

FLITWICK 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.

FLITWICK APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H062

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
C. Long	H062 - use of agricultural land to housing - infrastructure cannot cope with traffic at this present time. Steppingley crossroads already accident black spot. H248 - geologically liable to flooding - unsuitable for housing - impacts on SSI (Flitwick Moor).
Matt Harris	Controversial site however it is important that we focus growth on our key local centres. More people will mean more opportunities for business, transport, !!a bypass!! and better local facilities.

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 Preusch-Pearson	This is greenbelt would (illegible) the start of proposing again to fears about (?) the leisure centre? Flitwick cannot take anymore traffic!!
A. Mcllhaston	Green belt!
Alda Mason	Within the green belt, therefore SHOULD NOT be built on. It is against your own policies so don't do it. These proposals will not enhance the town; it will bring detrimental changes outlined in other responses I have made to the various proposals.
Andrew Long	H062 site currently Green Belt. More appropriate "white land" sites elsewhere (e.g.H077). Great care needed to preserve "green wedge/open space" between Flitwick, Steppingley and Amphill. Area of Great Landscape Value.
Andrew Mcllhatton	Green Belt must be protected.
C. A. Cooke	Greenbelt!!! Steppingley and Flitwick need to be separate to keep town/county divide!
Christopher Page	I believe this development would be out of place and I am strongly against further encroachment on green belt land. In light of recent developments regarding Center Parcs and the impending development despite village objections I feel this would be further evidence of the council's lack of commitment to ensuring protection of green belt land.
David Penfold	Using green belt so should not be considered. Only adding to climate change problem by removing more natural landscape and adding concrete.
Dr A Bourne/ Dr F. Steele	Would not support any housing development on farmland and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security.
Dr Karin Horowitz	There is too much development taking place in this immediate area. Traffic congestion is already rife and with the planned Center Parcs development, there will be major traffic issues. The area is deemed greenbelt and further housing and business developments are therefore highly inappropriate. The greenbelt is under more pressure than ever before and therefore needs even more protection.

Submitted by	Comments
G. E. Ashburner	I do not think there is sufficient infrastructure in Flitwick to cope with any more housing and especially because housing means MORE CARS, usually at least 2 per house.
G. Tilley	Green Belt should be preserved. Flitwick and Steppingley need to be kept as separate cities as Flitwick/Amphill has already been effectively joined
Hugh Jackson	The exclusion of significant urbanisation of Steppingley is essential to preserve its rural qualities not simply for its inhabitants but also to retain the immeasurably valuable country amenity that it provides for very many from the towns of Flitwick and Amphill. With development from Milton Keynes to Bedford now proceeding, it is essential that the "green lung" afforded by Steppingley, Ridgmont and Woburn be preserved - the creation of the "forest" of Marston Vale, whilst to be welcomed, provides no sustainable amenity for the inhabitants of Flitwick or Amphill. The overruling by the Secretary of State of Mid Beds decision to decline planning permission for Center Parcs is an appalling example of political meddling which will now radically change, for all time, the character of this area. If there is to be any prospect of retaining the amenity of Steppingley, its green belt must be squandered no further.
Ian Rambart	Totally in appropriate for housing too far out and it looks from the map that the farm next to him didn't want to sell!!
Jacqueline Raftery	Strongly disagree to development on green belt land and area of great landscape value. Transport-have you considered the combined impact of Center Parcs, town centre and sports centre development on the local roads and what about the impacts on the trains that are already overcrowded.
Jason Bagge	This site is in the countryside and too far from the rest of Flitwick.
Jean Abbott	1. This land is in the Green Belt and should therefore be protected. 2. Steppingley Road is already busy and an exit from a development of this size could be dangerous. 3. Development in this area would increase pressure on Flitwick Wood and would detract from the attractiveness of the area. 4. The fields included in and adjacent to this area have populations of breeding skylark (a bird whose decreasing numbers are a cause of national concern) and are used in the winter by finches and other birds.
Jim Godden	This puts residential housing in an area which is already an accident black spot and also moves the visible boundary of the town into a totally new area of the county. Isolation from Flitwick by the Woburn Estate land will be an ongoing problem.
Julia Pankhurst	This site is in Green Belt and is totally inappropriate. It would cause significant coalescence between Steppingley and Flitwick. Thank you.
Julian Hoppit	I am very strongly opposed to development on the green belt because of my commitment to the principles that underpin the whole purpose of the green belt: to protect rural areas from urban sprawl. The additional traffic will also impact directly on me, both because I cycle from Steppingley to Flitwick regularly and because of increased traffic driving directly past my house.

Submitted by	Comments
Julie Moxon	We have little enough green space left in Flitwick. We moved here over 20 years ago for a semi rural environment and less traffic than we had in Watford. Flitwick has changed beyond recognition, and not in a good way. Lovely old houses have been turned into flats or pulled down; gardens have been built in; traffic and parking are appalling. We must not add to this and most specifically we must not allow the few remaining green areas to be damaged in any way. What kind of environment are we creating for the children of tomorrow?
Lionel Yarde	i feel strongly about losing further Green Belt considering we have just lost 362 acres of Green Belt to the Centre Parcs development, it would also leave the remaining land subject to infill.
Lucy Debenham	This site is on the edge of Flitwick and Flitwick itself does not have the infrastructure to cope with more traffic and housing. There is far too much housing and not enough investment in community facilities. Flitwick Town Council and MBDC need to look into the town centre to improve services and facilities to the public who currently have to travel outside of Flitwick if they dont want to buy at Tesco (who incidentally have a firm monopolising grip on the retail sector within Flitwick and strangle the living daylights out of any other retail enterprise) or do something family-orientated. The outskirts of Flitwick with the fields and woodland should stay as such, Flitwick should be proud to have access to the countryside so easily. No more nasty new builds that turn into souless sprawling estates and make Flitwick into a sleepy commuter town with no sense of community and no decent facilities. This site in particular should be left, as should the land around Froghall Road.
Mark Hustwitt	Overdevelopment on a greenfield site. No public transport. Too far from health facilities, schools, shops. Would create too much additional traffic on Steppingley Rd into and out of Flitwick (to Tescos). Near dangerous crossroads at Steppingley Rd and Froghall Rd. If developed planning gain should include roundabout here. If developed could it include some land set aside for allotments.
Mary Goulder	Flitwick has been subject to wholesale use of gardens for development purposes. Nothing can be done to rectify this but we can stop encroaching on open space by greedy developers who don't even build environmentally sound properties. I would sooner see this agricultural land turned over to grain production, which we know is now a guaranteed cost effective use of land. We cannot view things in isolation. We have Center Parcs, Nirah, Wixams, plus several other dwelling sites all encroaching on what is now open land. The infrastructure cannot support further development. It cannot support the current requirements in many instances.
Mr Colin Carpenter	This area also in the greenbelt is on the site of an old farm which is located at a dangerous crossroads. Any housing development here would be dangerous as Steppingley Road is very busy anyway. Housing development here would spread from here back to Flitwick Wood and increase traffic use on Steppingley Road a great deal. The farm house should be restored into a dwelling and should NOT be demolished as it is historic.
Mr D Williams	Over populated already.
Mr R Hammond	I do not think any housing or further expansion of any sort is needed in Flitwick - Flitwick has already out grown itself and certainly does not need any future developments of any kind.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr S Long	Absolutely not for development. Isolated from Flitwick existing development edge and out of proportion.
N A Bunyan	Steppingley Road is narrow, already feeds numerous housing estates as well as Tesco, is a huge congestion spot during school time and inevitably leads onto the Station Roundabout. Flitwick can NEVER further develop or act as a conduit for yet more traffic as long as this bottleneck over the railway line exists. This bridge already carries a huge amount of inappropriate traffic, mainly to Tesco and the M1. Unless and until the bridge capacity is doubled or even trebled, any further development around the town centre will create unacceptable traffic problems.
P.J Frampton obo ORS plc	This site lies within the green belt. There is no justification for taking land from the green belt as Flitwick when land excluded from the green belt (safeguarded land) is readily available and suitable for housing development-namely site h077.
Richard Barlow	Very poor access from anywhere. Increase in traffic along Steppingley Road and Frognall Road unacceptable given current road infrastructure.
Rob Mason	This site is within the Green Belt and development would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy. Your word not mine. Speaks for itself. An absolutely ridiculous place to build housing. More precious countryside would disappear. No doubt you've already bought the land anyway.
Roy Storey	The road system around this proposal is entirely unsatisfactory.
Sam Pankhurst	This site is Greenbelt. We have already lost too much of our Greenbelt to Center Parcs, and can not afford to lose any more. This site is not within easy walking distance of the Flitwick commercial centre, and is not served by regular bus links, so would encourage greater car use.
Susan Brown	This is green belt land and should be left as it is.
Tina Kent	This land is not only Green Belt, but also AGLV. This should absolutely protect in from any development.
V Scargill	This site is too far from the town centre with potential for major traffic problems. In addition the use of green belt land is totally unacceptable.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr.K.S.Campbell	Any developments on Steppingley Road will lead to an increase in traffic flow on an already busy road. it will lead to congestion at the main roundabout by Tescos. New developments are fine but serious consideration needs to be given to the road structure and traffic volume in Flitwick.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H077**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Long	Care needed because of proximity to railway (embankment) - noise, vibration other safety considerations. Improvement needed to Froghall Road and to railway bridge towards Doolittle Mill site. Pedestrian route to be provided to/from Redbourn School of Ampthill.
C B Long	Concerns re. further traffic problems along the Froghall Road. Steppingley crossroads already accident black spot. Will require infrastructure improvement to prevent considerable traffic congestion.
David Penfold	Not using green belt so would be a good usage of available space... Traffic congestion is a concern though and the over capacity of the trains from Flitwick into London would need to be resolved as these houses would be used by London commuters.
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	H077 would be an idea site for a relocated Tesco to relieve town centre pressures.
Matt Harris	Infill site perfect for development. As previous; it is important that we focus growth on our key local centres. More people will mean more opportunities for business, transport, !!a bypass!! and better local facilities.
P. J. Frampton on behalf of ORS plc and Flitwick Town Council	Please refer to accompanying correspondence (H137, H124) This site can provide new facilities to Flitwick including: . new employment to the north of the town . assist the town council in realising its aims to restructure the provision of leisure facilities . new public transport facilities.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
<p>P.J Frampton obo ORS plc and Flitwick town council</p>	<p>This site can provide new facilities to Flitwick including: # new employment to the worth of the town # assist the town council in realising its aims to restructure the provision of leisure facilities # new public transport facilities. At the outset I have to express the disappointment of my Clients to the apparent failure to consult on the merits of this land for mixed use development - as previously submitted to your authority in response to the consultation on the Core Strategy. Had consideration been given to this submission, the Site Allocations Issues and Options Consultation should then have recognised the following features. That no built development has been identified within the Green Belt. The site area is shown in red on the attached plan. The small pond located in the northern apex of the site is retained as open land That the latest Master Plan - prepared in conjunction with Flitwick Town Council has relocated the employment allocation so as to be closely related to the existing facilities at The Refus. That the suggested employment allocation has been enlarged to 1.07ha. If considered appropriate the employment land allocation could be extended westward towards Steppingley Road - and the range of employment uses, enlarge upon, as suggested in Draft PPS4 That the concept Master Plan responds to the development aspirations of the Town Council to achieve a major restructuring in the provision of leisure facilities for the town - and hence encompasses the land comprising the existing leisure centre (it is recognised that the redevelopment of the existing Leisure Centre may not be 'immediately available' for development as compared with the Safeguarded Land. That the capacity of the Safeguarded Land together with the Leisure Centre site is circa 600 dwellings - on a 15 hectare of land identified for housing development. That the gross site area of the Safeguarded Land and the FTC Leisure Centre site is c22 hec. In order to ensure that you are fully aware of concept scheme for the land at Steppingley Road and Froghall Road Flitwick I attach to these submissions: - Outline Master Plan Nov 2007 - Land Budget Nov 2007 - Valley Farm Access and Bus Appraisal Oct 2007 - FRA - Services and Utility Statement Oct 2007 The 'Accessibility information' produced in the SAD suggests mathematical precision in travel time which I suggest is inappropriate for this form of development - and in a number of incidences is considered inaccurate. I submit that the table should more appropriately describe these travel times as below: Walk Time Mins Public Transport Time (Mins) GP Surgery 20m Max Refer to TA 26 minutes return Hospital N/A journey service supported by Lower School 10 new development Middle School 10 Upper School 0 Flitwick T Centre 15 - 20 Major Retail Centre N/A Employment 500+ Jobs (Maulden Road 1. Area) 10 It is submitted that the land edged red on the accompany plan is the most appropriate direction for growth at Flitwick - as land that has been identified in the adopted Local Plan for accommodating new development as and when needed. Sustainable urban growth at Flitwick will focus growth to a Major Service Centre, strengthening the role of Flitwick as a market town - and closely relating urban growth to Flitwick where major investment is planned to regenerate and rejuvenate the Town Centre. In short form it should make good planning sense to focus</p>

