

HUSBORNE CRAWLEY 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.

HUSBORNE CRAWLEY APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E28

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
Marc Kitchen	This site maybe suitable for development but not in the manner suggested. There are good transport links, (once the proposed upgrades to the M1 and A421 are completed). It is worth noting that the area is primarily on greenbelt land. The proposed site use is not entirely welcome. There are already a significant number of industrial units in the immediate area. The development of further industrial units has the potential to create traffic problems, cause significant light pollution and depress nearby property values. Not to mention the unsightly blot on the landscape that they will cause. If the site is to be developed the creation of skilled and professional jobs should be a priority to bring prosperity to the Marston Vale area. Development of offices with some supporting retail, if indeed the site is developed at all, would better support objectives.
Richard Wood on behalf of the Bedford & Milton Keynes Waterway Trust	This site will be on the opposite site of the railway to the proposed route of the Bedford & Milton Keynes waterway as it runs between the Amazon warehouse and the line. This will be a high visibility/access point for the waterway and cycle/walking/mixed use access route. The nature of the development/employment usage might usefully take this into account.

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
Graham White	The existing warehouse/distribution centre at Marston Gate already causes a visual scar on the landscape for several miles around. No action has been taken to reduce neither the visual impact nor the light pollution, which is particularly intrusive for the villages of Ridgmont and Brogborough. Any additional development in the area would lead to further unacceptable, detrimental effects on the environment. Also the surrounding road infrastructure cannot cope with the additional volumes of traffic which would be generated.
Susan White	The existing warehouse/distribution centre at Marston Gate already causes a visual scar on the landscape for several miles around. No action has been taken to reduce neither the visual impact nor the light pollution, which is particularly intrusive for the villages of Ridgmont and Brogborough. Any additional development in the area would lead to further unacceptable, detrimental effects on the environment. Also the surrounding road infrastructure cannot cope with the additional volumes of traffic which would be generated.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H023/E45

