

ASPLEY GUISE 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.

ASPLEY GUISE APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H001

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs S Smith	I support the need to provide more housing and that people want to live in a village location - this development is small enough so to not swallow up the village into Milton Keynes which I think is what the villagers feel will happen. We have a very strong community with in the village which I feel would disappear if we have lots of housing was created around the village.

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
Alexia Ballance	This a beautiful field on the edge of the village, over the brow of the hill on a slope facing open countryside. So not only would building here result in the village creeping outwards, but also, for the first time, the edge of the village would become visible from some distance southwards across country.
Annie Fitzgerald	Services in this area are already stretched i.e. doctors dentists, schools with the developments in Woburn Sands they are on overload! In my opinion this adds nothing to Aspley Guise other than using another piece of precious green belt.
Colin	As a resident of A/G I totally object to all the proposed future growth in and around the area, especially in A/G. The road is ridiculously busy, so much that the weight and volume has caused the road (Westhill) to be in disrepair. Aggregate lorries taking to and from the motorway, coaches lorries you name it, building contractors going to the development in Woburn Sands etc. The highways are in fact relaying the road as I write. Proving that whilst the road (Westhill) is closed people can use other routes. obviously its cheaper and less confrontational to improve the road service than to stop/slow the volume down, all this traffic is causing disruption to the residents, noise, pollution, damage to the properties, etc. This is with out all the other proposed dwellings. You get the idea. Pleased to discuss.
Dr P and Mrs M J Johnson	This proposed development would destroy a prime green site in the village and any development would set a precedent for loss of the immediate adjacent fields which stretch from Spinney Lane to Horsepool Lane. This green space has an abundance of wildlife and provides a beautiful view from various points. The inevitable increased number of vehicles would add further to the problem of traffic along the narrow lanes in a village which already struggles with traffic density. Various services in this area are already inadequate and Aspley Guise does not need more houses. This development would be inappropriate in the green belt and should be rejected.
J E Smelt	To create further housing on this site of open countryside, (much enjoyed by walkers, joggers, cyclists etc.) will be detrimental to the village community. No more suburban developments please! Green belt land.
M G Ladell	Worried about the countryside being ruined.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr R T Chamberlain	1. Taking valuable farm land 2. Having just had ten years of quarry, and still have another ten years to go. I think it's time to give us a bit of a break 2. We have hardly any public transport come through the village - only 4/5 buses a day 4. The road in and around Broom are not suitable for this major plan.
Mrs Eldin	The site at the back of Mayfield Crescent will not only spoil my view, it will also add to the existing problem with rats and mice.
Mrs H Finn	Narrow local roads which hardly support local traffic now let alone with the addition of 9 houses and their cars ... definite impact on countryside here.
Mrs M R Chamberlain	1/ Taking valuable farm land 2/ We have just had ten years of quarrying and still have 10 more years of it 3/ There are only four single decked buses that go through the village a day, five days a week 4/ The roads in and around village are not suitable for any more traffic
P M C Marchant	Aspley Guise has no shop, post office & virtually no public transport so all this will mean is more CARS.
Philip Wallace	This site is wholly inappropriate on green field land and its development would significantly impair the fine views of Woburn enjoyed by all who walk along Woburn Lane. The lane is already over-crowded with traffic and more housing can only make things worse.
Robin Harewood-Lee	The proposed development would be inappropriate for the surrounding single track rural roads between Woburn/Aspley Heath/Aspley Guise.
Sue Lickorish	Development on this site would severely impact on the countryside character and green belt. It would only be for large, high value homes, which doesn't help local people trying to get on the property ladder.
Woolridge	Roads too small for any more cars.

Ref Number: H030

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs S Smith	I have no problem with small developments which are in keeping with the area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H071

