

## FLITTON & GREENFIELD 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.

**FLITTON & GREENFIELD APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Appendix one lists additional comments submitted using the consultation survey form. Some surveys were submitted by individuals on behalf of a company, agency or organisation. As a point of clarification we list below (where details are held) the names of consultees who submitted these surveys, the bodies they represent and the sites commented on.

<b>Submitted by</b>	<b>Company / agency / organisation</b>	<b>Sites comment on</b>
Mr David Russell	David Russell Associates o.b.o. Mr M Downing	H355

**Ref Number: H005**

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

Submitted by	Comments
D Osborne	Site H005 = Flood plain Site H215 = (1) Will cause traffic congestion on joining the High Street traffic (2) Possible drainage problems. Site H117 = Disagree with the development of this site in total.

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
Ann Austin	This site is the most appropriate for Flitton as it is smaller in scale and is road frontage, which reflects the existing settlement. However it would be a shame to build on green space which provides views to the Moor. Any new build would add to the detriment of the traffic problems through the village.
CR Morey	This site is currently a gap in the ribbon development between the two villages which allows attractive views across the Flit valley towards Ampthill. Development would fill in the gap and tidy up a disused farm site but at some amenity cost with loss of the distinctiveness of the two villages. This development would however fit with the current policy and process of progressive (some would say "creeping") infill building for which Bedfordshire is famous. The main point in favour is that this is in scale and would cause less impact than the two larger proposals for the villages.
Mrs M E Morey	A development here would remove the rural feel to this village, cutting off views of fields which give this area a different feel to that of the more urban areas. We do not want all places to be the same! This site may have a tendency to flood due to surface run off in heavy storms (2or3 years ago).
Sally Metianu	Existing facilities are only within "easy" travelling distance for those with their own transport.

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
Angela Ayres	The site is liable to flooding and should therefore not be considered at all, as it would be irresponsible to build there.
Ann Bridgman	A pity to lose a site which supports much wild life and is a rare green space in the village.
David Sedgley	This site is an important strip of green field (possibly ancient grassland) between villages of Flitton & Greenfield with views that are appreciated by the local population and should never be built on. It is not inside the development envelope. It is designated as green space in the Parish Green Infrastructure Plan that is currently being developed.
G R Shortland	Not suitable for development in this rural area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
J Abrahams	Infrastructure is already under pressure, especially drainage and roads. Traffic through the village is at crisis point. Heavy traffic starting at the am. Existing homes are under stress from this heavy traffic. There are few pavements to speak of & none at all in School Lane. Walking through the village is a nightmare.
J. Regan	Development at this site will seriously alter the character of the settlement.
Jacqueline Baron	This is a totally inappropriate site for development. There is a small lower school but no middle or upper school. There are no shops or facilities in the area. Traffic is already at an all time high, it is used as a cut through and most cars speed. There are hardly any green spaces left in the village and will have significant impact.
Jane Earl	<p>Flitton and Greenfield have few services and the residents accept this. We live in a village because of the peaceful lifestyle. If more social infrastructure is desired, then we would live in a town. Once the village is lost to development it can never be regained.</p> <p>A little infill building could be supported on this site - maybe small houses or housing for the elderly which would fit in and not spoil the village setting for existing residents.</p>
Janette and Paul Foote	<p>If 200 houses are built on this site then there will be 400 cars. There is already a problem with cars queuing for the M1 through small villages. This means that the environment will suffer. Because there is no work in the village everyone is going to have to travel (using their cars) to reach a place of work.</p> <p>The distinction between the small villages is important to those of us who live in them and we would not like to see them gradually merged by the spread of large housing developments on the outskirts. Organic growth is preferable as it maintains a really good community spirit. And building in the middle of villages rather than at the edges will help villages maintain their identity.</p>
Jennifer Dancy	This (proposed) development does not satisfy any local needs but would instead place an additional burden on lower and middle schools - already oversubscribed with no spare capacity. Volume and speed of traffic is a problem throughout the Parish (as evidenced by the recent Parish Plan) and there are laughably few public transport options. These proposals mean more cars, more journeys, and are unsustainable in green terms leading to yet more out-commuting. New developments must be linked to local employment and enhance not reduce the quality of life for existing villagers.
John Burnett	Any development within this proposal will alter the rural aspect of the centre of the village and will detract from the conservation area.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Julian Sparrey	<p>Local services in Flitton &amp; Greenfield Parish are limited to 3 pubs, further increase in housing will increase traffic to Flitwick and Ampthill. The public transport provision is extremely limited (and no one knows when they run!).</p> <p>The road through Flitton and Greenfield is already a well used short cut between the M1 J12 and the A507. This particular section past the junction with Sand Road already suffers from speeding motorists and the slight curve in the road means that traffic pulling out from the site will have limited visibility.</p> <p>From this point it is probably the last place from the village where you have an uninterrupted view across the Flit "valley" to Maulden Woods, although just outside of the conservation area, should be considered as an important local view/green space (existing farm buildings are single storey and hidden by trees and hedges).</p>
Lynden Thompson	This land will get very waterlogged after heavy rain. Already in the last 2 years Greenfield Rd has flooded. Traffic problems along this road with speeding traffic going from A6 to M1.
Mel Bass	This site is low lying and damp, taking the run-off from the slope down from Pulloxhill. It borders Flitton moor and the river Flit. It should not be approved for any housing or commercial building.
Michael Pullen	The development being close to Flitwick Moor could set a precedent for more development close to this area of outstanding natural beauty and thereby threaten the already precarious protection currently afforded to the moor.
Mr & Mrs Brooks	Too large to be part of village with current infrastructure.
Mr & Mrs Lowe	This site is known to flood after heavy rain. This is very close to Flitwick Moor.
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
Mr V Emery	The filling of this open area would spoil the village environment. Traffic is already at an intolerable level exacerbated by through traffic.
Mr. & Mrs. P. J. Wood	Development on this site will cause loss of essential open space and be detrimental to the environment and character of the village.
Mrs C Bass	a block of this amount of housing in this small village is unacceptable and totally out of keeping with the rest of the village which has no shops, no post office and no facilities. This also borders on a nature reserve, as such in this small village it should never have been accepted for consideration. It appears mid-beds wants to concrete over all villages including back gardens. Don't blame the government it's your decision.
Mrs Claire Zapiec	Flitton has already suffered extensive infill development. A further 15 dwellings would expand the settlement envelope and provide significant environmental impact.
Mrs J Evans	Flitton is a very small village with no shops, post office, surgeries etc. Greenfield Road is already suffering from traffic travelling too fast and using it as a rat run to the A6 and Ampthill By-pass. There are no street lights and very narrow pavements. This is a rural road and any increase in housing at this particular spot would increase the dangers for pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders to an unacceptable degree. This area is already suffering from too much housing infill.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J H Stevenson	<p>My house happens to be directly opposite this site and therefore I can vouch for the fact that the site floods, as does my drive-way. However my house is higher than the site opposite, so any development in that field would suffer flooding to a greater degree than I do.</p> <p>A further point is the distressing volume (and speed) of traffic already coming through this village. A development like this will only increase the problem.</p> <p>Flitton &amp; Greenfield do not have adequate services to support further homes. The school is full (there is no parking outside either, so the roads nearby are congested at 9am and 3.30pm), there is barely a bus service rendering all residents unable to get to local amenities unless they have cars.</p>
Mrs L Hemmings	<p>This extra traffic will have a huge impact on an already busy road with speeding problems. This will also infill another green area that people have moved to (including us 17 years ago) and the view and feel of living in the open countryside. It will no longer feel this way as you are then looking over yet another developed area where once there was space, views and no street lighting, house and general lighting and noise. The village does not have a lot of amenities so cars are needed for people to get about and this then clogs roads access to site and house frontage causes more danger on the roads and wear and tear to the village roads, verges and lighting.</p>
Mrs M R Chamberlain	<p>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>
Mrs R Tillett	<p>I think it is inappropriate to increase the size of this village.</p>
Mrs S Gilbertson	<p>A development of this size would change the whole area with no infrastructure to support the development. Would ruin a rural area. No public transport so increased car usage on already unsuitable roads.</p>
Nicholas Thompson (Chairman Parish Council)	<p>This site has been known to flood after heavy rain. It invariably gets very boggy.</p>
Paul Fensome	<p>The existing infrastructure is inadequate for the village without further development adding to the problems. The roads are already overloaded with traffic going to and from the M1 and A6, including many HGVs which are causing damage to roads and property. There are no local services and poor public transport.</p>
R N Arthur	<p>This site is an important break in the ribbon development which has occurred along Greenfield Rd, Flitton and Flitton Rd, Greenfield. to build on this site would have a serious detrimental affect on the character of the village.</p>
S E Bridgeman	<p>This is agricultural land and one of the few green areas in the village. It is good for wildlife. More traffic problems would be created from the additional houses, thus creating more hazards. The existing services, such as they are, would be unable to support the additional housing.</p>
Sally Smith	<p>As a small village it is essential to a small villages essence to retain the still surviving green spaces between villages to preserve our separate identity that we are so proud of - build your houses in towns - we have no further room for more housing</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Sadler	Development would destroy the views across the fields towards Flitton moor and the church and would aggravate the problems already suffered from the layout of a linear village.
Theresa Burnett	<p>This site is one of the last remaining gaps between Flitton and Greenfield and I think it is important to maintain the individuality of these two villages, by not creating a continuous line of houses from one end of Greenfield to the other end of Flitton.</p> <p>Furthermore if any building were to take place on this site it should be restricted to fronting onto the High St only, and not of the snaking backfill type such as on the former Decco site, or at the southern end of Greenfield, as this is out of character with the existing layout of the village. Views back to the village from the moors and surrounding footpaths are spoilt by this sort of overdevelopment.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H096**

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
CR Morey	This proposal would have relatively low impact and as a "back land development" has a small road frontage and therefore low visibility. In particular it is on the same scale and style as other recent developments in the two villages such as Moorland Close and Berberry Drive and therefore the most acceptable of the four proposals for Flitton and Greenfield. An additional factor is that on the slope below Pulloxhill it is naturally well-drained unlike other new schemes such as Moat Farm and the several new developments on the opposite side(east)of the road in Greenfield which are sited on the flood plain of the Flit and have a recent history of flooding.
Mrs C Bass	This is a very small site and as such i think it would be appropriate for housing in this small village
Sally Metianu	Provided the houses are suitable for starter homes, especially for young people from the villages, I consider this development may be appropriate. If houses are overpriced or in other ways unsuitable as starter homes I would not support this development. Note, however, that there are no services very locally available and doctors surgeries are only accessible to those with their own transport.

