

LIDLINGTON 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.

LIDLINGTON APPENDIX ONE
Survey Additional Comments

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

Submitted by	Company / agency / organisation	Sites comment on
Miss Ellie Smith	DLP Planning Ltd	E03, E46, E47, H009, H031, H066, H081, H161, H211, H144/E36
Mr Richard Wood	Bedford & Milton Keynes Waterway Trust	H009, H211

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H009

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
Roderick Webb	Lidlington has just had 80 new houses built; the village has changed beyond all recognition. No More.

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 Jay	Access to site is narrow and would cause congestion on By-Road.
Adam Hiscocks	At present the junction between Bye Road and Church Street can become congested at times, especially when a train is due. As it is the main exit for the housing on Bye Road, Chiltern Close and at least half of Whitehall. Additionally, there is a minimal bus service, which takes an hour to get to Bedford, meaning the only usable public transport is the train, which can still work out more expensive than going by car and parking - so I would say there is not a good public transport provision in Lidlington. Existing facilities are only within easy travelling distance if a car is owned, Marston has an adequate provision of essential services, such as a post office, free ATM, doctors surgery, chemist and gas and electric cards for those on a pre-pay meter - however Marston is not easily reachable by train (with a 20 or so minute walk from Millbrook Station), and the bus services are limited.
Adele Moore	The site location is off a very narrow, single track, dirt road, which is of poor standard and under dispute of ownership between the railway and a local farmer. We are a small village which has just been swamped by a large development so we don't need any more housing. This site is not in fill and is off the beaten track, so to speak. It would not blend with the rest of the village but would be stuck out on a limb.
Amanda Jane Hartfield	I currently live in Chiltern Close and back onto this field over the years I have lived here I have observed the ground moving, in light of water drainage issues from Greensand ridge this proposal would increase the potential for ground subsidence and flooding issues. My view would be affected. The wildlife out in this area is superb having badgers and foxes and varying different bird life. Public access to the local school over the style for the children would also be comprised and a safety issue. Dogs walkers and ramblers frequent this area I therefore strongly object
Andrew Penn	There is no infrastructure and the road is totally unsuitable for development. A crazy idea to develop here
B Shepherd	Building on this site would impact the countryside views from the village. Access would be via Bye Road - too narrow to support further development
Colin J West	Outside settlement envelope Within area of great landscape value Infrastructure inadequate to cope Shared right of access/public right of way in dispute

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ellie Smith	The proposed access road would need improvement however the alterations to accommodate the increase in traffic would have a detrimental impact on the rural character of the western village boundary. The increased traffic would impact on the highway safety of existing road users and pedestrians together. The proposal would be back land development which would extend beyond the rear boundary lines of the existing properties on Chiltern Close. There is potential for loss of privacy if the site were to be developed in the proposed manner especially if the site were to be developed in an intensive manner. The impact of the development of this site would be detrimental to the overall character of the AGLV and would significantly affect the setting of the village on the approach road of Boughton End Lane from the A507. Notwithstanding this, the extension of the settlement envelope to encompass this area would necessitate an unsustainable extension to the urban area.
J B Nockels	Further development here would create more traffic problems as the use of Bye Road is increased to its junction with Station Road at the level crossing. Two local shops will not cope; indeed they will soon close for lack of value/rents. There is no Post Office in the village.
Jean Peall	The village has already expanded nearly 15% with Farriers way. No more please!!! This land suffers from spring water. Parking is already a problem in bye road.
Kevin Foley	This site access is the main route to school for many of our children, with the access being the main entrance to the potential site, I strongly object to planning of any sort given.
Linda Cray	This is a quiet rural area and in the past it has been used for a haulage business which did cause a lot of noise and disruption. Local shops in the village have already died out and mainly people use the supermarkets now. There is already plenty of other development in the village, which would appear to be adequate for a small village and to continue to be able to house children at the local village school.
Lyn Roberts	There is only one main road through the village being Church Street/ Station Road and at many times this cannot cope adequately with regards to the volume of traffic and with on street parking restricting visibility. Increased vehicle traffic merging from Bye Road onto this thoroughfare so close to the rail level crossing would exacerbate this traffic flow problem.
M Penn	The village infrastructure cannot support further development. The roads in particular will suffer with congestions.
Mike Blackmore	Crazy idea - this village has few facilities and they are reducing all the time. Another shop is closing in next year - library service has been halved. The proposed site suffers from subsidence and geological problems - ask network rail. Evidently rubber tyres are also buried with the hillside above this site. Increased traffic and reduction in our peace will definitely result in appeals against rateable values.

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs D Blackmore	The current rail and bus services are very limited so villagers commonly use cars. Additional housing will give rise to further traffic usage in an area commonly used by children and walkers and raises safety issues. Villagers use Marston Moretaine for shops and doctors or other nearby facilities. Common usage and habit already applies here. Bringing in extra housing will just increase traffic congestion and is unlikely to add support to services in Lidlington. Also it destroys both my and my neighbours human right to live peaceably in a rural setting with low traffic usage.
Mrs D A Ralphs	This is a small area where parents walk with young children to access the local school. Currently there is little traffic from the one house on this lane/bridle path. Traffic will significantly cause congestion and increase the dangers for local children. Whilst supporting the school there is no obvious way of ensuring growth in pupil numbers by new houses. For example the 70+ new houses recently built had only 5 new children for the lower school the rest are commuters and couples without children who do not spend their time in the village and have not shown any potential to use the existing services! We don't have a post office or cafe etc the buses are infrequent and the water and electricity is often cut off due to the village location and age of pipes etc.
Mrs Smullen	I strongly object to any further developing in Lidlington and the surrounding area. This is a quiet village and is an unsuitable site for any further development. We need to protect all of the green space that we can and not alter the character of the village. Enough damage will be done by the development of Centre Parks and increased congestion on the A507 which is already an accident black spot. I also strongly object to any development around Brogborough Lake. The A421 is an extremely congested road, sadly, with regular fatal accidents. Even with the widening, the infrastructure cannot support the development of a type of Falkirk wheel.
Robert Humphreys	No Post Office in the village to support. Access road too small and already congested due to recent housing developments.
Russell Obrien	I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

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

Submitted by	Comments
Richard Wood on behalf of the B&MK Waterways Trust	This development would be sited close to one of the preferred routes for the Bedford & Milton Keynes waterway in which respect it would sit comfortably with the project in providing leisure/holiday accommodation adjacent to a major multi-user access route (cycling, walking, and bridleway) and have the potential to provide complementary services. The current preferred route enters the lake west of this site, but the same rationale would apply, albeit to a lesser degree. Should the preferred route revert to running alongside this site allocation, we would want to be assured that there was sufficient space to accommodate the waterway.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H031

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
Jean Peall	40 more houses is far too many, perhaps 20 would be viable. Turning to A421 is bad, but this will improve with new road.
Mr S Phillips	I firmly believe the village has fulfilled its requirement to provide additional housing. There is no justifiable reason to increase the number already built. I've lived in the village for 12 years and the impact of new houses has had a detrimental effect - it would be devastating to have any further build. Consideration has to be given to the surrounding areas. I don't feel that there are enough services in the village to cater for additional housing, from a retail perspective, from a transport perspective, from an entertainment perspective, from a protection of the natural surroundings perspective. No, enough is enough thank you.