Submitted by	Comments
P.J Frampton obo ORS plc and Flitwick town council [continued]	new housing provision to Flitwick - so that future residents at this urban extension can benefit from the new services and facilities in the town centre. The range of housing and other facilities available to existing and future residents within the town will broaden. Flitwick will become a more sustainable settlement with this level of proposed growth.
Tina	I agree in principle, but only on the part, that is not within Green Belt

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alda Mason	The number of houses/flats in this development could mean that upwards of 2000 people (or more) could potentially move into this area (averaged a 4 people per household). This would mean more children of various ages meaning more school places needed. The schools are already struggling with the current numbers of children without expansion/improvement of such facilities the pressure would become intolerable. Extra vehicles on the roads would bring more pollution, more possibility of injuries, therefore leading to increases in the use of emergency services, doctors and health services, meaning more money spent on these (unless more cuts are made, which is a more likely scenario). In the end costing the council (meaning US the residents when you put up our rates again).
Andrew Turner	There is no known public transport covering this area which automatically means an huge increase in car use along Steppingly Road, creating even more problems than exist currently. Tie this in to the proposed town-centre redevelopment and there is the potential for chaos, especially at peak-times. Inevitably a new estate of this type would attract primarily families with young children, who most certainly will not be walking to school for example. Re-think this one
Catherine Bunyan	Flitwick is already groaning under the weight of traffic - Steppingly Road/Froggal Rd could not take the amount of extra traffic that this development would generate.
Howard Hodges	This will add to the considerable pressure on Flitwick centre, already taking too much traffic. Most housing in this area is too expensive for local people and will be bought up by commuters. This site will also swallow up some of the greenbelt which makes Flitwick a tolerable place to live.
Jacqueline Raftery	Strongly disagree to the mixed use development on safeguarded white and green belt land. Green space is a valuable commodity. Combined proposals for the town centre development, sports centre and housing proposals are going to tear the heart out of Flitwick. What about the next round of proposals-all green space will get built on if we are not careful. Have you considered the combined impact of above developments plus Centre Parcs on local roads. what about impact on trains, that are already overcrowded
Jason Bagge	Would need a bypass around Flitwick to support this number of houses and more social infrastructure such as a new lower/middle school, doctors etc...

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jean Abbott	1. Although not within the Green Belt building on this land would impact on the green belt and affect amenity value in surrounding areas. 2. Shopping & leisure facilities are already inadequate in Flitwick & a development of this size would add to the problems.
Jim Godden	This development is in a stream area which will force additional water under the Railway and will affect my property. Im surprised it is not designated as flood plain!
Julia Pankhurst	Although not in Green Belt this site is next to it and would cause coalescence between Flitwick, Ampthill & Steppingley. It is inappropriate. I also have concerns over the traffic in that area - Froghall Road is narrow, there are no footpaths and the railway bridge is already a hazard spot.
Mark Hustwitt	Overdevelopment on a greenfield site. Expanding Flitwick too much into the countryside. This is too big a development on this site. It would create additional traffic on Steppingley Road going into and out of Flitwick (to Tescos) and has no public transport links. It is far from the town centre, health facilities, schools etc.
Mr R Hammond	I do not think any housing or further expansion of any sort is needed in Flitwick - Flitwick has already out grown itself and certainly does not need any further developments of any kind
Mr.K.S.Campbell	The roads are not capable of supporting an increase in traffic volume.
R T Preusch-Pearson	Sport fields and at long last something for (illegible) who take most the blame for the damage and noise. Plus just bring w...(?) they are not wanted or to put it another way a youth club. Along with changing (?) facilities along with (illegible) the (illegible) sport fields for all ages and not just football.
Rob Mason	More country side being built on. Totally unsuitable. Access restricted, causing more unwanted congestion. Loss of allotments space. Housing on woodland next to the railway, totally unsuitable.
Roy Storey	Froghall Lane will need to be widened and the planners are assuming all residents will have their own transport.
G. Tilley	Since Ampthill/Flitwick is already joined on the other side of the railway and this area is not significantly greenbelt or attractive space, this seems the least bad option for housing development. Froghall Road would need improvement.
Julie Moxon	This is a reasonable place for some development, however traffic would be a major issue. Most households have 2 cars, so an additional 500 houses could mean an additional 800 - 1,000 vehicles pouring onto Steppingley Road. The number of dwellings should be significantly reduced and those which are built must have off road parking for at least two cars. It is also important that open spaces are provided for children to play ball and other games safely and for elderly people to sit and talk.
Paul Rowntree	No objection in principle, conditional upon the development site not impacting the Steppingley Road allotments. However it must be noted that the scale of this development would infill most of the open land between Flitwick and Ampthill risking unacceptable urban sprawl joining the two towns together.

Submitted by	Comments
Phil Winder	Part of this site should be set aside to improve facilities attached to the Leisure Centre (e.g. new football pitches, replacement swimming pool). Consider improvement to sports facilities as a development trade-off.
Richard Barlow	If road access to Froghall Road, via A507, was upgraded, in particular the bridge under the railway and with that in mind a ban on 3.5tonne vehicles along Steppingly road from Flitwick town centre, this could be a useful site.

Ref Number: H113/E17

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alda Mason	As this would be a brownfield site, I have no particular objection to this proposal. My only concern, again, is the pressure on schools, doctors, emergency services etc., due to the number of new families moving in. Consideration should be give to improving/expanding these within the proposals. A new parking area (multi storey?) would benefit the whole town and relieve the nuisance parking currently happening for residents in certain areas close to the station.
Andrew Long	Essential that new railway station with improved bus-rail interchange kiss and ride, taxi rank and other passenger facilities are provided. Site must also incorporate a "town square" or appropriate and visible town centre. Station frontage to be on corner of Steppingley Road and railway bridge.
Angela Duffin	I feel strongly that Flitwick should be developed to include a definite, possibly pedestrianised, centre as it currently lacks a heart and is rather disjointed. I have lived in Flitwick for over 11 years and would love to see good restaurants, bars and nice shops for all ages. I believe Flitwick has a large enough population with disposable income to support amenities other than just necessity shops. As an aside, by planting trees within the town centre, Flitwick's image would be greatly improved. I believe Flitwick's image requires an overhaul as its present look is extremely unattractive. This would help in enticing people to spend their free time in Flitwick instead of Ampthill.
Colin Carpenter	This site right next to Flitwick Station is in an ideal location for development as it is in the centre of Flitwick and does not directly affect any greenbelt or wildlife sensitive areas. It is ideally located next to all facilities and would help solve the problem of supplying more housing developments in Flitwick.
David Penfold	Not using green belt so would be a good usage of available space... Traffic congestion is a concern though and the over capacity of the trains from Flitwick into London would need to be resolved as these houses would be used by London commuters. Town centre desperately needs to be re-planned.
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	H077 would be an ideal site for a relocated Tesco to relieve town centre pressures
G. Tilley	Needs redevelopment - cf. Flitwick town centre plan, of which this area is the most attractive part. Limited potential for housing.
Ian Rambart	From the original plans that came out about this I think the car parks need looking at as not all like multi story and the houses appearance did not fit in with surrounding area.
Matt Harris	This has GOT to happen!
Mrs G Carpenter	You should always use brownfield/in town sites before considering any that would use the greenbelt. This site has all the required amenities of the town within walking distance so use of vehicles is not necessary.
R T Preusch-Pearson	This will only work for shops, cafes, restaurants etc. If this station can (?) is have multi storey and then split into for station and shops use but not as part of Tesco.
Richard Barlow	No more hair dressers nor estate agents.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
A Prescott-Pearson	Too much traffic; Flitwick cannot take anymore cars going through its centre; attracting more commuters into town is bad as well - are Capital Connect going to fill (?) anymore f...(?)?
Jacqueline Raftery	Strongly disagree with the proposed site density 250-300 dwellings on 287 hectares, what are we trying to do-create canary wharf in Flitwick!!!!
John Forster	I deplore the arbitrary decision to plonk the leisure centre on the Millennium Park. The traffic along the Dunstable Road is already very heavy. Life for those living in the area will become intolerable when this and all the other developments like Center Parcs and Nirah are built, since the main road through Flitwick is currently the only feasible access. It is a disgrace that the town council has not seen fit to discuss this matter openly nor to canvass the opinion of Flitwick residents on the location. I think the Millennium Park should be developed as a park for local residents, with shrubs, bushes, trees (mature if possible) and a path winding through from one corner to the other, complete with lighting and park benches. At the moment it is wasted space.
Juliette White	I don't see anyway that development in this location could take place without increasing traffic congestion to unmanageable levels. Apart from the train line, public transport to and from Flitwick is limited and most people who e.g. go to the existing Tesco store drive there. (Not enough information is given in the description to sensible answer some of the questions).
Mr D Williams	Over populated already.
Mrs D Bradshaw	Facilities in Flitwick are already stretched, with the doctors' surgery supporting the surrounding villages as well as Flitwick itself. Traffic at peak times makes journeys longer and considerable queuing is experienced at roundabouts in the centre of the town. To develop sites in the centre of the town would only increase the traffic problems and bearing in mind the two schools in the area would make school times more dangerous for the children at the beginning and end of the school day. The leisure centre should be extended on the existing site, away from the centre of the town and parking facilities improved for people using the town centre facilities, post office, dentist, bank etc.
Roy Storey	This site is a former gravel pit. The number of dwellings far exceeds the the norm for its size and will mean "highrise" blocks. The car parking for the station is in question as is the step free access to the station. the owner of the land will be the only one smiling if this goes ahead
Sian Jones	I am concerned with the additional weight of traffic and how it will affect Flitwick which already suffers with traffic jams.
Sue Griffith	Congestion of Steppingley Road by commuter traffic. Tesco customers. Together with the extra residents.
William Griffiths	It has already been pointed out that the current Road Traffic Problems will not be resolved or further improved by making this area Mixed Use. it should be dedicated to the Railway Parking Difficulty

Submitted by	Comments
No name given	The map shows a purple shaded area with the edge very close to the existing road i.e. Steppingly Road. Other possible developments indicated warehouse/storage which would involve HGVs. There is very little road space at the moment with mostly cars. HGVs would make things worse and buildings so close to the road would stop any future widening of this, so you would end up with a situation similar to Ampthill. Roads too narrow and can't be improved. Center Parcs would exacerbate this as traffic flows from M1 junction 12 through Flitwick. Tesco is/was also planning development close to the edge of the road. It is nice that the public are consulted. Better still if someone with local knowledge is in your team.
Julie Moxon	There is room for improvement in this area, however it must be carefully managed to avoid increasing the already horrendous traffic congestion. There are several schools in the vicinity and children's lives are already endangered by the volume of traffic and the speeds at which many people drive. Not forgetting the parking issues on the surrounding streets. Tesco must not be allowed to grow any larger. It already adversely dominates the town and prevents other businesses from being really successful. The variety of businesses is very limited; we don't want any more estate agents or take away venues. A community centre would be most welcome.
Richard Abbiss	In any development of this area an additional railway crossing is essential. The existing crossing can't cope with peak time demands.
Rob Mason	I agree that Flitwick town centre needs more retail outlets and a multi storey car park, another supermarket would be great, to break the Tesco monopoly/stranglehold. Any further housing development would cause chaos and congestion to an already busy town centre, especially with the Forced Through decision about Center Parcs. It would also cause problems for the current level of schools and especially the medical centre.