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
G R Shortland	Suitable for a few houses.
Lynden Thompson	This site is a possibility as not a waterlogged field. Still have problems with traffic through village - but site could not cope with 18 so therefore 10 - 12 only making extra 20 cars.
Mel Bass	There is certainly a need for a small number of affordable new homes in the village, preferably for part ownership or rental through a housing association. Whether this would be the best site I am not certain but the block facing Flitton Road may be sufficient in any event.
Mrs M E Morey	This site would be more in keeping with previous developments in this area e.g. Morland Close where the visual impact from the main road would be minimal. Would not support any facilities but is closer to Flitwick, i.e. walkable .There is scope for a new cycle/footpath to be created to give more direct access to Flitwick. What happened to the footpath from opposite Moat Farm diagonally to Flitwick Moor and Mill? This appears to have vanished under a new gated development. Not very reassuring.
Nicholas Thompson (Chairman Parish Council)	This is a possible site but for far fewer houses than 12- 18. There is a possibility of a new school site between this site and the recreation ground.

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
No name given	Greenfield does not need anymore development there is a development adjacent to my property about to start and we don't want any more, there is no point calling our village because there won't be any green fields left shortly.
Bernard Stack	Site has had previous planning applications turned down. I purchased 30 Flitton Road after consultation with planning team and I am very bemused to see planning for development being sought. The field provides a much needed facility for wildlife, increasing traffic and increased levels of activity on to the already full capacitated water drainage network, this site will rob all local residents of an area which is pleasing that it is satisfying local wildlife to be eradicated for personal gain by owners who do not live in village as stated in previous planning applications and do not care about Flitton/Greenfield communities.
David Sedgley	This site is an important strip of green field (possibly ancient grassland) between villages of Flitton & Greenfield and should never be built on. It is not inside the development envelope. It lies opposite a small group of affordable houses which are about to be built and development of this site would further create a sense of a completely built environment inappropriate in a small village. It is designated as green space in the Parish Green Infrastructure Plan that is currently being developed. Great Crested newts have been seen in adjacent gardens and we believe they may hibernate in this field - possibly breeding in a pond at Centenary Wood - BNHS monitors will shortly be investigating this possibility.
J Abrahams	More housing = more traffic. Greenfield is already suffering from traffic which does not abide by speed limit. Heavy lorries shake our houses from 1am each day. Subsidence will soon be an issue, or some other impact on existing homes. We have few pavements and in some cases e.g. School Lane none at all! it is now dangerous just walking through the village because of the traffic. In addition the infrastructure, particularly drainage is under pressure.
J Regan	Any development will seriously alter the character of the settlement.
Jane Earl	Infill only to preserve the character of the village
Jennifer Dancy	There is no spare capacity in lower and middle school to support this proposal which would presumably mean more young children as the housing suggested is 1/2 or 3-bedroomed. Nor are there local jobs, public transport or any supporting infrastructure which would underpin a development of this size. It is important that the rural buffer zone between the settlements of Flitton and Greenfield is maintained as it provides much of the character already lost by relentless infilling, particularly in Greenfield but in Flitton too. The density of building required does not sit well with the (existing) housing in Holmewood Rd and would affect those villagers amenity in terms of views, overlooking, noise, etc. The proposed development is not sustainable in energy terms as it will result in more car journeys (needed not just for work but access to shops, healthcare facilities, etc.) and will also worsen the existing traffic problems in the Parish.
Jeremy Hart	Flitton is a small village/hamlet surrounded by greenbelt. The facilities and infrastructure are only just able to cope with existing housing. There has already been limited house-building in the villages of Flitton and Greenfield in the last few years. Any large-scale expansion would totally ruin the character of the villages.

Submitted by	Comments
Melvyn Cox	After moving into the property 8 months ago, while i was doing some tidying in the garden i came across an abundance of newts, one of them being the black crested newt along with two other species. I contacted a Mr Sedgley of Mill Lane, Greenfield regarding the discovery who is in charge of Flitwick Moors Conservation Area and has a record of this discussion who informed me that the black crested newt is a protected species under the EU law. I believe they are coming into my garden from the orchard at the back of my property and were still in the area two days ago.
Mr & Mrs Brooks	Too large to be part of village with current infrastructure.
Mr & Mrs Lowe	The change of use has already been refused on appeal. Therefore planning on this site is totally unacceptable to even contemplate. Surely we need to save some of our trees and greenery in Greenfield.
Mrs J H Stevenson	Flitton & Greenfield do not have adequate services to support further homes. The school is full (there is no parking outside either, so the roads nearby are congested at 9am and 3.30pm), there is barely a bus service rendering all residents unable to get to local amenities unless they have cars; thereby increasing the already distressing volume (and speed) of traffic already coming through this village. The Wixams estate is only going to add to our traffic woes, as most sat-navs are programmed to direct Wixams residents through Flitton to get to the M1. This is a small village which is losing all of its character through development. No more new homes here please - we've already had our fair share!
Mrs L Hemmings	Yet another infill site that stretches the road and street lighting facilities and the structure of living in a village. Villages are such where we should have space and land not every piece of land or field or older dwelling to be expanded on.
Mrs S Gilbertson	This is a small site that has supported many forms of wild life, it is at present been torn apart and ruin by the owners in the interest of gaining planning permission. Having been left neglected for 20 years a garden is been developed I believe without planning consent. Many trees have been torn down. This field supports many newts which are a protected species; I have seen many types of butterflies as well as frogs, toads, hedgehogs and mammals. The additional car usage in an area without public transport is unacceptable the access is already dangerous. No village amenities to support this site. Would spoil a small village environment.
Paul Fensome	The existing infrastructure is already inadequate for the village. There is already a proposal for starter homes nearly opposite this site which will satisfy the needs of the village.
Phil Winder	High-density housing of the type proposed would affect the character of the village and further erode the rural landscape. Greenfield has a lower school but almost no other infrastructure to support this development.
R N Arthur	Building on this site would be further building on agricultural land and open spaces in the village.
Sally Smith	Again this seeks to diminish further our green space - as a small village with little green space in and surrounding our villages this is rare commodity and should not be diminished further. Unlikely to be within the current village development limit and therefore against council policy to develop within. Greater pressure on our few amenities.

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Sadler	The trend of purchasing in the village indicates that starter-homes are not suitable owing to lack of amenities; Flitwick and Ampthill tend to be more attractive with good transport routes and easy access to facilities.
Susan Alison Cox	Greenfield is called so for a reason - We moved here because of the outlook - this was also not shown on our search when we purchased this property- the infrastructure would need to be seriously considered - the increased traffic through appalling road conditions,
V Green	The area shown for development could be considered as part "back land" development which would create a precedent for other sites in Greenfield. I would also question whether existing services will be able to meet the needs of this number of houses.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H1 17**

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 Osborne	Site H005 = Flood plain. Site H215 = (1) Will cause traffic congestion on joining the High Street traffic (2) Possible drainage problems. Site H1 17 = Disagree with the development of this site in total.
Gillian Kern	I would prefer to see 1 large development which is contained, has access that filters traffic off Greenfield Road Flitton and High Street Greenfield to the roads in the vicinity (this will balance traffic flow rather than making the gateway to the villages via the main road. I would also prefer a development that brings 106 Planning Gain to the local community to provide the infra-structure that growth will demand. Many small infill developments will not bring any financial and infrastructure gains to Flitton and Greenfield.
Matt Harris	Would help support local lower schools and pubs. Are small shops sustainable in this area?

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
D Mitchell	This site is prone to flooding. With 200 houses the effect on the water shed would need to be carefully considered so as not to affect existing properties lying at lower levels.
Nigel Colclough	I was interested to see that a new school was needed as there are no places available in local schools! Pulloxhill school have at present 51 pupils and figures show that numbers will slowly decline. They have available places for 60 students at present so do have spare places at present. As the school is a small school with mixed year groups the school has the room to be extended to have individual year groups which would benefit the children and also make available places for a further 40 plus children therefore saving the need for a new school to be built for this development.

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 Brown	Inappropriate number of houses proposed relative to the size of the village. Huge increase in traffic on small country roads. Not enough amenities for existing village of Flitton.
Alan Paterson	The scale of development is out of keeping with the village size. Infringing on the Cemetery boundary is unacceptable and will ruin its tranquillity where I have my plot reserved!

