost unique habitat of Coopers Hill SSSI. It is a very fragile and comparatively small reserve that could not survive further adjacent development. If there are choices please rule out development of any sort in this area. Existing use as a sports facility would be lost and the local community would lose a valuable resource both in the Nature Reserve and the sports field. This land should not be developed further.
Judy Davey	My objection to this site is that it is so close to a SSSI These areas need protection which housing does not provide.
June Cillon	The present, pleasant approach to the town should not be further cluttered with a housing development needing car parking, facilities etc.
J V Speirs	Coopers Hill would be cut off from the surrounding countryside which would be bad for the ecology of the area. The heath land and the rare species on the site could easily be damaged by larger numbers of people trampling over it.
Kathy Johnson	The area adjacent to this - Coopers Hill Nature reserve - is a vital, valuable wildlife site because of its heath land. It has been designated SSI because of this. If you allow the housing development to go ahead it would be cut off from surrounding countryside by housing and be ruined. Housing can be put anywhere, it doesn't make any difference to the development, but priceless wildlife sites cannot. Once they're lost, they are lost for ever. This development must not be allowed.
Keith Balmer	This site is adjacent to Coopers Hill, a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The additional pressure from residents, pets, run-off, disturbance etc. would have a detrimental effect on Bedfordshire's largest, and best, piece of heath land, which is already under pressure. SSSI's should have a buffer zone around them to protect them from damage. The rugby club provides a buffer of sorts. This application should be rejected on environmental grounds.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Kerrie Cottrell	This site would be adjacent to one of the most important heath land sites in Bedfordshire. I think the negative impact of such a large number of dwellings next to an already heavily used site will far outweigh any benefits. I also have concerns about the loss of local sports facilities if this site were to be developed.
L McPheat	We feel strongly that Ampthill should be kept as it is; a quiet Georgian market town. Developing on greenbelt land is a no-no. Keep Ampthill as it is. Greenbelt land should be kept as just that.
L. R. G. Page	A most inappropriate development impacting upon - green belt restrictions - nearby Coopers Hill/The Firs SSI/protected site - precipitating erosion of greenbelt to the east (site between Moor pond Diece and H097) and south (undeveloped agricultural land bounded by A507, H097 and Coopers Hill) - will undermine "leisure" value of nearby Ampthill Park by greatly increased use I am opposed to all the developments proposed for green belt areas. Ampthill can be very easily ruined. Development of H097 would place the adjoining (Firs/Coopers Hill) area of SSI/AONB at great peril as it is already under pressure from inappropriate use.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Lindsey Rogers	I have strongly disagreed with the statements above as Ampthill already has major traffic problems and therefore cannot support further large housing development within the town. In addition, and most importantly, any development in this area would mean the loss of a major local amenity (the Rugby Club) and would have a huge detrimental impact on the adjoining Coopers Hill area.
Marc Henshall	Where on earth would the new rugby ground go? On another field i would suspect. Don't approve, the rugby club is an import part of the towns community and culture.
Margaret Goose	Concern about potential impact on Coopers Hill Nature Reserve and SSSI. Loss of rare species, loss of scarce heath land habitat as well as encroaching on area of Green Belt.
Margaret Wright	This would be development outside the town envelopment which is inappropriate. Also encroaches on the green belt.
Mark Smith	This site is too close to Coopers Hill Nature Reserve, a site of Special Scientific Interest to be considered.
Matthew Morris	This site is within the Green Belt and should not be developed. It is adjacent to Coopers Hill which is one of Bedfordshire's best remaining examples of heath land. A proposed development would only add to the risks of damaging Coopers Hill caused by trampling and accidental fires and would also cut it off from the surrounding countryside. For these reasons, development should not be considered on this site as the risk of damage to Coopers Hill is too great.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	This site is in the Green Belt and development here would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy. The site is remote from the town centre (some 750m) and is isolated from the main built-up area, and would thus represent an intrusion into open countryside. No public transport passes the site. There is also concern about its proximity to the fragile SSSI at Coopers Hill. Cooper's Hill is the best remaining example in Bedfordshire of heath land situated on the acidic soils of the Lower Greensand Ridge, and several species rare in the County can be found here. It is a serious concern that permitting housing on adjacent land would result in damaging amounts of trampling, accidental fires and a loss of the ecological integrity of Cooper's Hill as it became cut off from the surrounding countryside. This site should be rejected.
Mike Brown	Coopers Hill Nature reserve is a vital heath land wildlife site right next door to this proposed development. It has been designated SSI because of this importance. If this housing development is allowed it will cut off the site from surrounding countryside effectively condemning its wildlife. Housing can be put anywhere, it doesn't make any difference to the development, but wildlife sites like this cannot. Once they're lost, they are lost for ever. This development must not be allowed, it is just not required at this sort of expense.
Mike Kirby	We need to keep as many sporting facilities as possible - close to the community for the future of our children and therefore the future of the town.
Mike Wade	Building on this land will mean the loss of a significant local amenity (rugby club).
Name not given	Not suitable. Greenbelt land, should never be built on. Whole area should be kept as recreational.
Mr & Mrs Phillips	Housing on this site would lead to damaging of the surrounding heath land.
Mr Andrew W Smith	The Rugby Club and surrounding grounds provide a "Green Lung" for Ampthill. It would be a disgrace if this land was built on and the Rugby Club relocated elsewhere. It provides an important amenity for people of the town, and is vital as a green space as Ampthill grows.
Mr C Garraway	This site is next to an SSSI (Coopers Hill) which must be protected from the encroachment of building. The recent development beside the Cheshire home has already proved out of character opposite the park and this development would ruin the character of the approach to the town from the by-pass. No! No! No!
Mr M. Wooldridge	This area should be kept as rural in sympathy with the park areas. Housing on this site is yet a further infringement into this recreational area. The park attracts as many visitors as shoppers to the town.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Mrs D Bradshaw	To allow development on this site would mean taking sports facilities away from the area - big mistake when we are trying to encourage our young children to participate in more physical activity.
Mrs H. Wilson	The rugby club is valuable to the local community for sport and socialising and would be a big loss to the town. Also the Firs being a special site of scientific interest it is not suitable to have a housing estate next door.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Liz Roots	This is a charming part of Ampthill and definitely should be left alone. Any potential development on this site should immediately be stopped.
Mrs P King	Will spoil the entrance to Ampthill. Green belt.
Mrs. K.S. Tyrrel	This development would sit in an area otherwise used for leisure. A pod of houses on the edge of town, next to the SSSI site and the park brings no benefit at all. This area is a buffer zone between town and the 507. It should not be built on under any circumstances.
Mrs. Maureen Marsden	I do not support any development near the Coopers Hill Nature Reserve as this should be left alone for the Wildlife animals and for people to walk when they want to. There are lots of wildlife animals on the Coopers Hill which I have seen very often and these should be left to breed so that future generations can enjoy the area like my family have done for many many years. I visit this site every day with my dogs and see new things all the time and the last thing I need to see is over 100 houses and all that goes with them!! I strongly oppose this development.
Nick Watson	The proposal would build on Green Belt. The Rugby Club represents an important part of Ampthill and its loss will be significantly detrimental to the community.
Nicola Bodie	I am concerned about Coopers Hill. It is the best remaining example in Bedfordshire of heath land situated in the acidic soils of the lower greensand ridge, and several species rare in the county can be found here. Heath land is easily damaged by trampling and uncontrolled burning and I am concerned that siting housing on the adjacent land will result in the above happening and I am worried about the loss of the ecological integrity of Coopers Hill as it becomes cut off from the surrounding countryside by housing. Please do not let this happen!
Nigel Pollard	A very strange and bad idea. I would be very concerned about the extension of Ampthill westward for no good reason and the impact on Coopers Hill in particular.
Patricia Douglas	This site is used regularly for rugby and football. It is between the Firs and the Park both of which are important wild-life areas. Development would have a very serious negative impact on the area which is one of Ampthill's greatest assets and which attracts both residents and visitors for its beauty and tranquillity. It should be retained as an area for healthy exercise and leisure pursuits.
Paul ODell	Ampthill is already congested with traffic with little parking available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixham town estate, which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixham development is so close to Ampthill that it will already have a detrimental affect to the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people - as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
Paul Vidler	Site is too close to Coopers Hill, an SSSI, and would have a serious detrimental effect on the local ecology.
Pauline Heather	This is too near to Coopers Hill heath land and could be damaged by extra traffic, both motorised and people.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Philip Field	This development would be in the wrong place and completely change the character of Ampthill. If this site is developed where do the sports facilities go?
R McPheer	Green belt land must be preserved. The rugby and football carried out on this land is beneficial for young players and old and provides a social contribution to the town.
R N Arthur	This site is adjacent to Coopers Hill, one of the few remaining heath land sites in Beds and the home of several rare species. The development of this site would create a serious threat to the ecology of Coopers Hill because of trampling and accidental damage, eg fires. If more housing has to be built in Ampthill, there are far more appropriate sites which will not have the detrimental environmental impact of the development of this site.
R.W.Timothy	The Rugby Club should stay as it is. Any sort of development on this site would be detrimental to the whole area. At the moment it is in easy walking distance for players and spectators. Development would (1)put pressure on existing junction with bypass.(2)Increase traffic into town with people driving kids to school etc.[People will not walk to town facilities].(3)Ruin the character of the Park and The Firs.(4)Further diminish the Green Belt Area around Ampthill [Centre Parks etc]. You have not mentioned the Queensman Football ground which is part of Dillingham Park. Where are the Clubs to be relocated too? Will a future site cause even more congestion? No to development on this site!
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as a housing site. The green belt status of such a site must be sacrosanct if Ampthill is to retain any identity as an individual settlement. This site would also have a major adverse impact on the local environment and wildlife (park, nature reserve etc).
Richard Holden	Green belt. Should not be included.
Rob McPheat	It is absurd to consider building on a green belt sports facility that is used regularly by children and adults alike and also providing strong social links within the town.
Robert Arnott	Building on this greenbelt site would strongly alter the character of Ampthill from the west and also infringe/have a major environmental impact on the historic park to the North. Shame on you for even considering it!!
Rosemary Partk	If this site is agreed upon for development then it will open the flood gates for all other green belt sites to be built upon. This site in theory looks ideally placed for access to the town; however it also adjoins the Firs which are a site of special scientific interest. It is a beautiful area much enjoyed by the local residents and those that come from further afield. I'm amazed that a club which has run for so many years providing sporting facilities should be out for financial gain at the expense of the local community. The club is ideally placed in close proximity to the other sporting clubs in Ampthill. To my mind this is the least sensible site to be developed that has been suggested.
Sharon Hemmings	This is our rugby club and well attended community facility- not least it is next to Coopers Hill heath which surely is a valuable resource and not to be tampered with by housing in close proximity!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Lewis	Development of this site would be ruinous for the environmental and landscape to the west side of Ampthill. One of Ampthill's main amenities is the Park and the Coopers Hill area, which is adjacent to the Rugby Club. A development on this site would completely spoil this area (the recent development of flats along this road was also miss-guided). This site is within the green belt, which should be maintained at all costs. Development here would inevitably lead to further infill between the town and the bypass. The proposal for 150 dwellings would also be fairly high density housing.
Simon Oera-Roderick	The development of this site would totally destroy the environment and enjoyment of the many that use the firs and surrounding areas. The use of the park and area by adults and children alike would be ruined by the traffic and noise this development would bring. Whilst I enjoy health debate, it would be appalling to proceed with this any further.
Sophie Dacksmlu	Green belt. Ruin an attractive route into Ampthill. Easy for the children & adults to walk to for Rugby. Need a transport link to Milton Keynes.
Sue Hamon Watt	What about MDDC core strategy of no development in green belt??
Theresa Jackson	This site is directly situated next to a Coopers Hill nature reserve and SSSI, there are fewer and fewer places for people to enjoy the countryside, exercise the pets and children and as a result the few places that are remaining are becoming severely eroded with increased use, this situation will only become worse if sites such as this aren't protected. The provision of rugby pitches is also a very useful community asset and in a nation where children are becoming more sedentary it is vital to protect these outdoor spaces.
V Scargill	Entirely unsuitable for development. It is within the green belt and additionally adjacent to Coopers Hill Nature Reserve which would inevitably be adversely affected.
Val Stavely	Coopers Hill has wonderful heather and is much loved and visited. More trampling and other risks must follow sitting more housing next to it. Rare habitats and rare species are threatened by this development which must not be allowed. As a member of the Wildlife Trust and a member of a conservation group that works on this site every year I am outraged it should even be considered for adjacent housing development. wildlife needs maximum protection.
Valerie Tanner	This site provides a much needed local recreation service. At a time when we are all being encouraged to get fitter and young children need a local playing field; it would be a disaster to the local community.
Wade, Nicolette	H097 is of particular concern. Building houses on the rugby club means that a significant local resource, which has provided children in the area with an opportunity to play sport, will be lost. I cannot find any information about alternative provision there is already very little in the way of resources for children & young people. The roads are already very congested & these proposals will make it worse.
Wood	Not within easy walking distance with shopping. Many residents would understandably use their cars. This underlines the acute problem of any development in Ampthill - the worsening traffic congestion in the narrow town centre streets and the associate parking problems. The site is sandwiched between Coopers Hill and Ampthill Park and would have a very adverse impact on this fine and historic area of parkland.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Yvonne Young	Amphill has had plenty of infill buildings. The roads are certainly unable to take much more traffic and parking is now a serious problem in the whole town. Great care is needed now not to ruin the last of the greenbelt and our wildlife site at Coopers Hill.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Graham Bellamy	Very close to coopers hill SSSI sensitive heath land habitat of national importance already suffering erosion and damage from level of visiting
J. Morris	Concerned about fragmentation/disconnection of this site with the town. Reflects my general concern that the proposals reflect what has been offered/submitted and now what is considered most appropriate and strategically relevant.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Amphill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.
Mrs Joan Gillett	I do not like to see H097 included. There has been sufficient development with all the flats, to spoil the rural aspect beyond the entrance to The Firs seems a pity. Also isn't this the Rugby ground?
Priscilla Davies	This particular site is too near to the SSSI Coopers Hill and could endanger the eco system which supports this particular site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H121