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

Submitted by	Comments
Colin	As a resident of A/G I totally object to all the proposed future growth in and around the area, especially in A/G. The road is ridiculously busy, so much that the weight and volume has caused the road (Westhill) to be in disrepair. Aggregate lorries taking to and from the motorway, coaches lorries you name it, building contractors going to the development in Woburn sands etc. The highways are in fact relaying the road as I write. Proving that whilst the road (Westhill) is closed people can use other routes. Obviously its cheaper and less confrontational to improve the road service than to stop/slow the volume down, all this traffic is causing disruption to the residents, noise, pollution, damage to the properties, etc. This is with out all the other proposed dwellings. You get the idea. Pleased to discuss.
Dr P and Mrs M J Johnson	This proposed development for a significant increase in houses at the heart of the village is inappropriate and should be rejected. It would spoil views from high points across the village and beautiful walks which all will be used by residents. Traffic in Church Street is already a problem and both access points are inappropriate. A further burden on local services would also result.
Laura Anne Layton	Yes Church Road is already congested beyond belief. Cars park anywhere. There will be a horrific accident soon. The road is used as a rat run along Salford Road. Any further building would only add to the misery of residents.
Mr B S Franklin	1- Access from Church Hill would mean the demolition of an existing house. 2- Church Hill is a private road & is too narrow for any vehicle larger than a private car. 3- Access from common farm would need the building of a completely new road across a green belt field. 4- The field identified for the new homes is being spoiled by new dumping of builders refuse.
R E Hopkins	These houses would be high income bracket. Access across the farm land would impinge upon public right of way footpath as would access alongside the cemetery. If sewage and storm drain problems could be solved this would lead to further development of the farm land. Existing access to Tudor view sub-standard.
R Franklin	Development of this high area above the existing village settlement would change totally the look of the village. Existing road structure of the village cannot accommodate this scale of development. New road from Common Farm into Westhill would cause further problems where golf club & recreation ground already come onto the road - this was seen to create problems years ago when caravan rallies were held on adjacent sites. - traffic was chaotic - roads cannot cope!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H072

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
Gerald Cosby	This site (which actually is proposed for three dwelling not four as stated) is already developed land, inside the existing village development, and replacing an existing commercial office use, will in practical terms reduce traffic and vehicle movements. The site is not visible from any section of the surrounding village, is not visible against any skyline, and is accessed from a private drive.
Mr B S Franklin	Provided access is as proposed, i.e. from Tudor View and the development in not linked in any way to H071, then 4 new homes to replace 2 old ones & clearing the shacks will be an improvement.
Mrs S Smith	Small tasteful developments are not harmful to the village feel provided there is ample parking provided for each house. I would not want large numbers of houses built as I feel we would lose the village feel

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
Dr P and Mrs M J Johnson	This proposed development for a significant increase in houses at the heart of the village is inappropriate and should be rejected. It would spoil views from high points across the village and beautiful walks which all will be used by residents. Traffic in Church Street is already a problem and both access points are inappropriate. A further burden on local services.
Laura Layton	Church Street is already congested and over burdened by the amount of cars that use Church Street and run into Salford Road which has become a very busy fast rat run. The road is not suitable for any more traffic. Further developments like this will only detract from the loveliness that once was Aspley Guise. Protect and help restore the village – don't destroy it with people greedy for profit please.
RE Hopkins	Use of present access by four dwellings with average 3 vehicles each, i.e. an increase of possible 100% or more, will increase road risks and traffic problems.
R Franklin	Development of this high area above the existing village settlement would change totally the look of the village. Existing road structure of the village cannot accommodate this scale of development. New road from Common Farm into Westhill would cause further problems where golf club & recreation ground already come onto the road - this was seen to create problems years ago when caravan rallies were held on adjacent sites. - traffic was chaotic - roads cannot cope!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H303

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 Headfield	MBDC talk about preventing coalescence of the Cuckoo(MK) with the nest(Mid Beds) by extending the green belt north of the Marston Valley railway line. This green belt extension is essential. What progress is being made? The A421 to Central MK must be duelled from Junction 13 before this development is even considered, or Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise will become an even worse rat-run. Has MBDC any power at all vs. MK Council or The South East Region (which is trying to take over planning authority in this area)? The meeting at A Guise of 27th March clashed with an MK Council meeting to consider a huge development in the heart of Woburn Sands. By intention?
A J Latham	Overdevelopment in this area is totally unacceptable. Every last inch of green "breathing" space seems to be under threat. Why is it that Bedfordshire has to suffer the growing pains of Milton Keynes, a Buckinghamshire city! What with the East, South East and whatever other strategy plan big brother has ongoing people households like ours feel besieged and totally fed up with everything going on in this area. If we could up sticks we would be off like a shot.
D. Cox	This area should remain greenbelt, not urban sprawl from Milton Keynes. The roads in this area are already a problem at peak times, and generally the infrastructure is not in place to cope with this planned expansion.
Dr P and Mrs M J Johnson	This proposal for several hundred new houses in Aspley Guise should be rejected. It encroaches on land which should be maintained as a green area north of the railway, and would ass a further burden to health and other services as well as the already major traffic problem.
Ian Pickering	These plans need to be considered by the East of England RSS before being considered by the Mid Beds LDF.
Laura Layton	Ridiculous proposal - totally out of keeping with the historic history and future of Aspley Guise.
Michael Brooks	Development of this site would seriously erode the gap between Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise. Furthermore, it conflicts with Mid Beds Councils proposals, identified in the Core Strategy, for an extension of the Green Belt north of Aspley Guise. Whilst some limited development on the Mid Beds side of the boundary with Milton Keynes taking the form of an urban extension to Milton Keynes may be inevitable, this site should not be part of it.
Mrs S Smith	I feel as do a lot of other people I have talked too that to build large developments would spoil the village and the village would run the risk of losing its identity and that we would eventually be swallowed up by housing development like so many other villages over the years.