Submitted by	Comments
Andy Cusack	There are no local facilities or Transport Links to support a "new" village of this size. I live in Flitton and we do not have sufficient transport facilities now. Not large enough area for a junior school also and no Middle/upper schools in catchment area to take additional children. New villages should be built in areas where they can expand if required, with transport links built too (i.e. Wixams).
Angela Ayres	A development of any size on this site would completely change the character of the village. The number of houses proposed would almost double it, but any would be unnecessary. There is a public footpath across the site which would be affected. Access down Cobbett Lane is impossible as the access is far too narrow.
Ann Austin	This site would greatly alter the character of the village and is totally inappropriate for a small village. Housing estates should never be considered in such an area where there are no facilities or infrastructure to support it. Flitton is a small settlement with a variety of road fronting dwellings with green space between them. This is the essence of the village.
Ann Bridgman	A huge development for such a small village with too much pressure on already stretched local roads. There are better sites available for the school. A large number of children in the school come from outside the village. The present site is adequate for village children.
C.R.Morey	Services are available in Flitwick, however these are currently very much overstretched and are too far away to access without transport. There are no truly local services that can be reached on foot and this development would make no difference beyond increasing the number of car journeys and pressure on parking in local towns. Flitton is a commuter village and the population mostly works in Bedford/Luton/London with resultant pressure on the roads (A6/M1) and demands for parking at Flitwick Station. This development would put substantial extra traffic on an already over-used village high street which is used as a "rat run" from the Flitwick by-pass to the M1 and the surrounding country roads. A development of 250 3-bed houses would bring approx 500 extra cars in daily use if current patterns of use are a guide. Services such as the school/supermarket/doctors would have to be built or expanded as the existing facilities are already at full-stretch. This is creating 1930s style suburbia rather than new communities such as The Wixhams.

Submitted by	Comments
David Douglas	<p>The field is in the Green Belt and designated and used for Agricultural purposes. Witness sheep grazing in January/February 2008 The proposed development is wholly inappropriate for the village of Flitton which is identified as a Small Village in the Core Strategy. This development of 200 houses standing on its own would change the nature of the village by virtually doubling its size. The infrastructure of the village could not support the increase which by its nature will attract families with children. Even if a small shop is built on the site, (the viability would be questionable with more village shops closing than being opened these days which would probably mean an empty property and a place for youngsters to congregate), the vast majority of the household shopping will entail car journeys to local towns. As there is little or no employment in Flitton, this will be coupled with the need for commuting to and from work either to Flitwick station or even longer distances. With no bus service in the village capable of delivering the flexibility that would be required, additional car journeys will be inevitable. There is no doctor or dentist in the village, more car journeys necessary. The roads in the village are barely able to cope with the traffic now (and suffer from speeding motorist) as they are narrow and with on street parking, problems are already caused in peak times. The junior school in the village is over subscribed. There is no middle or senior school. Therefore families coming to the development will also need to provide transport to schools outside the village. If a school were to built in the village there would be more vehicles bringing children to the school and this would be make for even worse traffic congestion than there is now at the start and end of the school day. I am not aware of any plans that indicate Local Authorities wish to build new schools or budgets being available to do so. It is apparent that apart from this being an inappropriate application for Flitton based on its status as a Small Village that the damage caused by all the issues listed above to the Carbon Footprint would be enormous. There are very limited facilities for children in the village now and the increase in population created by this development would have the potential to cause problems with teenagers which are apparent in other local towns and villages. When coupled with H219, which is effectively a linked site, it is even more inappropriate and damaging and would be contributing 250 houses i.e. over 50% of the 400 requirement in the County.</p>
David Nutkins	<p>As this site is in Flitton which has minimal public transport links and no shops, hotels, post office etc, its residents would inevitably be dependent on private cars and the proposed size of development is completely out of scale with the idea of a "small" village.</p>
David Sedgley	<p>This site is an important large green field with views that are appreciated by the local population and should never be built on. It provides a large open space between Flitton &amp; Wardheges. It is not inside the development envelope. It is designated as green space in the Parish Green Infrastructure Plan that is currently being developed. The size of development proposed is totally inappropriate for a small village. There is a proposed site for a future school on county council land opposite.</p>
Deborah Lawson	<p>This is far too large scale development for a small rural village</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Dr. M. D. Stephenson	The Land is not suitable for development as there are absolutely no facilities in Flitton with virtually no public transport and no shops doctors or schools anywhere near. This is a ludicrous suggestion to even think about putting this number of houses where there is no infrastructure to support it.
Duncan Lloyd	It would be entirely inappropriate for this site in Flitton to contribute 200 houses to a total requirement of 400. The land itself is designated Greenbelt and has significant wildlife inhabitants including foxes, birds as well as being used most years for sheep grazing and Hay production. The current local infrastructure barely supports the current small village and any additional developments should be very small and unobtrusive to the local environment. Over the last decade the villages of Flitton/Greenfield/Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock and further development would destroy the village environment. There are many more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place and therefore would be more suitable and benefit from additional investment in infrastructure and amenities.
G R Shortland	Small village location. Good farm land. Bad impact to local area.
J Abrahams	200 dwellings - you cant be serious! This major development would change the village irrevocably. We already have problems with traffic, speeding, lack of pavements, drainage and flooding. Please do not give the permission for this major development to go ahead.
Jacqueline Baron	This site is totally unsuitable for the number of houses proposed. There are no facilities this is a huge piece of green land that makes our village in the countryside. Why can't you keep your hands off it? Flitton will not be a village any more it will be a town. We have enough towns, we chose to live in a village and you have no right to change it.
Jane Earl	This is greenbelt land, used for farming supporting livestock and the production of fodder. It would significantly effect the local environment. The land is a higher level than adjoining properties and any development would dominate the landscape. There is no shop, Post Office and a very infrequent bus which does not service the village at times for those working. There is unlikely to be sufficient local employment and most occupants would work in London, Luton and Bedford - not contributing to the local community at all. This development would ruin the view of the existing property. It will not be a village if this occurs.
John Boylen	Flitton is a very small village; the proposal of over 200 houses would double the size. Flitton does not have the infrastructure or the amenities. The government wants people not to use cars; if this proposal goes ahead it could possibly increase the cars by between 500-1000. This proposal would impact the whole area and would go against all government guidelines. I strongly OBJECT
John Burnett	This number of houses will completely overwhelm the small village in which we live. We have moved to this type of village because it is surrounded by greenery and open fields. At the moment Flitton is separated from neighbouring villages by open space. This proposal would change these aspects for the worse. We would lose our identity which is an integral part of our village life. Litton would no longer be a small village where we know everyone

Submitted by	Comments
Julian Sparey	Provision of this scale would double the size of the village, requiring a massive increase in infrastructure of utilities for power water and sewage which would be an engineering nightmare. The land is at the highest point in the area and all houses would over look existing properties, it would be highly visible for miles around and destroy the character and nature of the village.
Laura-Jane Sullivan	This is a huge piece of land. Is this greenbelt? It will have catastrophic effects on local residents, noise and traffic. There are no amenities in the village, or public transport to support building of this size.
Lesley Owens	The proposal for 200 homes is completely unrealistic as the infrastructure would not cope, it is a quiet village and building on this scale would not be appropriate.
Lynden Thompson	Site totally unsuitable - problems already with drainage coming down from Pulloxhill roads causing water logged field at lower end and full drainage ditch causing flooding in the village. Not suitable to take lots of traffic. 200+ houses potential for 400+ cars! No shops in village and talk of stopping only bus! People in the village must have at least one car.
M G Brown	1) Development out of all proportion to size of village. 2) Projected school is at end of Flitton & Greenfield, not "between" the two villages. 3) Would overburden local roads - no local employment. 4) Site is prone to water logging. Cancellation of car boot sales after one attempt - building on this scale would increase flood risk to Flitton High Street/Berberry Drive properties.
Marcus Stott	Building of 200 houses on this site is totally unacceptable. The area already suffers from high volume traffic travelling at dangerous speeds and the roads are simply not fit for the heavy load traffic and volume of traffic passing through. Increasing the households of a small village so dramatically can only have a detrimental affect on roads, facilities and resources in the village. Furthermore, the area is agricultural land and is in keeping with the ambience of the green village environment. Development has already taken place in recent years in the immediate vicinity and the request for further development on such a scale is disgraceful. I support small developments of 10 houses or so in keeping with the community, but oppose large scale developments like this.
Martin Ayres	A development of the size proposed would double the population of Flitton (excluding Greenfield) and would destroy the character of the village.
Matthew Liddle	The proposal is completely contrary to the small village core strategy and completely inappropriate for a rural setting (adjoining a conservation area) with no local amenities and infrastructure.