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Keith Alexander-Buckley	An appropriate location for a residential development, although I am concerned that this is in greenbelt. However, the development is relatively small and still would provide for a green buffer between it and the A507. The 101 junction would need to be modified for extra traffic from this and other (Flitwick Road) developments but it is probably one of the better options.
Nigel Pollard	Not a big site - but perfectly reasonable plan as far as I am concerned. This land is not accessible now so redevelopment has low impact.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A. Swain	More traffic congestion at pupil drop off outside Redborne College
Alan Cardwell	Too near greenbelt. Will erode separation of Ampthill from Flitwick.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Greenbelt land. Surgery less than 30 minutes.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Andy McGowan	Green Belt land adjacent to the school should be protected as such. Further erosion of the space between Ampthill and Flitwick is highly undesirable.
Anne Davies	To build on greenbelt for so few houses is not a good option. Small areas of greenbelt such as this are important to retain, either in isolation or as part of a larger area of greenbelt. If we allow greenbelt to be eroded in this way, it says a lot about our commitment to the overall philosophy which underpins protection of open spaces. For the sake of so few homes, it's not worth scrapping the greenbelt philosophy for this site.
B D Ackombe	Unsuitable density & extension of housing
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	We definitely do not need any further developments debouching traffic onto Flitwick Road, which is already dangerously overloaded at busy times. Particularly at hazard would be the hundreds of students who walk or cycle to & from Redborne Upper School and who could face extra traffic flows crossing their paths getting to & from both this site and Site H052. We would support some housing development off Abbey Lane, which could both accept more traffic and lead it to the bypass and the M.1. Without troubling existing users of Flitwick Road. The Green Belt status of "The Grange" should be protected.
Duckett P.A.	No infrastructure available. Insufficient schooling, medical, public transport and emergency service resources. Sewage and drainage likewise insufficient to the demand. Too far from town so increased congestion and short hop car usage environmental issues.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
I. Church	Amphill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands). This is green belt land set up to halt the expansion and ruination of historic towns such as ours.
Jan brown	The traffic is already bad, this will make it worse.
Ian Nutley	Oppose, greenbelt land, lack of school provision.
James Gibb	I strongly oppose development in the Green Belt, while other options are available. This development would have a strong impact on the small gap between Flitwick and Ampthill. As with H052, residents are more likely to support shops in Flitwick than those in Ampthill.
Jane Staples	This site is designated Green Belt and should not even be considered for development. It is hoped that the District Council will stand by its Core Strategy that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt".
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	We do not believe greenbelt land should be used for building. Access into Flitwick Road is already over used by traffic & the access & exit would be dangerous to the pupils of Redborne School.
JV Speirs	This is green belt land and as such should not be developed in this way.
L. R. G. Page	See H052, this proposal will make congestion/hazards related to Redbourne School worse... A significant topographical feature of Ampthill would be compromised (coming from one-o-one roundabout). Erosion of greenbelt would result. The large, mature trees adjoining/in the grounds of Ampthill Grange are the habitat of both owls and bats and English Nature would want to be consulted.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Linda Kitchener	This site falls within Green Belt and it is against the District Councils Core Strategy - as it states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt"
Marc Henshall	This is green belt, build in the big towns, and leave the small ones alone!
Margaret Wright	The development of this site would mean the coalescence of Ampthill and Flitwick which must be avoided at all costs. It is also the green belt area.
Mark Smith	This is within the greenbelt and should not be considered.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Mr. L. A. Lowe	No development should be allowed within the green belt.
Mrs H. Wilson	This is green belt land which should be protected.
Paul New	The plan appears to show the removal of the Grange, this is not acceptable.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as a housing site. The green belt status of such a site must be sacrosanct if Ampthill is to retain any identity as an individual settlement. This site would in effect be part of a creeping extension to coalesce with Flitwick.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Richard Holden	Green belt and remote [Illegible].
Roy Sinfield	For the District Council to say that it needs provision for between 250 and 500 homes in Ampthill is totally unacceptable. Even if the final figure was at the lower end it would add greatly to the problems already seen as a result the poor road infrastructure serving the town, particularly north to south. One can only guess at the catastrophic consequences should the ultimate development reach the upper figure. The roads in and around Ampthill can't support large additions of housing as the town centre is already regularly choked, particularly at peak times of the day. MBDC's Core Strategy states that no development will be allocated in the Green Belt. It is important that the council maintains this stance as it is essential that we retain the integrity, tradition and character of our Market Towns. The agricultural and green belt land that surrounds Ampthill provides an important buffer between the town and Flitwick, Maulden and other villages.
S Dackombe	Spoil a nice route into Ampthill.
Simon Lewis	It's in the green belt and therefore should not be considered for development.
Steve Davies	These large period houses and their grounds should be preserved as part of the historic interest of Ampthill and I strongly oppose these sites being developed. Development of this site only serves to generate significant revenue for the current owner and developer and is not in the general public interest.
Sue Hamon Watt	What about MBDC core strategy of no development allowed in green belt?
Nicolette Wade	H097 is of particular concern. Building houses on the rugby club means that a significant local resource, which has provided children in the area with an opportunity to play sport, will be lost. I cannot find any information about alternative provision there is already very little in the way of resources for children & young people. The roads are already very congested & these proposals will make it worse.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H122

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Denis	Despite the greenbelt attached to this land we were able to introduce a relief road to ease congestion and supply the quota of housing for Ampthill in one go I believe that would be preferable to the whole town rather than put a 100 here and a few others there. We will certainly have to consider the impact of additional cars so this would be an excellent option.
Helen Armitage	A relief road to alleviate congestion in the town centre would be very welcome. I should like to see a leisure centre included in these facilities.
Warmingtons	Ampthill is identified as a major service centre and this proposal allows for expansion of the town with the benefit of possible provision of a relief road around the east of the town to take away through traffic from both Ampthill and Maulden. With Ampthill's extensive shopping and schooling facilities, together with good communications, development of this site would be of a sustainable nature. Expansion of Ampthill is likely to impinge upon green belt land and this would be a suitable location for same. The northern area of the site is well landscaped, minimising the impact on surrounding areas.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Carowell	This is a massive site and would have a significant unfavourable impact changing the character of the town and is contrary to community wishes expressed in the town plan.
Alan Sprod	I support this proposal on the grounds of creating less damage to the environment than other proposals. If more housing must be built, then this large and featureless plot would be preferable to spoiling more attractive sites elsewhere on the fringe of the town.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	My wife and I disagree to some extent about this proposal, which is why all our "tick box" responses are in neutral and we have compromised on the amber "traffic light": "Maybe". She feels that the whole site is Green Belt land and ought not to be invaded. I feel that, since we have already recommended making Abbey Lane a focus for new housing (partly to prevent Flitwick Road from being overwhelmed), it would be consistent to allow some modest development - say, of a couple of dozen affordable houses - on the Northern side of the Lane, between the existing housing and Abbey farm. Nevertheless, I do agree that the bulk of Site H122 should be preserved as a valuable "green borderland" between Ampthill & Maulden.
Matt Harris	Relief road details would be helpful.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Greenbelt land. Boundary between Ampthill and Maulden must be kept apart. Potential to use as by-pass. If lower school 7.58mins why surgery over 30minutes when just around corner!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing or employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A. Russell	Amphill cannot support developments of this size. If it's changed to encourage developments the nature and community will be ruined.
Alexandra Booth	This land has been designated as green belt land - and for a good reason. It is vital that Amphill and Maulden are not allowed to merge. Maulden is a village with its own character and must not be allowed to be subsumed into Amphill. Maulden has already merged with Clophill at the other end of the village and any further expansion on the edges of Maulden would be disastrous. Whilst it is not presently proposed that houses be built on the entirety of the land between Amphill and Maulden this would be the slippery slope and must not be allowed to happen. It would also result in the loss of a large area of green space to the east of Amphill. The Council must stand by its own local plan with regard to designated green belt and find more suitable sites on which to build, of which there seem to be sufficient in the various sites put forward by landowners without the need to lose this crucial area of green belt.
Andy Atherton	It's a beautiful piece of Green Belt. Please leave as is - don't ruin this piece of countryside!
Andy McGowan	Green belt should be protected at all costs. That said, the option of a relief road warrants consideration but Green Belt needs would override the benefit of the relief road.
Anne Davies	Too little detail has been given about this site. Land to the East of Amphill, is a rather sweeping statement! Are you considering a road onto the mini-roundabout at the junction with Ailesbury Road? Or an additional road linked onto Snow Hill or further on, towards Maulden? Considering that this site has the greatest number of dwellings, of all the options, some further detail is essential to constitute meaningful consultation. A new housing site this large, between Amphill and Maulden, will hasten the merger of the two towns, which may be inevitable in time, but if its a real possibility so soon, you need to seek local residents views in an open and transparent manner. I would like the opportunity to comment on this proposal once I can see what it really involves.
B. Dackombe	Infringement of green belt and distinction between Amphill and Maulden
Barry Wright	Strongly disagree with any relaxation of green belt policy to refuse development permission.
C. Hedges	Site is green belt and will result in loss of local amenity (sports ground). The proposal will effectively merge [Illegible] the settlements of Amphill and Maulden.