Submitted by	Comments
Patricia Rezon	I believe that this application should be refused. Viewed in isolation there could be an initial case to consider. When you look at it in connection with the three major building projects already underway close by as Milton Keynes pushes east - some 6,000 houses plus the proposals before the Council under application H023 and E45 you realise there is not! Current road and public transport infrastructure is not in place to support this application and existing road links to the M1 would be greatly affected. The green field barrier that distinguishes Beds from Bucks would begin to disappear and urban sprawl and the destruction of the character of the area should be avoided at all costs.
R Dormer	Existing roads and outflow into Aspley Guise via Salford Road would cause major traffic problems in Market Square and surrounding side roads.
Rebecca Bird	Traffic congestion at J13 is already heavy - this development would add to this. The local doctor's surgery already has to be developed to incorporate a development in Woburn Sands - could it support another large development. There are no national health dentists in the area taking new patients now. The local shops parking is already stretched to maximum - if parking becomes more of an issue people will stop using the local high street which will have dramatic effect. The schools in the area are small - can they take more children?

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H023/E45

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
Marc Kitchen	Employment created should be highly skilled/professional jobs that will bring prosperity to the area. The development of industrial units/storage/distribution should be resisted. There are plenty of these developments within the immediate vicinity. The remainder of the A421 from M1 J13 to MK (near Kingston) must be duelled. J13 will also need significant improvement (above and beyond that proposed as part of the motorway widening M1 J10-J13 and A421 to Bedford duelling) otherwise it will not have sufficient capacity.
Mr David Jackson	This submission is made on behalf of the South East Milton Keynes Consortium. Whilst the wording of the consultation document is generally welcome, there are a number of matters that need to be addressed in the way in which the project has been referred to in the Issues and Options Paper. These matters are the extent of built development, the Mid-Beds housing and employment figures and accessibility information. The matters are further outlined in a letter sent to the council dated 01/04/08. With regard to the range of facilities that may be required to serve the residents of the new development, the Consortium notes the comments of the PCT and the LEA in relation to the limited available capacity at existing facilities. It is the intention that the Consortium's proposals will include new schools and accommodation for GPs to address deficiencies in provision and further discussions will take place with the LEA and PCT to determine the appropriate scale of provision.

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
Christine Chalk	This site is very close to 2 main roads and a very congested motorway junction (13). I think that 7000 dwelling are too many for a relatively small site which is not part of Milton Keynes or particularly well connected to Milton Keynes.
Richard Wood on behalf of the Bedford & Milton Keynes Waterway Trust	The proposed route for the Bedford & Milton Keynes Waterway runs through this site allocation and in line with MDBC policy we would expect the route to be safeguarded in the context of any proposed development. Given that the waterway and associated multi-user (cycling/walking/bridleway) routes will significantly enhance housing values on the site, offer potential for complementary economic activity, contribute to green transport options and provide high quality green/blue infrastructure within the site, we would expect developer input to the project as a condition for any planning consent and preferably the imaginative integration of the waterway into the design and layout, in consultation with the Trust. The waterway could also be part of the surface water strategy for any development.