Ref Number: H1 14

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
Alda Mason	Again this is on land close to an existing development therefore I have no objections to this proposal, but again consideration should be made to improve/expand the educational establishments, doctors and emergency services. Improving the road would also be a good idea as traffic would increase with the advent of new people coming into the town.
David Penfold	Sensible usage to support the town centre
Dr A Bourne/Dr F. Steele	Would not support any housing development on farmland and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security.
J. Priestley	Situation is ideal for commuters. Should be developed for flats without garages or car park in immediate vicinity.

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Jim Godden	This appears to be replacing a children's play area for which there is no obvious safe alternative proposed.
Mr D Williams	Over populated already.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H124

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
David Penfold	Not using green belt so would be a good use of land.
Dr A Bourne/Dr F.Steele	Would not support any housing development on farmland and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security

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
Jason Bagge	If the Tennis Courts could be located to another area then i would consider this site suitable for housing.
Julie Moxon	This area is already heavily congested with traffic and parking. it is dangerous for pedestrians, especially children and the elderly. Further housing would significantly increase the number of vehicles entering and leaving the site, adding to the congestion and polluting the environment. Fewer houses should be built, all with off road parking for at least two cars - even one bedroom apartments often have 2 cars. Gardens should be of a reasonable size and some open spaces and play areas should be part of the design. If we crowd lots of people into small spaces, they will become brutalised and we will be nurturing problems such as those experienced in areas of Luton and Bedford.

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
Alda Mason	I note that is land is on the tennis courts. You want to build houses on an outdoor amenity! Where will this amenity be placed? or will it be lost? When the government are spouting concern about obesity and lack of fitness, you are considering building on land where a sport is played?! Madness!! I notice it also covers about half of the allotments, again taking away an outdoor pursuit that benefits the people using the allotments, as I said, madness!!!!
Andrew McIlhatton	Sports facilities are too important to lose.

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Hustwitt	This development depends of relocating the tennis club on to allotment land which would remove this important and sustainable public amenity. There is already a lack of allotments in Flitwick and a waiting list for them when they fall empty. Taking them out for this use would not be environmentally beneficial and would reduce available allotments for future users. Locating houses near allotments like this will also cause environmental nuisance issues from noise of allotment holders, smoke from allotment fires and potential for highways issues of vehicles crossing the allotment site. The tennis club should be developed elsewhere. As a suggestion additional allotments could be a useful planning gain for large-scale developments in Flitwick to help remedy this situation.
Matt Harris	This site should be left as an area of high-quality green in our town.
Mr D Williams	Over populated already.
P.J Frampton obo ORS plc	Development of this site would result in the loss of an existing recreational resource which is well used. No provision is made for the replacement of this facility. The allocation of this site would be contrary to the planning principles for maintaining existing recreational facilities. The isolated housing would be poorly related to the existing pattern of existing pattern of urban development.
P.J Frampton on behalf of Orsple	Development of this site would result in the loss of an existing recreational resource which is well used. No provision is made for the replacement of this facility. The allocation of this site would be contrary to the planning principles for maintaining existing recreational facilities (PPG 17) In isolation the housing would be poorly related to the existing pattern of urban development
Paul Rowntree	I strongly object to this because a direct consequence of this development would be the apparent moving of the tennis club onto a new indoor tennis centre on allotment land (development proposal E32 to build an indoor tennis centre on the allotments) Building on the main allotments in Flitwick which are fully utilised, have a waiting list for space on them and are to the best of my knowledge grade 1 agricultural land would be a total disgrace and would be extremely divisive impacting a significant proportion of the population of Flitwick. This also conflicts with the consultation for Flitwick town centre and rebuilding of the sports centre which proposed extension of the allotments because of the current demand.
Roy Storey	This facility is will mean the loss of about one third of the allotments in Steppingley Road, this unacceptable. The town Council has a waiting list for allotments and a requirement to supply them.
Tina Kent	This is currently a tennis club, where will the club go, as none of the sites submitted within this survey are suitable: They are all either Green Belt Land or allocated for allotments.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H137

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
Matt Harris	Good site, on bus corridor.
P T Hughes	Has the potential for traffic links between A507 East and West with connections onto A6 North & South & M1 Junction 13
Sam Franklin	Flitwick is identified in the emerging Core Strategy as a major service centre and a focus for growth. Although this site is within the Green Belt it is currently rough land adjacent to existing housing. There is an opportunity to create open space as well as a small block of housing. The land is close to schools, shops and other facilities as well as within distance by public transport of the railway station and highly sustainable. Land immediately beyond the site is proposed to be developed for playing fields by the Local Authority and it is therefore a logical defensible boundary. There is recognised capacity in lower, middle and upper schools in Flitwick and a requirement for new premises for Primary Care Trust. The land is not within the flood plain and meets all of the necessary sustainability criteria either by walking or by public transport.

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

Submitted by	Comments
G. Tilley	Small development to extend existing recent build on area of no special attractiveness would be acceptable

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
Alda Mason	As this proposal is within the Green Belt and the development would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy, don't build on it. It is ridiculous that you are even considering this site (and others within the green belt) especially as it against your own policies. We do not have the infrastructure in place to support new people coming in and this needs to be addressed before considering any type of building or expansion. It is like putting the cart before the horse if you build first and then improve the infrastructure. This is one area that you should take a leaf out of the USA building proposals, as they have to build schools, shops and healthcare establishments as well as amenities when they are building new housing/employment builds.
David Penfold	Using green belt so would not be a good usage of natural landscape adding to the climate change problem by removing green belt and adding concrete.
Dr A Bourne/ Dr F. Steele	Would not support any housing development on farmland and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Jane DSouza	This land is designated green belt and as such should not be developed on (under any circumstances). The access onto Ampthill Road is not sufficient to support new housing and proposed playing fields. It is close to a pedestrian crossing and just getting on to Ampthill Road is getting more and more difficult as traffic increases. Turning right is almost impossible! This site is completely unsuitable for housing or any other use that takes away its green status and increases traffic flow onto Ampthill Road. Furthermore, Redborne pupils use the pavements heavily at school times, and an access point here would increase the risk of an accident.
Jean Abbott	1. Its in the Green Belt and therefore shouldn't be used. 2. It would add to the already heavy traffic on Ampthill Road.
Jim Godden	Development appears to be on flood plain and should not be developed.
Julie Moxon	No housing should be built on green belt land. Some use for sports pitches is acceptable as long as it never becomes housing, commercial or industrial land. it would be acceptable to build a changing facility as long as it was of sympathetic design, possibly wooden.
Mr D Williams	Over populated already.
Mr R Hammond	I do not think any housing or further expansion of any sort is needed in Flitwick - Flitwick has already out grown itself and certainly does not need any future developments of any kind
P.J. Frampton on behalf of ORS plc	This site lies within the green belt. There is no justification for taking land from the green belt to provide housing when suitable and available land exists off Steppingly Road (Site H077) Site H077 has been purposefully identified in the local plan as a suitable location to accommodate growth of Flitwick Site H137 is poorly related to the existing pattern of settlement. No provision has been made for access
Rob Mason	This site is within the Green Belt and development would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy. Your own words. Speaks for itself doesn't it. Any extra housing would have a detrimental affect on the existing schools levels and medical centre facilities.
Roy Storey	Not so long ago there was one dwelling on the site in front of this proposal. The greed of developers and the stupidity of the planners have ensured that which we have now. The proposed football school of excellence on the adjacent field will be unacceptable to those who buy properties on the land.
Tina	This should not be built upon as it is Green Belt Land
Wendy Doody	Green belt should be preserved at all costs

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H248

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
C. Long	H062 - use of agricultural land to housing - infrastructure cannot cope with traffic at this present time. Steppingley crossroads already accident black spot H248 - geologically liable to flooding - unsuitable for housing - impacts on SSI (Flitwick Moor).
Matt Harris	Controversial site previously turned down. However it would seem to be a good location for edge-of-town development.
Richard Barlow	This site, although inside the GREEN BELT, would, PROVIDED the 150 metre buffer zone is enforced, be a useful area to develop. However, I have serious reservations about the enforcement of the buffer zone.
Rowland Goodman	The southern part of this land is a former sandpit and is therefore really brownfield land. It would be a very green development because it is less than 10 minutes walk to the railway station. If roundabouts were put in Maulden Road opposite the industrial estate and in Greenfield Road opposite the Mill, it would help improve the traffic flow in Flitwick by taking some through traffic away from current residential streets. I know that the Council wants to build new leisure facilities in Flitwick. Instead of having a woodland buffer between the new development and the Moor, why not build the new leisure centre in the buffer zone? The existing leisure centre site could be used for new housing to raise money to help pay for a new leisure centre. Being so close to the centre of Flitwick, and close to Maulden Road and Greenfield Road it would be easy for people to get to - in short a perfect site.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Rambart	Remember more than one parking space is essential as most homes own 2 cars or more. This way we stop everyone parking on the street.
Mrs M E Morey	This site requires very sensitive development with regard to the Moor. A large buffer zone is essential with less dense development's smaller set of small cul de sacs off the Maulden Road would be more in keeping.

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. P. Goodwin	I think that houses built here would have a damaging affect on the Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The presence of the houses would probably change the supply and quality of the water, which is crucial to the wildlife of the site. There would also be more disturbance to wildlife.
A. Preusch-Pearson	This is an important recreational area in Flitwick, leading on to the woods and Flitwick Moor. When will developers stop trying to build on the most picturesque spots. Centre Parcs is building of [illegible]. Leave well alone!