Submitted by	Comments
Mel Bass	<p>Flitton, as a small village with no remaining services to speak of, would be a most unsuitable venue for a development on this scale. The village has suffered over several years from the excesses of egregious developers, while meagre services have dwindled and disappeared. No shop, post office or retail business would be likely to survive in the medium to long term, and would potentially threaten the viability of established businesses in Silsoe for the provision of postal, newspaper and occasional local provisions. Such a proposal would surely run counter to government policy for concentration of services into multi-disciplinary centres. For example, in healthcare, into Health Centres accommodating several doctors, nurses, etc. This only makes sense if the areas of population growth are close to those service centres and not four, five, six miles distant - where each use of need for a doctor (and every other service) necessitates a lengthy round trip by car. A need has been identified for a replacement for Greenfield Lower School. But this would be a particularly unsuitable site for that purpose from traffic and transport viewpoints. The surrounding roads suffer heavy commuter and commercial traffic and the junction of Sand and Silsoe roads are increasingly becoming scenes of minor accidents. Certainly, the site could not provide safe pupil access on foot or by cycle. All pupil access would necessarily be by car or dedicated bus, adding further to road traffic congestion at peak times. From an environmental viewpoint, the site is important. Not so much for its intrinsic value as because of the negative impact its covering with concrete and tarmac would have. It is bounded by houses in Wardhedges Road, Burbery Close, High Street and Sand Road. Taken together, that mass of houses would be dense by any standard, but totally out of keeping with its position outside of the development envelope in a small village.</p>
Michael Pullen	Insufficient infrastructure to support this scale of development.
Mr & Mrs Brooks	Too large to be part of village with current infrastructure.
Mr & Mrs Lowe	The local school is full. There is no local transport and no shops or post offices in the area to cope with extra housing. The roads are already congested.
Mr & Mrs Phillips	To develop such a large area within a small village environment would lead to the loss of the village identity and the potential to the grouping of the other villages around into a small town type area.
Mr and Mrs J. Clive Walton	Flash flooding is already a risk due to surrounding higher fields draining into the stream. The village has been flooded in the past. Concrete replacing fields which currently soak up water would increase the flow of excess water with the likelihood of creating floods. With narrow country roads any significant increase in traffic increases danger and pollution. A large development of this nature would ruin a country village and surrounding countryside.
Mr Ferrari	I strongly feel that the local villages are bursting at the moment with new housing being put up all the time. I have children at the existing local school which is already full and certainly a village the size of Flitton cannot cope with an additional number of new homes, there is simply not the infrastructure.
Mr V Emery	Although it is a small village there is already a steady flow of through traffic. Further development here would completely spoil the village environment. Experience over the years has indicated that services are chosen outside the village resulting in closure of post offices and shops.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr. & Mrs. P. J. Wood	Any development on this site will result in loss of open space and seriously change the nature and character of the village of Flitton. The whole environment will be seriously damaged and will literally urbanise the area. This site is prone to frequent flooding and any building will exacerbate this problem.
Mr. A. Marshall	A new school on part of this site would be ideal. As for more house building I must say no. There are no shops, doctors, or public services within 3 miles distance. Very little public transport. Road traffic is already heavy on our narrow roads.
Mrs C Bass	Site 117 in Flitton a small village is totally out of keeping with this village. Nowhere is there a block of 200 houses in Flitton. There are no shops, no post office, and no facilities for this amount of housing. Doctor's surgeries in Ampthill and Flitwick are bursting to the seams, having to wait 3 weeks to see a doctor. This site should never have been put forward.
Mrs C Stuart	Flitton is a small village which already has traffic problems as motorists use it as a cut through. This causes noise and pollution through a conservation area - the village needs traffic calming measures not more traffic.
Mrs Christine Ward	Field in Sand Rd is the last open space between Flitton and Ward Hedges. Large developments on edge of villages will cause them to merge, lose identity and divide loyalties. Continuing policy of infilling is more workable. Everyone in area has to travel by car, more homes mean more cars involving longer daily queues towards and on M1 and A6. A new first school will not be needed when the 2 tier system is adopted.
Mrs Claire Zapiec	Once green land has been given over to development it cannot be returned. The scale and location of this site totally swamps the small village of Flitton. This development would have a shattering environmental effect on Flitton & Wardhedges, expanding the settlement envelope & destroying the character of the village.
Mrs J H Stevenson	Flitton & Greenfield do not have adequate services to support further homes. The school is full (there is no parking outside either, so the roads nearby are congested at 9am and 3.30pm), there is barely a bus service rendering all residents unable to get to local amenities unless they have cars; thereby increasing the already distressing volume (and speed) of traffic already coming through this village. The Wixams estate is only going to add to our traffic woes, as most sat-navs are programmed to direct Wixams residents through Flitton to get to the M1. This is a small village which is losing all of its character through development. No more new homes here please - we've already had our fair share!
Mrs J Pegram	This is greenbelt land for wildlife eg deer foxes and birds. Sheep graze here and hay is produced. If built on it could cause flooding to existing properties as there will be no soil to soak up the water. The infrastructure cannot sustain any more housing. In Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges we have already contributed significantly to local housing stock in the last 20 years.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs L Hemmings	How can we possibly support a huge housing estate along with school and road structure, this development is for a town not a village. We no longer exist as a village if this is developed. The outlook for a lot of houses nearby will be completely ruined along with fields, hedgerows, and wildlife. We do not wish our resources to be stretched and our village developed into a town, the roads will be impassable at times and the noise and pollution factor is almost immeasurable. The wear and tear of our already poor infrastructure will be dreadful. Most of our facilities and infrastructure make us a village, not a village with a huge development thrown up, where would the village be then???
Mrs M E Morey	The site is too dominant and would overpower the delightful conservation area. The rural atmosphere would be spoiled, why do this? The houses would generate 500 cars plus, which would impinge on the already overloaded roads which are used as a rat run for the motorway. Residents would be too far away from facilities and would need to use their cars. A development of this size would require massive new infrastructure i.e. sewers, water access roads.
Mrs R Tillett	This development would have a significant affect on the character of the village.
Mrs Theresa Cusack	From your shading you seem to have filled in the existing village cemetery with new houses!!! Flitton has very few local services at all, not even street lights on the main road which is hugely dangerous at night.
Mrs. G. R. Stephenson	My reasons for objecting to this proposed site are as follows: (a) There are no facilities in the village to serve large scale developments i.e. no shops, schools, doctors, frequent bus service etc. (b) The estate agents describe Flitton as "a much sought after village" because it is quiet and peaceful. If large developments are allowed to be built it will no longer be an attractive place to reside and yet another historical rural village will be destroyed. (c) Currently we enjoy the company of woodpeckers, foxes, squirrels, owls and, in the summer over the field submitted for development, skylarks. All this wildlife will be lost if this development is allowed to proceed. (d) At night we can look up and observe the stars and planets because we have little light pollution i.e. no street lighting in Flitton. If we have some 250 houses built in close proximity to our gardens we will no longer be able to enjoy the benefits of our rural environment. (e) I doubt whether any of our present services such as water supply, sewerage, electricity, gas piping etc. are adequate to cope with so many new homes without major investment by these industries. (f) We already have a traffic problem through the village with very large lorries using it as a short cut to the bypass and speeding motorists creating a rat-run. The prospect of some possible 900 extra village residents using the access routes will create major and possibly fatal traffic hazards.
Nicholas Thompson (Chairman Parish Council)	This is the most appalling site in every way. For a small village with no facilities this application is totally inappropriate. Even if it was vastly scaled down it would be inappropriate. Not at all suitable as a possible for new school or shops. Traffic speeds down this road. Flooding potential for some houses in Wardhedges Rd & Burberry Drive
Patsy Kean	This would destroy the character of the village, more than doubling its size.
Peter Lawson	A development of this size would swamp the village and change its character completely.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Phil Winder	A large development would completely change the character of the village, create traffic problems and severely impact the local environment.
Philip Horan	The proposed site crosses a RoW and is close to a conservation area. Local schools (Lower/Middle) would not support proposed growth. The existing road infrastructure is inadequate and would not support increased volume of traffic the proposal would generate. Flitton is classed as a small village / Hamlet and all efforts should be made to ensure this status is preserved. If approved the proposal would harm the soul of the village.
R N Arthur	The development of a site this size would alter the entire character of Flitton, a historic village much of which is in a conservation area, by effectively urbanising the village. There is no need for this level of housing in Flitton - Flitton provides minimal employment, has few facilities and poor public transport. If developed this would significantly increase car usage in the area.
S E Bridgeman	The development would not empathise with the general character of the village, which is mainly lineal. At present the local school is already taking in children from outside the village which puts more pressure on an already fragile infrastructure of road transport. It is even questionable whether a new school is required. Also, this is currently open farmland.
Sallie Phillips	The development will blur the boundaries between Flitton and Ward Hedges, as we are currently already seeing between Flitton and Greenfield. There is further capacity for Lower School education at Pulloxhill Lower School, which is undersubscribed. A few children being driven from new developments would be preferable to all children from Pulloxhill and Greenfield having to be driven to a new site further away. However, the villages would benefit from a local shop, post office or cafe.
Sally Metianu	A development of this size is completely unsuitable for a small village. Through traffic is already a problem, and these small roads could not support a large development. 200 houses would almost certainly mean 400 vehicles, as there is virtually no public transport.
Sally Smith	This large chunk of land if developed would probably change a small village into a large village at which point we may as well wave goodbye to Flitton and Greenfield as we know it. The field is a rolling hill and is one of the highest points that can be seen from many parts of the both Greenfield and Flitton - if developed instead of a rolling hill with livestock on it, it would be covered in ugly new houses - may as well live in a town - may as well move to a different county. Not in the village development limit and therefore contravenes council policy to develop. I do ask myself if Mid beds council are trying to ruin mid beds - are you? These consultations that seek to develop our village are endless and ongoing - are you trying to achieve a point when you have worn out the village response - objector fatigue - what it seems like.

Submitted by	Comments
Simon Sadler	The offer of shopping facilities at that end of the village does not take into account the impact on the already struggling businesses in Silsoe and Pulloxhill, and it would still be more convenient for Greenfield people to go to Flitwick. As a governor of Greenfield School, I know that the site is not being considered for a new school. The character of the village would be completely changed by a development of this size, especially where there is no infrastructure at present; indeed the current problems of having a high 5age of London commuters would be exacerbated.
Theresa Burnett	Flitton is a small village and a development of this size would totally destroy the nature and character of the village, changing it irreparably and beyond recognition. There would be no services and very limited transport available to support this increase in population, and any new shops or schools built on the site would just add to the congestion. If this site were chosen, you might as well bulldoze the whole village and start again. We need to preserve the diversity of our towns and villages, not turn them all into large housing estates.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H219**

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 Osborne	Site H005 = Flood plain Site H215 = (1) Will cause traffic congestion on joining the High Street traffic (2) Possible drainage problems. Site H117 = Disagree with the development of this site in total.
Warmingtons	Little development has in the past been allowed in smaller villages, and that development which has occurred has generally been of executive housing. This has not allowed younger members of families currently resident in the village to remain within their own village once becoming independent, often leading to them migrating away to other settlements. There is a need for limited expansion of villages and to allow for a fair mix of housing to encourage those with existing connections to remain within the area. Current affordable housing policies do not necessarily address this need. The development would present a natural rounding off of the central core of the village.