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 Headfield	MBDC talk about preventing coalescence of the Cuckoo(MK) with the nest(Mid Beds) by extending the green belt north of the Marston Valley railway line. This green belt extension is essential. What progress is being made? The A421 to Central MK must be dualled from Junction 13 before this development is even considered, or Woburn Sands and Aspley Guise will become an even worse rat-run. Has MBDC any power at all vs. MK Council or The South East Region (which is trying to take over planning authority in this area)? The meeting at A Guise of 27th March clashed with an MK Council meeting to consider a huge development in the heart of Woburn Sands. By intention?
B M Fleet	Villages should remain villages. One or two new houses built every now and then is ok, but masses no.
Colin	What is this doing to the surrounding area, ring road for Aspley Guise? No didn't think so, this area is taking far to much heavy traffic as it is with out the extra caused by road works building contractors, suppliers, earth moving equip, aggregate lorries that are regular truckers through Aspley Guise now. Would be pleased to discuss.
D.Cox	This area should remain green belt, there is already a problem with noise pollution from the M1 and the A421, also air pollution could become a problem with the planned development and subsequent increase in traffic volumes. These areas around Milton Keynes should be left as green lungs for the city. The urban sprawl from Milton Keynes will slowly destroy the area around Aspley Guise.
Dr P and Mrs M J Johnson	This proposal for the extension of Milton Keynes if completed as illustrated would be a disaster for Aspley Guise and other villages. There must be an extensive green area maintained on the north side of the Aspley Guise rail crossing and west of junction 13 and the A421. Local services including the medical surgery are already overloaded and traffic around the area is a major problem. The proposal for expanding housing in Aspley Guise and the surrounding green areas has not yet been considered under the east of England plan and must be rejected.
Duncan Philips	Congestion in this area has increased significantly in last 10 years with no corresponding increase in infrastructure. The villages are being swallowed up into Milton Keynes urban sprawl.
Helen Macario	The proposed development has been submitted in an underhand manner, in an attempt to fulfil the Governments housing targets, without any consideration being taken of its impact on the lives of those who currently live in the area, nor of the real (rather than perceived) need for such huge housing numbers on the edge of Milton Keynes. It would be a miserable place to live, being immediately adjacent to the M1 on one side and the heavily-congested A421 on the other. The sole potential for this development would be to create a slum situation from the outset.
Ian Pickering	The need for development on this scale should be considered as part of the East of England RSS before being considered as part of the Mid Beds LDF. The proposals in the South East Plan for development in this area do not remove the need for consideration by the East of England Plan as this area is in the East of England Region. Residents of Aspley Guise have a right for this development to be considered within their own region not dictated by a neighbouring region.