Submitted by	Comments
Alda Mason	<p>Considering this is green belt land and is against the emerging core strategy I think it is ludicrous that this is even being proposed. The building of all the housing proposed in the entire plan does not appear to have provision for expanding the educational establishments, placing more and varied retail outlets (rather than the monopoly that Tesco currently has to the detriment of the town folk regarding the cost of goods, expanding the health care provision in the town, improving the roads to take the ever increasing traffic on our roads, which will be made much worse by any developments. There is no emergency cover in Flitwick currently, and with the proposed expansion of the town, it will place even more people at risk without such cover. I understand that there was a previous application rejected so what has changed that you are looking at this site again????</p>
Andrew Budd	<p>This proposal should be immediately rejected as the farmland on which the development is proposed lies adjacent to Flitwick Moor which is of the utmost biodiversity/ecological value to the County, as well as being nationally important. The risks of permanent damage to Flitwick Moor through the large development, from changes to the water supply/quality, and disturbance to the sites wildlife (particularly as a result of increased visitor numbers, cats, dogs etc, simply cannot be countenanced. This is a precious and fragile habitat which I would expect the Council to do all in its power to protect! This site is next to a flood plain (Flitwick Moor) and takes some of the strain of water from the moor. I feel that building anything on this site will cause flooding in both Greenfields and Flitwick as the moor will not be able to deal with the extra water.</p>
Andrew Hards	<p>I have been a resident of both Flitwick & Ampthill for over 25 years. As a keen walker & naturalist I am stunned that Flitwick Moor is once again under threat. It seems that every year someone tries to compromise our natural heritage by encroaching upon this unique site. A 150 yard buffer will make no difference whatsoever. I have walked all over the Mid Beds area & there are plenty of other sites that can be developed without having to compromise our natural heritage.</p>
Andy & Melissa Banthorpe	<p>This land is close to the SSSI of Flitwick Moor. Any development will affect the very fragile ecosystem in the area in many ways. Examples are water runoff and the change to water levels, increased litter, dog mess etc on what is the flagship wet woodland in the county. Even if you just look at the mosses, fungi and lichens on the site it is very important in face for mosses etc it is a premier site in the country. As keen naturalists we want to see this site and others preserved in our county as places where wildlife can thrive - there is no mitigation possible with development at a site like this. There is no way that any development should be allowed to get any closer to the site than at present.</p>
Anne Govier	<p>Such a development, so close to Flitwick Moor, could cause great harm to this very important wildlife site through disturbance, possibility of greatly increased visitor numbers and alteration to the water-table. This would be catastrophic.</p>
Bill Griffiths	<p>This site has special scientific interest and its eco quality will decline.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
C L Terry	The site has limited access and will create an unacceptable increase in the volume of traffic using Maulden Rd which already has very poor visibility for turning into Kings Rd. In addition the proximity to the SSSI would cause harm to the site. Furthermore the area will be subject to flooding as it is low lying when compared to existing water courses. On a wider point of view the commercial leisure and social facilities in Flitwick are inadequate and the failure to include a proper town centre due to political inadequacy means that no further development should take place in this area.
C. A. Cooke	Too close to Green Belt! Too close to Flitwick Moor and a development would spoil a unique site.
D T Withers	It is grossly irresponsible to build anything so close to an exceedingly important SSSI site.
D. T. Saunders	Building on this site would completely destroy the Flitwick Moor and the wildlife in this area.
D.L. and J. M. Hodgkinson	Flitwick Moor is a Site of Special Scientific Interest and as such should be protected and cherished. Housing proposals for this site have been turned down in the past and we urge that they be so again. It is not good enough to put in "a buffer zone and less dense housing" as there would still be too much disturbance ; the whole site is needed to protect the nature reserve and should eventually become part of it. The vital water supply to the site would be affected if houses were built here, thus damaging the important flora and fauna in the area.
David Sedgley	This land was recently put into permanent Greenbelt by Mid Beds council due to the environmental impact that development would have on the extremely important, rare and fragile Flitwick Moor. It should never have appeared in this survey.
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	Would not support any housing development on farmland and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security.
Enid Clark	To build on the Moor would ruin a SSI important site. Campaigns in the past have shown the feelings of Flitwick residents against this development. Traffic concerns in Flitwick are very important and further housing would have great implications.
Fiona Bureau	With respect, how many times do local people have to raise objections to planning applications on land adjacent to this SSSI? It is a nationally important area for wildlife, with many rare mosses, fungi and invertebrates, all of which are very sensitive to disturbance, both in terms of people walking in the immediate locality and in changes to the water table. Since so much of Flitwick has already been destroyed by development, could planning consent be refused here in favour of building in less sensitive areas, such as the Old Robsons yard area and the land along Steppingly Road?
Fleur Beck	I strongly oppose this proposal to build on Green Belt land. Please can you confirm to me that this has been protected for 10 years?
Frances Neal	Flitwick Moor has been there for centuries and is one of nature's jewels. When there are so many other areas for housing development the damage to the natural environment that a development here would cause is inexcusable. It must not be allowed.
G. Griffiths	This moorland has special scientific interest with rare blue butterfly and other natural interest grass and mosses. Once this is lost it cannot be replaced. It is also a local beauty spot and Green Belt.

Submitted by	Comments
G. Tilley	Green Belt issue is vital. Poor transport links for housing. Far too extensive.
Graham and Pat Bellamy	This should not go ahead. It is in green Belt. Too close to Flitwick moor a rare habitat dependant on good quality water supply from ground water . Quality and quantity of water may be affected by development. Also Flitwick moor habitats are fragile and may be damaged by unsustainable increase in visitors. Also more disturbance to wildlife, especially breeding and wintering birds, such as water rail and woodcock by dogs off lease, also disturbance of grazing livestock which provide essential management to the grasslands, by increased dog walking.
Howard Hodges	These new houses will be out of "local" price range & will be brought out in the main by commuters to London or MK. This land is also an important buffer to Flitwick Moor, & building on it will damage the water table & destroy the Moor. There will also be added pressure on the Moor from human visitors & the introduction of cats in the housing will add dangers to wildlife.
Ian Barker	This site has been repeatedly put in for planning time after time and has been rejected after strong protests from all of Flitwick. The local community has just bought folly wood to increase the size of the SSSI site. It would really be helpful after all the effort put in by everyone concerned if this site was removed permanently from any further planning application process. There is more than enough space for all the proposed housing in the triangle between Ampthill and Maulden roads without stretching Flitwick down to the moor.
Ian Nutley	Green belt land, adjacent to SSSI. Oppose.
Ian Scott	This area has been subject to great debate over the years and historically should be retained as green belt for as long as possible. Any development close to the Flitwick Moor will/would have severe impact on that fragile environment.
J. Priestley	This site has been contentious for many years. The landowners keep trying to cash in. They need to be made aware in uncertain terms that development is not acceptable to the community.
Jason Bagge	Build on Flitwick Moor - no I do not support this.
Jean Abbott	1. This is Green Belt land and has archaeological interest and so shouldn't be built on. 2. It will be immediately adjacent to Flitwick Moor and Folly Wood and would be likely to have serious effects on the drainage and wildlife value of these important sites. 3. I think it is outrageous that developers should keep on trying to develop this area, where planning consent has already been refused on previous occasions.
Jim Godden	This again looks like the Flitwick Moor proposal repeatedly refused even at public enquiry. It must be opposed as this is vital green belt.
John Hele	Placing any housing on this site with it being so close to Flitwick Moor would be disastrous for the flora and fauna of the moor. Domestic pets and animals would devastate the birds and small mammals of the moor which is unique within the surrounding area.

Submitted by	Comments
John Pitts	This site is immediately adjacent to Flitwick Moor; FM is a SSSI and a unique habitat not only within Bedfordshire and the East Anglia region but from an European viewpoint. I would strongly support the Wild Life Trust in objecting to any plans for this adjacent land and you already have registered my objection to plans put forward a year or so ago which were successfully sustained. Housing on this land would destroy the unique nature reserve with excessive human intervention and domestic cats. Drainage would completely unbalance the sensitive hydrology.
John Silvester	To build adjacent to Flitwick Moor would be a disaster. Just two of the many problems from low-cost housing would be the prevalence of children and cats. They would quickly destroy the delicate balance of the area
John Thorp	Contrary to the emerging core strategy and a major development on this area could very adversely effect the nearby Flitwick Moor / Folly Wood. A possible narrow ribbon development along the existing road could be beneficial if linked to a transfer of the major part of the plot to the Wildlife Trust to preserve as part of Flitwick Moor.
Judy Davey	Although this site is in a good location I strongly disagree with the planning proposal due to its location in relation to Flitwick Moor as you know a SSSI Areas like this need protection, building houses next to such an area does not provide this protection Not everyone treats land and the environment with respect and more pressure would be placed on Flitwick Moor
Julie Moxon	It is absolutely crucial to the well being of Flitwick Moor that no development takes place in this area. The ecology of the moor depends on maintaining the water levels as they are and any building close by would significantly alter this with disastrous results for flora and fauna. This is a precious and ancient gift, which nothing should be allowed to destroy.
Juliette White	I am opposed to any housing development adjacent to the ecologically important site of Flitwick Moor, despite the offer of a woodland buffer. Any development in this area may irreversibly destroy its unique ecological balance.
JV Speirs	If this proposal goes ahead the special interest of Flitwick Moor (botanical, invertebrate, mosses, fungi) will be irreparably damaged by changes to the water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage caused by a large number of visitors to such a fragile habitat. In any case this is green belt land and as such should not be developed in this way.
Kate Frost	This site would not be suitable as it is too close to Flitwick Moor. There is little land around Flitwick of wildlife interest - so do NOT build where it would mean us loosing what little there is around
Kathy Johnson	The area adjacent to this - Flitwick Moor Nature reserve - is the most important wetland site in Bedfordshire and is a SSI because of this. Any adjacent housing development would inevitably detrimentally impact the water levels for the site. It has been there for millennia and for the people of the area a fabulous and unique place. The council has no right destroy it. Housing development can go anywhere, it doesn't make any difference to the development, but priceless wildlife sites cannot. Once they're lost, they are lost for ever. This development must not be allowed

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Keith Balmer	This site is adjacent to Flitwick Moor SSSI, one of the most important wetlands in the region. The pressure on the site from additional residents and their pets, together with pollution run-off, and potential effects on the water table makes this site unsuitable for development of any sort. It should be retained as a buffer zone for the SSSI. The application should be rejected on environmental grounds.
Kerrie Cottrell	Flitwick moor is a nationally important site, and I feel a housing development this close would really jeopardise the future of the site. A buffer zone is not sufficient to militate against the disruption and damage that would be caused by such a development.
Kevin Sherwood	Residential should not be considered at all!!!! This site is ideal for the new Leisure Centre. A land swop could occur with the current Leisure Centre Site, the playing fields could back on to the Moor and the site preserved as a ecologically landscaped barrier to the SSSI.
Lionel Yarde	This site has already been subject to planning refusal as it is adjacent to Flitwick Moor.
Liz Stokes	Any development near to the wonderful area of Flitwick Moor would potentially damage the ecological balance, and spoil the area aesthetically.
Lucian Morris	This site is too close to Flitwick Moor and could have considerable impact upon it. The moor is a rich but potentially vulnerable environment and should be left as is without significant development next to it. There are many better sites in Flitwick that I feel would be better suited to the purpose. I strongly feel that most development within Bedfordshire should be centred around current towns. However, I do not like the idea of development close to such vulnerable sites. The moor is a wetland habitat and developing close by could significantly impact this by changing the water table or impacting local drainage.
Lucy Debenham	It is green belt land and the area around the moor and the moor itself is not a suitable area. You may say that its green belt and therefore nothing is guaranteed, but it shouldn't even be considered.
M P Skerratt	This site would provide huge congestion into Flitwick from the surrounding. Villages and increase the congestions for the current population based on the Maulden Road side. I cannot support this proposed development as the countryside is Green Belt and that has been placed to protect the countryside and further development will place a concrete scar across rural England. The wildlife and plant life locally provides a great interest to all including Schools, so why destroy that. Also proposing such working with have detrimental effect on pollution within the area which is obviously not good for the environment and with young children very close to the site this would be a huge concern to all in the area.
Mandy Wilsmore	This land should not be built upon. the buffer that is mentioned is not good enough. The moor was saved once before - and now they are after building again.
Margaret Goose	Concern about the potential impact on the SSSI at Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve e.g. water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage.
Mark Anstee	Every year it is proposed to build on this site. This will destroy the moors. Why is this site even on the list?