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 Jay	Site isn't currently used for holiday/leisure as stated. Road would not support that development nor schools- liable to flood from Brogborough lake
Adele Moore	This site is outside the village envelope therefore a development would not blend in but be very detached from the core of the community. We have just had a substantial development that is more than enough to prop up local services and facilities and don't need any more. This site has never been used for holiday/leisure purposes and ceased to be used for car boot activities as this was unlawful as the owner lives on the site.
Andrew Penn	The immediate and adjacent roads are narrow windy and totally unsuitable for this development. Please say no!
Anita Eames	This site is not presently used as holiday site although the owner would like it to be!
B Shepherd	Large number of new homes recently completed in Lidlington. Further development would alter the character of this small village.
Colin J West	Outside settlement envelope Infrastructure inadequate to cope Exceptional need not demonstrated Access to site from a village road, near dangerous bends and poor visibility Basically a garden plot; never been a farm or holiday site.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Ellie Smith	It is not specified where the proposed access would be taken from; however it is likely that the existing access would be utilised from Sheeptick End which is considered insufficient due to inadequate visibility. The proposal would involve back land development extending beyond the rear boundary lines of the existing properties on Sheeptick End with potential for loss of privacy. The impact upon the landscape surrounding the potential development site would result in the potential for an important area of green open space to be lost. The farm use appears to have ceased within this site and it is believed that the leisure use is associated with the Town and Country Planning Order 1995 entitlement for provision of a touring Caravan site. The land remains undeveloped and any further encroachment for the purposes of providing additional housing would have a detrimental impact on the open character of the landscape and the visual amenity currently enjoyed by adjoining residents.
Iain Clapham	This is the site of unlawful development. It should be considered as Green Belt.
J B Nockels	A development of 20/40 homes on this site is totally inappropriate and the infrastructure (water and electricity services) could not support it. Water supply in that area is a well known problem to the Parish Council and water board.
Kevin Foley	We require no more developments in Lidlington.
Lyn Roberts	This site as far as I have witnessed has not been used in any manner for holiday accommodation but as a site for car boot sales. The Sheeptick End is a minor road that cannot afford such an increase in traffic volume. Most family homes have at least two vehicles. Main shopping facilities are at least 9 miles in Bedford or Milton Keynes and thus own transport is necessary for heavy shopping trips. Further to which the proposed housing would deteriorate the picturesque view that much of the existing village enjoys of Brogborough Lake.
Maureen Smeaton	This site already contains Brick built Holiday accommodation for which, allegedly, planning was not obtained/agreed. To increase this would set a precedent for others to use the thin edge of the wedge to start up businesses without planning permission and then extend them. Also is there a need for such holiday lets?
Mrs M Penn	The existing infrastructure of this small village cannot support a development as large as that proposed.
Russell Obrien	I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.

Submitted by	Comments
Tamegger	Lidlington will soon be spoilt by over development instead of this we feel that much more suitable sites can be found closer to larger towns or housing estates around Beds which will have better transport links as exiting Lidlington is already a challenge in rush hour. This development is simply trying to squeeze as much property as possible into a small plot of beautiful land which lines the country side and railway tracks and will take away any remaining beauty from the surrounding area. In addition the high street already suffers from fast flowing traffic cutting through Lidlington linking the A421 to A507 via Marston Mortain with car speeds often screeching over the newly built roundabout additional housing will mean on average another 90 cars entering and leaving each day and substantial traffic calming will need to be brought in to reduce the risk of incident as the increase in residents and construction traffic will increase risk to an already unrestricted rat run.
Tim Mason	I understand that actual current use of the site contravenes its planning permission, a situation that should not be allowed to continue.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: H066**

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
Jean Peall	The houses will need good foundations!!! Can't see how these 2 would make any significant difference to anything.

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
No name given	Outside settlement envelope Within area of great landscape value Infrastructure inadequate to cope Site subject to instability and natural springs Condition on previous approval to be green space; not to be built upon Exceptional need not demonstrated
A Jay	Existing new properties in greensand ridge are already suffering from subsistence and this is effecting non greensand ridge properties within same postcode regards insurance
Andrew Penn	The original Greensand Ridge should not have been allowed as the access to High Street is dangerous. Plus half the existing houses are slipping down the hill and suffering subsidence - as we said they would. Building more would be a mistake.
Colin J West	Outside settlement development. Within area of great landscape value. Infrastructure inadequate to cope. Site subject to instability & natural springs. Condition on previous approval to be green space; not to be built upon. Exceptional need not demonstrated.
Ellie Smith	The proposal seeks to secure a housing designation for two dwellings with unspecified access on land that adjoins the existing residential settlement on Greensand Ridge to the north, sparsely populated residential properties on High Street to the south, open countryside in an AGLV. Furthermore, a tree preservation order is in place on the site for the tree occupying the southern central area of the land. No details have been provided of the proposed access route to the land, although this could be taken from Greensand Ridge. The increased traffic would impact highway safety of existing road users and pedestrians alike together with the increased level of noise and disturbance to existing residents. The impact of the development of this site would be detrimental to the overall character of the Area of Great Landscape Value and would significantly affect the setting of the village on the approach from Boughton End Lane, which currently enjoys fairly uninterrupted views across the land.
Iain Clapham	This area is unstable - the greensands development is slipping.
J B Nockels	Greensand Ridge adjoins a 1 in 10 hill and increase in volume of traffic from the Ridge onto the hill would be dangerous.
Kevin Foley	There is no need for this development; the only reason is money and nothing else.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Lyn Roberts	<p>This development would be detrimental to the picturesque view of Lidlington Hill. It is very dangerous even at present to have traffic merging half way up the hill which has limited viewing due to the curves in the road. This site would exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>Building on a hill such as this creates structural problems and defects arising out of land movement.</p>
M Penn	<p>Two houses are not by themselves a big problem but the site already has issues with subsidence and movement. Owners of homes on the Greensand Ridge are suffering with land movement.</p> <p>Lidlington has very few facilities and the existing infrastructure will be severely tested with increased development.</p>
Mark Symonds	<p>The elevated position would result in any development of this land being visible from distant views causing a detrimental visual impact on the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Also because of the elevated position any development of this site would have a serious detrimental effect on the rear gardens and the privacy of the properties in Greensand Ridge.</p> <p>In terms of access the proposed site is probably in one of the most inaccessible parts of the village which is served currently by an un-adopted road. Also additional vehicular movements along this road would cause access problems due to the gradient.</p>
Mike Blackmore	<p>Crazy again - this road has suffered flooding and drainage problems for years.</p>
Mrs L Symonds	<p>The Road servicing the original Greensand Ridge development is currently going through adoption process after 10 years. The reason for the delay is two fold, original developers failed to complete adoption paperwork and drainage was also not adopted and has had to be upgraded for adoption which is currently going through. The site in question is topographically unsuitable and will not benefit the village in any way.</p>
Roderick Webb	<p>The proposed site suffers from poor drainage, has a natural spring supporting local wildlife and is not easily accessible without major work.</p>
Russell Obrien	<p>I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H081