Submitted by	Comments
Celia Gregory	More development in this historically agricultural village is completely unsustainable. We are only a few miles from The Wixams where your Council have accepted plans to build 7000 new houses. We do not need any more houses in this area. The local amenities are over-used already - there are just not enough shops to cater for the existing population let alone the thousands of new inhabitants from The Wixams who will no doubt come to Ampthill and Flitwick for their shopping. Car parks in both towns are at full-stretch now!! In addition the roads in this area cannot take much more traffic without serious improvement-- traffic clogs at the Clophill roundabout every rush hour; the M1 has queues on it in the evening with locals trying to get home; the trains to London are over-crowded at peak times. This area cannot cope with more houses and inhabitants.
D. Blackaby	This is green belt. Dividing Ampthill from Maulden. This area too populated now, will only lead to more unrest.
D. E. Mann	Sewerage facilities no good. Too much traffic on estate. Not enough amenities for school - doctors. I object to all the buildings being proposed.
D. Webb	By using this land it would join Ampthill to Maulden, and lose the open countryside.
Debbie Lewis	This land is currently used by many local residents recreationally (rural walks), the east of Ampthill is lacking in green areas and this farm land (green belt) provides a balance at this side of town. Additional development would ruin this beautiful area and leave Ampthill only a stones throw from Malden.
Duckett P.A.	Road traffic. No easy access to railways and motorways. Unnecessary destruction of green land when sufficient brown field land exists in areas of mid beds such as Biggleswade and Sandy.
E M Field	I would strongly oppose any development in the Green Belt. Ampthill and Maulden must not be allowed to merge.
E. Foster	This would increase the size of Ampthill by 25%. NOT needed. Traffic is already bad.
E. Joy	Keep it green belt. This is why people move and pay the extra live in Ampthill.
Gail Hobday	I feel that development of this site would lessen the distinction between Ampthill And Maulden and is for too many houses which would probably change the character of Ampthill. It would also be a loss of a large amount of open space.
H. A. Braybrook	This area has been designated as green belt and I can see no good reason to change that designation.
I. Church	Ampthill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands). This is green belt land set up to halt the expansion and ruination of historic towns such as ours. I'm sure Maulden village feels the same, they have their own identity at the moment, and this would be lost.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Nutley	Oppose, greenbelt land, lack of school provision. Plus even if relief road built, local roads would be unable to cope.
Jackie Fitch	Amphill, Flitwick and Maulden should be protected as separate and distinct communities. Any encroachment onto the green belt to the east would threaten this and, in particular, would compromise the character and integrity of the market town. The existing infrastructure and local services in the town more than adequately provide for existing local needs within a well-defined area.
Jake Bishop	This would merge Amphill with Maulden, both communities like being apart.
James Gibb	Despite the fact that there might be the possibility of providing a relief road for the town centre, which could be of benefit to us in Church St, I strongly oppose any development in the Green Belt, while other options are available. This development is over the crest of the hill separating Maulden and Amphill and would have a deleterious visual effect from the Maulden side. It would seriously narrow the already small gap between the two settlements.
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	We do not believe greenbelt land should be used for building. Existing Amphill town infrastructure, in particular roads which cannot be widened, are overstretched with present usage. Following development at Wixams & other developments, the position will become untenable.
Jerry Fitch	Any expansion of Amphill into the green belt to the east would compromise the character and integrity of the market town. Amphill, Flitwick and Maulden must be protected as distinct and separate communities, and must not be allowed to fall victims to the urban sprawl that would inevitably set in if the green belt were to be lost. The District Councils own strategy does not allow for development of the green belt, so why is this, and other green belt areas, even being considered for any development ? Furthermore, this area is much used by local residents for leisure and recreational purposes.
Jim Mozley	The proposed site is just to the East of the last development of new houses that I seem to remember was also in the Green Belt between Maulden and Amphill. That proposal was allowed and the houses now exist. I believe that allowing this development will further reduce the free space between Maulden and Amphill and is not in the best interests of conserving the nature of the two communities.
Joe Bloggs	Amphill and Maulden are already at risk of merging into one: why risk losing the distinctive characters of two towns, not to mention the views of those who live there? Besides, Redborne school is already full to bust, and there are congestion problems in Amphill town centre. If these plans were to go ahead, I would expect a very strong backlash from the local community which would extend beyond mere nimbyism.
John Kirkup, Dip Arch RIBA	The intensive development of this huge wedge of land will benefit only the present site owner; turn Amphill from a pleasant country town into an ugly urban sprawl; betray those planners and local elected representatives of the local population who sincerely believed that they were planning for posterity with essential green lungs spacing out residential and commercial developments. What should most horrify the residents who presently overlook this green flank and remaining shred of woodland are the two words mixed development. Amphill is a town of particular historical interest and must stay tightly within its historical boundary. Waitrose is bad enough, the pending loss of Albert Richardson's sensitively appropriate Town Hall - a crime!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
K. Hart	land is green belt and to build would have a huge effect on the countryside and wildlife. The village and town of Ampthill and Maulden do not have the schooling/doctors/dentists to support development of this size.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	This development is of a monstrous scale, and is completely disproportionate compared with the size of Ampthill. Further it encroaches on greenbelt which provides a buffer between Ampthill and Maulden, stopping the two from merging and helps to preserve the distinct nature and attractiveness of Ampthill. Whilst I accept that some development must take place around Ampthill and I have indicated my support to some of the other more proportionate proposals, I find this proposal totally without merit. I urge the council to stand by their commitment to retaining the greenbelt and to as best as possible preserve Ampthill's character by rejecting this proposal.
Kerrie McIntosh	This is on green belt land and will link Ampthill and Maulden taking away the countryside that separates the two. Increase in traffic and parking will affect traffic from Maulden, Ampthill including Abbey Lane which already is a cut through and cant cope with an increase of traffic into Ampthill via Oliver Street etc. Flitwick Rd Maulden already takes a large amount of traffic from and to the bypass.
L. McPheat	Keep Ampthill as it is. Green belt land should be kept as just that.
L. R. G. Page	The scale of this proposal would transform Ampthill and greatly expand boundaries to the east where poor road access to area proposed Proximity to conservation area (at northern end) Erosion of greenbelt on a massive scale.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Linda Kitchener	This site falls within the Green Belt and so as the District Councils Core Strategy states that "no development will be allocated in the Greenbelt. I am unable to see why this proposal has even been considered, let alone put up for public consultation. This green belt should not be built on for any reason and any use. This proposal is for a site within the Parish of Maulden and yet is for Ampthill's allocation - surely development of a Parish should occur from the current infrastructure outwards - not away from a village centre?
Louise Atherton	This is glorious open countryside well used and loved by the local residents of the east of Ampthill. To develop it would reduce this whole side of the town to a concrete mass. I want my children to grow up with good local facilities and the countryside around them - it is why we moved to Ampthill. To develop this land would rob them and all future families in this side of town with that opportunity.
M. L. Carter	This land is Green belt and should not be used, to lose land such as this is to the detriment of residents in the surrounding area as it is a breathing space in a busy landscape. It would also almost join Maulden and Ampthill into one long housing corridor.
Marc Henshall	This will ruin the area, build in the big towns, and leave the small ones alone!
Margaret Mozley	I am particularly concerned about the gradual erosion of the green belt between Maulden and Ampthill. This also happened 15 years or so ago when green belt land adjacent to the proposed development was used to build a big housing development. If this land was used there would seem to be little or no gap between the 2 towns and it would make the development of Ampthill very heavily geared to the East.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Margaret Wright	The development of this site would mean the coalescence of Ampthill and Maulden. Also encroaches on the green belt.
Mark Smith	This development falls in Maulden & is in the greenbelt & should therefore not be considered.
Martin Stein	Green belt land must be protected. Danger/threat to existing allotments due to access road/increased traffic. Massive development for size of Ampthill.
Michael Brooks	This site is in the Green Belt and development here would erode open countryside between Ampthill and Maulden. Ampthill has limited facilities compared with Flitwick and should not grow much further. Road access in the Ampthill area is poor, with the road to Flitwick (for railway station) and the south highly congested, and the road to Bedford of poor standard with a dangerous bend. The site is poorly accessed by public transport with a very spasmodic bus service along the Ampthill-Maulden road. Even the nearest part of the site to the town centre is some 700m (most of the site is much more than this) and uphill -- people would be unlikely to walk this far. This site should be rejected.
Michael Kirby	I am concerned about access from Exton Close Water drainage - I am concerned that the lower land near the recycling centre will tend to flood The "identity" of Ampthill if facilities eroded by development here.
Mike Browning	As the summary states this area is Green Belt and as such I have a very strong objection to building on this site.
Mike Kirby	Ampthill as it is struggling to cope with the number of people wanting to live and shop here. More houses here will further strain the already bursting infrastructure and further damage Ampthill's identity.
Mr Steven Bowley	There is a very real danger of the Parishes of Maulden and Ampthill merging if this plan goes ahead, creating one giant conurbation running from the A6 to the A507. This proposal goes against the District Councils Core Strategy that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt". The land proposed for this development is designated a green belt area and forms a natural boundary between Maulden and Ampthill. In my opinion is likely that a dangerous road junction would be created on Snow Hill should the land there be utilised for any development, and that the increase in traffic would create increased congestion in both Ampthill and Maulden. The Lower, Middle and Upper Schools in Maulden and Ampthill are already running at capacity and would be unable to absorb the increased number of children that such a development would naturally bring to the area. The loss of the Green Belt land would also mean the loss an area of high recreational usage from the local people who use the many footpaths through this rural area. It would be a great loss to lose this "lung" for the area.
Mr & Mrs T Hazzard	If this development was permitted it would drastically reduce the existing natural barrier between Maulden and Ampthill. The suggestion of a relief road is totally irrational as the facility exists at present with the use of Flitwick Road, Maulden. More significantly this is a Green Belt zone and therefore development should not be permitted under any circumstances.
Mr A Carter	This huge site would be undesirable effect of reducing the gap between Ampthill and Maulden. I do not wish to see Maulden swallowed up like that, the green belt land should not be retained anyway.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Keith Staples	This is Green Belt Land and it is therefore unlawful to develop the land and that is what the original law was designed to do..... to protect against building on the land and to stop the law being changed and consequently ruining the environment. Also the land has a lot of wildlife..... Birds, Squirrels, Rabbits and many more animal indigenous to this country and area, which would be destroyed if the land was developed. The land is used for farming essential crops which is essential to the country and contributes to the countries wealth and food stocks and reduces the need to import foods from other countries. Finally, people use this land throughout the year for country pursuits such as walking and relaxing in the countryside. As less and less space becomes available for such activities, so this area becomes more and more important to the people..... and isn't that is what it's all about?!!
Mr M. Wooldridge	This development is more suited to the old station area. The proposed development would be more traffic for Abbey Lane and any traffic from Maulden or local roads would if heading for the M1 would be more traffic for Ampthill town centre. Already too much green belt is disappearing and local towns and villages are virtually joined together.
Mr Matt Cross	I have recently moved from Dunstable because of the terrible traffic congestion and the complete lack of competence of Bedfordshire county & local councils to plan & implement the infrastructure needed before the new house developments were built (Dunstable bypass & A505 to M1 link Rd, etc) that is why Dunstable is now at gridlock and major businesses have moved out of the town. Unless you want traffic at a standstill & your quality of life deteriorated you will resist this proposal at all costs or face having to move as I did!
Mr R Hart	This is green belt and should remain green belt. This is a natural green belt division between Ampthill and Maulden and should stay as a natural division. There are other sites going towards the motorway that are by far more suitable for any development. Traffic has already increased dramatically in this area, and both Ampthill and Maulden will suffer immensely by this proposal.
Mr S Long	Completely inappropriate site, green belt and isolated from existing development boundary.
Mr & Mrs R Sabey	Green Belt. Do not wish Maulden to be joined with Ampthill.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Mr. L. A. Lowe	A development on this scale would lead to over loading of local services such as shops, in-town parking, schools, surgeries, post office etc. Access to the town centre would be via narrow roads which are already made dangerous by on-street parking. The size of the proposed development would swamp the already difficult parking problems in Ampthill. Loss of edge-of-town-open spaces.
Mrs E. Scott	1. Makes mockery of green belt status. 2. In effect would join Ampthill and Maulden into one large area. 3. I chose to live in a rural town not a huge housing development. It would change character of Ampthill completely. 4. Foresee future problems in terms of crime. 5. Traffic problems.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Gretel Nevols	This site is on Green Belt land designed to compliment the gap between the town of Ampthill and the village of Maulden. To build here would open the way to more development in the area which will finally close this gap and sound the death knell for the village of Maulden. We will be swallowed up and disappear into the town of Ampthill. The Lower and Middle Schools in Ampthill stand adjacent on the same site so your information regarding times to reach the lower school are sadly inaccurate, also to the north of this site the bus runs once an hour if you are lucky and neither of the schools stand on a bus route in Ampthill so your times there are rather optimistic.
Mrs H. Wilson	I think all green belt land should be protected. This area is used for walkers and is local countryside enjoyed by many. If one section of green belt land is built on there is no protection for any green belt land in the future.
Mrs Hemmings	It is important that Ampthill and Maulden maintain separate identities- there is a great danger the two will effectively merge over time through development. In addition as this is a hilly area concreting over much of it would surely put more pressure on drainage away through ponds on Ailesbury road. The traffic through Maulden already drives too fast for the area- with more traffic around the area when Wixams is built surely Ampthill will be under strain with a development here with more traffic coming through the town centre to get out on A507 in MK direction where many people work.
Mrs J M Crisp	Far too big proposal on green belt which must be protected at all costs. Maulden has limited facilities. This would create lots more traffic. Maulden already has a speeding traffic problem.
Mrs Karen Procter	I expect the Council to stick to their core Strategy that no development will be allocated in the Greenbelt
Mrs Kirby	If this site is developed it will not support any of the present infrastructures. It is Greenbelt and should remain as such, if developed it would merge with Maulden. There has to be plenty of land to develop to fill our needs without using green belt! This should be kept as green belt. The plans are for a far too big development, and will ruin Ampthill, the traffic congestion will be huge even if a relief road is put in.
Mrs Mary P. Wooldridge	The site proposed is near to Snowhill Maulden which would mean a joining of Ampthill and Maulden. It is green belt land and not well served by roads and services. I would think a better idea would be to develop E68. This would develop employment and consolidate Ampthill's plan as a major service centre.
Mrs P. King	Green belt.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Susan Wardle	The proposed development would require a very large area of Green Belt land that is right on the boundary with Ampthill to be released for development. This is in conflict with the information contained in the Mid Beds District Councils Core Strategy and Development Control Policies: Preferred Options document dated Sept 2007. Under the heading of Preferred Option CS2 - Green Belt this states: The Council's Preferred Option is that: The existing extent of the adopted South Bedfordshire Green Belt in Mid Bedfordshire should continue to be maintained up to 2021 to contain the outward growth of settlements including Ampthill and Flitwick and prevent the coalescence of settlements within it. The Site Allocations DPD will not consider allocating new development sites within the Green Belt. It also states: The emerging East of England Plan considers the broad extent of Greenbelts in the region is appropriate and will be maintained. The Council agrees with this conclusion and its Preferred Option is to release no existing Green Belt land for development purposes up to 2021. At the two main towns within the Green Belt, Ampthill and Flitwick, there is scope to accommodate future development on safeguarded 'white' land excluded from the adopted Greenbelt. In making best use of this land to help meet future development needs, Ampthill and Flitwick's role as major settlements can be consolidated. Consolidate and develop the role of Ampthill and Flitwick as Major Service Centres recognising the need to maintain the separate identity of those settlements and the existing Greenbelt constraint. If we are to be able to believe what the Council tell us, surely this application must be declined.
Mrs. A. Morris	Mid Beds should stick to its core strategy to keep green belt - green belt.
Mrs. K. S. Tyrrel	This will link Maulden to Ampthill - it's in Maulden Parish in fact. I am opposed to this because the use of green belt land in these circumstances is completely inappropriate.
N Simmons	Building houses here would bring Maulden and Ampthill too close together. The strain on existing services would be too much. The new estate is always having power cuts because the national grid cant cope. The sewage farm wouldn't be able to cope. Nor the Doctors/Dentists. There would be too many cars. People who buy these houses may work in London, making Ampthill even more of a commuter town.
Nick Watson	The size and position of this site is entirely at odds with sustainable development in Mid Beds. The proposed location is on Green Belt land and any development of this land will result in the merging of the boundaries between Ampthill and Maulden, creating a single conurbation which would detrimentally impact on the identity and character of this part of Bedfordshire. Additionally the proposed location is some distance from local services and amenities encouraging the use of cars and therefore impacting on the environment. Existing local amenities, particularly schools would be unable to cope with this growth. I would be strongly opposed to this development.
Nigel Hopwood	Ampthill is not a large enough town and does not have the services or infrastructure to support such a volume of additional houses. Horrendous!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Nigel Pollard	I would be very concerned about any plan that eroded the clear distinction, and geographical separation, between Ampthill and Maulden. No, no, no. Forgot to add ... I do not agree at all that the potential for a Relief Road is a point in favour of this site. A road through from Abbey Lane to Maulden Road achieves nothing more than the existing Flitwick Road, Maulden already does. Unless a relief road is going to include a tunnel or cutting through the Greensand Ridge (!), I do not see that any North-South relief road will help as it will not by-pass the town centre?
Patricia Douglas	This development would be out of proportion to the existing town. It would go a long way to merging Ampthill and Maulden which would not be wanted by either community. The area is farmland and home to much wild-life. It is regularly used for walking by many people. Even if a relief road were built traffic would still come through Ampthill to get to Bedford and a development this size would generate a lot of traffic.
Paul New	Green belt - no!
Paul ODell	Ampthill is already congested with traffic with little parking available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixham town estate, which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixham development is so close to Ampthill that it will already have a detrimental affect to the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people - as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
Peter Gregory	Ampthill and Maulden are already overburdened with Housing and the local facilities are not able or sufficient to support any further increase in the population. e.g. not enough retail outlets/shops in Ampthill or Flitwick; inadequate parking facilities in both places; Roads especially the M1 overloaded; schools and utilities not able to take further expansion.
Peter Rayner	I strongly oppose development of Green Belt land in Ampthill. The targets can be achieved by utilising other opportunities for development that do not impinge on Green Belt land. A development of this size will destroy the existing nature of Ampthill as a village community and will put tremendous strain on the existing infrastructure. Traffic into and through the town centre could not be accommodated from such a large and sprawling development.
Phil Watson	This proposal will spoil the countryside between Ampthill and Maulden. It will also further erode the distance between the 2 locations. I believe both communities would prefer to ensure their identities as separate places are retained, rather than eventually merge into 1 conurbation.
Philip Field	The use of this prime farmland for 400+ is short sighted and would change the character of Ampthill and overload services. The local traffic system would be further congested by the scale of this development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
R McPheat	Building on this allocated green belt land, with a proposed relief road, will reduce village boundaries and be a negative for future land preservation policies as well as increase traffic and pollution in the area. The proposed development is outside the Ampthill Town boundary. Green belt land must be preserved for future generations. The proposed development will go towards the boundary definition between Ampthill and Maulden being diminished and should be removed from the current and future plans. The area is too close to Flitwick and will lessen the divide between the two towns
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as a housing site. The green belt status of such a site must be sacrosanct if Ampthill is to retain any identity as an individual settlement.
Richard Holden	Green belt - should not be considered.
Robert Butcher	Being part of the Green Belt this site should not be considered for any development whatsoever.
Robin Adams	Green Belt land should remain as green belt.
Robin Bartlett	The countryside corridor between Ampthill and Maulden is already extremely narrow, barely sufficient to provide separate identities between the two settlements. A development of this size clearly compromises this as well as the local countryside and open views. Too many settlements in Mid Beds virtually merge - Flitwick and Ampthill, Greenfield/Flitton - often with unattractive and unappealing consequences. Mid Beds Council should guard against this happening.
Roger Highton	This development is inappropriate as it is in the green belt separating Maulden and Ampthill with the loss of agricultural land.
Roy Sinfield	For the District Council to say that it needs provision for between 250 and 500 homes in Ampthill is totally unacceptable. Even if the final figure was at the lower end it would add greatly to the problems already seen as a result the poor road infrastructure serving the town, particularly north to south. One can only guess at the catastrophic consequences should the ultimate development reach the upper figure. The roads in and around Ampthill can't support large additions of housing as the town centre is already regularly choked, particularly at peak times of the day. MBDC's Core Strategy states that no development will be allocated in the Green Belt. It is important that the council maintains this stance as it is essential that we retain the integrity, tradition and character of our Market Towns. The agricultural and green belt land that surrounds Ampthill provides an important buffer between the town and Flitwick, Maulden and other villages.
S M Braybrook	This is green belt land so is by definition entirely unsuitable for any development and contrary to the strategic vision.
S. C. Webb	Leave Ampthill as a village come town as it is.
S. Dackoch	Current green belt.
S. Melville	This site would put a great strain on facilities in the town and potentially increase population by a third - also encroach towards Maulden, blurring boundaries.
Sally Davis	Too far from town centre. Site is green belt and should be left alone.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Lewis	The questions above do not allow me to adequately represent my opposition to this proposal, I disagree with it fundamentally. It impinges significantly on the green belt, it erodes the open space between Ampthill and Maulden to the width of one field, development of which would inevitably follow. It would also substantially alter the character of the existing woodlands estate (Ailesbury Road/Wingate Drive) at the north end of the proposed development, as the topography would make the proposed development a dominant feature in the landscape. There is also a nature reserve on this site. Traffic on the minor roads to the north and south of the area would also be increased. Mid Beds have indicated that it contravenes their core strategy, so they should not give this the go-ahead. This development should not be allowed to proceed under any circumstances.
Jane Staples	This land is designated Green Belt and should not be considered for development. It is hoped the District Councils core strategy which states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt" will be adhered.
Steve Kirby	This site is greenbelt and forms the boundary of Ampthill. This boundary is essential to prevent encroachment towards Maulden. Development of this site would be contrary to the core strategy.
Sue Braybrook	This green belt land - so is by definition entirely unsuitable for any development. I see no point in having a core strategic vision which is then ignored.
Sue Hamon Watt	What about MBDC core strategy of not building within Green Belt. Totally inappropriate to build here.
Susan Kirby	This proposal would further erode the green belt and the core strategy. It would also be contrary to the future needs of Ampthill. Green belt should not be eroded and should be left alone. It should not even be included in this, it should be out of the equation.
T. Freeman	Town Centre congestion. Lack of retail outlets. Lack of recreational facilities. Lack of employment - the majority of people work outside the area.
Theresa Jackson	I feel very strongly that green belt land should not be used in any event, the countryside is under severe pressure and we risk spoiling the very essence up of the district through development on rural green belt land, this would also pave the way for future development to grow unchecked.
Valerie Thomas	This is green belt. Green belt means that countryside is kept for our grandchildren to enjoy. It is essential that you keep your policy (core value) of not building on green belt. There is a real danger of becoming urban and not rural. The streets in the centre of Ampthill cannot be widened and is struggling now to cope with the traffic at peak times.
Wood	This is for the most part a prominent site higher than the adjacent existing housing developments and visually would intrude on the landscape in general and in relation to that housing in particular. An acute problem with development in Ampthill is the worsening congestion in the narrow streets of the town centre and associated car parking problems. The inclusion of an eastern relief road for Ampthill within this site would only shift, perhaps, some of the congestion from the southern approach to the town centre to the eastern approach; it would not alleviate that congestion.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
L McPheat	We feel strongly that Ampthill should be kept as it is; a quiet Georgian market town. Developing on greenbelt land is a no-no.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.
Mr and Mrs DJ Rust	Excessive building on open countryside which separates Ampthill from Maulden. will cause appalling traffic congestion in already busy narrow streets in small market town with buildings of significant historical significance. will cause problems with schooling as the local schools are already oversubscribed particularly Redborne Upper and Alamdea which would be the local schools for this area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H203**