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. R. Morey	Services are available in Flitwick, however these are currently very much overstretched and are too far away to access without transport. There are no truly local services that can be reached on foot and this development would make no difference beyond increasing the number of car journeys and pressure on parking in local towns. Flitton is a commuter village and the population mostly works in Bedford/Luton/London with resultant demands for parking at Flitwick Station. This development would put considerable extra traffic on an already over-used village high street which is used as a "rat run" from the Flitwick by-pass to the M1. 50 3-bed houses would bring approx 100 extra cars in daily use if current patterns of use are a guide.
Gillian Kern	I would prefer to see 1 large development which is contained, has access that filters traffic off Greenfield Road Flitton and High Street Greenfield to the roads in the vicinity (this will balance traffic flow rather than making the gateway to the villages via the main road. I would also prefer a development that brings 106 Planning Gain to the local community to provide the infra-structure that growth will demand. Many small infill developments will not bring any financial and infrastructure gains to Flitton and Greenfield.

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
Angela Ayres	This site is one of the highest points in the village, and any change of use would result in very unsightly buildings which would severely damage the environmental aspect of the village. There is no need whatsoever for this development in Flitton.
Ann Bridgman	This development is far too large for a small village. It is on farmland behind the present houses and is back filling-not in filling. Access to the main roads would create a serious traffic hazard.
David Douglas	The proposed development is inappropriate for Flitton which is designated a Small Village in the Core Strategy. A new housing estate of 50 units does not fit with this strategy and would dramatically change the character of the village. The development is proposed for land that is in the Green Belt and used for agricultural purposes with sheep grazing on it or during January and February this year. It cannot possibly be considered as infill in small spaces on existing residential streets. This application would provide 50 of the counties requirement of 400 homes in a village that has been in filled over a number of years. It is obvious that the development by its nature will attract families with children of all ages. The village cannot sustain a development of this size. There is no employment, shop, doctor or dentist in the village, the village school, which only caters for juniors, is oversubscribed. There is no reliable and frequent bus service and therefore all school trips out of the village, commuting to Flitwick station and beyond, household shopping etc will require additional vehicular movements causing great damage to the environment and the Carbon Footprint. As the roads in the village are narrow and have cars parked on them, a good deal of extra congestion at peak times can be anticipated. When coupled with application H117, which is a linked site, the development would provide 250 houses, more than doubling the size of the village.
David Nutkins	As this site is in Flitton which has minimal public transport links and no shops, hotels, post office etc, its residents would inevitably be dependent on private cars and the proposed size of development is out of scale with the idea of a "small" village. Additionally the access to the site off the high street would significantly add to the turning traffic on a road without proper pavements
David Sedgley	This site is an important area of green field with views from a Right of Way that are appreciated by the local population and should not be built on. It is outside the development envelope. It is designated as green space in the Parish Green Infrastructure Plan that is currently being developed.
Deborah Lawson	A development of this scale is out of proportion to the village size and would be totally out of character to the rural small village feel of Flitton.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Duncan Lloyd	It would be entirely inappropriate for this site in Flitton to contribute 50 houses to a total requirement of 400. The land itself is designated Greenbelt and has significant wildlife inhabitants including foxes and birds as well as being used most years for sheep grazing production and a working farm. The current local infrastructure barely supports the current small village and any additional developments should be very small and unobtrusive to the local environment. Over the last decade the villages of Flitton/Greenfield/Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock and further development would destroy the village environment. There are many more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place and therefore would be more suitable and benefit from additional investment in infrastructure and amenities.
G R Shortland	Small village. Good farm land. Bad impact to rural area.
J Abrahams	50 dwellings on this small piece of land. Please consider the existing problems with traffic, drainage, speeding and lack of pavements.
Jane Earl	This is greenbelt land, used for farming supporting livestock and the production of fodder. It would significantly effect the local environment. The land is a higher level than adjoining properties and any development would dominate the landscape. The access is poor. Access is a hazard, particularly morning and evening. High St is very busy at peak times. Vehicles turning into the Road would be at risk and would be noisy for residents. The traffic has to be stopped to allow large vehicles out of the current entrance. There is no shop, Post Office and a very infrequent bus which does not service the village at times for those working. There is unlikely to be sufficient local employment and most occupants would work in London, Luton and Bedford - not contributing to the local community at all. A feature of the proposed building is said to be the views. This development would ruin the view of the existing property. It will not be a village if this occurs.
John Burnett	A development of this type would completely destroy the character of the village. If this proposal goes ahead, you may as well pull the historic centre of the village down and start again. The proposal would add to congestion within a dangerous part of the village road system.
Lynden Thompson	Site totally unsuitable - transport in village virtually non-existent. Bad drainage facilities in Flitton - already floods opposite site. Narrow village road cannot take any more traffic. Conservation area!
M G Brown	50 houses out of proportion to size of village. No local employment - more traffic, more pollution. No local facilities (except school - traffic to school would be increased - already a problem).
Marcus Stott	Building of 50 houses on this site is totally unacceptable. The area already suffers from high volume traffic travelling at dangerous speeds and the roads are simply not fit for the heavy load traffic and volume of traffic passing through. Increasing the households of a small village so dramatically can only have a detrimental affect on roads, facilities and resources in the village. Development has already taken place in recent years in the immediate vicinity and the request for further development on such a scale is disgraceful. I support small developments of 10 houses or so in keeping with the community, but oppose large scale developments like this.
Martin Ayres	The proposal is out of scale with the historic centre of the village. The new road junction in the High Street could be dangerous for motorists and pedestrians.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Matthew Liddle	The proposal is completely contrary to the small village core strategy and completely inappropriate for a rural setting (adjoining a conservation area) with no local amenities or infrastructure. Any further development in the vicinity would create significant problems for existing services and facilities.
Mr & Mrs Brooks	Too large to be part of village with current infrastructure.
Mr & Mrs Lowe	This site is totally unsuitable for development. There is no transport in the village. There will be drainage and flooding problems to the houses below the field. Also the new access onto an already busy village road does not bear thinking about. The houses in Burberry Drive will get flooded.
Mr Arthur Marshall	We are a small village with no public services. Our small school is full to capacity. We have one small public house. Shops and doctors are three miles distance away, public transport is very limited. A whole new sewage system would have to be put in as our present system has a job to cope now with the extra flow from the new houses that have been built over the past few years.
Mr V Emery	The village is too small to accommodate further traffic and the inclusion of more houses in this limited area would completely spoil the central village environment.
Mr. & Mrs. P. J. Wood	Any development on this site will change the character of the small village of Flitton. The environment will be damaged and there will be a serious loss of open space. This is a very busy road and problems with extra traffic will cause access problems.
Mrs C Bass	I believe this site is considered for 50 houses. This is a small village and this amount of houses in one block is totally out of keeping with this small village, that has no shops, no post office. All new houses here require families to drive everywhere. Should never have been accepted for consideration.
Mrs Claire Zapiec	As a small rural village Flitton has already experienced significant infill development, providing extra housing, cars, traffic, pollution and environmental impact. This development further expands the settlement envelope and blurs Flitton borders further.
Mrs J H Stevenson	Flitton & Greenfield do not have adequate services to support further homes. The school is full (there is no parking outside either, so the roads nearby are congested at 9am and 3.30pm), there is barely a bus service rendering all residents unable to get to local amenities unless they have cars; thereby increasing the already distressing volume (and speed) of traffic already coming through this village. The Wixams estate is only going to add to our traffic woes, as most sat-navs are programmed to direct Wixams residents through Flitton to get to the M1. This is a small village which is losing all of its character through development. No more new homes here please - we've already had our fair share!