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
Diane OConnell	Within walking distance of Lidlington station. Will provide support for existing remaining shops, pubs and village groups.
Ellie Smith	There are no details as to the proposed access to the land, although is likely that this is taken from Marston Road. The site is open in nature and the development would have a detrimental impact upon the rural character of the eastern boundary of the village. The increased traffic flows would additionally impact upon the highway safety of existing road users and pedestrians. The development of this site would significantly affect the setting of the village on the approach to the village from Marston Moretaine. The proposed designation at this site would constitute greenfield development that would be out of character in this location. The sites development would destroy the rural character and appearance of the area and result in the loss of an important visual gap in the countryside. It is considered that this form of housing development at this location.
Mr D O Connell	Development would support the few remaining local shops and dairy milk round, local school is within walking distance. The site is on the Bedford Bletchley railway and has its own local station; the railway has had extensive upgrading and needs support.
Terry OBrien	The site is located very close to the railway station and with the planned improvement to the rail service; the development will provide an increased opportunity to reduce reliance on the private car. The proposed reclassification of Lidlington from Large to Small Village will undoubtedly limit growth and severely constrain support for local services and 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
Adele Moore	Lidlington has just been swamped with phase one of this development, which was 72 homes increasing the village size by nearly 20%. This has done more than enough to sustain local facilities etc. We do not need additional housing with the additional traffic congestion that this will inevitably bring. Most houses have at least 2 cars but these properties are only built to accommodate 1 vehicle.
Andrew Penn	The existing development was quite enough. Any more will seriously overload the infrastructure on that side of the village.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Angela Steele	There are hardly any amenities in the village, the roads are already too busy with traffic cutting through the village, and another junction on the Marston road would be dangerous. The High Street has already noticeably got busier with the traffic from David Wilson homes this is a narrow road on a hill with cars travelling much too fast, Church street is very often congested , which makes it harder for the school children to cross the road in the morning, with no zebra crossings in the village. The school would be stretched to accommodate a large influx of children. The development would be very close to the railway, noisy and dangerous in my opinion.
B Shepherd	Further development of this extent would seriously impact the character of the village
Chris Hallmark	Having recently moved to the village I now understand that its village character is under threat from additional development and I feel strongly that extra housing would damage the village. In addition, the development would be on land only just landscaped with trees as part of the "making good" of the recent development. My view is that there are more environmentally suitable locations in Marston Vale, and also that brown field sites should be considered before eating into this green field site. The additional traffic through the village would also cause difficulties in the village, as well as causing our family additional road noise and disruption.
Colin J West	Outside settlement envelope. Infrastructure inadequate to cope. Exceptional need not demonstrated. Phase 1 caused a lot of public anxiety particularly when no. of dwellings built exceeded the number on the original proposal. Dissection of site by a bridleway will spoil enjoyment of walkers.
I Batsman	A new housing development has only recently been completed in this area, and this has already grown the village substantially - any further development would be detrimental to village life.
Iain Clapham	There has been too much development in the village in a very short time. Sustainable integration is just not happening, planners should get Abreast of the social outcomes of their actions.
J B Nockels	This area does not have the capability to support any new development of housing, especially on this site.
James Croucher MTP MRTPI	The site is newly-planted community forest, an inherent part of the allocation site in the Adopted Local Plan. To allocate this forest land would result in the loss of long-term landscape planting which is inherently required to mitigate the visual impact of the now-complete allocation site.

Submitted by	Comments
Jan Swallow	<p>I have lived happily in this village for 23 yrs and in that time there have been many houses built. I am unsure of the ratio/%age of new houses as to existing housing as of 1985, but I feel that in order to maintain the intimate village atmosphere, no more housing should be built in, around or close to Lidlington and that we have to make a stand now to prevent any further building or development creeping in. Your Parishes page for Lidlington states that "Lidlington is identified as a Small Village in the emerging Core Strategy" yet on all the housing plans that I have read for Lidlington they are describing it as a Large Village which I believe is neither true nor acceptable. If we do indeed let our village become any larger I feel there will be no defining space or countryside between Lidlington and the surrounding so-called villages which are themselves rapidly expanding and the enjoyable country feel that is so important to the villagers of Lidlington will be lost forever.</p>
Jean Peall	<p>Already too many here.</p>
Jonathan Odams	<p>I strongly object to this further development. I purchased my new house in Lidlington in January 2008 on the edge of new development off Marston Lane. We relocated from Leics. Village of Quorn, to an area of outstanding countryside views, this development will have a major impact on my family's quality of life. I feel cheated and misled by the builder David Wilson and if the MBDC agree to this development, by the council as well.</p> <p>I strongly oppose this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)there are more environmentally sustainable locations elsewhere in the district 2)the site is not previously developed and there are better brownfield sites elsewhere in Mid Beds 3)it would be difficult to design an appropriate development without affecting the landscape 4)there would be an unacceptable impact on the amenities of existing nearby properties such as play areas and walking routes 5)additional traffic generation would be more readily accommodated elsewhere in the network
Julie Hallmark	<p>I have lived in The Lane now for just 1 year, and already we have had to contact the police on several occasions regarding very dangerous driving on the roundabout at The Lane turning. If more houses are built using the same stretch of road the problem will just be doubled.</p> <p>Also the land in question has new trees planted and is a welcomed green space for all those around it, more housing would only spoil the landscape there are better sites available in Mid Beds</p> <p>The Lower School wouldn't be able to accommodate the potential new intakes</p> <p>Office accommodation is also already planned for part of that site also, it seems too much is trying to be crammed into a small space which will just spoil the entire look at the entrance to the village (ugly first impression)!!</p>
Kevin Foley	<p>No more development in Lidlington.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Lindsay Kemp	<p>This land fulfils a vital role in segregating the village from the surrounding countryside. The proposal would both extend the built-up area into a valuable green lung and be contrary to the Councils previously-expressed objectives when the brief was prepared in 2001 for the David Wilson development now nearing completion: (2.2) the visual improvement of the settlement edge to allow a sympathetic integration of built form and the wider landscape; (2.3) the creation of a woodland with full public access accompanied by a robust plan for its future maintenance; (5.24) a 20-metre-wide band of planting shall be provided along the entire length of the railway boundary with the proposed cycleway/bridle path beyond. The value of the land as a local amenity is evident from its frequent use for walking, cycling, etc. To permit it to be allocated for development would make nonsense of the Councils stated requirements and render worthless the time and money spent in recent planting.</p>
Lucy Childerley	<p>Lidlington school and transport system for the older children will be overstretched with further new dwellings. There are more environmentally sustainable sites elsewhere in the District. Also the site currently provides a valuable recreation area for residents of the village, it is not developed and so should be left as a green site when there are lots more brownfield sites which should be developed first as a way of improving Mid Beds. On a personal and human note, our house was sold with a view, no mention of a phase 2. We are going to have offices to the side, which we can accept, but then to block our front view is too much impact on our and other affected properties.</p>
Lyn Roberts	<p>This area seems to be the natural and historic boundary of the village. The road is a thoroughfare to Marston Moretaine and is a definitive route to leaving one village to enter further along another village. Building in this area would create a feeling of eventually the two villages merging and this would be detrimental to both villages as their identities would be lost.</p>
Miss Bird	<p>We strongly disagree with this area being developed. The vale is being planted to attract wildlife not destroy it! The housing would be too near to the railway and be a danger for children. The shops in the village are not stocked very well and do not support the number of villagers. We have to travel by car or bus to get to Marston Moreteyne for better facilities such as Dr, bank and Co-op. More houses would just mean more traffic at this stage. I'm also very concerned that when we bought our property were told the farmer might build 1 house but that was it - very upsetting and annoying to hear you are now proposing 45 homes!!!!</p>
Miss Samantha Fulcher	<p>We very strongly disagree with the proposed development of phase two in Lidlington. There are many reasons for this disagreement, a couple of them being - the un-necessary damage to the countryside and landscape, More traffic on the already very busy surrounding roads. This new site is proposed right beside the local railway line, there any many other quieter locations around the county that are more appropriate for development. The village amenities are already taking the strain of Phase 1 of the Lidlington development without adding more housing and more people.</p>