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Hustwitt	The site would be an unacceptable expansion of the urban area of the town. It is too near Flitwick Moor and the SSSI sited there. It would potentially cause considerable environmental damage. It is also far from facilities - health centres, schools, town centre, public transport.
Matthew Morris	This site is green belt and should not be developed. Furthermore, it is adjacent to Flitwick Moor, a Site of Special Scientific Interest which is Bedfordshire's largest area of wetland and not only locally important but of national importance too. A buffer of 150m from the proposed development to Flitwick Moor is not sufficient to risk damage to the site caused by changes to the water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage caused by an unsustainably high number of visitors to such a fragile habitat.
Michael Brooks	This site is in the Green Belt, the principle of which is that it should endure; it should therefore not be altered in this area. The site is close to Flitwick Moor SSSI, the largest area of wetland in Bedfordshire, outstanding for its botanical and invertebrate interest, as well as being of national importance for mosses and fungi. If housing were located on this site, the special interest of Flitwick Moor would inevitably be damaged by changes to the water environment (including water quality); also by disturbance to wildlife from an unsustainably high number of visitors and by domestic pets which would be bound come from housing in close proximity to such a fragile habitat. The proposed 150m buffer zone would be insufficient to prevent this. The most that might be permitted would be a few dwellings, one unit deep only, along the frontage on the eastern side of Maulden Road between the existing northern extent of development and Folly Farm. This site should be rejected outright.
Michael G Brown	This site is too close to the important wetland of Flitwick Moor. Building on this site will change the water supply to the Moor, and change its habitat irretrievably. The impact of increased human activity and its associated pets, especially felines, will jeopardise the continuation of the small colony of water rail. Planning permission for this site has already been refused. The reasons for this refusal are still valid, and are the reasons it should not be included in the development plan.
Mike Brown	This proposal is completely inappropriate. Flitwick Moor is the most important wetland in Bedfordshire and of national Importance for some species. Any development will beyond any shadow of doubt adversely impact hydrology and therefore the Moor. There is no scenario at all, ever, that should envisage this sort of development. There are vast areas of farmland of little or no wildlife value around Flitwick that could take a development of this size, and the council should be proactive in encouraging other sites to come forward.
Miss L Gould	This site has potential to be developed for shops and services but could affect local environmental land. This site is a site of special scientific interest, Flitwick Moor is the largest area of wetland in Bedfordshire.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mr A K Rogers	Dear Sir. I believe development on this site will cause great harm to the adjacent Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve as the water table is very near the surface and therefore any drainage of the development site would also drain water from the moor. If houses are built the moor would also become a dumping ground for all kinds of rubbish and pollution, as all run off would end up in the moor as it dose from the nearby industrial estate. Therefore irreparable damage will be done by changes to the water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage caused by local residents to such a fragile habitat.
Mr and Mrs Phillips	Green Belt Sites should remain Green Belt Sites. In particular we have a big concern over the damage that would be caused to this outstanding Special Scientific Interest site by the covering over of natural ground areas with concrete and tarmac. This would affect the wildlife within this area.
Mr and Mrs Sheridan	If this development is planned on the same site that the people of Flitwick have objected too for many years i.e. on land that affects the natural habitat of the moor, then we object for ALL the reasons stated in previous objections. The moor is an integral part of Flitwicks history, it is unique not only to Bedfordshire but to the country as a whole. Why else would the Wild Life Trust support it? To destroy such a treasure would be criminal. However, if the land on the opposite side of Maulden Road can be utilised, we would have no objections. Neither would we object to houses being built alongside the current bungalows, again, so long as they do not encroach on the moor and its natural water table. But this will probably not suit the developers because of the close proximity of the industrial estate and the sewerage works!
Mr Colin Carpenter	This site which is in the greenbelt, is one of the most important sites in Flitwick Moor SSSI and is part of the whole River Flit Valley Mire area. Flitwick Moor is SO IMPORTANT as a wildlife reserve that no development on this land should ever be considered. The hydrology and drainage of the site would be seriously affected by building houses in this area.
Mr D Williams	Over populated already.
Mr R Hammond	I do not think any housing or further expansion of any sort is needed in Flitwick - Flitwick has already out grown itself and certainly does not need any future developments of any kind
Mrs C Skerratt	This site should not be used for any future development because soon Flitwick will become a sprawling community that has outgrown its nice small town appeal. The station is already extremely busy everyday and if more housing developments are to be built it will be very unpleasant for any commuters. Other areas near the town would be better for business development as existing developments are already there. However to development on land that is very attractive and buzzing with wild life that has a lot of appeal would ruin the little countryside that is left around this area.
Mrs G Carpenter	I'm astounded that you're even considering this site for development. The effect of any development on Flitwick Moor would be disastrous - more people in the area using the Moor for recreation, cats would go there + kill wildlife, water levels would be affected. A 150 metre buffer would stop none of these. Ridiculous to even suggest it.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs J M Crisp	The people of Flitwick campaigned long and hard to get housing rejected for this site because of its proximity to Flitwick moor. This site should not even be under consideration. any development could not help but be detrimental to the moor and its flora and fauna.
Mrs Linda Hamilton	Flitwick Moor is of such importance as a unique area of wetland in Bedfordshire that we just cannot take the risk of developing adjacent farmland. Changes of any kind to the water supply could wreak untold havoc on the area and a treasured location could be lost forever.
Mrs P Palmer	1) Maulden rd is already a nightmare regarding traffic, too busy and mornings and evenings much too fast! 2) Flitwick Moor is much too valuable to destroy by building houses and make no mistake it WILL destroy the Moor and the wildlife by altering the water table and also by cats etc roaming and killing the birds. The moors already suffers from vandalism from children and teenagers and this will only get worse with houses nearer. If you destroy the Moors now, against everyone's wishes, what do you intend leaving as your excuse for future generations - a load of houses and a few sticks of scrub?? Local people have fought long and hard to protect the Moor for very good reason, why do you insist on going against their wishes - I expect the money will come in handy and after all why leave Flitwick with anything of any beauty.
Mrs R Tillett	I am concerned about development on this site because of its close proximity to Flitwick Moor nature reserve.
Mrs W H Gould	I do not think there is any "new" social infrastructure that this site could support, and that building on (or near) wildlife Trust Nature Reserve eg. "Flitwick Moor" would have a very destructive effect and impact on the local countryside and wildlife and bring more noise and crime to what is at the moment a quiet area.
Mrs. Lindsey Barker	I am absolutely horror struck that this site is even being considered for housing development after all the fighting for the Nature Reserve in the past. It will upset the water table and everything around it and it is about time this area of land was made safe from developers.
Ms Val Stavely	Flitwick Moor is a very precious and rare habitat area and any development posing any threat to the health of the habitat should be a last resort or never. 250 - 275 dwellings even with buffer zone would threaten the rare species survival. it will be too late if damage occurs as a result of a development such as this, to realise it was a mistake. Please do not take the risk.
Nicola Bodie	I am concerned about Flitwick moor nature reserve. Flitwick moor is known for its botanical and invertebrate interest, as well as its national importance of mosses and fungi. If housing is built on the adjacent land, the special interest of the site will be irreparably damaged by changes to the water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage caused by an unsustainably high number of visitors to such a fragile habitat. This cannot be allowed to happen!
Nigel Pollard	I would be very concerned about the impact on Flitwick Moor SSSI. A narrow buffer will not help - the impact of development on the drainage in this part of Flitwick could destroy one of Bedfordshire's (and indeed the UKs) key sites of natural heritage.
P.J Frampton obo ORS plc	there is no justification for taking land from this green belt to meet development needs of the borough when land that is excluded from the green belt is suitable and available to accommodate sustainable urban growth of Flitwick.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Patsy Kean	This is far too close to the SSI of Flitwick Moor.
Paul Bowyer	Housing on this site would have a negative impact on the surrounding area. This is open green land use by local people and this would be lost if houses were built. There are few shops and facilities in walking distance of this site and the increase in people this would bring would put a strain on the facilities already in the town and create a lot more traffic through the quiet villages of greenfield and Pulloxhill.
Paul Vidler	This site is too close to Flitwick Moor, an SSSI, and any development would have a serious detrimental effect on the local ecology.
Pauline Heather	This will ruin Flitwick Moor - disturb wild life and change the water quality.
Phil Winder	A large development of this kind would inevitably have a substantial negative impact on the adjacent Flitwick Moor SSSI. This site should be retained for agricultural use, consistent with the Green Belt.
R N Arthur	This site is adjacent to Flitwick Moor, a unique SSSI which contains many very rare mosses and plants, which will be irreparably damaged by development of this site for housing. If houses need to be built in Flitwick there is other more appropriate land available, development of which will not impact on Flitwick moor. it is imperative that Flitwick moor is protected for future generations.
R T Preusch-Pearson	Nothing more than a [illegible] and local history [illegible].
Rob Mason	This site should be left as it is. It is green belt land. You admit that yourself, as such, development goes against your own strategy. It would obviously have an impact on Flitwick Moor, a site of special interest. Building there has been contested in the past, and planning permission refused, so that should be the end of the matter. I strongly disagree with development there, and will do all in my power to prevent it.
Roy A Cleary	as we have been down this route before, i think this site should be be protected for all time. all land to the east of Maulden road should never be considered for housing or industry.
Roy Storey	A vast amount of public mony has been spent on ensuring this land would not be built on, Councillors of all parties have claimed the glory, WHY are we now in a position to have to fight this all over again
Simon Bevis	This site is the most important natural site in Bedfordshire & any damage would be irreparable. I have no problem with any other sites in the area but please, please leave this nature reserve space. from the rest of the town to protect it from the encroachment of lights, cats, rubbish, noise & any other pollutants that could undo millennia of natures work. I will even actively support all efforts for any other sites in the area to help protect this one.
Steven Brinkworth	This development will have significant negative impact on Flitwick Moor.
Susan Brown	The potential for damage to Flitwick Moor is to great. This area is of special scientific interest and needs to be protected not put at risk All green belt land should be left alone.