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J Pegram	Developing this land would bring great risks to surrounding properties of flooding, due to lack of soil for the water to drain away. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the additional drainage. Also the current infrastructure barley supports the current small village. Flitton Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past years so further development would only destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered as they would not need additional investment.
Mrs L Hemmings	The village does not want and cannot support a large development we are a village not a would-be town. We do not have and do not want lots of facilities this makes us a village
Mrs M E Morey	Too large a development within a small rural village. Very dominant adjacent to a conservation area. Would generate too much traffic in this fragile environment. The high street is too narrow and cannot be widened.
Mrs S P Brooks	We moved to 50 High Street Flitton nearly 4 years ago because it was like stepping back in time, a beautiful village and lovely peaceful countryside, we checked in case building was likely behind our house and was told it was unlikely the farmer would get building permission to build so we felt safe that our house would not be ruined by further building. If this goes ahead our village will be ruined.
Nicholas Thompson (Chairman Parish Council)	This site is on an extremely steep slope and major renovation work would be needed. It is totally inappropriate for many reasons - There is a ditch between this site and some houses in Wardhedges Road which would undoubtedly cause flooding. We are a small village with no facilities so any housing must be infill only. The majority of this site is green field (not brown field) and it also abuts a conservation area.
Patsy Kean	This would alter the character of the village. There are few amenities to support the extra population. It would impinge on the green field sites close to the river and moor.
Paul Fensome	Totally unsuitable development proposal for the village. It will swamp the existing area, add excessively to the traffic movements on an unsuitable road, and have a detrimental effect on the countryside and local environment. If this proposal is accepted it will lead to the acceptance of the adjacent site reference H117 (Land at Sand Road, Flitton) and create a massive overload on the area, and lead to even more pressure for development to the East of the site.
Peter Brooks	Any development of this site would totally ruin the village.
Peter Lawson	A development of this size would overwhelm the village and change its character in an adverse manner
R N Arthur	Flitton is a village much of which is in a conservation area. See also my comments on the proposed development at Sand Rd Flitton which also apply here.
S E Bridgeman	Flitton High Street is one of the major features of the village which is mainly lineal. Thos proposed development is backfilling on agricultural land. It would adversely affect the character of the village and greatly increase the traffic flow, which is already considerable through this part of the village. Also it appears to ignore the guidelines as set out in Mid Beds Design Guide for residential areas 2005 section 5, study 4.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Sally Metianu	Local traffic congestion along this road is already a problem. Further housing would put enormous pressure on roads, drainage, and all other local facilities. As public transport is virtually non-existent and local services and infrastructure at present barely support a small village, facilities would be overstretched by a development of this size.
Sally Smith	Outside of the village development limit and therefore contravenes council rules. Would bring traffic into one of the most dangerous corners of the village at the bottom of Flitton Hill, again is part of the same lovely rolling hill as the land at Sand Road (H1 17) and therefore as a high point of the village, housing on it would dominate the landscape and the vista and completely detract from a small village feeling. Road infrastructure could not handle the increased traffic. Brown sites in towns should be used to find room of development of the size you are seeking - not small villages - we are one of the few left - you should be protecting us not seeking to develop.
Simon Sadler	The current infrastructure would be unable to sustain a development of this size and the problems of having an increasing number of London commuters would get worse.
Theresa Burnett	This would be an oversized development within the scale of the village. It would also significantly alter the linear nature of the village. Council should aim to provide the necessary housing without the need to alter the character and nature of existing villages, so a small village shouldn't become a large village, and so on. It is important for all the Mid Beds residents that diversity of settlements is preserved, so that we can all chose what sort of environment we want to live in, or visit in our leisure time. Increasing the population in Flitton to this extent is only going to have a detrimental effect on the environment, in terms of traffic, pollution and pressure on services in neighbouring towns.

**Ref Number: H342**

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
Mrs Christine Ward	Everybody living in potential new homes in the area will have to use a car in to order to access basic facilities such as work, shops, doctors surgeries etc. This will increase traffic through villages and current congestion on M1 & A6

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
Mr John Pegram	Flitton and the surrounding villages are already experiencing increased traffic flow. Thirty more dwellings would obviously increase this further. The infrastructures of the roads around these villages were not and are not designed to take heavy traffic flow. More housing would also cause further impact on the diminishing wild life within the village areas. In developing this land it would bring greater risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment. We therefore request this application to be denied.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Marcus Stott	Wardhedges is identified in the Core Strategy as a Countryside Settlement and Flitton as a small village. Small villages should not be considered for development unless there is an exceptional need. There is no exceptional need for development in this area and important countryside gaps, such as this site, cannot be allocated for development without having a significant detrimental impact on the local environment and infrastructure. Traffic congestion is already a major problem in the area and significant increases in dwellings, such as these proposed, will only increase this problem. Investment would have to be considered in not only improving the local roads but also public transport, doctors, dentists, lower schools, post office - all of which the area already suffers from a lack of resources. Furthermore, the current market situation for new house building, may result in the site having "half built" houses, or being abandoned for a number of years until the market picks up again. This could lead to health and safety issues, detrimental impact environmentally and the possibility of illegal use as a temporary residential site. The large site in Silsoe appears to have suffered the same fate of a half developed building site for the last 12 months which is quite frankly an eyesore. Maybe the council should consider forcing building developers to complete development sites in a given timeframe?
Mr Melvyn Bass	The site is close to the flood plain of the river Flit and at the base of the hill which descends from Pulloxhill. For those reasons it is not actively farmed. It is situated at the junctions of High Street, Sand Road and Greenfield Road, each of which carries heavy goods vehicles en route to and from the Pulloxhill Business Park. Speeding traffic is also a problem in the area and there are no calming measures in situ at this point. It is therefore completely unsuitable for housing development in my opinion even if the village were in desperate need for more houses at this point, which it is not.
Mr Michael Brown	A development of this size will only exacerbate the traffic flow through Flitton, as the village has no facilities apart from the Church and the pub (whose existence is precarious). This site is too close to the junction of Sand Road and Greenfield Road for the scale of development proposed.
Mr Nicholas Thompson	Flitton is a small village with no shops, no doctors, very few buses and, in fact, very few facilities at all other than a lower school and a church. A car is essential to reach all other facilities. This site is one of only 2 sites within the village with a view over Flitton Moor. It is therefore an essential open space and any development on this site would be detrimental to the village environment and character. This site is also prone to flooding.
Mr Roy Neil Arthur	This is one of the few remaining open areas on the main road through Flitton and Greenfield. To build here has no merit in terms of the general building criteria in a small village and would be to the detriment of the ambiance of the village.
Mr Simon Sadler	There are no local services nor infrastructure planned with any development in mind.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Deborah Lawson	The site is central to the village and has been identified in the Green Infrastructure Plan as a potential village green, open community space and a pleasant alternative to residential. These plans would scupper any potential to turn this area into a village heart. The traffic created in this busy area, opp. Sand Road and where the pavements are already narrow and on opposite sides of the road, necessitating crossing here, would add to congestion and mix up pedestrians and vehicles. This is something which the Parish Plan is seeking to avoid by improving pedestrian access, not making it worse.
Mrs Elizabeth Patterson	Site will be on a busy road where although in a 30mph limit, according to the interactive signs, traffic does not appear to keep to this limit. It is also opposite a junction where there is the potential for accidents to occur. The village is rapidly becoming a small town without the benefit of facilities to go with all the developments occurring.
Mrs Jacqueline Baron	There is already too much traffic travelling along this road and this will only add to this. The traffic travels too fast and is a danger, there are large lorries travelling through this village .There are no places in the lower or middle schools for any children. There is no bus service. There are no shops. I strongly object to green fields being used for housing. Residents of the village moved there for the space and countryside this will be ruined. The village has already had several new estates built and new houses in-between existing. This has to stop now. The value of our property will seriously decline. Are you offering compensation for that? the owner claims the land is redundant that is not true it is being used for livestock. Is this just a money making exercise for him? While he makes money we lose money but more importantly our life style of coming home to a little bit of country and open space.
Mrs Jennifer Dancy	The accessibility info for the proposed site shows a walk of over 30mins to the closest GP- what it doesn't say is that the footpaths are mostly too narrow for pushchairs and are often on only one side of the road. Flitton has no local shops or Post office and the lower school in Greenfield is full. Clearly, yet more house building will result in even greater traffic problems for our small, rural community-destroying the only real amenity we possess, our peaceful, countryside surroundings and rural, small village status. There is no exceptional need for this development. Please stop consulting and instead listen to the community. The community has worked together to produce a Parish Plan and a Green Infrastructure Plan. These clearly show the community's desire to protect the parish's remaining green space and their frustration with the problems associated with development, eg traffic, lack of community facilities and inadequate public transport to name a few. Where are the local jobs being created to make this scale of development consistent with the Councils stated aim of reducing out-commuting? This proposal is not sustainable and should be rejected.
Mrs Jillian Regan	More housing at this site will make worse an already unrelenting stream of traffic through the village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Joy Pegram	Flitton and the surrounding villages are already experiencing increased traffic flow. Thirty more dwellings would obviously increase this further. The infrastructures of the roads around the village were not and are not designed to take heavy traffic flow. More housing would also cause further impact on the diminishing wild life within the village areas. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses surrounding. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment. We therefore request this application to be denied.
Mrs Laura-Jane Sullivan	This is in a small village that is already over-developed. The roads are terrible, the school full, no shops, doctors etc exist and the village already floods regularly. It is a shame our farmers are being encouraged by this government to give up a British trade for money.
Mrs Lynden Thompson	Flitton is only a small village, the only facility being a public house. The lower school is a 20 minute walk away along a busy road at rush hour times and therefore unsuitable to walk children to and from school and nursery. This land overlooks Flitton Moor "a site of special interest" which floods from waters of the Flit and flood waters running down from clay soils in Pulloxhill. Residents opposite the site regularly have their gardens flooded after heavy rain.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Arthur Marshall	No infrastructure and local amenities to cope with all this development.
Mrs Margaret Lowe	This site would greatly increase the traffic through an already very busy village with speeding problems. It would impact greatly on the countryside. The local school is full. No post office, in fact the only local amenity is a small village hall. It could also affect the floodplain as it is adjacent to Flitwick Moor.