Submitted by	Comments
Mr & Mrs Cooper-Watson	We already have problems with parking on this new estate. Rigen Close, which leads to this area for development is only the minimum width and deliveries are sometimes a problem. Parking is so limited that people are parking on the road in Rigen Close and therefore reducing access further, any increase in traffic would be a major problem.
Mr S Phillips	I firmly believe the village has fulfilled its requirement to provide additional housing. There is no justifiable reason to increase the number already built - especially on this site. Ive lived on The Grove for 12 years and the impact of new houses has had a detrimental effect on my property and that of my neighbours already - it would be devastating to have any further build - especially directly in front of our properties. Consideration HAS to be given to the surrounding areas. I dont feel that there are enough services in the village to cater for additional housing, from a retail perspective, from a transport perspective, from an entertainment perspective, from a protection of the natural surroundings perspective. No, enough is enough thank you.
Mrs D A Ralphs	This is a small area where parents walk with young children to access the local school. Currently there is little traffic from the one house on this lane/bridle path. Traffic will significantly cause congestion and increase the dangers for local children. Whilst supporting the school there is no obvious way of ensuring growth in pupil numbers by new houses. For example the 70+ new houses recently built had only 5 new children for the lower school the rest are commuters and couples without children who do not spend their time in the village and have not shown any potential to use the existing services! We don't have a post office or cafe etc the buses are infrequent and the water and electricity is often cut off due to the village location and age of pipes etc. The upheaval of new developments will cost the existing security and wellbeing of local residence highly.
Mrs M Penn	The development of this site could potentially damage the saplings recently planted for the millennium. The village is too small and the existing infrastructure will not cope with the increased strain.
Mrs Tina Joslin	The local services and social infrastructure can not support existing new housing let alone if more are built.
Paul Childerley	I feel that building 45 more dwellings on a green site of an already saturated village seems madness when we have some many other eye sores of brownfield sites in the District which, if developed would vastly improve Mid Beds. This David Wilson development would be difficult to design a suitable development without affecting the landscape of a greatly enjoyed, safe, green space for children and adults alike. There is actually very little green space for children to enjoy in the village and this is an important one. The additional traffic would be more readily accommodated elsewhere in Mid Beds and there are quieter places to build away from railways in Mid Beds. This development will have a hugely negative impact on all surrounding properties who are already crammed in.

Submitted by	Comments
Rebecca McNulty	<p>Lidlington is a small village with few amenities. Further development on this scale would have an unacceptable impact on the existing amenities and a detrimental impact on the surrounding countryside, upon which investment in expanding forest areas has already begun. I also believe that the landscape which is within this site is such that the design of the development would be difficult and the road layout required would increase traffic generation which would more readily be accommodated on other brownfield sites.</p> <p>To develop the village further in this area would be detrimental to the surrounding community as a whole and put added pressure on the road structure and minimal public transport links (railway networks). To build housing so close to the railway would be very noisy and I am sure there are other quieter and more suitable sites in brownfield areas around mid-beds</p>
Richard and Justina Cole	<p>We feel that there are better brownfield sites elsewhere in mid Beds. We cannot see how the landscape will not be adversely affected by this proposal. Other areas would accommodate additional traffic generation more readily. Proximity to the railway would mean quieter locations available elsewhere would be more suitable.</p>
Richard Batsman	<p>Lidlington as a small village has already been developed.</p>
Russell Obrien	<p>I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.</p>
Tamegger	<p>Lidlington will soon be spoilt by over development instead of this we feel that much more suitable sites can be found closer to larger towns or housing estates around Beds which will have better transport links as exiting Lidlington is already a challenge in rush hour. This development is simply trying to squeeze as much property as possible into a small plot of beautiful land which lines the country side and railway tracks and will take away any remaining beauty from the surrounding area. In addition the high street already suffers from fast flowing traffic cutting through Lidlington linking the A421 to A507 via Marston Mortain with car speeds often screeching over the newly built roundabout additional housing will mean on average another 90 cars entering and leaving each day and substantial traffic calming will need to be brought in to reduce the risk of incident as the increase in residents and construction traffic will increase risk to an already unrestricted rat run.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H161