Submitted by	Comments
Janet Dale	This project will be detrimental to village life. Dwellings of 7000 will increase the traffic considerably on small country roads. People moved, and paid extra money, to enjoy the quieter lifestyle. If I wanted to be part of Milton Keynes I would have moved there.
John Franklin	This site should be included in the green belt extension - and as such should not be developed. Also, why does MKs SDA have to impact on Mid Beds - in fact the regional authorities are different (AG /Mid Beds sits within East region, not South East). In summary: Why should Mid Beds have to build 5,600 homes in a proposed greenbelt area (as dictated from outside the Eastern region by the SE regional plan for MKs SE SDA) as part of MKs expansion without allowing this figure to be part of Mid Beds TOTAL allocation of building 4,400 homes by 2026. This would mean that Mid Beds is in fact being asked to build a combined total of 10,000 new homes by 2026 - is this correct??? MBDCs current position (24/1/07) suggests that they are happy to allow 2,700 homes to be built instead of 5,600 - no reasons given? so MBDC is allowing a total of 7,100 total to be built by 2026 - district wide?
Laura Anne Layton	The site in question should be green land and landscaped to provide a buffer for Aspley Guise residents against the constant hum and drone of traffic for M1 and other major trunk roads. I drive along Salford Road every day to my home at 102 and I pass hawks, deer, barn owls - It's almost the last bastion of unspoilt land in this area. Aspley Guise is already poorly served with its roads, many of which have become a rat run for commuters. Mid Beds should defend villages like Aspley Guise, not cow-tow to anyone else - that's what you are elected for! Also the MK Citizen sometimes has 46 pages of job vacancies - they can't fill jobs at the moment so please don't intimate that this will be good for jobs - there is over employment in this vicinity. The only major thing this village lacks is a shop and central point of focus - now the shop has gone I see it as the beginning of the end of what was and could still be one of the outstanding villages in Mid Beds. You should be proud to represent us and fight for our future. Please don't throw us away to satisfy rubbish government targets. Look what a mess the Government is making of all it touches at the moment!
Lisa Goddard	I bought my property in Aspley guise in 2007. I paid a premium to live in a village surrounded by green belt land as I did not want to be surrounded by housing estates. By building these estates you will undoubtedly de value my home. Who will compensate me? Any new estates will include council housing, from experience of growing up on a council estate in Luton, the crime rate in our sleepy village will dramatically increase also. I am totally against new housing in Aspley Guise.
M G Ladell	I would like to see an area of open space between ourselves (Aspley Guise) and Milton Keynes.
Mr & Mrs R H Sinden	The number of houses proposed is completely out of scale with the adjacent villages. It would alter the environment in A. Guise, W. Sands & H. Crawley irrevocably - changing their nature completely. None of them would have facilities or infrastructure to cope with development of this scale.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr and Mrs Wyatt	We need to keep some space between Aspley Guise and MK otherwise it will become just another suburb. Mixed development sounds like a lot of warehouses which will just mean more HGVs and more traffic problems. We firmly believe this area should be greenbelt and remain as countryside as there is a need to preserve some green space in our increasingly urbanised area.
Mr B S Franklin	This development will swamp the north side of Aspley Guise & ruin the character of the village. It will become just another area of Milton Keynes The existing roads, i.e. Salford Road, Church St and The Square could not possibly cope with the new volume of traffic. The open countryside barrier between Aspley Guise and Milton Keynes must be retained.
Mrs S Clark	Strongly support mid beds proposals for green belt, should this go ahead. Milton Keynes should not join up with Aspley Guise
Mrs S Smith	I feel this would be the start of the village being swallowed up by Milton Keynes which is not what the majority of the villagers would want as this would take a way the village feel and it would become an other village surrounded by housing estates. I have no problem with small developments of a few houses with in the village as long as they are in keeping and do not impact on the look of the village
Mrs Tracy Willis	I feel vey strongly that the proposed development will have a negative impact on the infrastructure, and surrounding countryside.
Patricia Rezon	An application that should be rejected out of hand. Along side this application Bucks and Milton Keynes are planning 5500 homes along the M1 corridor. This application, like those is structural overload - at the J13 roundabout a new roadway is opening to elevate current congestion and pollution. This application would destruct and negate and gains currently being won! There is no infrastructure. Road, retail, public transport, schools, doctors, dentists etc to support such a large development. It would destroy the greenbelt boundary that has always separated Beds from Bucks and M.K and a new technology park is the last think that is needed here.
R Franklin	I do not accept this area of Aspley Guise & Husbourne Crawley should become part of "Greater MK". This seems to be government imposed planning with MBDC bending over to accept (at least in part) this intrusion into Bedfordshire. Our part of Bedfordshire is rural and should be maintained as such. Any building here would not benefit Bedfordshire (and would not even contribute to Bedfordshire build numbers!) Sorry, I cannot accept this - extend greenbelt to county boundary.
Rebecca Bird	Congestion around junction 13 - this will add to that congestion. No local dentist currently taking on national health patients. Local doctors - already difficult to get an appointment within a few days, this will become worse. Local high street parking is already stretched, if parking becomes worse people will stop using the high street, shops will close. Local woods etc. could become overused - effects on wildlife. Development area - covers a number of footpaths what happens to those?
Robin Richardson	Local village country roads are already being used as rat race commuter routes and a housing site of this size will simply add to the problems. Just look at the state of the roads now in both capacity and pot holes.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ronald E Hopkins	Green Belt, outside Milton Keynes development and area originally agreed as sacrosanct and now renegaded upon by planners. This is good, productive farmland and a country amenity are you going to replace that with 'linear parks'?
Sue Lickorish	So Green Belt means nothing any more, then? This development would be many times larger than Aspley Guise and threatens to swallow us up into Milton Keynes. There is no way local services can support this development. It is a huge area of open countryside that would bring MK right to our doorsteps. I regularly walk the footpath along Wednesden Lane, past New Barns Farm to Berry Lane. From this position, you can clearly see the impact this development will have on our rural countryside. It will significantly affect the character of the area.
T Mann	This site encroaches on our green space and will cause increased congestion in an already congested area. I strongly object to Milton Keynes expansion into Bedfordshire.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	Development of this entire site would seriously erode the gap between Woburn Sands/Milton Keynes and Aspley Guise/Husborne Crawley. Furthermore, it conflicts with Mid Beds Councils own proposals, identified in the Core Strategy with much public support, for an extension of the Green Belt north of Aspley Guise and Husborne Crawley. Whilst some limited urban extension to Milton Keynes on the Mid Beds side of the boundary may be inevitable, 5600 dwellings is far too many. Development at a reasonable density on that part of the site excluded from the proposed Green Belt extension could produce say 2000 dwellings. MBDC should not be swayed by the conclusions of the SE Plan EiP Panel and should stick to their original proposals. Remember that Mid Beds residents were not consulted on the SE Plan, and the SE Plan should have no influence on what happens in the East of England. Development affecting the Braystone CWS and HULA meadows should be avoided at all costs.

ASPLEY GUISE APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Andrew KW Powell	Aspley Guise	The object of any decision as far as AG is concerned should be to maintain the nature of the village. As the houses will inevitably be built north of the railway, later if not sooner, then it behoves us to be pragmatic. I therefore suggest that the area of Bedfordshire north of the railway and west of the M1 be offered to MK and that the road be closed to traffic at the railway station. The people who buy houses in this area will look to MK for their activities anyway and that should be encouraged. They will also not then depend on the village or parish for services. Regards, Andrew KW Powell.