Submitted by	Comments
Ms Tina Kent	This site is within Green Belt and was very recently made permanent Green Belt and with a development suggested thrown out. It is near the moor and adjacent to a site of SSI, CWS and with historic interest. The woodland buffer is not adequate to built near moor, even if this was relevant (but it is not in my opinion as it is Green Belt and should be safe-guarded against any kind of development). The special conditions surrounding the Moor and its vulnerable positions (regarding drainage etc) would make this site totally unsuitable. It is the worst proposition of all within the Flitwick area and the most damaging. It is not even, that near the new proposed Town Centre and would also incur more traffic.
V Scargill	An application for housing on this site has recently been rejected. It is absolutely unsuitable as not only is this within the green belt but it would encroach unacceptably near to Flitwick Moor on invaluable wildlife site of great historical interest. The town is already unacceptably near the moor.
William Griffiths	Flitwick Moor is a conservation project requiring a total open space around its perimeter. Any buildings in the immediate vicinity would conflict with the area designated as of scientific interest and cause an imbalance to the current species.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H317

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
Mr Graeme Free	The site comprises a roughly L-shaped parcel of land. To the front of the site is a residential dwelling house adjacent to which is a Ford car dealership. The rear of the site comprises a building in Class B1 office use, several servicing bays related to the car dealership and a large area of hard standing used to park cars. The current commercial use of the site together with the large expanse of hard standing is detrimental to the appearance and openness of the Green Belt. Any proposed residential development would create a more compact form of development enhancing the appearance, landscaping and openness of the Green Belt in this location. Furthermore, the report site is well screened from the open countryside by trees and hedges, which would minimise views of the site from the public realm. The development of the site could create demand for public services in the area, thus improving the vitality and viability of this part of Flitwick. Therefore, local facilities and services would be improved by the residential development of this site.
Mr Graham Tilley	Given sufficient, safe road access, this would seem a sensible use of site if 101 Garage is abandoned, although as the only remaining competition to Tesco for petrol in the Ampthill - Flitwick area, its loss would be most regrettable

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Julie Moxon	If existing buildings are demolished and renewed it might be acceptable, but definitely not to cram more units onto the site along with the existing buildings. This area is already congested at peak times, so additional vehicular movement in this area is particularly unwelcome, especially with its proximity to the school and the danger to the lives of young people.

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 James Gibb	It is within the green belt. Given that the green belt between Flitwick and Ampthill is so narrow at this point, there should be a bar on such degradation. Also, given the likelihood of more severe weather due to climate change, any development on the flood plain should be avoided.
Mr James Godden	On Flood plain, see submission

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Michael Brooks	If this site is brownfield land, there might be some merit in its development. However, the narrow strip of Green Belt separating Ampthill and Flitwick has already been eroded by development at Doo Little Mill and on the former depot on the opposite side of the watercourse. The site is well away from the centres of both Ampthill and Flitwick and so no local facilities are within easy walking distance.
Mr Andrew Long	It has always been the case that the "green wedge" separating Flitwick from Ampthill should be safeguarded. This should remain the case with the LDF once this replaces the current Local Plan. It may also be the case that the A507 will require "dualling" at a future date, given the planned housing & other developments being proposed in Mid Beds. If indeed this is the case, then safeguarding for such road widening is essential. Road improvements cannot be discounted, given the Flitwick Town Centre (Tesco/Cowlgrove) proposals, Centre Parcs, NIRAH, The Wixams & other traffic generating developments! Great care is needed to ensure infrastructure matches growth. Planning consents should not be given where the infrastructure is lacking in capacity or cannot be match-funded through Section 106 Agreements, etc.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H345**

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 Andrew Long	Amphill Road/Froghall Lane is totally unsuitable for further development unless significant road improvements are carried out. This includes the Steppingley Hospital crossroads, the railway bridge under the Midland Main Line, the bends at Doo Little and provision of a footway with street lighting. The further consideration of the water course behind the site has implications once Centre Parcs is developed, as this stream drains from the Centre Parcs site. The site should be safeguarded should the facilities at Steppingley Hospital require expansion or additional medical facilities for Flitwick be required.
Mr Andrew Mcilhatton	This proposal is for an inappropriate development within highly vulnerable green belt. Development on this site will contribute towards an undesirable coalescence between Flitwick, Amphill and Steppingley.
Mr Graham Tilley	In view of other developments in Flitwick, keeping green belt countryside north of Amphill Road should be a priority
Mr James Farnsworth	It is greenbelt area and as such should be left alone.
Mr James Gibb	Although the impact of this site on the green belt is less than the proposed development at 101 garage, any development within the green belt should be resisted, unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary.
Mr Matthew Morris	The proposed development is on green belt land and should not be developed or even be considered for development. Green belt land exists to protect our green spaces from urban sprawl and to provide us with green spaces to enjoy and to provide refuge for local wildlife. This development is on a main road which acts as a busy link between Steppingley, Flitwick and Amphill. No mention of road congestion has been mentioned and I believe access to and from the proposed site would be too dangerous.
Mr Michael Brooks	This site is within the Green Belt and that is sufficient reason for its rejection. However, its access from Froghall Road, with its bad bend under the railway bridge, would increase traffic and decrease road safety. Furthermore, it is remote from both Amphill and Flitwick town centres and local services.
Mr S Pankhurst	This site is within Green Belt and therefore not appropriate for development. In addition, it is on the boundary between Steppingley and Flitwick and would therefore erode the green space between Flitwick and Steppingley contributing to future urban coalescence.
Mrs Barbara Stone	This site is an important part of the green belt which is needed to prevent coalescence between Flitwick and Amphill.
Mrs Julie Moxon	Only brown sites should be built on. Any green areas remaining in Flitwick - now very few, should be preserved for the well being of residents and ecological balance. Flitwick is rapidly disappearing under bland concrete structures and losing any historical references and any buildings with character. I am particularly against the practice of large houses and bungalows being demolished to be replaced with numerous smaller dwellings and with people building in their gardens. There will soon be no properties available in the town suitable for young families with outdoor play and relaxation space.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs Vivienne Williams	The form is not really relevant to the site in question. 6 to 10 houses built on Green Belt land, within driving distance of facilities, no public transport and positioned on a busy narrow road, would not make a "significant contribution..." and be against Mid Beds policy of building on Green Belt.
Ms Mary Goulder	This area is already congested at certain times during the day as the road is used as a cross country route. I object to any development large or small that uses green belt or agricultural land.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E07

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Rambart	Always a good idea to keep industrial areas together
J Priestley	This site is suitable provided there is good job provision. It should be an objective to increase the proportion of residents working locally before any more housing is created.
Kevin Sherwood	This is an ideal employment site the only problem i can see is transport access for HGV. Maulden Road would need to be improved and a weight limit enforced into Flitwick
Matt Harris	Good to retain more employment in local area, especially B1. Public transport non-existent?
P T Hughes	Good transport potential onto Flitwick - Maulden Road and traffic can reach A507 and proceed east and west.
Richard Barlow	As area surrounds the existing industrial area and has access from A507, it makes sense to utilise the area. One major concern, however, is the poor access from Flitwick town centre. Even with the proposed development of the town centre, I think a ban of vehicles over 3.5Tonne in Kings Road, Station Road and the Avenue needs to be implemented.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Andrew Long	E07 out of scale to surroundings. Not possible to be rail-served in logistics/distribution context. Better sites elsewhere in Mid Beds - adjacent to Ridgmont bypass, M1 junction 13 of Amazon units etc. E07 site better suited for housing development.
G Tilley	Expands existing area without impinging on attractive countryside.
Rob Mason	You admit that This site is within the Green Belt and development would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy Surely that speaks for itself. Why propose it at all? There is no need for a country park. There is plenty of countryside on the other side of the road, IF YOU DONTT BUILD NEEDLESS HOUSING ON IT!! or are you just trying to softening the blow! What is B1, B2 and B8 use. How can an accurate opinion be formed when these numbers are not defined? How high would these building be? District Council initial comments: Further employment development could consolidate Flitwick's role as a Major Service centre. Maybe the residents of Flitwick do not want it to become a major service centre. Has anyone asked them??

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. Preusch-Pearson	This is greenbelt! Do you really believe that local jobs will pay enough so people can afford to buy the houses which are going to build here?

Submitted by	Comments
Alda Mason	<p>Again this propose site is within the green belt which is against the emerging core strategy.</p> <p>Are you just proposing sites that you know will get a huge reaction against, so that you can slip in the sites you have already decided on???</p> <p>Surely any money you have should go on improving the school buildings at Redborne Upper (for one). The school is subsiding; the classrooms are old and no longer fit for modern purpose. The entire school needs bulldozing and rebuilding to make it a better place for students to learn and teachers to teach. It is disgraceful that you want to build more houses and bring more industry in, thereby bringing in more people to use and already creaking schools system, before improving what there is already in the town.</p>
C B Long	<p>Out of scale with existing town structure. Impact of heavy industrial traffic on already inappropriate road system.</p>
Colin Carpenter	<p>I disagree with this decision to develop land behind the existing industrial estate because the amount of traffic generated would be huge especially with large lorries and juggernauts. Maulden Road is also very busy and traffic use on this road is increasing every year. Also the area behind the industrial estate contains Pussy Pond and is an important link with the 2 Moors Heritage Trail. The site is also close to Ruxox an archaeological site and views from the top are spectacular.</p>
David Penfold	<p>This uses up Green field land to provide industrial space so this is not in the interests of the local population and would be another loss of natural landscape all adding the climate change problem of too much concrete, traffic and pollution.</p>
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	<p>Would not support any commercial development on farmland (except farming) and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security</p>
James Patrick Clark	<p>Your questions above are tilted to support the proposed development. Flitwick has always been a dormitory town and since Tesco has been built the variety of retail shops has been reduced.</p> <p>To build nearer to Flitwick Moor would only cause further damage to the environment of the SSSI.</p> <p>The traffic situation, especially the already dangerous Greenfield Road Flitwick (by the mill) will only get worse. Increased employment would only be temporary while the building was going on. Flitwick already needs more infrastructure to support the current population. This would encourage more people to find work locally, thus reducing commuting traffic.</p>
Jean Abbott	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is going to be the landscape of wildlife value of a country park with an industrial estate on one side and the sewage works & Ampthill bypass on the other? 2. This is Green Belt land & shouldn't be built on.
Julie Moxon	<p>There should be no building for housing, industrial or commercial use on green belt land. It is very important to maintain green areas for health and well being reasons.</p> <p>it would be acceptable to develop some of this area as a country park as this would be beneficial to the environment and would preserve a natural environment for our children and grandchildren.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Michael Brooks	This site is in the Green Belt, whose boundary it is not intended to revise (Core Strategy). Despite this, a small extension to the employment area immediately adjacent to the existing industrial estate at Commerce Way and Enterprise Way would be acceptable at the southern/SW end of the site, but not covering the whole area submitted. Any extension to the existing industrial estate should be generously landscaped: at present, the hard edge between development and open countryside is rather stark. The country park proposal, however, would be highly welcome and would take some of the pressure off other facilities in the area, especially Ampthill Park which is over-used with erosion and other problems. A way should be found to enable the country park to the north of the site without requiring development of the whole of the site proposed by the developer.
Mr D Williams	Tesco wants to expand already. It's got the chemists in the town but is not a good store, staff scruffy and impolite.
Mr R Hammond	I do not think any housing or further expansion of any sort is needed in Flitwick - Flitwick has already out grown itself and certainly does not need any future developments of any kind
Mrs W H Gould	There are lots of local services in the allocated areas that are already being supported by local people, and I think there are enough housing estates in these allocated areas, and to build on a greenbelt nature reserves fields is wrong (eg. Flitwick Moor)
P Jones	You need to put buffer greenbelt between industrial units and housing!! Have you considered how much car parking will be needed? How much further will you build towards Ampthill and Maulden. Is this all really necessary?? More industry - more traffic - more parking!!
P.J. Frampton on behalf of Ors plc	There is no justification for the scale of employment land identified or for the taking of land from this greenbelt. A small employment land release on land bounded by Steppingly Road/Froghall Road would service the future needs of Flitwick in conjunction with employment growth within the town centre.
Roy Storey	GREEN BELT LAND No thought is given to this proposal except the sign of pound notes. There is the Pussy Pond there is the the land between the top end of Roman way and The Ridgeway which does not have public right of way. There is the landscaping of this area which contains many species of trees and shrubs, Will the proposer please wake up to these points.
Sian Jones	I think further business and industrial use in this area will cause increase in noise and adversely affect vehicle movement through and around Flitwick.
Tina	This is Green Belt land and should only have a Country Park, not any form of business use on it.
V. Scargill	To extend this industrial area to be more than double the current size would encroach far too much onto open countryside - the proposal for a country park would come nowhere near compensation for this loss of facility. it is also far too close to Flitwick Moor - a major wildlife nature reserve. Disturbance would be inevitable