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Brian Russell	This is one site that has the potential to be of benefit to the town and not make a negative impact.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	The town certainly needs more affordable housing and this site, within easy walking distance of the centre, would suit any residents who need to rely on public transport. Press for an even higher proportion of affordable stock here! It would also be a good location for permit-controlled parking for people who work in town centre businesses. This should, in turn, free up parking spaces in the centre for shoppers and visitors. Go for it!
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	Long Stay Car Parking is urgently needed in Ampthill for the future prosperity of the town & also to clear the suburban streets of annoying & dangerous parking. If this requires the site to include a housing development then so be it.
K. Irvin	The site is a good "in-fill" site.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	A proportionate development which would help the council meet its housing objectives. It may require some work to the roundabout which I assume will be used to provide access. I very much doubt the requirement for a Long Stay Car Park and question why the developer wishes to do this - is there any further information on this?
Margaret Mozley	It seems this would provide some much needed lower income bracket housing in a spot which is a bit of an eyesore and which does not encroach too much on green belt land.
Mark Smith	I feel I could support this proposal as the scheme potentially provides a solution to long term parking in the town, as I can see no other potential sites so near to the town centre. However, the housing needs to be complementary to an area so near to St. Andrews Church & the cemetery (behind the development).
Mr. L. A. Lowe	As proposed, the provision of long stay parking would be of great value to the town. The relatively small number of houses will not have any significant effect on local facilities.
Mrs H. Wilson	Although next to a country wildlife site this development is not huge and the land is not greenbelt.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Suitable, with plant screening for current residents. Long stay car park should have barrier to stop youths using car park at night for meetings and disturbing neighbours.
Phil Watson	It would be good to clean up this very scruffy piece of land. My only hope is that this will induce the cable companies to install cable over to this side of Ampthill. The distance from the BT telephone exchange means that broadband is a joke.
Rosemary Park	We need low cost housing and a long stay car park it is also in a possible area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Cardwell	Good site with little impact on the town or surrounding area. Has added benefit of much needed car parking.
Anne Davies	The main problem with this site, as far as I can predict, would be ease of access. Assuming that each of the 40 dwellings has one car and many may have two (I would predict that the 13 largest houses will have two cars each), turning right into the site and right, out of the site will be difficult at peak times. Congestion will result. Another consideration should be the safety and security for cars and users of the proposed car park, which has the potential to be remote, hidden from the main road and sadly, may become a magnet for some young people, who will take the opportunity to behave inappropriately, near a residential area. Good lighting and CCTV must be essential elements for this proposal.
Nigel Pollard	Not so sure about the housing potential but an enlarged and thriving Ampthill is going to need a long-term car park to prevent Church Road, Lea Road, St. Andrews Close etc. becoming even more dangerous than they already are. It will be a shame to lose this bit of "wild" land but I cannot see an alternative.
Patricia Douglas	If this site were developed to include a car-park it could increase traffic on Church St/Maulden Road and traffic turning on to the road would probably need a roundabout or something else to slow cars which often travel much too fast down this stretch. Disturbance to the wild-life in the area and the proximity of the burial ground would also be factors.
Simon Lewis	This land is currently unused. Housing plus a car park may be a reasonable development proposal, though it would need to be done carefully to be sympathetic to the character of this side of town and also the adjacent cemetery and nearby church. 40 dwellings plus parking seems quite high density compared with the adjacent existing housing.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
A E Sonnenstein	This site has previously been turned down for building and the car park has been turned down 3 times and gone to inspectorate level. Head of planning also stated that this land would never be developed. All previous plans for this site should be looked into before it is even being considered for development.
Alan Paterson	The open site is part of the attraction and vista as one enters Ampthill from the east - with a view of older houses and the parish church. The road near here is very narrow and on bends making it unsuitable for a car park entrance. The site is small and housing could more easily be accommodated elsewhere. The old allotments near Park Hill would be more suitable for Car Parking. ((Why wasn't extra car parking included when Waitrose was built!! - Underground below the Supermarket for example - planning seems piecemeal))
Alan Sprod	Church Street, east of the church is a natural boundary between housing on the south side and open land on the north. This development would create a ribbon of housing and destroy the "green" view towards the north.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Andy McGowan	This site is a mess at present. There is need for parking facilities for the church and possibly long stay faculties for workers in town. If this were done in green way then the impact would be a positive one in the town. Indeed it is critical that this site is used for the benefit of the town as a whole and is not used for significant housing development. It is interesting to note how long the apartments in the centre of town took to sell.
Barry Cannon	This site is not suitable for development due to the drainage issues and proximity to the CWS.
Barry Wright	Against any relaxation of green belt policy.
C E Sonnenstein	This site has been the subject of a number of planning applications including a car park which have all been refused. Three appeals, inspectors have endorsed the refusals. The site is an A.L.G.V. and is close to a country wildlife site. It is also an essential open space between Ampthill and Maulden.
David Green	The old "orchard" adjacent to this land was considered as a long term car park when the proposal for Waitrose was first raised. Quite rightly Ampthill Council and local residents opposed this and the ODPM saw sense and refused permission. The main basis for that argument was that Church Street was not suitable for such an increase in traffic and due to the road camber it was deemed a dangerous proposal by Bedfordshire Police. I see this proposal as even more likely to impact on traffic flow near to a blind bend at the roundabout with Ailesbury Road. The area at Gasworks Path is also a tranquil area for local residents to visit & a place of respect for the cemetery which is beautifully laid out and which offers families of the bereaved to reflect without intrusion of housing or noise from school activities.
Duckett P.A.	No pedestrian access to Ampthill on that side of the road. Crossings would have to be installed and pavement safety barriers. In addition, there are insufficient school places at lower and middle schools, poor access and egress by road in and out of town, public transport provision is risible. Medical facilities and emergency services insufficiently resourced. Drainage for run off and waste antiquated.
E Foster	Road access is not good. Ampthill centre always blocked by parking outside post office. Would spoil the view as you came from Maulden.
E M Field	Development would destroy the beautiful view of Ampthill church and its setting as you approach from Maulden. Inappropriate for car park because it is too high-profile a site within the Ampthill townscape.
F. K. and D. M. BREEZE	Development of this site would spoil views of Ampthill and the conservation including St Andrews church on approach from the east. If development were to be permitted, the height of any development must be limited to protect existing views from the east. This principle was applied to the development of St Andrews Close. In addition, housing density should also reflect the character of adjacent existing housing. The proposed car park would be too far from the centre of Ampthill to be useful. However if permitted, a car park management strategy must be required to control hours of use in the interest of amenity and to ensure adequate security.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
I. Church	<p>Amphill has not the infrastructure or facilities to support the proposed doubling of its population. The transport service is inadequate for the existing population. The added, approximate, 6000 cars that 4400 new dwellings would bring the roads to a stand still (plus the 5000 cars trying to get to Flitwick train station from the new Elstow town). This also brings with it pollution. Pollution I don't want my children exposed to, hence moving to a small town in the first instance. There are not enough jobs locally to sustain the current population, let alone the proposed increase (bearing in mind the biggest employer in the town moved to Chicksands). Long stay car park! This is Amphill not Luton town centre! Our centre contains hairdressers, estate agents, antique shops and restaurants! Why would we need a long stay car park! Improve the public transport and push for tax incentives for people working within a 2 mile radius of their homes.</p>
James Douglas	<p>The charm of Amphill is given to it by the nestling of its Georgian centre with its narrow streets in the countryside and parks of mid Bedfordshire. The approaches from Maulden with the views to St Andrews church are part of this pleasant arrangement. If significant development were to take place near Gas House Lane the effect would be as detrimental as any planned near the other approaches to the centre: The Georgian centre would be in danger of being crowded out. Traffic and associated hazards would certainly increase with such a development so close to the town centre as commuters and other road users headed West.</p>
James Gibb	<p>While the provision of long-term car parking would be welcome, the addition of housing to a previously rejected scheme is highly unwelcome. The height of any housing would destroy an attractive view to the east of the town, whereas a well designed car park would not. The additional traffic on Church St from a long-term car park would only have an effect morning and evening on working days, whereas traffic generated by housing would have a much greater effect.</p>
John Kitchener	<p>No matter how carefully this site is developed, and how thoughtfully roads are added / improved, together with footpaths being developed and improved access will still be dangerous both for motorists and pedestrians. A car park at the back of this development will not assist, merely cause more congestion. Being close to a site of special nature conservation building work will have a huge impact on the site. The site is also immediately next to Amphill's new grave yard - which should remain a peaceful, special place.</p>
John Pitts	<p>This was an orchard before the existing owner let this fall into scrub land by cutting the trees down. Orchards are a valuable wild life sanctuary and a rapidly vanishing habitat that could support a wide range of wildlife. It adjoins a CWS and if there any development here it should be sympathetic to the wild life needs, social need for green spaces and the aesthetics of adjoining the local church and other valuable heritage building. If development is allowed then this should be with a sympathetic view towards all these factors.</p>
L McPheat	<p>We feel strongly that Amphill should be kept as it is; a quiet Georgian market town. Developing on greenbelt land is a no-no. Keep Amphill as it is. Green belt land should be kept as just that.</p>
Lee Henshall	<p>No more developments!</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Marc Henshall	Why on earth does Ampthill need a long stay car park? People come for Waitrose mostly and its too far away to be any use for that. The rest of our shops are either hairdressers (too many) estate agents or coffee shops, and I'm sure there aren't many people coming from miles away to shop here. The traffic has increased enough in the centre as it is. The town centre is simply not big enough to cope with anymore! As for the houses, more houses means more traffic and further erosion of our town's atmosphere. Build somewhere else!
Margaret Wright	This is an attractive approach to the town. A development of this type would increase traffic congestion on the approach to the town.
Michael White	Placing housing on this land is unfair to all the people who have loved ones in the church grounds or new cemetery as they will always have somebody looking over them and will never feel alone with them. Also I do not think people would buy property that over looks a cemetery.
Mr C Garraway	Housing is not appropriate here for these reasons: Development too small to have significant impact on numbers of housing overall, therefore will not prevent need for other sites to be used as well. Housing here would change the entry to Ampthill (view of church) etc. However, as a site for a landscaped (tree-filled) long-stay car park it would be invaluable as it would significantly ease the pressure on visitor parking spaces, allowing workers (hair-dressers, shop assistants, etc) commuting from Bedford and Luton to park without taking up town-centre shopping places. Unless the plan is to knock down the old council offices and make that space available?
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Mrs Iraina Witts	I strongly oppose this planning application. It will spoil the surrounding area, and create much more traffic and disruption to the residents living in the area. After Waitrose was built the traffic in the area has increased significantly and to add more housing and create a car park will further disrupt Ampthill and its local residents who moved here for its peaceful and quiet surroundings.
Mrs Jean Ward	Seems to be a very crowded site with many so houses and apartments. Long stay car park will need good security.
Mrs Val Thomas	It would make an ideal location for a much needed car park for Ampthill Town Centre. Especially for the Masonic Centre, The Parish Church and the shops. In consideration for the good people living nearby, especially St Andrews Close which would back onto it, it should be a daytime car park only with gates to stop overnight parking. Vandalism could be a problem with youngsters and skateboards, drinking alcohol etc. CCTV is a must. Thanks for listening.
Mrs. K. S. Tyrrel	The site is very much the edge of town and it is a beautiful entrance to the town. Houses here would just lead to more town centre congestion.
Paul New	I believed that this land had previously been identified for a long stay car park?
Philip Field	Development would substantially change the character of Ampthill.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as a housing site. It is in a critical location for one of the best views of Ampthill and the town's character would be adversely affected if this view were to be lost. The landscape value designation and the wildlife context should mean rejection of this site; otherwise the designations have no purpose.
Richard Holden	Most of the Inspectors comments concerning this site remain pertinent today, and should be adhered to (previous planning appeal) If they are, this proposed development should not take place.
Steven Joy	More development of green belt when so many brown field sites are left in disrepair. Schools infrastructure can hardly cope now. Ampthill Hill St. is now congested and building of Wixhams is going to compound the problem.
V Scargill	This site is entirely unsuitable for development. Such building would greatly impact on the adjacent wildlife site in an adverse way. Development should be opposed.
Wade, Nicolette	H097 is of particular concern. Building houses on the rugby club means that a significant local resource, which has provided children in the area with an opportunity to play sport, will be lost. I cannot find any information about alternative provision there is already very little in the way of resources for children & young people. The roads are already very congested & these proposals will make it worse.
Wood	Access to local services and facilities seriously impeded by very narrow pavements between the site and Church Avenue. An acute problem of any development in Ampthill is the worsening traffic congestion in the narrow streets of the town centre and associated parking problems. An attractive approach to the town centre from the east with the church and other old buildings prominently placed has already been slightly spoilt by development and intrusion of future modern buildings would be very regrettable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H363