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 Jay	Local School couldn't support this. Road is inappropriate for development
Adam Hiscocks	As detailed in the other survey for this site: At present the junction between Bye Road and Church Street can become congested at times, especially when a train is due. As it is the main exit for the housing on Bye Road, Chiltern Close and at least half of Whitehall. Additionally, there is a minimal bus service, which takes an hour to get to Bedford, meaning the only usable public transport is the train, which can still work out more expensive than going by car and parking - so I would say there is not a good public transport provision in Lidlington. Existing facilities are only within easy travelling distance if a car is owned, Marston has an adequate provision of essential services, such as a post office, free ATM, doctors surgery, chemist and gas and electric cards for those on a pre-pay meter - however Marston is not easily reachable by train (with a 20 or so minute walk from Millbrook Station), and the bus services are limited.
Andrew Penn	The access road is far too narrow and leads on to existing overcrowded roads. Most people would doubtless use Whitehall as a short cut and further ruin the road surface of this private road
Colin J West	Outside settlement envelope Within area of great landscape value Infrastructure inadequate to cope Exceptional need not be demonstrated Shared right of access/public right of way in dispute
Ellie Smith	The proposed access to the site would be taken from the existing railway access track and would need improvement to accommodate additional traffic however the alterations necessary would have a detrimental impact upon the rural character of the village boundary. The increased traffic flows would additionally impact upon the highway safety of existing road users and pedestrians. The proposal would involve back land development extending beyond the rear boundary lines of the existing properties on Chiltern Close. There is potential for loss of privacy to the existing residents of Chiltern Close and occupants of Bye Road Farm. The development of this site would be detrimental to the overall character of the AGLV and would significantly affect the setting of the village on the approach road of Boughton End Lane from the A507, which currently enjoys fairly uninterrupted views across the land.
Emma	I do however believe the above proposal is not a good idea for Lidlington.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Emmeline Creamer	<p>The issue of local services is somewhat irrelevant at present, as one of the two village shops is due to close next year, and the other is very poorly run. The local pubs would perhaps benefit from the development, although I think two pubs will struggle to stay open in Lidlington anyway. The Local School is already at the stage where people need to register their Children for the pre-school service at birth - perhaps a village expansion would be too much for such a small school.</p> <p>Sadly the "village" of Lidlington is fast sprawling, and with it, the core Village qualities and respect are disappearing. The streets are becoming lined with dog excrement and litter, and there is becoming more of a "Gang Culture", probably drug-related. This may well be a sign of the times, but It can only be fuelled by an influx of further residents.</p> <p>I appreciate that further housing is needed, however do not feel that this "Cramped" corner of Lidlington will be of any benefit.</p>
Iain Clapham	<p>This is part of the green belt. It should never have been used for commercial.</p>
J B Nockels	<p>Further development here would create more traffic problems as the use of Bye Road is increased to its junction with Station Road at the level crossing. Two local shops will not cope; indeed they will soon close for lack of value/rents. There is no Post Office in the village.</p>
Jean Peall	<p>We've had sufficient development with Farriers way. No more needed.</p>
Kevin Foley	<p>No more development in Lidlington</p>
Lyn Roberts	<p>This site as far as I have witnessed has not been used in any manner for holiday accommodation but as a site for car boot sales. The Sheeptick End is a minor road that cannot afford such an increase in traffic volume. Most family homes have at least two vehicles.</p>
Mike Blackmore	<p>Crazy idea - this village has few facilities and they are reducing all the time. Another shop is closing in next year - library service has been halved. The proposed site suffers from subsidence and geological problems - ask network rail. Evidently rubber tyres are also buried within the hillside above this site. Increased traffic and reduction in our peace will definitely result in appeals against. also where are the schools for extra children etc.,</p>
Mrs D Blackmore	<p>See comments on ref H009.. The addition of 20 dwellings in an area currently in constant use and accessed by children and walkers will cause additional traffic congestion and a safety hazard. There are currently little or no infrastructures in place to deal with additional people at this level and generally housing is added with no thought or plan for the infrastructure needed until much later. We already have new additional housing as of 2007. where is the infrastructure for that??</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mrs DA Ralphs	<p>This is a small area where parents walk with young children to access the local school. Currently there is little traffic from the one house on this lane/bridle path. Traffic will significantly cause congestion and increase the dangers for local children. Whilst supporting the school there is no obvious way of ensuring growth in pupil numbers by new houses. For example the 70+ new houses recently built had only 5 new children for the lower school the rest are commuters and couples without children who do not spend their time in the village and have not shown any potential to use the existing services! We don't have a post office or cafe etc the buses are infrequent and the water and electricity is often cut off due to the village location and age of pipes etc.</p> <p>Traffic will significantly cause congestion and increase the dangers for local children. Whilst supporting the school there is no obvious way of ensuring growth in pupil numbers by new houses. For example the 70+ new houses recently built had only 5 new children for the lower school the rest are commuters and couples without children who do not spend their time in the village and have not shown any potential to use the existing services! We don't have a post office or cafe etc the buses are infrequent and the water and electricity is often cut off due to the village location and age of pipes etc. The local roads are small access to village regularly cut off by rail closures. The village community cannot support light industry or increased numbers. The local children are currently bussed to schools already bursting at the seams.</p>
Mrs M Penn	The infrastructure of this small village cannot cope with the strain of such a large development in the heart of the village.
Robert Humphreys	Access road already congested too small for the development. Ground unstable due to sandy soil. No post office in village to be supported. Green Sand Ridge footpath, at present a nice walk, goes through the middle of it.
Russell Obrien	I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.
Tamegger	Lidlington will soon be spoilt by over development instead of this we feel that much more suitable sites can be found closer to larger towns or housing estates around Beds which will have better transport links as exiting Lidlington is already a challenge in rush hour. This development is simply trying to squeeze as much property as possible into a small plot of beautiful land which lines the country side and railway tracks and will take away any remaining beauty from the surrounding area. In addition the high street already suffers from fast flowing traffic cutting through Lidlington linking the A421 to A507 via Marston Mortain with car speeds often screeching over the newly built roundabout additional housing will mean on average another 90 cars entering and leaving each day and substantial traffic calming will need to be brought in to reduce the risk of incident as the increase in residents and construction traffic will increase risk to an already unrestricted rat run.