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

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

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

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

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

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

Submitted by	Comments
Ian Pickering	The need for development on this scale should be considered as part of the East of England RSS before being considered as part of the Mid Beds LDF. The proposals in the South East Plan for development in this area do not remove the need for consideration by the East of England Plan as this area is in the East of England Region. Residents of Aspley Guise have a right for this development to be considered within their own region not dictated by a neighbouring region.
Janet Dale	This project will be detrimental to village life. Dwellings of 7000 will increase the traffic considerably on small country roads. People moved, and paid extra money, to enjoy the quieter lifestyle. If I wanted to be part of Milton Keynes I would have moved there.
John Franklin	<p>This site should be included in the green belt extension - and as such should not be developed.</p> <p>Also, why does MKs SDA have to impact on Mid Beds - in fact the regional authorities are different (AG /Mid Beds sits within East region, not South East).</p> <p>IN SUMMARY: Why should Mid Beds have to build 5,600 homes in a proposed greenbelt area (as dictated from outside the Eastern region by the SE regional plan for MKs SE SDA) as part of MKs expansion without allowing this figure to be part of Mid Beds TOTAL allocation of building 4,400 homes by 2026. This would mean that Mid Beds is in fact being asked to build a combined total of 10,000 new homes by 2026 - is this correct???</p> <p>MBDC's current position (24/1/07) suggests that they are happy to allow 2,700 homes to be built instead of 5,600 - no reasons given? so MBDC is allowing a total of 7,100 total to be built by 2026 - district wide?</p>
Laura Anne Layton	<p>The site in question should be green land and landscaped to provide a buffer for Aspley Guise residents against the constant hum and drone of traffic for M1 and other major trunk roads. I drive along Salford Road every day to my home at 102 and I pass hawks, deer, barn owls - Its almost the last bastion of unspoilt land in this area. Aspley Guise is already poorly served with its roads, many of which have become a rat run for commuters. Mid Beds should defend villages like Aspley Guise, not cow-tow to anyone else - that's what you are elected for! Also the MK Citizen sometimes has 46 pages of job vacancies - they can't fill jobs at the moment so please don't intimate that this will be good for jobs - there is over employment in this vicinity.</p> <p>The only major thing this village lacks is a shop and central point of focus - now the shop has gone I see it as the beginning of the end of what was and could still be one of the outstanding villages in Mid Beds. You should be proud to represent us and fight for our future. Please don't throw us away to satisfy rubbish government targets. Look what a mess the Government is making of all it touches at the moment!</p>
Lisa Goddard	<p>I bought my property in Aspley guise in 2007. I paid a premium to live in a village surrounded by green belt land as I did not want to be surrounded by housing estates. By building these estates you will undoubtedly de value my home. Who will compensate me?</p> <p>Any new estates will include council housing, from experience of growing up on a council estate in Luton , the crime rate in our sleepy village will dramatically increase also.</p> <p>I am totally against new housing in Aspley Guise.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
M G Ladell	I would like to see an area of open space between ourselves (Aspley Guise) and Milton Keynes.
Mr & Mrs R H Sinden	The number of houses proposed is completely out of scale with the adjacent villages. It would alter the environment in A. Guise, W. Sands & H. Crawley irrevocably - changing their nature completely. None of them would have facilities or infrastructure to cope with development of this scale.
Mr and Mrs Wyatt	We need to keep some space between Aspley Guise and MK otherwise it will become just another suburb. Mixed development sounds like a lot of warehouses which will just mean more HGVs and more traffic problems. We firmly believe this area should be greenbelt and remain as countryside as there is a need to preserve some green space in our increasingly urbanised area.
Mr B S Franklin	This development will swamp the north side of Aspley Guise & ruin the character of the village. It will become just another area of Milton Keynes The existing roads, i.e. Salford Road, Church St and The Square could not possibly cope with the new volume of traffic. The open countryside barrier between Aspley Guise and Milton Keynes must be retained.
Mrs S Clark	Strongly support mid beds proposals for green belt, should this go ahead. Milton Keynes should not join up with Aspley Guise
Mrs S Smith	I feel this would be the start of the village being swallowed up by Milton Keynes which is not what the majority of the villagers would want as this would take a way the village feel and it would become an other village surrounded by housing estates. I have no problem with small developments of a few houses with in the village as long as they are in keeping and do not impact on the look of the village
Mrs Tracy Willis	I feel vey strongly that the proposed development will have a negative impact on the infrastructure, and surrounding countryside.
Patricia Rezon	An application that should be rejected out of hand. Along side this application Bucks and Milton Keynes are planning 5500 homes along the M1 corridor. This application, like those is structural overload - at the J13 roundabout a new roadway is opening to elevate current congestion and pollution. This application would destruct and negate and gains currently being won! There is no infrastructure. Road, retail, public transport, schools, doctors, dentists etc to support such a large development. It would destroy the greenbelt boundary that has always separated Beds from Bucks and M.K and a new technology park is the last think that is needed here.
R Franklin	I do not accept this area of Aspley Guise & Husborne Crawley should become part of "Greater MK". This seems to be government imposed planning with MBDC bending over to accept (at least in part) this intrusion into Bedfordshire. Our part of Bedfordshire is rural and should be maintained as such. Any building here would not benefit Bedfordshire (and would not even contribute to Bedfordshire build numbers!) Sorry, I cannot accept this - extend greenbelt to county boundary.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Rebecca Bird	<p>Congestion around junction 13 - this will add to that congestion No local dentist currently taking on national health patients Local doctors - already difficult to get an appointment within a few days, this will become worse. Local high street parking is already stretched, if parking becomes worse people will stop using the high street, shops will close. Local woods etc. could become overused - effects on wildlife. Development area - covers a number of footpaths what happens to those?</p>
Robin Richardson	<p>Local village country roads are already being used as rat race commuter routes and a housing site of this size will simply add to the problems. Just look at the state of the roads now in both capacity and pot holes.</p>
Ronald E Hopkins	<p>Green Belt, outside Milton Keynes development and area originally agreed as sacrosanct and now renegaded upon by planners. This is good, productive farmland and a country amenity are you going to replace that with 'linear parks'?</p>
Sue Lickorish	<p>So Green Belt means nothing any more, then? This development would be many times larger than Aspley Guise and threatens to swallow us up into Milton Keynes. There is no way local services can support this development. It is a huge area of open countryside that would bring MK right to our doorsteps. I regularly walk the footpath along Wednesden Lane, past New Barns Farm to Berry Lane. From this position, you can clearly see the impact this development will have on our rural countryside. It will significantly affect the character of the area.</p>
T Mann	<p>This site encroaches on our green space and will cause increased congestion in an already congested area. I strongly object to Milton Keynes expansion into Bedfordshire.</p>

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

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

HUSBORNE CRAWLEY APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

No representations concerning the parish or its sites were received by email.