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Michael Brooks	This site was already identified in the Mid Beds Local Plan, and therefore some development here is to be expected. However, previous proposals for this site have failed due to problems of overlooking existing properties and/or parking provision, with the impact on Park Hill a particular concern. These problems can be overcome by reducing the number of dwellings on the site and revising the layout. There should be no vehicular access from Park Hill. Also, development on this site should contribute towards the improvement and enhancement of the adjacent Ampthill Park, which is already over-used and suffering from erosion and dog-fouling problems. This is especially so if no open space is to be provided within the development itself, although a children's play area at least should be provided on-site. The development should also make a contribution towards the aims and work of the Greensand Trust.
Mrs Joy Mead	This site is not large and whereas some extra housing may be appropriate I do feel that 50 homes would create a lot of traffic issues. Bedford Road surrounding Swaffield Close is already very congested owing to parking issues for homeowners which Waitrose has inevitably contributed to. Adding more housing will obviously increase this. The beauty of living in Ampthill is the feeling of space and countryside around-squeezing extra homes in will further spoil this.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Kerrie Cottrell	This is an inappropriate development of a green space, which provides a buffer between existing housing and the park.
Mr Alan Paterson	This site should not be developed for housing as land adjacent to the centre of Ampthill is in very short supply. With significant and increasing need for car parking in Ampthill (as it grows) this land should be reserved for additional car parking. Significant parking congestion exists today and plans for a car park to the east are inadequate and in the wrong place. Putting additional houses here will add significantly to town centre car parking and traffic congestion. If Ampthill's shops and businesses are to thrive town CENTRE car parking must be a priority over speculative housing.
Mr Graham Tilley	Access from Bedford Street is already highly congested. The centre of Ampthill already feels overcrowded. The idea of many additional dwellings crammed into an inaccessible space is just ridiculous
Mr Ian Brown	This development sounds awfully familiar. Is it different to the other ones for that land already turned down ?
Mr Ian Forrester	Ampthill, will be unable to function as the town it is at present if more housing and strain on the infrastructure is placed upon it. The town will and all the history of Ampthill die should these plans proceed. It seems that all we will have from Luton to Bedford will be a giant housing estate with no greenbelt or park land for the residents to enjoy.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr James Gibb	There is considerable congestion in Bedford Street already, mainly caused by the success of the Waitrose store and the cars displaced from the car parks that preceded it. Swaffield Close debouches opposite Waitrose and the additional traffic generated by the new housing would make matters worse. It is an inappropriately large development within the conservation area, where development should be limited to infilling within the existing footprint. It also abuts directly on to Ampthill Park, and that is likely to degrade that part of the Park to a great extent.
Mr Lewis Page	1) I know this site but have walked it again today. 2) If agreed, all construction and other traffic would access via Swaffield Close, already terribly plagued with parking problems. This would be intolerable for existing residents of Swaffield Close. 3) 50 houses I equate to 100/125 cars which can only exacerbate horrendous parking/traffic problems produced by misconceived realignment of Bedford Street following the construction of Waitrose. Only Waitrose and a limited range of shops available in Ampthill would benefit. There are all expensive. Bargain hunting families would go to Tesco or elsewhere. Extra traffic is bound to result in Ampthills 18th century streets being damaged. 4) Effects of this proposal on health and education resources, I believe, will be wholly negative. 2 years ago PTC indicated new health facilities would be provided on site of the almost redundant Steppingley hospital where there is much more space. 5) Ideally the site should be reincorporated into the adjacent historic par (which will otherwise suffer from proximity of housing) from where it no doubt came.
Mr Matt Cross	I don't think this site is suitable due to the already congested roads around the town centre, especially Bedford Road around Waitrose where the traffic already backs up to BAE Systems at peak times.
Mr Peter Luddington	Since the Waitrose supermarket was built and the B530 through Ampthill was changed with the stupid road narrowing the congestion in this area is appalling. Building 50 additional houses in Swaffield Close will only add to the traffic mayhem in this area. Cars park on pavements and frequently result in major traffic hazards here. I also think this development will impinge on the park area which is one of Ampthill truly unspoilt places. Please leave it alone.
Mr Steve Davies	Conservation area and traffic congestion already unbearable in Bedford Street since the opening of Waitrose
Mrs Theresa Jackson	Being sited adjacent to Ampthill Park I feel that this would inevitably impact on the wildlife and eco system in the park, there are fewer and fewer places for young people to learn about and appreciate the natural world that they live in. Also the traffic in peak times around the town centre is getting unmanageable and with the potential for another 100 cars+ in this area it really is not suited.
Ms Mary Goulder	the position regarding Ampthill as a key focus for growth is problematic. The centre of the town is congested to the point where many people no longer walk through. Bedford St road layout does not allow a larger vehicle on one side without causing traffic hold ups. Retail outlets remain empty, as do the apartments on the Waitrose site. Growth in this town needs to be given much more thought if we are not to lose the intimate character, which is already under threat; and have yet more retail outlets in and around the centre left empty.
Name Not Given	Conservation area? Congestion!