Ref Number: H211

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 Jay	Plot of land floods on occasion and is too small to cope with this number of houses- school couldn't cope with numbers.
Andrew Penn	A crazy idea - wit the surrounding narrow windy roads and lack of other infrastructure. Doubtless this manic application is in the hope of sneaking one through for a lesser number of dwellings.
Colin J West	Outside settlement envelope Infrastructure inadequate to cope Exceptional need not be demonstrated Adjacent to a site of historical interest Rights of way across site unlawfully closed & must be re-opened
Ellie Smith	The proposal seeks to secure a housing provision of 61 dwellings at land north west of the village of Lidlington. The site access is not specified however it is likely that the existing access would be utilised, and provide a central spine estate road to meander through the site. The potential impact on neighbouring properties in the utilisation of this access would furthermore increase the level of noise and disturbance to existing residents. There is potential for loss of privacy if the site were to be developed in the proposed manner and to the proposed density figures. The site is defined by the boundary planting of mature hedgerow interspersed with a number of tree species. The impact upon the landscape surrounding the potential development site would result in the potential for an important area of green open space to be lost, resulting in an introduction of built form and residential paraphernalia to significantly reduce the visual amenity of the area.
Iain Clapham	This is a private garden with a footpath which the owner stops the public from using. The site should be dismissed automatically until the footpath is re-opened.
J B Nockels	Totally out of character with the village and of 61 dwellings would require significant new infrastructure to support it.
Jean Peall	This is far too many on top of Farriers way. We have no facilities to support!! The shops need serious help - Farriers way has made little difference.
Kevin Foley	No more development in Lidlington
Mr S Long	Inappropriate site for development. Too far from village and disconnected
Mrs D Blackmore	This site might be suitable to support housing. However given the current habit of building houses first without ANY regard to a supporting infrastructure until much later ...if at all, it is not suitable or viable to add housing where little or no supporting infrastructure currently exists.
Mrs M Penn	This proposal is nothing short of madness given the close proximity of the site to the main road out of the village. It is likely to lead to severe congestion while works are carried out and create huge problems with parking on the road. This village does not have the amenities nor infrastructure to support a development of this size. Furthermore traffic through Whitehall - a private road - is likely to increase significantly creating more damage to this poorly maintained road.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Russell Obrien	I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.
Tamegger	Lidlington will soon be spoilt by over development instead of this we feel that much more suitable sites can be found closer to larger towns or housing estates around Beds which will have better transport links as exiting Lidlington is already a challenge in rush hour. This development is simply trying to squeeze as much property as possible into a small plot of beautiful land which lines the country side and railway tracks and will take away any remaining beauty from the surrounding area. In addition the high street already suffers from fast flowing traffic cutting through Lidlington linking the A421 to A507 via Marston Mortaine with car speeds often screeching over the newly built roundabout additional housing will mean on average another 90 cars entering and leaving each day and substantial traffic calming will need to be brought in to reduce the risk of incident as the increase in residents and construction traffic will increase risk to an already unrestricted rat run.

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

Submitted by	Comments
Richard Wood on behalf of the B&MK Waterways Trust	This site is close to the one of the preferred routes for the waterway, although not the current favoured line which would enter the lake some way west of the proposed development. If the former route was adopted we would wish to be consulted to ensure the waterway was not compromised and for the potential uplift the waterway might give to any housing development taken into account in terms of developer contributions to green infrastructure.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H211a

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

Submitted by	Comments
Mr Jeff Bulled	The ribbon of development along the roadside would be OK. Not the development of the whole site.
Mrs Jean Peall	On its own, this seems quite a nice little development but I cant see it supporting any existing local services. Lidlington does need SHELTERED HOUSING and BUNGALOWS suitable for the elderly. I have enormous concerns that Lidlington will become a sprawl like Marston - or worse. If the Eco town goes ahead then this development would fill the very small gap between Lidlington and the Eco town.
Name Not Given	Maybe depending how it is done, The village should retain its character and not join Marston and Brogborough.] A small development tucked out of the way would be okay. Would welcome better transport links and some village facilities; shops etc. I have to travel 50 miles to work every day so any employment facilities nearby would be welcomed.

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 Carl Hickey	do not spoil Lidlington
Mr Iain Clapham	This site must be rejected and no time or money wasted until the footpaths are fully restored. This application site should not be permitted the respect of any authority until all footpath violations are remedied. If lawbreakers are given equal treatment then there is no point in anybody obeying the law. This is the surest way to bring society down and is an attack on our democracy.
Mrs Amanda Hickey	No more houses needed in Lidlington, it is a lovely village and big enough as it is. Please don't spoil Lidlington and its surrounding countryside
Mrs Denese Blackmare	This site poses a considerable traffic danger when cars emerge from it and a narrow winding road with little clear vision.
Mrs Maureen Smeaton	Not a good site unless road/traffic/corner is taken into consideration as access in and out of site would present risk
Mrs Tess Mason	Public transport from here is almost non-existent. We need to retain our relatively small size to maintain community spirit and involvement which at present are excellent in Lidlington. We should retain our beautiful countryside for all to enjoy.
Name Not Given	I have lived in the village of Lidlington for over fifty years. The site proposal for the erection of five houses is situated outside the permitted limits of the village, separated from the last house by the village allotments. It is bounded on the two sides by minor roads, along one of which over a period of many years, a ribbon of nine houses have been built mainly to support agriculture. In recent years an application to develop this site has been refused. Development of this site, outside of village limits would not blend with the street scene and be contrary to good planning practice.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation**Ref Number: E03**

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

Submitted by	Comments
Jean Peall	Industry needs to be sympathetic with environment. Will jobs actually be given to local people??

This additional comment was made by a respondent who felt 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). The proposed site use is not welcome. There are already a significant number of industrial type units in the immediate area. The development of further industrial units/storage/distribution 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. New jobs created would be unskilled work. 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.

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
Iain Clapham	This site operated for several decades longer than the locals were promised. It must shut.
Kevin Foley	There are enough empty dwellings / yards to accommodate small business investments
Name not given	The landfill site should be returned to green field. Presently the view from Lidlington to Cranfield is spoiled by the scarring of the land fill. To erect warehouse units in the area will be detrimental to the enjoyment due by the end of the landfill sites use.

Submitted by	Comments
Miss Ellie Smith	<p>The proposal site encompasses an area adjoining the entrance and weighbridge area to the landfill site and the A421 to the north of the County Wildlife Site at Brogborough Clay Pit Lake. The realigned A421 as proposed would pass directly to the south of the site and a designated access road would be provided from the Manor Farm junction to service the landfill site. The proposal would be in contravention to the established principles of the guidance in PPS1, the draft PPS4 and PPS7, and would not be considered a diversification of the existing waste management facility. The proposed additional HGV traffic would be detrimental to road/pedestrian users of the new access road from the realigned A421 and would establish a long term employment use of the site. This proposal would lead to an unsustainable land use in the open countryside which would be difficult to serve via public transport and as such would increase traffic thereby increasing highway safety issues.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E46

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
A Jay	Access inappropriate for such a development
Andrew Penn	This is even more insane than putting dwellings here. Totally unsuited road for commercial traffic as was clear when it was haulage yard.
Ellie Smith	The proposed access road would need improvement to accommodate additional traffic however such would have a detrimental impact upon the rural character of the western village boundary. The increased traffic flows, including the proliferation of HGVs in light of the proposed B8 use, would significantly impact the highway safety of existing road users and pedestrians alike, together with the increased level of noise/disturbance to existing residents. The proposal would involve back land development extending beyond the rear boundary lines of the existing properties on Chiltern Close. There is potential for loss of privacy to the existing residents and indeed the occupants of Bye Road Farm, coupled with the increased noise/disturbance associated with the proposed use. The development of the site would be detrimental to the character of the AGLV and would significantly affect the setting of the village on the approach road of Boughton End Lane.
Iain Clapham	This should be restored to Green Belt.
J B Nockels	Further development here would create more traffic problems as the use of Bye Road is increased to its junction with Station Road at the level crossing. Two local shops will not cope; indeed they will soon close for lack of value/rents. There is no Post Office in the village.
Jean Peall	Bye road is not suitable to cope with extra traffic. It already has a parking problem. The road junction by the level crossing would not cope with further traffic from industry - when the gates close the traffic queues up.
Julie Hallmark	Lidlington is a village and it should be kept as such
Kevin Foley	This would be a danger to all school children using the local school, playing fields and social area.
Linda Cray	The lane leading to this site is used daily by primary school children and would be dangerous if used excessively by heavy vehicles. This area should be kept as it is now, a small track for access to the farm; anything other than this would spoil a very nice rural location. In the past the latter end of this site was used as a small haulage yard and was quite noisy for residents at the end of Chiltern Close. Let us keep Lidlington as it was meant to be - a lovely small village. We have had quite enough development here over the last few years.
Lyn Roberts	There is no viable road structure that exists to accommodate traffic of this volume leaving and entering to this proposal that would not impede on local residents.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Mike Blackmore	There is no identified need for these kind of developments in Lidlington - Travelodge is in Marston/there is a hotel in Ampthill/there is a hotel in Woburn and Centre Parks is coming to Woburn. Industrial Units would not be in keeping with the residential area of Bye Road. In addition extra traffic movements and parking would be an issue, in addition to devaluing property in the area. Rateable values in the area would need to be challenged. NB A hotel was built in Aspley Guise I believe, which was not used - NB that is I believe now a residential development
Mrs D Blackmore	The potential access road is currently in constant use by children and walkers. Extra traffic is detrimental to the safety and well being of Lidlington's residents. Villagers commonly use local shops in Marston and Flitwick. No purpose is served by suggesting potential to support local business where little exists and is not supported by the villagers currently.
Mrs M Penn	Lidlington infrastructure cannot support a hotel and a leisure complex in the heart of this small village.
Rebecca Turner	I cannot understand why a quiet village with limited road links requires a leisure facility and hotel. This is an unnecessary development that will impact in a negative way on the traffic congestion of the village and will be detrimental to the rural countryside that the site overlooks. Again the only benefit will be a financial one to the current landowner.
Robert Humphreys	Very poor access. This site should not be used as a haulage yard. The access road is used as a pleasant walk for villagers at the moment.
Roderick Webb	Lidlington is a residential village with small access roads not suited to large vehicles. It does not need an employment facility within the village.
Russell Obrien	I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: E47

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
A Jay	Site not big enough and floods sometimes. Road not suitable and would be hazardous.
Andrew Penn	100 cars - you must be joking. The roads are far too narrow and windy. We saw the chaos that ensued when the car boot was briefly on this part of the road.
Diana Mary Archer	Is there enough capacity with the sewerage to cope with the extra intake? The supply of water seems to be a big problem in the area, i.e. continual and persistent leaking. Road structure is inadequate, not coping at the present level, also no foot paths in the area which makes walking hazardous.
Ellie Smith	<p>The proposed access from Sheeptick End Road is considered insufficient due to inadequate visibility splays. The proposal would be back land development extending beyond the rear boundary lines of the existing properties on Sheeptick End. There is potential for loss of privacy to adjoining properties due to consistent traffic associated with the combined uses. The impact on the landscape surrounding the proposed site would result in the potential for an area of green space to be lost.</p> <p>The farm use appears to have ceased within this site and it is believed that the leisure use is associated with the Town & Country Planning Order entitlement for provision of a touring Caravan site. The land remains undeveloped in terms of permanent structures; as such the intensification of land use would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area. The development would destroy the rural character and appearance of the area and result in the loss of an important visual gap in the countryside</p>
Iain Clapham	<p>This is the site of unlawful development.</p> <p>Any approval would show the planning process and the people who administer it to be totally pathetic.</p>
J B Nockels	A development of 20/40 homes on this site is totally inappropriate and the infrastructure (water and electricity services) could not support it. Water supply in that area is a well known problem to the Parish Council and water board.
Jean Peall	This creates potential for disturbance. Please keep our village quiet and peaceful. I cant see how this would help the village at all.
Julie Hallmark	Lidlington is a village and should be kept so!
Lyn Roberts	It appears to me that this proposal is one of several that have been submitted for the same area of land. Once again volume of traffic would be a problem.
Mr S Long	Inappropriate development too far from the village, unsustainable isolates development that would affect the overall rural location negatively.
Mrs M Penn	The access to this site will cause severe congestion getting in and out of this village.

Submitted by	Comments
Rebecca Turner	Currently this is a quiet and beautiful countryside residential area. I can not see what benefit will be gained by building facilities such as accommodation, health and leisure etc. These facilities and new jobs will be unnecessary with developments such as the New Centre Parks opening nearby. This development will destroy the area for the current residents of Sheeptick End and the only benefit I can see is a financial one to the current landowner.
Roderick Webb	Lidlington is a quiet, residential village which does not require a leisure centre as there is a perfectly good one at Flitwick. Vehicle access would not be improved so the villagers would suffer with the increase in traffic.
Russell Obrien	I bought my house in Bye Road hoping to live on the edge of a village and enjoy the benefits of living in a rural location. I do not want to live in a small town. I do not want our green spaces built upon; they can never be reclaimed once buried in concrete. It seems the authorities will not be happy until this county is covered in concrete and housing. The countryside is rapidly being carved up and buried to cater for our increasing population. We already have too many houses and too many people in this county. No more development please.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Ref Number: H144/E36

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
Jean Peall	Needs to be sympathetic with environment - this land has local significant beauty. Keep the countryside. Traffic could be a problem around Millbrook, a507 crossroads and through Marston Moreteyne. Small sympathetic industries would be suitable if mixed with housing. Only very small pockets of housing - it's not far from Wixam's big development. If there are too many houses here there will be no jobs left for local people.
Matt Harris	Somewhere between Maybe and No. Difficult site. No local services apart from Ampthill and Flitwick. Poor access onto A507. Small village with local character which should be valued.
Mr S Long	The site causes significant traffic problems for Millbrook and Marston Moreteyne. Housing development would be inappropriate as the settlement would be isolated, though the area nearest Lidlington might have some argument for housing but generally inappropriate. Established employment area so revisions to the existing development site for employment possible, but traffic movement a real concern. Also need to keep any development height to two story as the site affects a conservation hamlet and the Greensand Ridge. This site is unsuitable for housing development, but may be suitable for revised development for employment use. Access is a significant problem negatively affecting Millbrook and Marston Moreteyne villages. More effort should be undertaken to respect the conservation hamlet of Millbrook from the impact of the site. Housing here would be isolated, inappropriate and problematic. Though the edge of the site nearest Lidlington might have some argument for housing development, the rest of the site does not. The site has access problems and is too large for the rural setting causing traffic problems in Marston Moreteyne and Millbrook villages
Roderick Webb	Millbrook Proving Ground already employs a number of local people but I suspect most come from outside the community. Housing is not required locally and any increase in vehicle movement would add to congestion in Bedfordshire's minor road network. Residents already suffer the noise associated with vehicle testing. Enough is enough. More detailed proposals are required.