**Ref Number: H355**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr David Russell	Please see document in Appendix Three

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
Mr Arthur Marshall	No local infrastructure and local amenities to cope with all this new housing.
Mr John Pegram	The Planning Inspectorate report dated 9th December 1998 regarding the planning application for our present property, states by the Inspector Mr H Rose, clearly the importance of preserving the gap between the two villages of Flitton and Wardhedges. Clearly this new application for 41 dwellings impinges on this open land. Wardhedges and the surrounding villages are already experiencing increased traffic flow. Forty-one more dwellings would obviously increase this further. The infrastructures of the roads around these villages were not and are not designed to take heavy traffic flow. More housing would also cause further impact on the diminishing wild life within the village areas. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. This field already floods with the excess water from the drainage ditch at the rear of our property. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses surrounding. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment. We therefore request this application to be denied.
Mr Michael Brown	This development would double the size of Wardhedges and would absorb the buffer zone between Flitton and Wardhedges. The area has few facilities, so any such development would significantly increase the traffic through Flitton and Silsoe.
Mr Neil Newton	Local infrastructure will not support increased housing and existing building in the area is already high
Mr Simon Sadler	I understood that there was a policy of distinguishing between separate communities which this development runs against.
Mrs Jillian Regan	Traffic problems within the village (volume, speed etc) will be made significantly worse by this development.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Robert Hodgson	The current site designation of "***IMPORTANT*** COUNTRYSIDE GAP", should surely suggest that this land would not be built on. The current countryside plan clearly states that the current border between Wardhedges and Flitton should not be closed anymore. There was recently a proposal to site Travellers in this area. I protested against that development for the same reason as I am now. The travellers proposal was removed as it was not appropriate. If traditional housing is built at a site that was not suitable for Travellers, then you are going to have to explain to me how that is not racist.
Mr Roy Neil Arthur	It has always been agreed in the past that the village of Flitton and the hamlet of Wardhedges should be kept separate and this development would join the two communities and should therefore not be permitted. In addition it meets none of the other criteria for development in a small village
Mrs Christine Ward	Everyone living in a new home in the village will inevitably need a car in order access basic facilities such as shops, doctors surgeries, work etc. The villages are already being used as a rat run towards the M1 and A6. Roads leading towards Major roads are already congested in rush hour periods. It is a pity to join small villages by building on only open land in between; this will cause them to lose their unique identities.
Mrs Deborah Lawson	This site is too large in relation to the small village classification and would increase the population without adding any of the necessary infrastructure. It would certainly increase traffic in the village which would be detrimental.
Mrs Jacqueline Baron	There has been already massive developments in Wardhedges and the residents deserve to be left in peace and have a little bit of green open space left for them to enjoy. The traffic is already like a town as it is used as a rat run to the motorway, to Silsoe, to the A6. There is no transport in the area, there are no places in the lower and middle schools, there are no shops, this is not an appropriate place to put more houses.
Mrs Jane Bourne	This area is an important countryside gap between Wardhedges and Flitton and should remain so. 41 houses would more than double the size of Wardhedges and, if we need to find 400 more homes in Mid-Beds by 2026, it seems excessive that more than 10 per cent of these potential new homes should be built in a Countryside Settlement, like Wardhedges. In my opinion, the land would be better put to use for growing food.
Mrs Jennifer Dancy	The proposed development would destroy an important buffer zone between the hamlet of Wardhedges and Flitton. The scale of the proposed housebuilding is overwhelming and would seriously affect the character of the area as well as causing significant traffic problems. There are no shops, Post Office or GPs in the Parish and public transport is not an option residents choose (see the recently completed Parish Plan) meaning yet more unsustainable growth. Please refer to the Flitton and Greenfield Green Infrastructure Plan, this is an important Countryside Gap. Residents clearly stated their desire to keep the Parish rural in character and protect the remaining open spaces. The village does lack sheltered housing/accommodation for the elderly but these proposals do nothing to address that and therefore there is no exceptional need for the development. Please refuse this proposal.

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Marcus Stott	<p>Wardhedges is identified in the Core Strategy as a Countryside Settlement and Flitton as a small village. Small villages should not be considered for development unless there is an exceptional need. There is no exceptional need for development in this area and important countryside gaps, such as this site, cannot be allocated for development without having a significant detrimental impact on the local environment and infrastructure. Traffic congestion is already a major problem in the area and significant increases in dwellings, such as these proposed, will only increase this problem. Investment would have to be considered in not only improving the local roads but also public transport, doctors, dentists, lower schools, post office - all of which the area already suffers from a lack of resources. Furthermore, the current market situation for new house building, may result in the site having "half built" houses, or being abandoned for a number of years until the market picks up again. This could lead to health and safety issues, detrimental impact environmentally and the possibility of illegal use as a temporary residential site. The large site in Silsoe appears to have suffered the same fate of a half developed building site for the last 12 months which is quite frankly an eyesore. Maybe the council should consider forcing building developers to complete development sites in a given timeframe?</p>
Mr Michael Girle	<p>Building on this land would link the villages of Flitton and Wardhedges. The villages would lose their independence and the rural aspect of the area would suffer. There has already been a significant increase in the amount of building in the area. Thankfully it has been done in areas where it has mostly gone unnoticed. To fill a complete brownfield site with housing would in my opinion ruin a part of the county which has maintained its identity. Would the proposed site be included in Flitton or Wardhedges. Or worse still would the whole area just become another extension of Flitwick.</p>
Mr Nicholas Thompson	<p>Flitton is a small village and Wardhedges is a countryside settlement. This development would effectively join the two settlements, something which is totally out of order. The gap has always been sacrosanct and this has been mentioned a number of times by planning officers and indeed inspectors. A number of residents from Berberry Drive have this protected gap in their deeds. There are no facilities in either Flitton or Wardhedges. A car would therefore be essential for everything (except a pub).</p>
Mr Nigel Pinder	<p>Wardhedges, Alitton and Greenfield are three distinct villages. A development of this size virtually joins the three villages together and goes against the majority of the reasons for the current habitants of these villages to live there. The space is an important countryside gap, essential to the charm of these villages. To do away with such a vast area of countryside would be detrimental to the appeal of the villages. There is simply not sufficient local services to cover this size of development. Doctors, shops and schooling - to name but three - are not close enough for this number of people, and the resultant traffic on the road as a result would cause congestion on roads that are already being used to capacity.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Laura-Jane Sullivan	This site floods regularly. It a stated border between the villages of Flitton and Wardhedges that must be kept. Will cause detrimental distress to all the dwellings that face this site. Building on this site will force floodwater to cascade further down into the already over-developed village. There are no services for 5 miles and so a car is a necessity - not something I thought this government wanted to encourage.
Mrs Lesley Owens	Wardhedges is a small village in its own right, the residents have fought to keep its identity should this development go ahead it will join Wardhedges, Flitton and Greenfield together. More houses are not needed in this area especially in a climate where house sales are falling, with big builders laying off workers by the thousand! The infrastructure will not support this development, the local school is already oversubscribed and the village does not support the facilities which would be required. We should not be allowed to build on every available open space, village life is being wiped out by developers.
Mrs Joy Pegram	The Planning Inspectorate report dated 9th December 1998 regarding the planning application for our present property, states by the Inspector Mr H Rose, clearly the importance of preserving the gap between the two villages of Flitton and Wardhedges. Clearly this new application for 41 dwellings impinges on this open land. Wardhedges and the surrounding villages are already experiencing increased traffic flow. Forty-one more dwellings would obviously increase this further. The infrastructures of the roads around these villages were not and are not designed to take heavy traffic flow. More housing would also cause further impact on the diminishing wild life within the village areas. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. This field already floods with the excess water from the drainage ditch at the rear of our property. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses surrounding. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment.
Mrs Lynden Thompson	Flitton is only a small village and as noted in the District Council comments this development would join the settlements of Flitton and Wardhedges, something which has never been allowed in the past. Residents who live locally to the development have clauses in their deeds stating this land is a protected gap. Neither settlement have any facilities other than public houses and a car is therefore essential.
Mrs Margaret Lowe	Wardhedges is a small hamlet and this proposal is on land that was always stated to be important open countryside to keep Wardhedges and Flitton separate. There are no shops locally and no post office. The lower school in Greenfield is full. No public transport would cause more speeding and congestion through the villages which are already a rat-run to and from the M1.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs S Bosket	<p>You would need a car to get anywhere from Wardhedges and an extra 41 houses would cause more congestion. Silsoe Road is already very busy with cars driving much too fast. Wardhedges is a very small community and to add in these houses would destroy the current infrastructure not to mention the wildlife that live in these fields. Its such a worry to work all the time to live somewhere peaceful and have a constant threat of development. There are plenty of areas that need rejuvenating, why not update and improves these areas instead of destroying more countryside and small community life.</p>
Mrs Lucy Stott	<p>Wardhedges is identified in the Core Strategy as a Countryside Settlement and Flitton as a small village. Small villages should not be considered for development unless there is an exceptional need. There is no exceptional need for development in this area and important countryside gaps, such as this site, cannot be allocated for development without having a significant detrimental impact on the local environment and infrastructure. Traffic congestion is already a major problem in the area and significant increases in dwellings, such as these proposed, will only increase this problem. Investment would have to be considered in not only improving the local roads but also public transport, doctors, dentists, lower schools, post office - all of which the area already suffers from a lack of resources. Furthermore, the current market situation for new house building, may result in the site having "half built" houses, or being abandoned for a number of years until the market picks up again. This could lead to health and safety issues, detrimental impact environmentally and the possibility of illegal use as a temporary residential site. The large site in Silsoe appears to have suffered the same fate of a half developed building site for the last 12 months which is quite frankly an eyesore. Maybe the council should consider forcing building developers to complete development sites in a given timeframe?</p>

**FLITTON & GREENFIELD APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Gillian Kern	Flitton & Greenfield	<p>I have recently received my local parish magazine (mid March) in which I have read about the proposed development sites in the county and in particular those in Greenfield and Flitton. I have also learnt that every household should have received have received a Talk to Mid Beds brochure as part of the consultation exercise and that I should have known about a local road-show at Silsoe on 22nd Feb. I am distinctly under - whelmed by the performance of Mid Beds Council: I have not received a copy of the brochure; I was unable to attend the road-show as I only discovered the dates after the event; I discover, having located the website, there is no indication of the closing date for comments or a clear link through to the plans for the proposed sites. The website is complex and the font is so small that I had to use a magnifying glass to read it - I suspect that you don't really want local residents commenting on the proposals - another fudged consultation! I am not opposed to growth in the villages but I object to further development prior to improvements in the infra-structure. I suspect that the tax on developers will be insufficient to contribute to the development of schools, local amenities, improved roads and public services needed for the increase in housing and that the LA will be unable to find sufficient borrowing from central government to increase the infra-structure adequately. Neither is there likely to be sufficient employment within the local area to reduce the increased traffic through the villages as workers head to the larger conurbations. If current developer practices are replicated during the period of growth villages are going to be unpleasant places to live and roads, pavements and open spaces will be spoilt for ever by the blight left by developers who do not make good and a planning department that fails to monitor developments adequately. I appreciate that my comments are curmudgeonly but recent experiences of development in my village and working with colleagues on growth plans in another LA have not imbued me with optimism that life in Mid Beds will be enhanced by the proposed house building programme.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Name	Subject	Comment
Mrs J Pegram	Flitton & Greenfield H219	In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties as there will be no soil for the water to soak into. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into which water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses further up. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. The current local infrastructure barely supports the current small village so any additional developments should be very small. Flitton/ Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to the local housing recently so further development would only destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered as they would not need additional investment.
Mrs J Pegram	Flitton & Greenfield, H117	This site in Flitton is unsuitable for development of 200 houses as it is designated greenbelt and has significant wildlife inhabitants including deer, foxes and birds, as well as being used most years for sheep grazing and hay production. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties as there will be no soil for the water to soak into. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into which water can soak. All that concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses further up. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. The current local infrastructure barely supports the current small village so any additional development should be very small. Flitton/Greenfield and Ward hedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in recent years, so further development would only destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered as they would not need additional investment.

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr John Pegram	Flitton & Greenfield, site H219	<p>This site in Flitton is unsuitable for development for 50 houses as it is designated Greenbelt and has significant wildlife inhabitants including deer, foxes and birds, as well as being used most years for sheep grazing and hay production. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses further up. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. The current local infrastructure barely supports the current small village so any additional developments should be very small. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. This site would encourage more vehicles which is against the government policies on pollution as basic amenities are a car distance away. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment.</p>
Mr John Pegram	Flitton & Greenfield, sites H117	<p>This site in Flitton is unsuitable for development for 200 houses as it is designated Greenbelt and has significant wildlife inhabitants including deer, foxes and birds, as well as being used most years for sheep grazing and hay production. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses further up. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. The current local infrastructure barely supports the current small village so any additional developments should be very small. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. The government have stated that we should cut down on pollution, this site would encourage more as all the basic amenities are a car distance away. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Cllr Victor Lee	Flitton, Greenfield and Pulloxhill	I am the County Councillor for Flitwick East which includes Flitton, Greenfield and Pulloxhill. I oppose all the proposed developments which have over 20 Dwellings, as this will have a detrimental impact on the character of the villages. These villages would be ruined if any of the larger developments were allowed. I hope the Mid Beds Officers and Councillors reject these large developments in this first phase. This will put the residents' minds at rest.
Keith Thorne	Greenfield, site H096	Land adjacent to 30 Flitton Road. Greenfield Having lived in the Hamlet/Village for many years and enjoyed the outlook onto open fields; unfortunately this has changed with the Views to the right of my property having had 3 Storey Buildings erected and behind that The Industrial Units on the left hand side of Pulloxhill Road/Greenfield Road going towards Pulloxhill. If the development was to succeed then one MUST CONSIDER that you will be looking at 4 roads including Pulloxhill Hill Road all adjoining the main road within a distance of some 50/75 Meters. Land at the beginning of Holmewood Road is designated for starter homes and will require access to the Main Road. Should a series accident occur that requires the attendance of the Police or a Fire Engine or Ambulance then I hope that those with this decision can live with themselves should it become a disaster after this small parcel of land be granted the planning application. At this present time trees are seriously affecting our view across open land with heights of some 16/20 feet high after we asked if they could be lopped and we were allowed to remove those branches that overhung our garden. -- Keith Thorne
Keith Thorne	Greenfield, site H096	OBJECTION TO LAND AT REAR OF 30 FLITTON ROAD. GREENFIELD. Reference to SITE H096 Having lived in the Hamlet/Village for many years and had the privilege to look out onto open fields to the rear ,I object most strongly to the possibility of having More Houses built on the only view left. The land to the right has had Three Story houses built and behind that the Industrial Units in Greenfield Road/Pulloxhill Road. With land on the Flitton Road designated for starter homes at the entrance to Holmewood Road who will also require accession to the main road, with this land on the opposite side of the road also requiring access it will prove very difficult should anyone require either an Ambulance or a Fire Engine with the possibility of Four Entrances including Pulloxhill Road Within a Distance of some 50/75 Meters. It could turn out to be a suicide decision if the village has to rely on this land being used to cope with all aspects of this application. At the present time we have to cope with Trees of some 14/20 feet High and branches that overhang our land at the rear of our property.

Name	Subject	Comment
Margaret Thorne	Greenfield, site H096	<p>Objection to land at rear of 30 Flitton Road, Greenfield Ref to Site H096 Having lived in the Hamlet/Village for many years and had the privilege to look out on to open fields to the rear I object most strongly to the possibility to having more houses built on the only view left. The land to the right has had 3 storey houses built and behind that the Industrial Units in Greenfield Road/ Pulloxhill Road. With land on the Flitton Road designated for Starter Homes on the opposite of the Road as the entrance to Holmewood Road who will also require access onto the main road, with this land on the opposite side of the road also requiring access it will prove very difficult should anyone require an Ambulance a Fire engine or the Police with the possibility of four entrances including Pulloxhill Road within a distance of some 50/75 metres. It could turn out to be a suicide decision if the Village has to rely on this land being used to cope with all aspects of the application. At the present time we have to cope with trees 14/20 ft high and branches that overhang our land at the rear of the property From K.W.E. Thorne.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
David Douglas	H355, Flitton & Greenfield	<p>“The field is to the best of my knowledge in the Green Belt and is designated for Agricultural use, witness sheep grazing in 2008 and recent harvesting of the grass for winter feed. Building these houses would effectively link the villages of Wardhedges and Flitton thereby removing their separate identity. When recently 12 houses were built on the edge of Wardhedges a significant difference was noticed by the residents of Berberry Drive and those on High Street, whose houses abut the drainage stream, to the level of the water in the drainage stream at times of heavy rainfall. The building of a further 41 houses on what is effectively the flood plain for the stream and the concreting over of the fields and the consequent need to provide new drainage facilities into the stream caused by these actions, would force additional water into the stream and bring great risks of flooding with serious consequences for local residents. The proposed development is inappropriate for Flitton, which is designated a small village in the Core Strategy, and even more so for Wardhedges which has an even smaller categorisation. A new housing estate of over 40 units does not fit with the Core Strategy and would dramatically change the character of the village. This cannot possibly be considered as infill in small spaces on existing residential streets. The application would provide some 10% of the counties needs for house building in villages between now and 2021 in a village that has been quite heavily in filled over a number of years. The village has no employment opportunities and very poor bus services. Therefore all travel to work will be by car with the minimum distance being to Flitwick station. The station car park is already full to capacity and therefore journeys may have to be of a longer distance to find parking before obtaining public transport links. There is no shop or doctor or dentist in the village therefore all visits will again be by car. The lower school is over subscribed and the nearest middle and senior schools are all at least 15 minutes car or bus journey from the site. It is inevitable that a large number of school age children will move onto the site judging from the description of the houses to be built. These last 3 paragraphs indicate the impact on the carbon footprint by allowing at least another 100 cars, assuming 2 per house hold, to be accommodated on the new development. The vehicles would have to be used all the time as there are no amenities and no sensible public transport provisions for journeys to work, school, shops, doctors, dentist and for recreational purposes. The overall conclusion must be that this application should be rejected.”</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Mr & Mrs J A Pegram	H355, Flitton & Greenfield	<p>We are writing to object to the suggested residential development off Wardhedges Road in Flitton &amp; Wardhedges. The Planning Inspectorate report dated 9<sup>th</sup> December 1998 regarding the planning application for our present property, states by the Inspector Mr H Rose, clearly the importance of preserving the gap between the two villages of Flitton and Wardhedges. Clearly this new application for 41 dwellings impinges on this open land. Wardhedges and the surrounding villages are already experiencing increased traffic flow. Forty-one more dwellings would obviously increase this further. The infrastructures of the roads around these villages were not and are not designed to take heavy traffic flow. More housing would also cause further impact on the diminishing wild life within the village areas. In developing this land it would bring great risks of flooding to surrounding properties, as there will be no soil for the water to soak away. This field already floods with the excess water from the drainage ditch at the rear of our property. The Environment agency has stated that one big problem with adding housing is the loss of land into water can soak. All the concrete and house roofs would add to the existing risk to the village and houses surrounding. There has been flooding in Flitton in the past but existing measures would not sustain the addition of so much drainage. Flitton, Greenfield and Wardhedges have contributed significantly to local housing stock in the past few years, so further development would destroy the village environment. There are more suitable sites where amenities and infrastructure are already in place, these should be considered, as they would not need additional investment. We therefore request this application to be denied.</p>
John Boylen	Field between Flitton & Wardhedges	<p>The application which could have the most impact on myself and neighbours is the field between Flitton &amp; Wardhedges. Please note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When I purchased my house in 2001 my solicitor made many enquires with local planning with regard to this field. He was informed that this must remain a field to create a boundary between Flitton &amp; Wardhedges.</li> <li>• I also would refer to Mid Beds countryside document policy CS22 4.17 villages.</li> <li>• In 1998 The Planning Inspectorate report T/APP/J021/A/ (* /300620/PS states that this field should be maintained to preserve the boundary between Flitton &amp; Wardhedges. In 2004 Inspectorate Report 1154450 also makes a point of stating this field must be maintained..</li> <li>• The local school has reached it's capacity of 125 children and can not cope with any extra influx of children</li> <li>• The three fields along Silsoe Road are prone to flooding.</li> <li>• These are just some of the reasons why this proposed site should be dismissed.</li> </ul>