Submitted by	Comments
Name Not Given	Due to the park problems, which is creating severe congestion in the town. A better use for the area would be long term parking with selective screening, i feel this could create a good back drop to the park if done carefully

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: E19**

These additional comments were made by people who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs K.S. Tyrrel	A507 junctions would need to be improved.
James Gibb	Any traffic generated is unlikely to add significantly to congestion in the town centre. There is other nearby industrial development, so the visual impact should not be that great. It should be possible to landscape it so that it is screened from the A507.
Matt Harris	Excellent location for new employment.
Mrs. J. Gillett	Not quite sure of actual location, so can't comment.

These representations were made by people who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Keith Alexander-Buckley	It is impossible to comment as the proposer has not submitted additional information. This is just wasting our time and until more detail is provided I urge the council to reject.
Mrs J Gillett	Seems to add to the H097 encroachment but fair enough if that was to be scrapped.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Robert Arnott	A massive environmental impact on Ampthill Park altering the entire western character of town.
No name given	Ampthill is already congested with traffic with little parking available and the narrow street at the centre of town is already dangerous to pedestrians. The local amenities and especially the local schools are not capable of accommodating such a large development alongside the already huge Wixams town estate, which will also put a huge strain on the local job market. The Wixams development is so close to Ampthill that it will already have a detrimental affect to the local infrastructure. The vast majority of people who will be living in these houses will be coming from outside the area and I have not seen any proposals of how the infrastructure is being amended to accommodate the extra people - as soon as the houses are built! Finally why are we so hell bent on destroying one of the last character market towns in the area!
L. R. G. Page	Both proposals would impact detrimentally on greenbelt.
Nigel Pollard	Doolittle Mill a much more logical site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roy Sinfield	For the District Council to say that it needs provision for between 250 and 500 homes in Ampthill is totally unacceptable. Even if the final figure was at the lower end it would add greatly to the problems already seen as a result the poor road infrastructure serving the town, particularly north to south. One can only guess at the catastrophic consequences should the ultimate development reach the upper figure. The roads in and around Ampthill can't support large additions of housing as the town centre is already regularly choked, particularly at peak times of the day. MBDC's Core Strategy states that no development will be allocated in the Green Belt. It is important that the council maintains this stance as it is essential that we retain the integrity, tradition and character of our Market Towns. The agricultural and green belt land that surrounds Ampthill provides an important buffer between the town and Flitwick, Maulden and other villages.
C. Hedges	Given expected traffic increases for Centre Parks, the proposal gives rise to concerns over increased traffic congestion particularly around the junction of the A507/B530. Development would encroach into the green belt.
Rosemary Park	Green Belt No way.
Andy McGowan	Green belt must be protected.
I. Church	Green belt says it all!
Mrs. A. Vickers	Green belt. Not suitable. Keep as pasture.
Mrs H. Wilson	I feel this site is too far from Ampthill and would impact on the surrounding countryside.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to Flit-Amp market towns' may be worth consideration?
Douglas Collin	No comment re green belt
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Duckett P.A.	No obvious safe access onto bypass at this point. This is a fast road and unless it is duelled it will not support vehicles entering and leaving at this point without posing a serious safety risk. Also, it wont look very nice for holiday makers visiting Centre Parks!
Marc Henshall	Not on our greenbelt please!
Graham Bellamy	On this scale will sever countryside links into coopers hill SSSI from the west. This may be important for migration of species in response to climate change and sever corridor link towards new heath land at Centre Parks to west.
Ian Nutley	Oppose greenbelt land.
Mr T. Freeman	The areas allocated for employment would only support a fraction of new residents.
Nick Watson	The development on Green Belt would be detrimental to the character of the town.
Mr M. Wooldridge	This development would spoil the character and local amenity of Ampthill Park. This is a rural area of Ampthill and would be better developed as a recreational park area in sympathy with the local park.
Rob McPheat	This is a green field site. There are plenty of brown field sites that would be more suitable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Wood	This is a rural site with no public transport. The suggested tennis school or anything similar would generate traffic throughout the day and not just at 9 and at 5. It will be dependent on Ampthill for local services for which cars will be used. Ampthill already has worsening traffic congestion in its town centre streets and associated parking problems, and addition traffic from this site would have a further detrimental impact on the town centre. The site is on the fringe of Ampthill Park and buildings there will be visually intrusive on the enjoyment of those using the park. They will also intrude on the attractive approach to the town from the west.
Simon Lewis	This is an inappropriate location for such a development, primarily because it is in the green belt. It would provide a means of developing all the land between the A507 and the railway down as far as station road, then its a small matter of infill down to the existing Doolittle Mill development, so its the thin end of the wedge for a major expansion on this side of the town. This would increase lorry traffic on the road and potentially make an already dangerous stretch of road worse.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as an employment site. The green belt status of such a site must be sacrosanct if Ampthill is to retain any identity as an individual settlement. This site would also have major adverse impacts on the local environment and wildlife and on local traffic congestion (A507 Woburn St junction).
Jennifer Willies	This is green belt, we have already lost land to Centre Parks and it would be a disgrace to allow this to happen again.
Mark Smith	This is in the greenbelt and outside the Ampthill Industrial Estate. A total non-starter!
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	This proposal represents an opportunist bid to invade the Green Belt where there is no significant need. If Sites E64, 68 & 71 can be developed for business and employment, this site will be totally unneeded. Any business park here would represent a severe impairment of the Greensand panorama, as seen from Ampthill Park and from other vantage points along the Greensand Ridge Way. Such developments at the sites we do support (see above) would be far less intrusive. Massive landscape cost: minimal economic benefit!
Linda Kitchener	This site falls within the Green Belt and it goes against the District Councils Core Strategy which states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt". Lack of public transport also makes this site inappropriate for future job development - we should be looking at sites which are serviced adequately by public transport to reduce carbon emissions.
Philip Streeton	This site is adjacent to a paddock which I own, these areas are full of flora and fauna - from my home I can see an uninterrupted view of the tree line of the Greensand Ridge, which is beautiful. Any proposal which means swallowing up greenbelt land like this should be vigorously opposed.
Jane staples	This site is Green Belt and should not be considered for development, it is hoped that the District Council will adhere to its core strategy which states "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt".
Sue Hamon Watt	This site is in Green belt and therefore completely against MBDE core policy of not building in Green belt.
Mr S Long	This site is on one of Mid Beds most dangerous roads. The site is too far from existing development and inappropriate.