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 Jay	This would devastate Marston Vale- Services could not support-Rural nature of area would be lost forever.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Submitted by	Comments
Alison Barrett	Development of this site will compromise [illegible] the road infrastructure, leading to major congestion through the village of Marston Moretaine. Increased noise level. Insufficient medical provision, also education already over subscribed in Marston Moretaine Lower School/Marston Vale Middle School.
David Borrett	The existing site is low key and does not impact to any great extent on the local roads or countryside. If this site was to be further developed it should only be on a very limited scale. The Greensand Ridge is a heritage site and a large scale development would be in danger of making Millbrook be eclipsed. Local schools are oversubscribed and the existing road could not cope with large scale development.
Ellie Smith	The proposal seeks to secure a mixed use housing and employment designation across the entirety of the 261.77ha site currently an area of existing employment. There are no details as to the proposed access route to the land, or the likely division of the alternate uses. The proposed intensification of the land uses on the site would undoubtedly result in a detrimental impact on the character of the landscape and would create a coalescence of development with the adjoining villages of Millbrook and Lidlington. The increased traffic movements generated by the proposed development would impact upon highway safety for existing road users and pedestrians alike together with the increased level of noise and disturbance to existing residents. The proposed mixed use designations at this site would constitute part greenfield, part brownfield development, that would be out of character in this location.
Iain Clapham	<p>This site was given away to ensure jobs in Bedfordshire.</p> <p>The jobs are all gone - as should the Americans who operate this site.</p> <p>Any development here would be a slap in the face of the whole county that has lost public access to the most attractive piece of green space in Bedfordshire.</p>
J B Nockels	This site, if developed for housing would completely engulf the village of Lidlington. Neither roads nor services could cope with it.
Lyn Roberts	I anticipate that this development would impact on Millbrook more although I would have to say that there is a noise impact that the existing Proving Ground has on Lidlington. This noise maybe increased.
Marc Henshall	Is this a piss take?? This is huge! I don't think this would do allot for Millbroke or Lidlington's feel as a place!
Michael Brooks	This is an established employment site and therefore further employment development (excluding warehousing/distribution uses, for which access is unsuitable) would be acceptable, although improvements to road access and public transport would be necessary to reduce car dependency by employees and visitors. The remoteness of the site makes it unsuitable for any residential development. It is a long way from local services of any kind.
Michael Clothier	The road infrastructure is already overloaded in particular the junctions at both Millbrook and Lidlington to the a507. With the additional development of the Centre Parks the a507 not be the route of choice leading to a significant increase of both heavy and light vehicular traffic through Lidlington, Millbrook and Ampthill. the Millbrook proving ground is sited in a beautiful tract of countryside that would be lost forever if further development were to be allowed

Submitted by	Comments
Mr A. Weeks	<p>The total size of this site would dwarf both Lidlington and Marston Moretaine villages. Unless a new village is proposed then we do not see how this development is in keeping with the county development plan. In fact does this not go against the development plan which indicates size of village and appropriate development size? There are a number of alternative developments proposed for Lidlington, Marston and other surrounding towns and villages to meet planning requirements.</p> <p>A development of this magnitude would have a significant impact on the surrounding infrastructure, especially on the road network. The current road system, even with the dual A421 to Jn 13, will struggle to meet the demands of future proposed development in the Mid Beds area.</p>
Mr G A Larrington	Jobs will be lost if MPG think they can use the land for just housing.
Mrs S Clapham	This site is enormous and, if developed, would completely overwhelm the surrounding villages as well as destroy more of Bedfordshire's dwindling countryside.
Tim Mason	The area included a number of footpaths and rights of way that were closed off in order to create the test track. If the land was to be used for other purposes, then I assume that all the original rights would be re-instated.

LIDLINGTON APPENDIX TWO
Email Representations

Name	Subject	Comment
Roger Chick On behalf of Bedfordshire Area, Ramblers' Association	H211a Land at Sheeptick End, Lidlington	Lidlington Footpath No A5 is a dead-end route that crosses the site diagonally from the eastern corner. The footpath would probably require diversion if this site is developed.
Amanda Hickey	Lidlington	We moved to Lidlington three years ago because it is a lovely, quiet little village. It is a perfect location to bring up our family. We have already seen a new development of 70 houses by David Wilson Homes be built. This has already resulted in graffiti appearing and youths hanging about in the village playground. We would not like to see any further development which would see Lidlington change to a unpleasant larger village or even a small town. Why can't villages be left alone and towns extended instead or new towns created like the Wixams.
Jonathan Odams	Lidlington, site H081	I have completed the purchase of my new house in Lidlington in January last month on the edge of the David Wilson development off Marston Lane. Having relocated from Leicestershire village of Quorn, to an area of outstanding countryside views, this development will have a major impact on my family's quality of life. To purchase a property adjacent to open countryside in January to then have a proposal to build on this countryside in February is extremely disappointing. I feel cheated and misled by the builder David Wilson and if the MBDC agree to this development, by the council as well. Hasn't Lidlington been through enough development in the last 12 months!! I strongly oppose this planning application on the following grounds: 1) There are more environmentally sustainable locations elsewhere in the district 2) The site is not previously developed and there are better Brownfield sites elsewhere in Mid Beds 3) It would be difficult to design an appropriate development without affecting the landscape 4) There would be an unacceptable impact on the amenities of existing nearby properties such as play areas and walking routes 5) Additional traffic generation would be more readily accommodated elsewhere in the network Finally, the original development plan http://www.midbeds.gov.uk/Images/COL_tcm5-7865.PDF for the now completed Marston Road development stated in section 5.35:5.35 Remaining Land between the housing development and the ditch in the central part of the site shall be retained for, amongst other things, amenity use and opens pace associated with the development. To now renege on these plans is totally unacceptable.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

Jonathan Roots	Eco Towns and Site Allocations Process	It seems that Mid Beds are going about things in the right way but I'm very concerned that the goalposts on development are continually moving. It appeared that Wixams and these other proposals would culminate in our targets being met. Then we get the fast ball of possible Eco Town. Excuse me but what can be more Eco in Marston Forest/Vale but to leave it as er... Marston Forest? We definitely need to stop that and if we must develop further use brown field sites within the bounds of existing towns - e.g. old industrial units.
-------------------	---	--