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E30

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

Submitted by	Comments
Matt Harris	Good site, no public transport?
P. J Frampton on behalf of Ors Plc and Flitwick Town Council	There is no justification for the scale of employment land identified or for the taking of land from this greenbelt. A small employment land release on land bounded by Steppingly Road/Froghall Road would service the future needs of Flitwick in conjunction with employment growth within the town centre. The proposed location of the employment site as shown on the November 2007 Master Plan will closely relate with employment facilities to the Rufus Centre
	Refer to accompanying correspondence the proposed location of the employment site as shown on the November 2007 master plan will closely relate with employment facilities to the Rufus centre.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	Would not support any commercial development on farmland (except farming) and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security.
J Priestley	Greenbelt - reject in favour of E31.
Julia Pankhurst	This land is within Green Belt and is totally inappropriate. It would also create coalescence between Flitwick & Steppingly. Thank you.
Julie Moxon	Tennis facilities are provided in the leisure centre. There should be no building on green belt land. If additional tennis facilities are required they should be included in the plans for the H077 development.
Mr D Williams	Tesco wants to expand already. It's got the chemists in the town but is not a good store, staff scruffy and impolite.
Paul Rowntree	Object to the development on the south west side of Steppingly Road as it would impact on an area used for recreational purposes by the residents of Flitwick (the farmland has numerous paths) and impact on the view from Flitwick Wood
Tina Kent	This is Green Belt Land and should not be used for development of any kind. It is also AGLV. This should be open for public, not only for tennis players

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E31

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

Submitted by	Comments
J Priestley	Appropriate for a tennis centre to be provided on this site, so long as football pitches are not encroached upon (or equivalent space provided) and the leisure centre remains on the adjacent site.
Matt Harris	Site not appropriate for employment. Good alternative for tennis club.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Hustwitt	This development is on existing leisure land and if the leisure centre is developed elsewhere, freeing up the football fields would not be out of keeping with the site. The tennis club (or someone) is clearly putting in a number of applications like this to make the sites at E32 and H124 look more acceptable. The developments E32 and H124 are on allotment land and would remove this important and sustainable public amenity. There is already a lack of allotments in Flitwick and a waiting list for them when they fall empty. Taking them out for this use would not be environmentally beneficial and would reduce available allotments for future users. The tennis club should be developed elsewhere. As a suggestion additional allotments could be a useful planning gain for large-scale developments in Flitwick to help remedy this situation.
Paul Rowntree	No objection in principle, provided the following: No impact on the Steppingly Road allotments That the plans do not conflict with the consultation proposals for development of the sports centre area as part of the plan to move it to the town centre That the development does not extend across Steppingly Road to the south west side of it as shown in the map. The farmland there and paths on it are used by residents of Flitwick extensively for walking and recreational purposes and it would impact on the view from Flitwick Wood.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Dr A Bourne/ Dr F Steele	Would not support any commercial development on farmland (except farming) and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security
Ian Rambart	For 4 jobs is it worth it and wouldn't it be best to keep all the industry together. I know it depends on what it is, but there is not enough detail
Jason Bagge	I thought the new leisure centre was going on this site.

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Hustwitt	<p>This development is on a greenfield site and could lead to further development on this side of Steppingley Road, increasing urban sprawl.</p> <p>The tennis club (or someone) is clearly putting in a number of applications like this to make the site at its present location and on allotment land seem more palatable (and funding it from housing on its current site).</p> <p>The developments E32 and H124 on allotment land and would remove this important and sustainable public amenity. There is already a lack of allotments in Flitwick and a waiting list for them when they fall empty. Taking them out for this use would not be environmentally beneficial and would reduce available allotments for future users.</p> <p>The tennis club should be developed elsewhere.</p> <p>As a suggestion additional allotments could be a useful planning gain for large-scale developments in Flitwick to help remedy this situation.</p>
Mr D Williams	Tesco wants to expand already. It's got the chemists in the town but is not a good store, staff scruffy and impolite.
Paul Rowntree	<p>Part of this land is proposed for an expansion of the allotments in the recent consultation regarding the move of the sports centre to the town centre.</p> <p>Object unless the area of land in the consultation proposed for allotment use is removed from the proposal and unless the scheme does not impact on the existing allotments.</p>
Roy Storey	My thoughts on E32 and E31 are this, this land is Public Open Space which the town council is hell bent on selling???? it is not theirs to sell it belongs to the people of Flitwick and until there is a proper public debate on that which the Town council is proposing these two site should be removed from this consultation. The Council according to their proposals made plain in November/December last year planned for 80 dwellings to be built on this area, what is the truth tennis courts, houses or is it BOTH.
Tina Kent	This site should not be developed, as it would limit the possibilities of the new leisure centre to move over to this site.
William Griffiths	This land is currently an Open Space reserved for Football Pitches. In the Town .Council Plan, unacceptable Housing was indicated for this land

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E32

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

Submitted by	Comments
Julie Moxon	this is a more acceptable site for a tennis facility if there is a real need for such a facility. Perhaps it could be combined with an indoor cricket facility.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alda Mason	So you move an outdoor tennis centre to an indoor one. Good move, BUT you build over part of the allotments which would take away someone else's enjoyment of an outdoor pursuit (mainly the older generations, who maybe wouldn't attend the tennis sessions). None of these proposals appear, to me, to have been thought through properly. its almost as if someone took at dart and threw it at a map of Flitwick and wherever it landed that's where building proposals would be sited. No thought appears to have been made regarding infrastructure, road congestion, weight of traffic (possibly even affecting houses because of increased vibration), health provision and services, emergency services etc.
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	Would not support any commercial development on farmland (except farming) and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security.
Ian Rambart	Wouldn't it be best to keep business together rather than dotted around her and there.
Jim Godden	The allotment site is an existing amenity and is fully subscribed with a waiting list. This is not an appropriate place for the Tennis club to move to.
Lucy Debenham	If you are proposing to use valuable local resources such as the allotment site (incidentally I have a plot here) as a viable place for further development, then I am strongly against the proposals. Demand for allotments is high and there isn't enough infrastructure in Flitwick to support further housing development.
Mark Hustwitt	This development is on allotment land and would remove this important and sustainable public amenity. There is already a lack of allotments in Flitwick and a waiting list for them when they fall empty. Taking them out for this use would not be environmentally beneficial and would reduce available allotments for future users. The tennis club should be developed elsewhere. As a suggestion additional allotments could be a useful planning gain for large-scale developments in Flitwick to help remedy this situation.
Matt Harris	Should remain as allotments.
Mr D Williams	Tesco wants to expand already. It's got the chemists in the town but is not a good store, staff scruffy and impolite.

Submitted by	Comments
Paul Rowntree	Building on the main allotments in Flitwick which are fully utilised, have a waiting list for space on them and are to the best of my knowledge grade 1 agricultural land would be a total disgrace and would be extremely divisive impacting a significant proportion of the population of Flitwick. This also conflicts with the consultation for Flitwick town centre and rebuilding of the sports centre which proposed extension of the allotments because of the current demand.
Tina Kent	This land is safeguarded and for allotments, for which there is already a waiting list.
William Griffiths	This land is currently used as Football pitches because it is designated as an Recreational Open Space. The Town Council Development Plan had indicated unacceptable new housing on this land.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E62

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

Submitted by	Comments
Dr A Bourne/Dr F Steele	Would not support any commercial development on farmland (except farming) and green belt. This open space is vital for mitigating CO2 emissions and for future food security

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

Submitted by	Comments
Julie Moxon	There are already a number of nursery facilities in Flitwick and in close proximity to this site. it could be used for medical facilities, but it is on the edge of the town and would result in most people driving to it, thus increasing traffic and pollution This land could be used for rural or cultural activities such as horse riding or a drama centre, recording studio or art studio with facilities for painting, sculpting, pottery, etc. There could be a small retail outlet linked to the activities.
Matt Harris	Seems too far out of town to be sustainable for doctors / nursery / employment (DoLittle Mill site is on other side of railway however that site seems a more realistic contender to future Public Transport.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Alda Mason	You state that there would be possible uses for doctors surgery, vets, nursery. There is no concrete evidence that these will be put in place. I am probably very cynical, but it is a good way of getting people to agree to the proposals by stating that certain amenities/services may be put in place and then when the proposal has been accepted excuses are made and these amenities/services are not built to the detriment of all who live in the vicinity. There is already great pressure on the infrastructure of the town, we do not need more.
Ian Rambart	Wouldn't it be best to keep business together rather than dotted around her and there
June Kent	The ONLY thing Flitwick needs is relief from commuter parking i.e yellow lines on all roads from say 9am to 12 noon on Monday to Friday to stop the nuisance parking which has now crept all along Temple Way and Manor Way near to Steppingley Road. Restrict ALL street parking Monday to Friday and build a big car park for commuters at a charge of £1 a day like workers in Milton Keynes have to pay and rid the streets of dangerous and inconsiderate parking instead of more unnecessary developments like this.

Submitted by	Comments
Mark Hustwitt	Overdevelopment in the countryside. Could lead to further urban expansion onto this greenfield site.
Mr D Williams	Tesco wants to expand already. It's got the chemists in the town but is not a good store, staff scruffy and impolite.
Roy Storey	Everything about this site appears to be UNKNOWN and that leaves the door open for WHATEVER which sums up the entire plan for Flitwick. Who to blame I am unsure but the Town Council have their own plans within Flitwick and it has always been the aspiration of a certain person to achieve the impossible This has included having a new rail station built behind the Rufus Centre, the one facility Flitwick will need quite soon is a Burial Ground and this the one thing that the Town Council have forgotten about. I suggest these pie in the sky plans remain just that and we all get back to reality.

FLITWICK APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Carole Wren	Flitwick	<p>I have just looked at the proposals for developments in Flitwick and am concerned on a number of levels. Firstly will the increased number of residential accommodation in the area affect the price of my property in a negative way? On the whole people pay more money for property in quiet rural areas as opposed to larger urban areas. Will the council be providing compensation for home owners if the value of their property were to decrease as a result of the developments? Secondly I live in Flitwick because I enjoy being able to walk/cycle to the countryside from my front door without having to use my car. Already we have a Centre Parks development happening up the road which will eat into the available countryside in which I can walk but also increase the traffic through Flitwick creating noise and air pollution. I have an allotment at Steppingley road and can currently look out onto fields when working my plot. With the proposed developments I will be looking onto buildings. I understand that houses and jobs need to be created but if these proposals go ahead the area will have changed dramatically to the one that I moved into 6 years ago. So my question to you again is will the council give me and other home owners financial compensation?</p>
Jean Abbott	Flitwick	<p>I have just finished commenting individually on individual sites in Flitwick through the Talk to Mid-Beds site. I also wanted to express my concern about the likely effects if several of these sites are developed (I recognise that the council doesn't necessarily intend to use all of them). Even with the proposed developments in the town centre, facilities in Flitwick will be fairly limited, and I feel insufficient for the area. Traffic has already increased exponentially in the 30 years I've lived in the town and further building will only make this worse; furthermore it was also make it harder to get out of the town, an aspect which I feel is one of Flitwick's strong points. I am also outraged that developers persist in offering sites in the Green Belt. If we go on like this the whole of Bedfordshire will disappear under concrete.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Anne Roby	Flitwick	<p>I did not find I could answer the questionnaires fully because I thoroughly oppose the present plans of Flitwick Town Council and Mid-Beds Council to develop the centre of Flitwick with a double sized Tesco, more shops and housing and also the possibility of putting a new Leisure Centre in the Millennium Park. I believe that the Leisure centre cannot be moved there for other reasons, but nevertheless because the undoubted increase in traffic across the railway bridge, where a new petrol station would be and along the Steppingley Rd from all the other development Flitwick traffic will suffer interminable jams especially at peak times. The concept of allowing further housing and other development must be seen to be unacceptable by any highway authority. When seen from the regional aspect, Flitwick should not be seen as able to sustain major development if Tesco is allowed to double its size in its present position, even though it would be willing to give money for the other developments. The advantages of allowing it to become twice as big in a site away from the centre of town are great. It would free space to have a proper spacious new town centre, and development of other shopping. Tesco has driven other shops away as we all know. It could have a smaller convenience Tesco for those without transport to the out of town position. Surely proper supportive local buses, like the flitibus would be able to enable shoppers to get to the new super store. Flitwick planners must not forget the likely increase in traffic through Flitwick or to Flitwick if the Marston Vale huge eco town becomes a reality, as well as Nirah and the Centre Park. These are my other comments about the developers` planning applications. 1. Flitwick's green belt and other open spaces e.g. Flitwick Moor and adjacent land on the Maulden Rd H248, H062 E30 should be protected. 2. E32 is proposing to take over allotments (including mine and my husbands!). This land has been used for market gardening for many years is excellent soil, allotments are necessary for health and good food.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Anne Roby [continued]	Flitwick	<p>3. E 31 is taking away football pitches and one of the pleasantest parts of Flitwick as you enter the town along the Steppingley Rd. Once Flitwick loses its open spaces the town can never get them back. I have put forward my concerns for Flitwick, hoping they are shared too by yourself and other planners. I believe we may have to go for high rise (not very high) planned estates saving green space but most importantly dealing with traffic with another road bridge near the station to enable a one way system, and car parking out of town- explore the other options. If the government and regional authorities want to expand Flitwick, they should provide money and not expect Flitwick to mortgage its future to Tesco. I firmly believe that a really imaginative and costly plan, should attract money from regional, governmental and other sources. To be a successful new town Flitwick needs a spacious and workable town centre of character, to be proud of, yours sincerely Anne Roby.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Lucy Debenham	Flitwick	<p>I've been reviewing the plans for the development of Flitwick, and I have to say, as an allotment holder I'm actually quite angry that our allotment site has even been put forward for possible development. I have only recently become an allotment tenant, however I know that people there have put so much time and effort into that site, and a case of just moving the allotment site somewhere else is inconsiderate, unpractical and extremely demoralising for local residents. I actually feel quite insulted as it seems that MBDC doesn't realise the value and importance of this site. For Flitwick, I can probably assume correctly that the majority of people would not want this site to be developed. I understand the importance of sports facilities, but I don't understand why they can't be developed on the existing tennis club site. Flitwick is not a major service centre - it has a supermarket and a train station, and a handful of hairdressers, estate agents and pubs. That's about the extent of it's usefulness. There is not the infrastructure to keep building houses there with, quite frankly, poor local amenities and a severe lack in community spirit. I have lived in Flitwick all my life and the bigger it gets, the more soulless it becomes. Flitwick keeps expanding with new sprawling, lacklustre, expensive but ugly housing estates, and there is little input into providing decent facilities for the existing residents. A new 'village' hall, amenities for young people, a bigger library and some places of cultural interest would be so much more fitting than more shabby and hastily-erected housing estates. As a relatively young person, I do want to get on the property ladder. But I don't want to live in a cheaply made 'box' house on a sprawling estate, with a tiny garden and practically cardboard-thin walls that allow me to hear my neighbours. I have been into these houses, I know what they're like. However, I resent people moving into Flitwick that push house prices up, because they're moving here from more expensive areas, looking at Flitwick as a 'cheap' option. What's more, when the Beaumont Road area was developed, a large number of the houses were snapped up by landlords, so opportunity to buy was made a heck of a lot harder anyway. I am pretty certain that the same will happen with any further developments in Flitwick. What Flitwick needs more than anything is a bypass (as we are going to be crawling with traffic come Center Parcs' opening) and investment in local amenities. NOT more housing. What's more, I am actually quite concerned about Mr Olney and Cowlgrove, and how much influence he has and land he owns. I know of an incidence of him pushing to develop some land formerly known as The Paddocks in Ampthill, where the local council rejected his plans, local residents rejected his plans, MBDC rejected his plans, yet he went straight to the 'top' and they gave it the go ahead, without even visiting the site and it seems not taking into consideration the advice that that area was not entirely suitable for development. It worries me that he owns so</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Lucy Debenham [continued]	Flitwick	much land, and that even if we all reject Cowlgrove's development proposals, they'll do exactly the same thing and get their way again. I think the strategy is to put in a ridiculous planning application, then 'reduce' the scale of development as a 'compromise' and then keep pushing and pushing through all the different levels until someone who lives on the other side of the country gives the development the green light. I don't want this for Flitwick. My last point is that any green belt land should stay green belt. It's been earmarked green belt because it is obviously of some value. What's the point of earmarking it as green belt if it's not protected? I hope you take all of my points into consideration and thank you for the opportunity to present you with my views.
Neill Perry	Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve	I have recently learned of the proposed site for development adjacent to Flitwick Moor. I would like to formally object to this proposal due to the adverse environmental impact this will have on the moor.
Robert Poulter	Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve and Cooper's Hill Nature Reserve in Ampthill.	I understand that two of the proposed development sites are directly adjacent to Sites of Special Scientific Interest - Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve and Cooper's Hill Nature Reserve in Ampthill. I would oppose development on either of these sites as any nearby developments would obviously affect the conditions on the SSSIs to their detriment.

Name	Subject	Comment
Baroness Barbara Young	Flitwick ref: H248, Amphill ref: H097	I would like to record my objections to two sites that would have an impact on two nature conservation sites which have been designated as SSSIs, the highest national level of protection for nature conservation sites, showing how important their wildlife features are. The two proposed development sites are: 1. A proposal for 250-275 dwellings adjacent to Flitwick Moor Nature Reserve and SSSI, Flitwick (Consultation Code H248) Flitwick Moor is the largest wetland in Bedfordshire of special importance for mosses, fungi and invertebrates. The development of housing on the farmland next to the site would damage the site by impacting on water supply, water quality, and would bring many more people onto the reserve than it can sustain. The impact of disturbance on wetland reserves is well documented. 2. A proposal for 100-150 dwellings adjacent to Cooper's Hill Nature Reserve and SSSI, Amphill (Consultation Code H097) Cooper's Hill is one of the few remaining heath land sites in Bedfordshire. Heath land is particularly sensitive to pressure from people, with the risk of trampling, erosion of the sandy habitats by footpath pressure, fires both accidental and malicious and isolation of the site from the rest of the countryside. When several other counties have made specific commitments to protect their remaining heath land habitats following high profile planning enquiries, it would be poor for Bedfordshire's reputation if it permitted development adjacent to this rare and important habitat. I do hope my comments might influence the ultimate choice of sites.
David Penfold	Flitwick, site E07	I've had an offer accepted to purchase a house at 71 The Ridgeway and notice from the site Ref Number: E07 that there maybe an impact on the houses at the end of The Ridgeway where no 71 is. Please could you let me know what the possible impact is, as at the moment, from the drawings it looks like a road will be put through the back garden. Please could you also let me know what B1, B2 and B8 type of businesses may be. Hopefully you can appreciate that I need to know what may be happening before I go any further with the house purchase. Many Thanks David

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Name	Subject	Comment
John Tomlin	Flitwick, site H248	<p>As a resident of the Flitwick area for over 40 years I have witnessed the gradual decline in the area over this period and feel quite strongly against most of the developments proposed on Mid Beds web site www.talktomidbeds.co.uk, especially H248 which seriously encroaches on Flitwick Moor. Although I note the District Council's initial comments: Flitwick is identified in the emerging Core Strategy as a Major Service Centre and as such is a focus for growth. However, this site is within the Green Belt and development would be contrary to the emerging Core Strategy.) I, as a lover of open natural spaces, would like to add my voice to opposing this development. Flitwick in general is already, in my and I'm sure many other existing residents opinion, at saturation point in respect to public services, parking, pedestrian access and efficient town centre road access (e.g. bottle neck over the railway line & access along Steppingley road at Tesco's etc. etc.). The implementation of these new proposals (along with Centre Parks proposals) will further aggravate an already unacceptable situation in this area with the inevitable 'knock on effect' to adjacent towns and villages - Ampthill being a prime example. Should this not be the correct media for my comments could you please advise me accordingly.</p>
Andrew Hards	Ampthill & Flitwick	<p>I have been a resident of both Flitwick and Ampthill for nearly 25 years now. I am a keen walker and naturalist & genuinely believe there are some outstanding sites in our neighbourhood. I have been on Coopers Hill, early morning, when the heather is out & you could be in the New Forest, likewise Flitwick Moor (especially where the streams run rust coloured) has unique almost primeval qualities. Therefore, when I hear that these sites are yet once again under threat I really wonder what the hell is going on. I have walked all over the Mid Beds region & there are alternative sites to develop without having to compromise our natural heritage.</p>

Name	Subject	Comment
Neil James Newton	Parking at Flitwick train station	<p>Although I have made comments on some proposed developments using the Standard WEB based method there was one major concern that I have that seems to be relevant to the whole development issue rather than specific site. I hope you can maybe put my concerns in the correct place. Being a regular train user (along with a substantial amount of others from the surrounding area) I have recently seen the overcrowding situation in Flitwick only go from bad to worse. For many years it has-been a local issue and even now the parking for the train station (along with the costs) have driven many people (me included) to seek any available legal gap in the town to leave their cars. We don't want to-do this but really have no choice - there is no other allocated space for us... The villages surrounding Flitwick have to use this station and the public transport links to it are either non-existent or totally impracticable. My main worry is how the wealth of small developments in the surrounding areas will bring a large number of additional vehicles into the Flitwick area looking to use the Train Station. I have seen nothing to alleviate my fears in the way of additional parking etc... Most of the people buying the new houses will be doing so with a view to working in London and therefore using the train service. Can you provide me with any evidence that this has been at all considered in the recent investigations..</p>
John Silvester	Flitwick Moor	<p>My view is that anything that impinges on Flitwick Moor would be a disaster for the area. However much the developers say that they would provide a buffer zone, children and domestic pets, particularly cats, would affect the bird and animal population.</p>