Submitted by	Comments
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	We do not believe Greenbelt land should be used for building.

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
J. Morris	Concern about fragmentation of this site from the existing industrial estate to the south. I am concerned that the sites identified reflect what has been submitted rather than what is fit for purpose and strategically appropriate.
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E29

These additional comments were made by people who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Margaret Mozley	A much needed leisure service for Ampthill.
Mrs K.S. Tyrrel	A507 junctions would need to be improved.
S. Melville	These sites would not affect traffic congestion in the town but provide local employment.
Mr C Garraway	This area can be developed without significant impact on the character of the town. The indoor centre sounds a brilliant idea.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Keith Alexander-Buckley	I am troubled that this is in greenbelt and I'm not sure that the proposed tennis centre would be self sufficient. But if the developer is able to guarantee the development then this may have merit.
Mrs. J. Gillett	Not quite sure of actual location, so can't comment.
James Gibb	Opposed to developments in the Green Belt on principle. However, this is between the A507 and the railway, so is perhaps not too disastrous and encroachment. I failed to spot that E19 was also on Green Belt land, so the same comment would apply to that.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide employment housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Douglas Collin	Agreed comments re Greenbelt.
L. R. G. Page	Both proposals would impact detrimentally on greenbelt. E29 in particular would require hazardous access on to A507.
Roy Sinfield	For the District Council to say that it needs provision for between 250 and 500 homes in Ampthill is totally unacceptable. Even if the final figure was at the lower end it would add greatly to the problems already seen as a result the poor road infrastructure serving the town, particularly north to south. One can only guess at the catastrophic consequences should the ultimate development reach the upper figure. The roads in and around Ampthill can't support large additions of housing as the town centre is already regularly choked, particularly at peak times of the day. MBDC's Core Strategy states that no development will be allocated in the Green Belt. It is important that the council maintains this stance as it is essential that we retain the integrity, tradition and character of our Market Towns. The agricultural and green belt land that surrounds Ampthill provides an important buffer between the town and Flitwick, Maulden and other villages.
C. Hedges	Given expected traffic increases for Centre Parks the proposal gives rise to concerns over increased traffic congestion particularly around the junction of the A507/B530. Development would encroach into the green belt.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
I. Church	Green belt land says it all. The road adjacent to this site is 60mph, though the speed limit is often exceeded. It is too dangerous to cross; My young family and I will not be using the proposed facility.
I. Church	Green belt land was set up for a purpose, Lets not build on it!
Andy McGowan	Green belt needs to be protected.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Green Belt. Not suitable. Keep as agricultural.
Rosemary Park	Green belt. No way.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Marc Henshall	Not on our greenbelt please!
Ian Nutley	Oppose, greenbelt land, there is already suitable tennis provision in the area.
Nigel Pollard	Options in Flitwick would appear more logical.
Mr S Long	Separated from existing employment sites and on dangerous road. Development should be kept to expansion of existing employment site not sporadic new sites along this major through route.
Sue Hamon Watt	Site in green belt - totally contrary to MBDC policy to build here.
Duckett P.A.	Sounds a nice idea but in an inappropriate location. No access from town other than by car. Ampthill Bypass is not a pedestrian area, younger people on foot would be at enormous risk of serious injury/death when tempted to walk home. Existing Parkside Hall/Notts. Rooms/Sports Hall would be better location for multi function leisure site if you CPO them.
Rob McPheat	This is a green field site. There are plenty of brown field sites that would be more suitable.
Mark Smith	This is a non-starter as it's in the greenbelt, although a indoor tennis centre would be welcomed in a more suitable site within the Ampthill!
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	This is completely unacceptable as an employment site. The green belt status of such a site must be sacrosanct if Ampthill is to retain any identity as an individual settlement.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	This is the kind of leisure development which would work well on an urban brownfield site and be of considerable service to its community, but it hardly makes sense in this isolated rural location and certainly does not warrant an invasion of the Green Belt. If it did get established, how exactly would it serve our local community and what would be its carbon footprint if all its customers had to drive in from an inevitably wide catchment area?
Linda Kitchener	This site falls with Green Belt and so is against the District Councils Core Strategy that states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt".
Jane staples	This site is green Belt and as such should not be developed, it is hoped that the District Council will stand by its core strategy which currently states that "no development will be allocated in the Green Belt.
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	We do not believe in greenbelt land being used for building.

Submitted by	Comments
Philip Streeton	You cant just stick up a tennis centre in the immediate vicinity of one of the most important historic buildings in Ampthill!! The Tudor Hospital should be protected, not violated like this. And Where would the access road be???

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E64

These additional comments were made by people who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	Acceptable within the context of existing Doolittle Mill development. However should be dependent on improving public transport access between the site and the rest of the town.
James Gibb	Adjacent to previously developed site, which has been very attractively done. The potential for flooding clearly needs to be addressed, but should be superable.
Margaret Mozley	As part of the site has already been developed and is not an eyesore it seems sensible to use what ever amount of land that can be reclaimed for future job provision.
A McIlhatton	Extension of high quality development using low quality land.
Matt Harris	Good location with existing employment uses, and easy access to A507, Ampthill and Flitwick.
Mark Smith	I could support the extension of the Doolittle Office Site.
Keith Alexander-Buckley	I would recommend the proposal be modified to avoid building on the flood plan area but apart from that seems a good proposal.
Andy McGowan	If development is on the flood plain then design the Offices with parking at ground level and accommodation at a level safe from the flood risk.
Mrs K. S. Tyrrel	Only that the A507 cannot cope with much more traffic volume and the junctions on this road need attention.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Suitable.
S. Melville	These sites would not affect traffic congestion in the town but provide local employment.
Mrs H. Wilson	This site has been developed nearby and we need more employment.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	This would extend an already stylish business development, which is well connected to the Ampthill bypass by a roundabout. If this and Site E68 are both approved, which would make sense, a consent condition might be to provide a bus turning circle at the heart of the development, so that J2 & X42/44 buses between Ampthill & Flitwick could be diverted in and out from the main road, at least during business rush hours, to provide regular public transport links - as happens at Bedford Interchange further North. The stream on site should be suitably landscaped.
Nigel Pollard	To be encouraged. It would be nice to see Ampthill and Flitwick supporting more local jobs, encouraging local prosperity, reducing commuting etc.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Nutley	Acceptable, consideration to existing trees being maintained.
Barry Cannon	Improvements to the Doolittle Mill roundabout would be required.
Mrs. J. Gillett	Not quite sure of actual location so can't comment.
Nick Watson	Note that part of this development is on flood plain.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Julia Pankhurst	The floodplain should not be developed on, it is there for a reason. I understand that some of the site covers the floodplain - I object to this area, but have no issues with the rest of the site - it fits with the development already there. Thank you.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
C. Fred John	I have strong opinions in the negative about the current development. I believe that a further development on this site without proper/increased private and public would be chaotic (result in further chaos in this locale).
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market towns may be worth consideration"?
Lee Henshall	No more developments!

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E68

These additional comments were made by people who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Keith Alexander-Buckley	A good proposal.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	Acceptable within the context of existing Doolittle Mill development. However should be dependent on improving public transport access between the site and the rest of the town.
James Gibb	Adjacent to existing site. Concerned that bigger buildings would overshadow the present very attractive development.
Matt Harris	Again good location with existing employment uses.
Douglas Collin	Agreed comment.
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	As indicated in relation to Site E68, we would welcome further business park development of the quality of the original at Doolittle Mill and see its ready connection to the Ampthill bypass as a strong plus. Public transport links are currently not ideal - hence our suggestion of the provision of a bus turning circle at the heart of the expanded site, allowing services X42/44 & J2 to make swift in & out diversions from the main road and thus make access to/from both Doolittle Mill and Ampthill's town centre easier for the potential workforce and for customers of new and existing businesses. The stream should be landscaped.
Mark Smith	I feel that I could support a further extension of Doolittle Mill. if as well planned as the existing site!
Anne Davies	Looks like a sensible expansion of an already functioning and very aesthetically pleasing business site.
Mrs K. S. Tyrrel	Only that the A507 cannot cope with much more traffic volume and the junction on this road need attention.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Suitable.
S. Melville	These sites would not affect traffic congestion in the town but provide local employment.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Nutley	Acceptable, consideration to existing trees being maintained.
Barry Cannon	Improvements to Doolittle Mill roundabout would be required.
Mrs. J. Gillett	Not quite sure of actual location so can't comment.

These additional comments were made by people who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jeremy & Jennifer Jones	Development too large a scale.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market [Illegible] towns may be worth consideration"?
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
T. Freeman	The areas allocated for employment would only support a fraction of new residents.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: E71**

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alan Paterson	We should encourage high tech jobs at Reddings Wood - BUT NOT RETAIL.
Anne Davies	A good proposal.
B.M.A.Hill	Hopefully this will encourage additional employment for the immediate area.
C. Fred John	I think this site provides the best development potential around Ampthill and could even be expanded to include Health Centre, amenity shops, restaurants etc., unlike Doolittle Mill which is in its current state a dreadful development (Mock Georgian blot on the landscape!).
D.L. and J.M. Hodgkinson	We assume that this is essentially the same site as H080 (q.v.) and, therefore, we would approve of its redevelopment primarily for employment, but with some additional housing, WITHIN the existing screen of Redding's Wood, whose trees hide the current business premises rather well and minimise their potential impact on one of the finer areas of Bedfordshire's landscape along the Greensand escarpment. Extension BEYOND that screen would NOT meet with our approval, however, and therefore there would be a need to prioritise to get the quart of proposals into a pint pot. Then, the top priority should be employment with affordable housing second.
Ian Nutley	Brownfield site, no problem.
James Gibb	Probably preferable to residential development.
Joanne Randall	This is a much more suitable use for the Reddings wood site. HOUSES NO, but as an opportunity for meeting employment target YES
Kimberley Griffith	Yes, this would not disrupt anyone or anything. It is an ideal site.
Lisa Frangiamore	The site is already in use and is close enough to existing housing developments to provide jobs for local people.
Mark Smith	I can support the improvement of the site for this major employer in the area.
Mr G. S. Bave	As already existing site this would not have big impact and would create more employment. Housing development concerns me. Too large perhaps on a much smaller scale as Ampthill Road very busy now - could not cope.
Mr. J. Lockley	An excellent place to "hide" new houses - and a good opportunity to have houses and work close together which will minimise use of cars.
Mrs C Lai	I think this site should be considered at least for some housing development as well as employment otherwise the small amount of residences in that area will remain isolated.
Mrs. A. Vickers	Suitable.
Nigel Pollard	A much more logical option than HO80.
Pam Wilson	Fully in favour of both this site and Center Parcs applications.
Paul New	Industrial and commercial use - yes. Residential - NO.
Richard and Jane Cawkwell	Unclear what is being proposed for this site. Isn't it already a B1 use?
V Scargill	Continuing use for employment on the existing site only.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Helen Armitage	Traffic levels in Bedford Street are very heavy at times because of the bottleneck at the clock tower. This development would increase traffic levels substantially.
Jonathan Roots	All deliveries to be routed via A421
June Collin	Probably suitable for mixed use, not housing only, providing some employment opportunities.
JV Speirs	There is already congestion on the road from Houghton Conquest into Ampthill and so I would only support this development if a new road could be built to by-pass Ampthill.
Mrs K. S. Tyrrel	The road network would have to be improved. Ampthill town centre cannot cope with any more traffic volume.
Mrs. J. Gillett	Not quite sure of actual location so can't comment.
Paul Rolfe	Provided that the infrastructure be improved in relation to access and that the site itself is improved without impact on the surrounding countryside, I would be inclined to support this application.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future employment in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Alexis Webster	The road network in the immediate area can not cope with the traffic already present, further traffic such as lorries will cause issues on small country roads as the drivers seek out rat runs to avoid congestion on the a421, a 505 and a6.
Barry Cannon	Site not suitable for any development.
Brenda Hartley	I want this village to remain a village, we have had far too much development over the past few years; especially with the Wixhams. Our services and amenities are over subscribed already. I do not think that Houghton Conquest should be categorized as a large village. Over all we don't want to loose the village characteristics which we have, I would the village stay as it is.
C Thomas	The old Hunting Engineering site is already a blight in an area of great beauty attached to a historic village of limited transport access and 20mph speed limit. There are large areas of Bedford town centre being redeveloped that will provide employment/housing rendering this totally unnecessary. The A6 & A421 are current accident black spots and public transport is dire.
C. Goldthorpe	This is further over development of a rural area.
C. Hedges	Existing infrastructure is not sufficient to support development of this size. Services have been continually reduced in recent past. The site is clearly not suitable for residential development of this scale and an application has already been rejected. It is contrary to planning policy/legislation. It would be intrusive into areas of outstanding natural beauty 370 houses in this location would potentially create a "ghetto" with no prospect of adequate services on site. Existing traffic levels already cause problems on the approach to the town. These will be compounded by development close to Bedford. The site could sustain some increased employment levels but this would have to be instead of, not as well as, residential development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
E Brindley	I am against all the development in Houghton Conquest. Since moving into the village for a quiet rural life the village has already tripled in size. I was against the proposed Wixams development which at the time we were promised would not connect the this village. The hospital, doctors, ambulance, fire and police services are all overstretched and all this development will not help that and will quite possibly cause even more flooding as so much natural drainage will have been built on. Also if as much development is planned for other villages such as Stewartby and Wilstead everything will end up all joined together like a big city just like Milton Keynes. This area would cause even more congestion on the roads together with the rest of the Wixams development. Also will take away even more of the natural drainage of this area being a very clay soil would cause lots of problems for the whole area and should remain green belt.
E M Field	Any further development would affect the landscape from the Greensand Ridge at Houghton House/Kings Wood
Edna Brindley	The development of these sites assumes that people working in them will live in the proposed adjacent new developments for housing. In my view this will not happen and the end result will be traffic chaos on existing roads as people commute in and out. The infrastructure for this is & will continue to be totally inadequate.
John Hawker	Don't consider a village of the size and infrastructure of Houghton Conquest can sustain any more large scale development. With the extremely nearby Wixams development along with the proposed Nirah development I would say that this part of Mid Beds has its fair share of development. Please see below a number of points that I consider would need to be addressed before Houghton Conquest could sustain any further development. - Access onto the A6. Those who already live here have to contend with the extremely dangerous pull out, if they wish to access the A6 in a southerly direction. This can mean a wait of 4/5 minutes to access the road resulting in a long queue back into the side road. At present I can see this as accident waiting to happen without adding traffic. - Medical Provision - Bus routes - Social care - Village infrastructure - paths, lights , road condition - Schools - Marston Vale Forest project - Open spaces - park, playground.
Lee Henshall	No more developments!
Mr & Mrs J Purdy	A small expansion of the existing company may be acceptable, but significant additional employment will increase the traffic delays that are already apparent when employees arrive at or leave Lockheed Martin.
MR P.H. Dixon	This site is too close to Houghton House and more industry here would ruin the environment.
Mr. C. R. Greenstreet (?)	In my opinion all infrastructure needs to compensate these proposals must be considered along with their practicality prior to any further development taking place! After all Ampthill and Flitwick are already joined together - perhaps new road signs stating "Welcome to "Flit-Amp" market (?) towns may be worth consideration"?
Mrs H. Wilson	I feel this site would cause huge traffic problems particularly at peak times. Just with Insys traffic one can queue from just past Insys to get into Ampthill in the evenings. Also the local countryside would be spoilt.
Mrs J Bave	A good suggestion for more employment in the area as opposed to more houses/no jobs. No objections - as already existing site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Roy Brindley	The development of these sites assumes that people working in them will live in the proposed adjacent new developments for housing. In my view this will not happen and the end result will be traffic chaos on existing roads as people commute in and out. The infrastructure for this is & will continue to be totally inadequate. I am against all development in and around Houghton Conquest. I disagree that H.C. is a large village - Wootton, Cranfield, Wilstead maybe, H.C. is not. I would like to know what development proposals exist for adjacent areas such as Stewartby and Wilstead in order to appreciate the bigger picture. If we ignore the green belt in parts and develop it the legacy we leave will be the end of the green belt.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
Marion Thurtle	There is no indication on any of the proposals what provision is being made to support increased road traffic - alternative public transport (which is currently appalling). Why are there no proposals to re-open Ampthill station if the town is to be designated as a major service centre? Flitwick already struggles to cope with parking for the station & bus links are too infrequent.

AMPTHILL APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	H363 Land off Swaffield Close Amphill	This potential site is crossed by public right of way Amphill FP11, part of the Greensand Ridge Walk route. It is most important that this footpath access to Amphill Park is maintained unchanged. In particular, the existing hedges comprise many different species and offer character and variety along the length of the path. The hedges will need to be maintained at the present 2-3 meters height in order to provide a screen against any residential development. Any proposal to substantially alter the character of this path would be opposed by the Ramblers' Association.
Dr. J. Lockley, Senior Partner, the Oliver Street Surgery,	Amphill	In case anyone is concerned about the provision of G.P. medical care, the Oliver Street surgery would be very happy to take on a further 2,500 patients at least and we have space in our existing premises to do this.
Nigel Milway	Amphill	See Appendix Three.
Andrew Hards	Amphill & Flitwick	I have been a resident of both Flitwick and Amphill for nearly 25 years now. I am a keen walker and naturalist & genuinely believe there are some outstanding sites in our neighbourhood. I have been on Coopers Hill, early morning, when the heather is out & you could be in the New Forest, likewise Flitwick Moor (especially where the streams run rust coloured) has unique almost primeval qualities. Therefore, when I hear that these sites are yet once again under threat I really wonder what the hell is going on. I have walked all over the Mid Beds region & there are alternative sites to develop without having to compromise our natural heritage.
Martin Joynes	Amphill, site H051	<p>1. Secondary access via Lammas Way is a poor idea. This street, Fallowfield and Glebe Rd are very narrow. Many cars are parked on-street. Opening this up to traffic would result in accidents and endanger children and pedestrians.</p> <p>2. This site, once green belt, and now 'protected' for housing (great euphemism) is the only remaining open land on the eastern side of Flitwick Rd. Developing on this land WILL cause the effective coalescence of Amphill and Flitwick that the Local Plan says should be avoided.</p> <p>3. Why Amphill & Flitwick? Already horribly congested at peak times, both have major road bottlenecks at their centres. And yet more houses are proposed? Now that the A421 is being improved, why isn't more housing being allocated to the SWBSC?? Delay in improving the A421 was one of the reasons that Amphill and Flitwick were targeted. Now that this is no longer the case, surely the decision should be reviewed?</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
Philip Streeton	Ampthill, sites E19 and E29	<p>The above applications both border land owned by me - E29 would be immediately adjacent to my home, E19 would border my 2-acre paddock. How is it that I found out about the consultation process by pure chance whilst "Googling" for something else?? Surely prospective developments which impact so heavily on a conservation area and greenbelt land should be heavily publicized in order that the public may make their feelings known. Like most of the swallowing up of Mid Bedfordshire's ever-shrinking open spaces, this seems to have been done "on the sly". I am aghast that you would even consider these areas as suitable for development of any kind, and would like to express my strong opposition to development of either site. This is green belt land, and E29 is right next door to one of the most important historical buildings in the town - these proposals would be an unsightly blemish on a very attractive area.</p>

Submitted by	Subject	Comments
Duncan King	Development in Ampthill	<p>Thank you for writing to me about this matter, I would like to pass on a few thoughts and suggestions as follows. I am totally opposed to the growth of Ampthill from its current size. The things that make it nice, it's a small market town, with close proximity to the park and the countryside. These will be destroyed over time with the proposals that Mid Beds are considering</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If mid beds and Ampthill in particular are set to grow in size both in terms of new housing, commercial property and population growth, what about the infrastructure changes that are already needed in its current size? 2. Ampthill desperately needs a north - south bypass to handle the additional traffic. It almost certainly will require a railway station as well, as the area is a dormitory one and the new residents will most likely live here and work somewhere else. 3. Flitwick railway station would most probably close if Ampthill gets a station and this will create a lot more traffic and problems as a result. 3. There is a lack of retail facilities in the town, there is only one shop where you can buy groceries - Waitrose. 4. Why do we need growth in Ampthill? The positive reasons that people want to live here are bound to be destroyed by further growth, certainly the infrastructure is not sustainable in its current form to achieve this. 5. As a resident of Ampthill for most of my life, the attractions of the place are its Georgian charm, its Park, some period attractive houses and the fact that it is a small town. 6. It is evident that developers are desperate to find ways of building more houses in the town to make money. Most of this property development will be high end of the market and not affordable for locals. 7. This type of development would harm the town and diminish the reasons why people would want to live here i.e. over crowding, traffic levels, lack of shops etc 8. You only need to look at Flitwick to see the problems, un-planned growth and development with no clear direction of what should be the maximum size of the town and how to handle all its problems e.g. traffic, wrong siting of Tesco etc. I am sure that Mid Beds will do what suits them, so we can expect an increase in population, houses etc. Still, this is against the back drop of a credit crunch, possible U.K recession and the crisis in the housing market. The developers may disappear from the table as a result and we can all go back to sleep again!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation